

NCBV Quarterly Meeting
December 19, 2014
3:30pm

I. Roll Call and Confirmation of Quorum, Richard Saperstein

A quorum was present for this meeting.

Richard Saperstein, Chairperson
Bert Hansen, Vice Chairperson
Bill Schley, Northern Representative & Secretary
Harold Petrofsky, Southern Representative
Dustin Varnell
Beth Perring
Nels Brown
Mikie Yamada
Benita McHenry
Carol Ewing

Staff Present:

Melaine Mason, Deputy Administrator, Rehabilitation Division
Drazen Elez, ASO II, Program Chief
Russell Smith, BEO I, Rehabilitation Division, BEN
Susie Park, BEO I, Rehabilitation Division, BEN
Jeanne Clark, AA II, Rehabilitation Division, BEN

Robert Whitney, Deputy Attorney General, State of Nevada

II. Verification of Posting, Jeanne Clark

Jeanne Clark stated that this meeting's Agenda was posted in a correct and timely manner and was currently on file.

III. First Public Comment Session, Richard Saperstein

There were no public comments at this time.

IV. For Possible Action- Vote to Accept the Agenda, Richard Saperstein

Bert Hansen made a motion to accept the Agenda; Harold Petrofsky seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

V. Welcome and Introduction of Guests, Richard Saperstein

There were no guests present at this meeting.

VI. For Possible Action-Approval of the Meeting Minutes for the NCBV Meeting on September 12, 2014, Richard Saperstein

Bill Schley made a motion to approve these meeting minutes; Harold Petrofsky seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

VII. Old Business

A. Discussion-Update regarding Strategic Planning Project, Drazen Elez

Mr. Elez said that during the past meeting he was unable to discuss his updates regarding the Strategic Planning Projects due to attention given to other aspects of the meeting but wished to report the updates to these project goals at this time. Mr. Elez recalled about a year prior, when goals had been set up between the members and the Bureau, that there had been considerable progress in the year since reaching strategies agreed upon between Operators and the BEN Staff. Mr. Elez expressed his belief that the Program has since improved in making headway in the Strategic objectives goals.

Drazen Elez delivered his Strategic Planning report to the assembly regarding the past months.

#1 Goal: To have well trained Operators and staff:

1. In the past few months the Bureau has begun planning the annual Operator meeting putting together some preliminary ideas and will finalize those in the next few months.

#2 Goal: Develop an orientation to blindness for current and future staff.

1. Susie Park, BEO I completed training with Vickie Essner for technology and Suzanne Martin for mobility and independent living and BVR Staff regarding the various aspects of blindness.
2. The BEN Staff participated in conferences regarding business and management of food services. Specifically the BEN staff completed GSA training which the same training is given for Health Food Inspectors. This instruction was determined to help the staff understand and anticipate the similar sanitary issues within the one current BEN site inspected by the GSA in our Program allowing

them to anticipate and meet GSA health and sanitary standards and those in the future.

Goal: Encourage Staff to attend national training when available:

1. Drazen Elez and Melaine Mason attended the BLAST Conference in Austin, Texas along with Kae and Liz Pohe and Carol Ewing. The BEN Staff is also scheduled to attend the Sagebrush Conference in February 2015.

Goal: To recruit additional qualified, prospective Operators.

1. Continue Working closely with the BVR Staff to find new viable candidates in both northern and southern Nevada. Recently the Bureau has accepted one new potential trainee into the Program and another 4 individuals in the South are currently finalizing their documentation and then into the training program. Mr. Elez expressed his anticipation of recommending all or many of the 5 into the BEN Program. Mr. Elez discussed his ongoing meetings with other referred prospective Operators in addition to those already mentioned. 11:43

#3 Goal: To increase number of manned vending facilities:

Two new locations- The Sunset Park (currently in development of an Inter-local Agreement with the host agency) and VA Hospital in Reno were mentioned but will be discussed at length regarding their costs later in Section B. 12:15

Mikie Yamada is currently transitioning the Henderson Park Pavilion from being a partner-operated location to managing the site on her own.

#4 Goal: To manage Program resources efficiently with appropriate reserves to be maintained:

1. During the work with the Retirement policy revision the amount of reserve was identified with the assistance of the NCBV.
2. A budget proposal has been developed and submitted to the Legislature which included planned replacement of equipment according to the set schedule in order to enhance current site operations.
3. Revision on the Health and Retirement Policy has been submitted to RSA.

#5 Goal: To have clear and concise policies, procedures and protocols that effectively address BEN's current needs.

1. A list of policies has been created from which there are plans to revise in the next few months- some of which have already begun to be crafted. (i.e. There are current plans to revise committee bylaw as appropriate.) Mr. Elez suggested to

the NCBV Committee to begin to gradually identify those policies and bylaws which need updating by way of either scheduling a workshop or for by directing needed revisions to the appropriate NCBV subcommittees. 14:23

#6 Goal: Ensure vending facilities are managed efficiently with adequate profits and Operators are accountable for operations.

The Bureau is currently developing a Partner P&L to be completed each month and submitted to the Operators in order to assist the Operators and Bureau to have a greater, more accurate understanding of the actual operation of the site.

14:55

Beth Perring said she wished it was still possible to go to the online BEN Site to view the Bylaws and the Policies and Procedures. She asked if it was possible to receive a copy of the Bylaws and Policies & Procedures so they could be reviewed by members for revision. Drazen Elez agreed to Ms. Perring's request and advised that the Bylaws still appear in the official Rehabilitation Division site under the BEN tab. Richard Saperstein asked that a blanket email of these items be sent to all Operators. Melaine Mason asked that the website references of that location also appear on that email adding that approved NCBV Meeting Minutes can also be found at that same location. They have been posted beginning with the meeting February 21, 2014 to August 2014.

B. Discussion-Update on new, waived an in progress sites, Drazen Elez

Potential Sites:

Sunset Park Softball Fields-

The Bureau is in the process of developing an Inter-Local Agreement with this host agency which has been delivered to that agency. Mr. Elez added that Jeff Schumacher has kindly agreed to operate location for a time.

Reno VA Hospital-

This new location is about to open and the Bureau is working on a few proposed concepts of what type of facility this host agency and Bureau can agree upon. Once decided the Bureau can begin to develop a Federal permit. Mr. Elez acknowledged Richard Saperstein at this time for his aid in getting this location

underway which he judges will be quite beneficial to the BEN Program as well as those BEPs across the country.

Challenges for Existing Sites:

Both partners of the **Clark County Government Center** and the **Department of Energy** have given their notice to the Operator they would not be renewing their partner agreements this coming January. The Bureau is currently working on plans for transition solutions with the Operators and existing partners in order to assure continued proper operations are executed.

Nevada Department of Transportation, Reno (Carson City)

Susie Park, BEO I and Carol Ewing have been attempting to improve the standards of this Micro Market location by addressing the reported escalating issues to a higher level of the partner's company in order to reach an appropriate performance level of service.

Henderson Park Pavilion

Drazen Elez expressed his anticipation of having Operator, Mikie Yamada, manage this location without a partner beginning in March 2015.

Beth Perring asked if this operation was a Micro Market to which Mr. Elez answered that it was a location which caters to concert events within the Park and would not be a good fit for a Micro Market.

C. Reports from Subcommittees, Richard Saperstein:

1. Finance, Carol Ewing

No report at this time.

2. Policies & Procedures, Harold Petrofsky

No report at this time. Richard Saperstein requested that Harold Petrofsky schedule a subcommittee meeting to view the BEN Bylaws and Policies and Procedures for possible revision. Mr. Petrofsky agreed.

3. Training, Bill Schley

No report at this time. Bill Schley offered his time and support in his efforts to training the aforementioned candidates Drazen Elez mentioned earlier in the meeting. Mr. Elez thanked Mr. Schley and stated that he would reach out to him after his conference attendance that following week and that during his next visit

to Northern Nevada he would be meeting with these candidates personally and will meet with him to discuss the proposed training of these individuals. 22:55

4. Legislative Watchdog, Kawana Pohe

Mr. Pohe was absent from this meeting.

5. Future Planning, Bert Hansen

Bert Hansen indicated that Drazen Elez's earlier site report covered this subject; therefore he had nothing further to add. 23:30

VIII. New Business, Richard Saperstein

A. Discussion- Report on BLAST Conference, Drazen Elez

Drazen Elez initiated this discussion by expressing his appreciation to the assembly for being allowed to attend the BLAST Conference held in Austin describing it as a great opportunity to meet very influential individuals to the BEP programs throughout the US including the new leadership in the RSA who are managing the program. Mr. Elez mentioned meeting the new RSA Commissioner who is very knowledgeable and supportive of the national BEP programs who has hired a second person who can lend additional support to the RSA group. He expressed his pleasure meeting both individuals as he was able to gain their support and to suggest **implementing new, innovative and creative solutions** to our challenges to this new business environment rather than the same old habits which have been utilized in the past. They warned that blaming the poor economy was not the solution but to instead use inventive and resourceful ways in resolving these downturns. He learned that sales throughout the Randolph Sheppard businesses throughout US have decreased as well as the amount of Operators. Another message to existing Operators was to **mentor new blind individuals** entering the Programs. 26:03

Drazen Elez reported **healthy vending** as another topic for discussion. The idea of healthy vending was not limited to vending machines but for all food operations for all government entities who are moving in this direction. Their suggestion was rather than waiting for these requirements of healthier choices to be formally requested, be proactive instead by moving ahead early and adjust to offering such choices then to communicate this message of change to host agencies for their feedback.

The discussion of **leadership** and empowering oneself to becoming a leader and seeing the big picture in order to bring their program forward in

benefitting themselves as well as other operations in their home state and the entire US.

The **Hadley School for the Blind** had worked with Terry Smith, NFBEI and others within the blind community to create a training program for new operators. They wish to benefit smaller states recognizing their resource limitations that must resort to using much of the BEP Staff and exhausting their time. Larger states such as California or Texas have the ability to hire professional trainers. This training would include business, the financial aspect training of the Randolph-Sheppard Act, menu training, etc. after which each state would offer their own state-specific training.

Mr. Elez recognized this training as a great solution for BEN Program with a variety of benefits:

- To break from relying on one individual contracted trainer.
- Offers a more universal solution for new Operator instruction along with the benefit of having one dedicated instructor assigned to one potential Operator.
- Because it is a school operated for the blind there are several educated capable folks who have spent much to develop this training.
- By utilizing this website, individuals will not only get the greater overall training but the support available to produce an Operator with greater skill sets resulting in more successful outcomes, increased profits, set-asides and reduces loss of sites.

Beth Perring asks if this is a resident program to which Drazen Elez answered that it was an on-line training program. These courses will be offered in January 2015 and indicated a cost of approximately \$3000 per individual thus reducing other cost of training here in Nevada.

Drazen Elez invited Carol Ewing to express her comments regarding her experience with this BLAST Conference. Ms. Ewing described this 5-day event as excellent having approximately 600 vendors in attendance. Regarding the Hadley School for the Blind, she also gave a background for the school explaining that this school is the service project of the town of Hadley and in existence for quite a while and was quite excited about this on-line training. Terry Smith spoke about the NFBEI which BEN has subscribed to and continues to be enhanced. 34:00

B. Discussion/Possible Action-Makeover of BEN #38 Clark County Family Courts, Drazen Elez <Estimated cost of \$22,700>

Drazen Elez specified that the changes and modifications of this location have not yet been approved by the host agency therefore this preliminary plan which is being prepared is for the purpose of having it completed prior to the approval of the landlords allows the Bureau to move forward without waiting for another meeting. Mr. Elez stated that the current type of service, goods and its set up are not meeting the needs of the host agency and its 200-300 building employee population and traffic of about 600-700 per day which is being reflected in its revenue of approximately \$6000 per month. He further explained that the revenue -vs- foot traffic in that building underlines its underperformance and need for change which would be more representative of the services of the BEN Program. The modified plans include changing from the time consuming preparation of food in another room over to a coffee-style stand. Customers would have grab and go items such as sandwiches and salads, etc. Coffee would be the only prepared item as this location can support only one employee. Mr. Elez admitted that he felt this new proposed change revenue would vastly improve and the operation would be enhanced. 37:00

Beth Perring asked Drazen if a Micro Market would be appropriate for this space; Mr. Elez explained that Micro Markets work well in a controlled access situation and this site has more public access. Susie Park reported that she began her site modification discussions with the Court Administrator who seemed quite positive with her ideas as he explained that most employees must go through an airport security to enter the building; once inside it was a bit difficult to re-enter with food or snacks. She expressed her belief that this new plan for this site will work for the Program.

Beth Perring said that Papa John's sells a great prepared food and should be considered. Bert Hansen asked the cost amount of this modification and if a business plan study had been completed to determine if this cost justifies the increase in revenue from its present sales. Mr. Elez answered that based on a similar traffic studies at the Program's comparable sites, Clark County Family Court Snack Bar should earn an estimated revenue of \$18,000-\$20,000 -vs- \$5000-\$6000 or 200%-300% translating into higher paid monthly set aside. Harold Petrofsky reminded all of the fire restrictions imposed by the County Fire Marshall disallowing cooking in that

site and banning the use of extension cords used to keep food warm. He stated that he feels that this is a wiser plan considering these circumstances; otherwise he feared the site would fail completely. Drazen Elez asked for a vote on this project if approved by the host agency. Richard Saperstein asked Drazen Elez the timeframe for this renovation. Mr. Elez answered that this depended on the host agency and their speed of approval and pending other projects being developed after which will move forward in our plans; approximately 3-6 months 41:34

Bert Hansen made a motion to proceed with this Snack Bar's renovation (#38); Bill Schley seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

C. Discussion/Possible Action- Set Up of Possible Sunset Park Concession Stand, Drazen Elez <Estimated Cost of \$23,150>

Sunset Park was offered by Clark County to the Program last year giving the BEN Program an opportunity to establish a new site for a much lesser amount than most new sites. Much of this initial set up is already in. It includes plumbing and major equipment but would only need kitchen equipment necessary for operation and minor adjustments to the electrical. When Richard Saperstein asked Drazen Elez if this location was seasonal or year round Mr. Elez answered that the park is open year round, however it can be whatever the Operator wishes it to be as it serves seasonal adult soft ball leagues. The attendance has been measured to be 200-300 or 500-600 on the weekends for major events, whereby Mr. Elez adding that Sunset Park officials have been quite flexible as to the hours of operation giving the Program a choice and leaving that decision to the Operator's discretion based on his/her profits. The landlords were also open to allowing Operator/staff to operate an ice cream cart during busy or peak periods and will be written into the contract. Mr. Elez described this site as one that may not provide an adequate living to an Operator, but one that would be a great source of additional income as a second site. 44:46

Richard Saperstein asked the proximity of the snack bar to the softball fields and if a liquor license could be issued to the Operator. Mr. Elez answered that the snack bar is not only easily accessible to the 4 fields but in the middle of them. As to the question of the liquor license Drazen answered that it would not be allowed at this time as per the County. Mr. Saperstein remembered, in the past, operating softball complexes in

Carson City that most of the revenue was attributed to alcohol sales and without that type of support, he wondered if this would be a viable site. Mr. Elez agreed that with the alcohol sales an Operator could make quite a deal of money, however, believed that due to the high attendance and lack of nearby food establishments was a major plus. Bert Hansen opined that if alcohol use was anticipated, this site would have been operated by the County without requesting the Program's involvement.

Mr. Saperstein questioned whether the facility was large enough to house a grill, etc. There is no grill or hood presently on the inside, but possibly a grill could be placed on the outside of the snack bar. He stated that in absence of this grill the Operator would not be faced with longer lines and "wait" time as well as increased labor. He believed that by offering simple, packaged food initially would decrease labor costs. During a meeting a few months ago this site was presented and discussed as a new site. It was put out for bid resulting in Jeff Schumacher being assigned to this location from which contract negotiations began. When asked what Mr. Elez judged to be the timeframe in order for the Operator to pay back the amount of \$23,150, he answered that when revenue is low due to its seasonality the set aside schedule would take longer and based on this unforeseen set aside amount, he had no definite answer for him-probably a number of years. 48:30 Mr. Elez listed the types of equipment (hot dog roller, hot plate, coffee maker, beverage cooler, Panini grill, etc.) needed for this location including an ice machine and POS system while noting that 95% of this equipment is of a smaller nature and transferred to another location in case this location is not successful. Mr. Saperstein asked if this ice machine was a post-mix system for soft drinks, etc. to which Mr. Elez answered that it was.

Drazen Elez answered a variety of questions and concerns from Operators:

- ✓ Beth Perring described the park as being "huge" and heavily populated with frequent events occurring. She inquired about the possibility of using this facility as a concession stand on rollers/wheels. Using the Renaissance Fair as example, she questioned if those services could be transferred to that side of the Park in order to accommodate these visitors then return it to its original place for softball season. Mr. Elez agreed that this was a good idea and stated again his wish to add this option to the agreement with the Park to which they have initially agreed. He did

caution that 2 events- one being the Renaissance Fair had exclusive agreements with the Park for their vendors.

- ✓ Nels Brown warned that with a post mix system each tank will be 80% less due to its lack of water so there must be many tanks available. Drazen Elez said that his wish initially was to avoid dispensing with use of a soda fountain machine and utilize the grab-n-go bottle/cans due to the soda machine's high cost, time consumption along with the limitations Mr. Brown mentioned.
- ✓ Richard Saperstein asked if the water, power and sewage were already on site. Mr. Elez responded that there was, plus a currently installed 3-compartment and hand sink. Mr. Saperstein then queried whether park visitors were allowed to enter with their own food to which Mr. Elez replied that they were as it was a public park.
- ✓ Bill Schley wondered how many months this site would be operated due to weather conditions in Las Vegas despite other events which will fund this location. In this vastly populated, most visited park in the softball league alone lasts approximately 8 months Mr. Elez replied.

Bert Hansen stated that there is a 7-11 store across the street from this Park while Beth Perring countered this statement saying that this Park was quite expansive. Richard Saperstein voiced having a considerable amount of misgivings regarding whether the revenue needed to obtain the equipment was sufficient for its initial expenses; his doubts were based on his own previous experience with this type of venue. While appreciating Mr. Saperstein's input Drazen Elez expressed why this type of discussion was not expressed earlier prior to putting the site out for bid and awarding it to an Operator then initiating contract negotiations with Clark County. He added that at this juncture the Committee was now discussing a project that has already been approved well past several reports and updates of this location's status- all with no opposition expressed in moving forward. 57:34 Beth Perring repeated the concept she described earlier of taking this facility on wheels; Richard Saperstein repeated his doubts with this plan and this site's viability as it needed power, water and sewage. Beth Perring stated that all these utilities abounded throughout this large park. Mr. Saperstein then questioned if this item was voted on as he did not remember voting on it. Drazen Elez answered it was discussed last year and approved in September or October to which Mr. Saperstein asked if

negotiations with the County for this Park were currently ongoing and opined that if this was an action item which was already voted on this would have been considered an update. Carol Ewing remarked that she thought that the vote was to pursue this site to which Richard Saperstein said that though he does not remember the vote, if it was voted on, then proceed with it. Bert Hansen commented that “pursuing it” does not mean going forward with it but to get more information which is what Mr. Elez is now reporting. Mr. Elez stated that when information was initially sent out it was the same as what is now being discussed, including a list of equipment needed, along with a map of the Park, traffic, planned events and the Bureau’s assessment and its potential which was all emailed along with updates that are required.

Bert Hansen suggested that if this was an action item at this time then a vote should be taken. There was no motion to approve this item then Mr. Saperstein entertained a motion to disapprove this item and **Bert Hansen** made a motion to disapprove the Sunset Park Concession and Harold Petrofsky seconded the motion prior to calling for the vote. Richard Saperstein stated that since Mr. Petrosky seconded the motion prior to his calling for a vote then he felt that since they approved this acquisition prior to this meeting day then the process was midway and would have to call for a vote to disapprove this motion. Bert Hansen only answered “aye”. Mr. Saperstein called for a vote to approve this motion and no one approved this. Richard Saperstein wished to see the minutes which this was approved asking Carol Ewing to check her meeting minutes for this vote. Melaine Mason said that in August this was under Old Business and was discussed. She read from the Meeting Minutes of August 15, 2014:

[VII. Old Business

A. Discussion-Update on new, waived and in progress sites, Drazen Elez

Drazen Elez initiated his presentation with highlights regarding the following site matters:

Potential Sites:

Sunset Park, Las Vegas: The Bureau is presently working with Clark County Parks and Recreation on developing an Inter-local agreement after which the Bureau would go forward with the preparation of this site. The Bureau is eager to begin the seasonal operation, and later is anticipating the opportunity for a year-round operation.] 1:10

Richard Saperstein opined that if it was under Discussion and Update then there must have been a vote taken prior to this. Ms. Mason agreed reporting that she checked June, April and February 2014 and there was no discussion regarding Sunset Park, further research was needed to find

this item discussed in “New Business”. The time period of Fall of 2013 discussed as New Business was given by Mr. Elez. Richard Saperstein asked Robert Whitney if action can be postponed on this discussion in lieu of clarification to find if the NCBV had ever taken a vote on this site. Robert Whitney agreed that this was the appropriate action to be taken and presented until the next meeting with more information.

The Chair then entertained a motion to postpone any action until it can be researched and determined if a voted had been taken to approve or disapprove it. Bert Hansen made that motion; Bill Schley seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

When Mr. Saperstein asked other Committee members if they remember a vote being taken, none could remember, however Bill Schley recalled at least 3 discussions during previous meetings on the Sunset Park issue. Carol Ewing said that she did not remember a vote, per se, however recalled serious discussions and that it was to be pursued to see if this location could work. 1:10 Beth Perring expressed her observation in several random ice cream trucks in that area and that they needed to note the population while Nels Brown mentioned the requirement of knowing who else was doing business in that location. Richard Saperstein asked if the Bureau could determine their competition and if the Bureau could add a clause in the agreement with the Park to eliminate any other business within. Drazen Elez repeated that all of this relevant information has already been emailed to all upon initial discussion of the site and later as an attachment with the bid package. The idea of business exclusivity has also been agreed upon with the Park. He added that the 7-11 mentioned was a mile away from that location along with another mile and a half from a McDonald’s restaurant. Currently, in order for a visitor to buy food or drink, they must walk 25-30 min. to their location or leave the park, get into their car and drive through a few traffic lights involving a 20-min ordeal.

D. Discussion/Possible Action-Construction and Set Up of possible VA Reno Concession/Coffee Stand, Drazen Elez <Estimated Cost \$32,700>

This location was listed as a Potential Site in the Site Update attachment and considered a “new build” scenario costing more with three possible operational options. Drazen asked Susie Park, BEO I, to contribute to this presentation. Ms. Park stated that she has been in contact with Arlee, the Bureau’s contact at the VA Hospital and has presented her with three (3)

concepts to be considered in order to narrow down these options. This individual has not followed up or decided at this time. Regarding the actual construction with utilities- the electrical and plumbing will be supplied by the host agency and would be dependent upon their choice for the use of this area. Our purchase cost of equipment and custom fabrication is estimated on the “high side” of \$32,700. Since the host agency’s design decision has not been chosen, this estimate is the combined cost of all 3 of the proposed concepts. Richard Saperstein reported that he and Ms. Park went to visit the new wing of the hospital a few months prior and their proposed area for the BEN space is on the 2nd floor of the new wing with medical specialization located across from a walkway in an area close to scheduling/reception. His concern about this proposal involves the area of a wall 13 ft. wide x 20-25 ft. long with one side containing nothing but windows and currently set up as a reception area with a few chairs and little electrical for our needs and no plumbing set up at this time. Typically this 13 ft. wall set up would require a 3-compartment sink with two drain boards and a hand sink giving little room for other equipment. Secondly, in walking in the front doors of the hospital’s first floor, you walk directly into a clean, organized coffee & food stand or canteen. Beyond this area there was another 7-day per week spectacular full sized cafeteria also located on the main floor with ambient lighting with a variety of food bars with grills and fryers to prepare a vast assortment of foods. The VA’s proposed area for the BEN Program brings the site up to the 2nd floor with a breezeway connecting the main building with the new wing which brings the visitors into a reception area for specialized medicine and BEN’s proposed area.

Susie Park described this proposed operation as a coffee/ grab n go gourmet pre-packaged item operation –vs- the Cafeteria’s prepared food set up Mr. Saperstein described. Ms. Park listed the three ideas presented as a coffee cart, mini mart with more dry goods or a mini mart with more refrigerated selection. Since the proposed area is an outpatient area with 2 floors more traffic is expected during the day. It’s open Monday through Friday scheduling appointments 7:30am-5:00pm with upwards of 1200 employees seeking various new items. The hospital houses 110 beds in the main area as well, but in the new wing there are about 35 out-patient examining rooms with a constant visitor turnover with surgery areas that will facilitate waiting family members making this a viable site. Richard Saperstein added that the elevator drops off people in front of the proposed area. Beth Perring inquired about the viability of vending machines to which Mr. Saperstein expressed his doubt and reinforced Ms. Park’s plan

of offering unique gourmet food and drink which is not available throughout the rest of the hospital. 1:21

Melaine Mason advised that due to staff changes, etc. she became engaged in this project attending several meetings including one in the spring with Drazen Elez. She then acknowledged that certain traffic would not flow into this proposed new wing location, however, due to the proximity of this proposed space to those who will utilize this specialized 2nd floor area and the unique food she envisions this area to possibly not be hugely profitable but viable as is always a consideration for a new site. She reminded all to keep in mind that the Bureau does not wish to waste Program expenses or BEN staff time on anything but viable sites.

Ms. Mason listed positive areas of consideration in this discussing in gaining this site:

- She also specified that this would lead the BEN Program into the VA, which would be the only national BEP site within VA hospitals that is either absent or struggling allowing Nevada to become a front runner.
- The VA's openness to the Program within the last year and a half's discussions to negotiate this site includes an individual who is supportive of the Program and knowledgeable with the Randolph-Sheppard priority and also remembers Benita McHenry during her Las Vegas operation. This individual is also supportive of the fact that the Program can offer services that the canteen services either cannot or will not.
- With the advent of this relationship with the support of this individual the Program may have a bridge to opportunities into the Las Vegas VA market.

1:25

Richard Saperstein agreed with these points adding that this project must be accomplished in an appropriate, yet profitable fashion with the correct Operator who will offer great customer service as well as positive customer relations with the VA- all of which must be fulfilled if other VA opportunities would become available to the Program. In speaking of the physical makeup of this building he added that this new wing had its own entrance and that once in the new wing there was quite an inconvenience walk to the main building if one wished to visit the canteen or cafeteria. Susie Park agreed describing a walk down an elevator and through an extremely busy

hallway where patients are transported, etc. with the VA's representative, Arlee, expressing her surprise in the ease they were able to walk through during that time. Ms. Park also described the VA's support for this site offering expansive marketing opportunities and signage inside and outside near the sidewalk and TVs advertising services for the proposed area throughout the hospital.

Nels Brown asked if this would be a 7-day operation to which Susie Park answered that currently it was Monday through Friday 7:30am-5:00pm but the hospital indicated that these hours were likely to change with the needs of the patients. Richard Saperstein described a nearby area asking if big screen TVs, to accommodate the length of a patient's wait and draw customers to that area, could be added. Ms. Park's response was since this construction was in its preliminary stage; all suggestions will be considered and summarized. She anticipated this new spot to be a well-populated viable site with its foot traffic and unique location. She reported that representative Arlee preferred the current proposed area and big screen TVs are a great idea. Bert Hansen advocated a superb presentation by the Bureau to the VA in order that the Program avoids a stereo typical perception the VA may hold for BEN services. **Bert Hansen made a motion to pursue and proceed with this location; Bill Schley seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.**

E. Discussion/Possible Action: Review of the BEN Medical Reimbursement Policy, Richard Saperstein

Mr. Hansen wished to clarify to all Operators that one must have their request for reimbursements at scheduled times asking that schedule emailed to all. Drazen Elez agreed to resend to all Operators the email Melaine Mason originally stating that there have been emails originally from Janette Parish then by Melaine Mason regarding this matter. Ms. Mason reminded all that the policy and procedure regarding this item was crafted within the last 1 ½-2 years and passed through the Committee and Subcommittee identifying submissions by the 20th of the month following the end of the quarter and once they become published the 20th will read in the policies and procedures instead of reading "quarterly". She cited incidences of individuals submitting claims after 6-10 months. She also reminded all that per NAC & NRS this Statute is legally known as "Health Care Costs" and needs to align with the present regulation as it is currently referred incorrectly as "Medical Reimbursement". Being viewed as more

items changing; Ms. Mason wished to state that nothing is changing merely aligning it with the regulatory name.

Beth Perring asked what each period consisted of and when they occur:

Period Quarters for Claims Due

<u>Quarter</u>	<u>Due by</u>
1st January through March 2015	✓ April 20, 2015
2nd April through June 2015	✓ July 20, 2015
3rd July through September 2015	✓ October 20, 2015
4th October through December 2015	✓ January 20, 2015

In discussing responsibilities of reporting claims and the individual's unknown responsibilities, Melaine Mason interjected explaining that the policy pending RSA approval does allow cases in which the medical insurance does not report patient responsibility in a timely way would be understood and demonstrated recently as not being within that individual's control. Holding on to medical claims for a several months is not supported as this information is needed for the Bureau's financial reports.

Richard Saperstein asked if the proposed policy revision for both Health Care Costs and Retirement have been received to which Drazen Elez answered that though they have not presented any questions, there has been no approval so far as a result of his several emails of inquiry. They have stated that they feel this will be approved, however, after approval of the RSA they judge a few months later. Melaine Mason repeated the revision approval process; RSA approval, then returned to the Bureau and then the Bureau would submit to the Legislative Council Bureau and placed on the next Legislative agenda which meets every other month. Ms. Mason stated she highly recommends that all Operators attend to make statements, to ask questions and voice opinions. NCBV representation is needed during that hearing. After that is approved it becomes a regulation and that the corresponding policy requesting the one time distribution will require a work program that goes to Interim Finance Committee which meets every other month. Prior to that following the regulations change the new Policies and Procedures must be accepted to go forth and get authority in the BEN budget to distribute these funds. She judged a timeframe of approximately 6 months to be completed with this change and that regulations would be in effect and the Policies and Procedures tell all how to distribute these funds for both Health Care Costs and Retirement

requiring a meeting every two years to decide this distribution. Beth Perring asked if this would impact this year's Retirement distribution in January. Ms. Mason stated that it would not as the Bureau was following the current regulation. The paperwork is prepared for distribution in January. After the revision is in place then multiple distributions can be made based on what is approved in the new Policies and Procedures.

IX. Second Public Comment, Richard Saperstein

Beth Perring offered to join Harold Petrofsky's Policies and Procedures subcommittee team to which Mr. Petrofsky readily agreed.

X. Discussion- Date for the Next NCBV Meeting, Richard Saperstein
February 13, 2015 at 3:30pm was chosen.

XI. Adjournment, Richard Saperstein

Harold Petrofsky made a motion to adjourn; Bill Schley seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

This meeting adjourned at 5:22pm

1:49