Minutes – March 17, 2010 Meeting

Present in Springfield: David Vaught
Ed Bedore
Mike Bass
Diego Ferrer
Rick Morales

The Board started the meeting by confirming attendance at 11:30 a.m.

Member Morales made a motion to approve the minutes of February 9, 2010. The motion was seconded by Member Bedore. The motion was unanimously approved.

Chairman Vaught stated that the Office of the Inspector General requested to be moved up on the agenda due to time constraints. The Board agreed.

First up was the Existing Contract Review of the Office of the Executive Inspector General (OEIG) for Learning Management Systems Contract with Meridian Knowledge Solutions. Director Matt Brown gave a brief summary. The Illinois Procurement Code requires a 3/5 vote of this Board in order to conduct a review of an existing contract. The reason for this review is a request from Senator Susan Garrett on the issuance of this contract and its subsequent administration. Director Brown stated that he has been in some contact with OEIG and their staff to develop some thoughts about the proceedings today and before any discussion occurs the Board is required to take a vote. A motion was made to initiate a contract review by Member Morales and was seconded by Member Bass. The motion was unanimously approved.

This is the contract that the OEIG utilizes to provide on-line ethics training for State employees. This is a system that has been required by State law for the past four years. This process has been done electronically for the duration of those four years under this contract. Senator Garrett has some additional questions about the contract that the Board could not answer in the context of its pre-execution review of all State contracts. At her request it has become an agenda item. In attendance for OEIG is James Wright, the Executive Inspector General, First Deputy Sydney Roberts and Director of Ethics Training and Compliance Dave Keahl. Mr. Wright stated that they would be happy to answer any questions that the Board might have about the contract. Chairman Vaught asked that they provide the Board with a little background about the bids and competitive selection so the Board could understand the subject matter. Mr. Keahl stated that the original contract that was signed with Meridian in 2007 and was competitively bid. The purpose of the contract was to deliver State employee ethics training via the internet. In the first RFP process there were 12 bidders. There were four finalists and Meridian was chosen on the basis of their technical response to OEIG's business requirements as well as their price. It was really their price proposal that distinguished them from the other bidders. Member Morales asked what the term of the contract was. Mr. Keahl replied three years. Member Bedore asked why it was rebid after one year. Mr. Keahl replied that Meridian failed to meet one of the requirements in the contract. One of the key elements of any course by the State that is provided on-line is a requirement to comply with State law that the content be accessible to people with disabilities and the vendor was unable to produce a course that met those standards through a subcontract for that specific purpose. Member Bedore asked if OEIG was paying two contracts at the same time. Mr. Keahl replied no. There were payments made in FY09 under the two Meridian contracts, but the payments on the second contract began after the termination of the first contract. Chairman Vaught asked Director Brown to explain how the Board will proceed and what to expect. Director Brown stated that the Board's review typically exists on three levels: 1. the competitive nature of the solicitation as it was developed, evaluated and awarded; 2. the fiscal nature of their administration, particularly in light of a contract being terminated and subsequently replaced in a very similar if not identical fashion. The Board will be exploring the conditions in which that occurred as well as the nature of competition for that transition from contract #1 to contract #2; 3. The Board will be looking for the types of expectations the agency has of the vendor considering the first contract was terminated for cause. This will be the exploration the Board will be doing in the upcoming weeks and will reduce those questions to writing for staff to analyze and respond to. At that time it would be shared with the Board members and would be placed on the next agenda.

Mr. Wright replied that they would be happy to provide the Board with whatever information is needed. Mr. Keahl asked if the Board had any other questions that they could answer that could help the process along. Director Brown responded that from the staff perspective no, but for the Board's benefit. For example, with the nature of the fiscal year questions in the contract itself and how the contract lays out, could OEIG lay out for the Board what was the anticipated spend in the contract compared to what was actually expended as you closed each fiscal year? Director Brown stated that OEIG's numbers reflect differently from solicitation to contract to actual payment. So, there is a reconciliation question. Mr. Keahl replied that the difference between what gets advertised when a contract is first initiated is based on an estimate of services that are going to be provided as compared to what is actually expended. This is explained largely by the differences in numbers of employees that were trained subsequent to the signing of the contract. OEIG is spending less money currently than previously anticipated under those contracts. Director Brown asked if they had a general number of employees trained. Mr. Keahl replied that in FY07 they trained about 130,000 employees using the on-line training system. There were about 6,000 lost as a result of community colleges no longer using OEIG's services after FY07. Then the State law changed in terms of their jurisdiction and then subsequent to that there were minor decreases to the employees trained in the two subsequent years. What the Board will see going forward is roughly 60,000 using OEIG's on-line learning management system as a result of the universities using their own resources to provide on-line training to approximately 70,000 of their own employees. Director Brown asked if that was for FY10. Mr. Keahl replied affirmatively. Member Bass wanted OEIG to think as they are creating their response to the review. Approach the question or answer a question that would be based on whether Meridian had an implicit vantage point into the re-bid and in reality since they were the incumbent, but from a deeper level now. Member Bass stated that it sounds to him on this initial conversation that it was really the pricing component that drew the advantage to Meridian, which says on the technical side there were not as many diversions. Mr. Keahl replied that OEIG scored on a total of 2200 points and 600 were on price in the second RFP each of the three final vendors were very close in terms of their technical scoring and Meridian was actually second in that process, but their price was roughly 40% less than the second lowest bidder and there was even more disparity in the first RFP. Mr. Keahl stated that he certainly did not think Meridian having familiarity with their operations is all that accounts for the price disparity, because it existed the first time around. Member Bass stated that it existed the first time around and they didn't do what they said they were going to do. So did they effectively price their bid? Mr. Keahl replied that their inability to meet their technical specifications the first time around had to do with a subcontractor who did not have the technical expertise in the familiarity with the State's rather specific accessibility requirements and therefore failed to produced an appropriate course. No further questions were asked.

Next on the agenda was OEIG's lease #6006 at 32 W. Randolph in Chicago. Mr. Nick Kanellopoulos representing the Bureau of Property Management for CMS gave a brief summary. Mr. Kanellopoulos stated that the lease is a five year term that initially was posted to the Procurement Bulletin and also was sent to the Board. It included a 1 ½% increase in rent and through some discussions with the Board CMS realized that the rate would be unacceptable. CMS went back to the lessor with that information and continued negotiations and posted an amended lease to the Bulletin, which included a 10.85% reduction in the 1st year and the same reduction through the entire term. This lease was for 17,000 sq. ft. of space, however during negotiations the lessor provided information from an architect indicating that the actual square footage occupied by OEIG had been re-measured and had been 18,598 sq. ft. The State Architect reviewed the materials submitted and verified that the materials were accurate. There has been no expansion of space it was just the discrepancy in space. All utilities are covered in the rent rate with the exception of the electrical. Mr. Kanellopoulos stated he would be happy to answer any questions. Member Bedore stated that the 10.8% decrease is great, but in addition the State will be paying $350,000 more for the additional space that was just found. Mr. Kanellopoulos replied affirmatively. However, he stated that it is unlikely the space was ever exactly 17,000 sq. ft. It is an old building.

Member Bedore stated that the point is that the owners of the building are not going to see as big as a cut as you stated. Mr. Kanellopoulos replied affirmatively. Member Bedore made a comment from a Tribune article a few weeks ago. It stated "Over the weekend Quinn's budget director said that municipalities must share the pain of Illinois huge budget deficit by giving up part of their income tax collected by the State". That means every city across the State is going to take a 30% cut. Then the budget director for OMB said "you need to take a look and say OK does everyone have skin in the game". Do these owners and the Inspector General have skin in the game? Member Bedore stated he does not think so. When looking at the appropriation books OEIG did not get cut, but also OEIG is asking for an option of 6,800 some feet of additional space on the 17th floor. Over 10 years it is $1.5 million more. Member Bedore thought that the State was in bad shape and every city had to take a cut, why does the Inspector General have to be in downtown prime office space? Why pay downtown rate when the State is in trouble? If OEIG wants to stay in the space then the minimum should be a 15% - 20% cut in this rate. Why isn't this being cut? Member Bedore does not think these owners are sharing the pain. Do they have skin in the game? Member Bedore said they don't. Why is the State in this location? On top of that when you take a look at this there is a lot of storage space, conference rooms and understands file space, but that is all the more reason that they should not be in downtown prime space for unmanned space. Member Bedore asked if Mr. Kanellopoulos compared the extra space that was deducted to other leases. Member Bedore said he did a comparison on just the leases today. On South Indiana in Chicago 17% space for supplies, conference room, storage and file rooms. On East Madison 18%, Marion 25%, Western Ave. in Chicago 14%, Randolph Street in Chicago is 37%. Almost 40% of this lease money is going for storage and conference rooms, which could be on the West side in a warehouse somewhere. Member Bedore does not understand this, where is the pain. The budget director said that everyone should share the pain. Mr. Kanellopoulos replied that as for the files being in storage versus being at 32 W. Randolph that is not accurate. The OEIG is required to have all active files and all closed files from the past two years on site. Member Bedore stated that he was not arguing that point, the point is why do they have to be downtown? Mr. Kanellopoulos replied that the OEIG's office is a block away from JRTC; it is two blocks away from the Bilandic building and very close to numerous other State offices. Member Bedore asked if they were close to the offices in Springfield. Mr. Kanellopoulos stated that there is an office in Springfield. Member Bedore asked what their rate in Springfield was. Mr. Kanellopoulos replied that he did not have that rate. Mr. Kanellopoulos stated that the point he is trying to make is one way OEIG conducts business is State employees can walk over to their offices to file a complaint. It makes it easier for employees considering the vast number of employees in Chicago are within blocks of their office and can walk there. It makes sense to have it off site because there could be a chilling effect if you had to walk through State offices to be seen walking into the OEIG. Member Bedore said that he agrees with that. Mr. Kanellopoulos stated that is the reason it is downtown. Member Bedore said that it should be out of the loop. So, they would have to walk an extra two blocks. Why does it have to be in prime downtown space across from the Daley Center building? It doesn't and you know it doesn't. Also, there is an option of adding an additional 6,800 square feet. Member Bedore stated that he is going to make a motion to have that stricken from this lease. Mr. Kanellopoulos replied that the only way that option will be exercised is if OEIG increased their headcount and if that occurs due to their requirements to add more staff in Chicago then it would be posted to the Procurement Bulletin and the Board would see that. Chairman Vaught stated that he agrees that the Board would see it, but would it come back to the Board for review. Mr. Kanellopoulos replied that it would not be an agenda item. Mr. Kanellopoulos stated that a white paper would be submitted to the Board if the expansion option was exercised. Member Bedore asked why OEIG is not getting cut and the Procurement Policy Board is getting cut by 22%, the State Police is getting cut by 15% the city of Chicago, Springfield, Bloomington they are all getting cut by 30%. Member Bedore is making a proposal that this be cut by 20%. Member Bedore stated that about a year ago the National Realtors Association stated that commercial leasing was being decreased across the country. A 20% reduction and we have not seen that here. Member Bedore stated that OEIG should either move out of downtown or reduce the rate by 20%. Member Bedore wanted to know what skin they have in this. What skin do the owners have in this? Member Bedore said he does not see any.

Chairman Vaught stated that the Governor did propose a one year change for municipal reimbursement and the leases that we are doing are a little more permanent and are not the same thing for comparison. Chairman Vaught knows that the State Police is being cut, but those numbers are not finalized yet and he does not want anyone to misunderstand. Chairman Vaught does agree with Member Bedore's facts. Chairman Vaught wanted to know why CMS is not reducing the size of these lease by applying the new space standards. Mr. Kanellopoulos replied that the space is being used and there are no vacant areas or offices. Chairman Vaught asked if there is an applied standard and like that for DCEO, who currently has 100,000 sq. ft. in Springfield that exceeds the space standards, but in the new lease for DCEO when it was bid they are being reduced to 57,000 sq. ft. So, if DCEO can take a 40% reduction in space why can't OEIG take a reduction in space when it is in more prime and expensive space than DCEO? If there is going to be a standard it should be applied across the board to achieve savings and not just in rate, but also in use of space. Why is this organization exempt from that? Mr. Kanellopoulos replied that they are not exempt. The rules specify the standard of utilized and used space. In existing space CMS looks at issues like the cost of reducing the space to achieve that standard and this space would have to be re-built out again to achieve those kinds of numbers. Every office and workstation would have to be shrunk to achieve the overall decrease of square feet per employee. It wasn't to change each and every lease that comes before the

Board. Member Bedore stated that OEIG has 37% of this lease for back office operation and no one is questioning on whether it is being used or not used. The point is can they be somewhere else and not pay $20 a square foot. Yes you can and that is the point. OEIG should have never been there. The rate is way too high. OEIG can go to another building and it can be set up the way they want it.

Mr. Wright was given the opportunity to respond and stated that OEIG has had skin in the game for the last three years and have had a flat budget for the last three years. Much like the Board with increased responsibilities, OEIG also has increased responsibilities with legislation that was passed last August. OEIG is to act as a hiring monitor as well as review revolving door determinations and his last count each agency was suppose to put together a list of people who would have to have this revolving door determination on whether they can take employment elsewhere. The list OEIG just received was about 4,000 people and it gives them 10 days to turn around this determination. OEIG is severely understaffed and that is the reason why they are asking for more money and resources. Mr. Wright stated that OEIG would also like to see a lower rate in rental fees. Many of the employees come into the office via public transportation and if they are to move and still have the public transportation accessibility OEIG is willing to move. Member Bedore stated that this Board has been more than flat for the last few years and is getting a 22% cut. OEIG might have been flat, but is not getting cut. Member Bedore stated that he can find OEIG a savings of $400,000 – $500,000 by lowering the rent and that can be used for other things in appropriation. Member Bedore stated that by lowering the rate by 20% and dropping the option and you have got it. There is over $300,000 there and you can use that for something else. You talk about how you save money to the State and got money back. Member Bedore stated that in the past five years this Board has cost the State $1.3 million dollars to run and can document that we have $31 million dollars in savings in that 5 year period by the Board and believe that is a really good return. Member Bedore just stated that he showed OEIG how to save $300,000 - $400,000 if they are willing to do it and if CMS is willing to do it. Member Morales asked if the expansion option could be taken out. Mr. Wright replied that from OEIG's perspective it was only in there in the event that they get additional resources. If they do not get the additional resources then there is no reason to seek this additional space. Member Morales asked if it was taken out and OEIG did get additional resources can they expand then. Mr. Wright replied that he did not know. Mr. Kanellopoulos replied that CMS could amend the lease to add that type of square footage and would come before the Board for their approval. Member Bedore made a motion to object to this lease for a 20% reduction in the rate and to take out the option for the additional square footage. The motion was seconded by Member Bass. The motion was unanimously approved.

Next on the agenda was CMS facilities. Mr. Kanellopoulos wanted to give the Board a brief update. Mr. Kanellopoulos stated that on the Concordia lease CMS was able to go back to the lessor and get the $450,000 used towards rent abatement over the term of the lease. The holdovers are currently at 22. There are 17 in holdover and 5 that will be expiring between now and June 30, 2010. In August 2009 the goal for CMS was initially to reduce costs of security by $4 million dollars. On March 22, 2010 security reductions will be just a little over $4,013,900 in security reductions. Mr. Kanellopoulos stated that he will continue giving updates as they are made.

Chairman Vaught wanted to know where CMS was on the rules process. Mr. Kanellopoulos replied that one of CMS' attorneys is working with JCAR and they were sent a draft to format and it was sent back with questions and requests for additional information, which was provided to JCAR. CMS is waiting to get back a formatted draft from JCAR and at that point CMS will be ready to file. No further questions were asked.

Chairman Vaught stated that there are policy issues outstanding on SB51 including discussion on amendments. Chairman Vaught asked the other Board members if they think Director Brown needs to be more involved in that so the Board is a little more informed and it is clear that the Board's views are being expressed. Director Brown replied that he would deliver the Board's intentions to remain engaged in this process and maintain communications that are required to work both policy and implementation levels. There have been a number of phone calls recently and levels of participation are just now coming forward. He would be happy to report to the Board on the content of each of those meetings and the Board level of participation.

Director of Operations Doug Kucia with CMS stated it is exactly their intention based on the implementation side to involve the PPB at this point. This has been a pretty dogging task and for the sake of efficiency and time management, CMS wanted to have things more fully flushed out and analyzed so the interaction between the PPB and the various subcommittee groups would be productive and fruitful. Mr. Kucia stated that Director Brown was very helpful in a previous meeting that was held and moving forward, CMS intends to involve the PPB in terms of implementation in their discussions. Chairman Vaught asked if CMS is recommending to the General Assembly that changes need to be made to SB51 on sole source. Mr. Ben Bagby Legal Counsel for CMS replied that CMS did propose at one time that the sole source provision be changed so when there is an objection to a sole source posting that the particular posting go to a hearing and not every single transaction that CMS has. Mr. Bagby believes it was presented again, but does not know the status of it. In FY09, the four CPO's did about 1,200 sole source transactions and of those, CMS did about 352 and when a hearing is done on each one of those it involves a great investment in staff time. Mr. Bagby wanted to update the Board on their sole source hearings. Senate Bill 51 had a requirement that a public hearing be held. Since CMS had not done hearings before and thought it would be a good idea to do a pilot hearing to figure out what it takes to manage these sole source hearings and what impact they might have. There have been 12 hearings over the past several weeks that dealt with 49 sole source postings. Out of the 49 hearings, only 4% actually had a sole source issue that should be dealt with in a public forum. Mr. Bagby stated that notes were taken and comments were considered from the audience and the PPB representatives on the course of events. After that CMS reported their experience to the SB51 sole source hearing subcommittee. If the Board has any suggestions CMS welcomes them. No further questions were asked.

Mr. Kucia wanted to make the PPB aware of the timeline. April 1st CMS expects to have the first part narrative and recommendations completed. April 14th is the CPO meeting at 10:00 a.m. in Springfield and they are in the process of scheduling an April 22nd meeting where the recommendations will be presented to the PPB, EEC and the Governor's office and all Constitutional Officers. Then there will be a systems focus to make sure come July 1 that there will be an electronic solution to the subcontracting requirement and recording of vendor communication.

Next on the agenda was DCFS lease #5230 at 1911-1921 S. Indiana Ave. in Chicago. Mr. Kanellopoulos stated this lease is a 125,265 sq. ft. lease. It is a five year firm lease. This office contains many administrative functions for DCFS. Two of the nine floors are open 24/7 for issues dealing with children. That is why the electricity and security cost is higher. The current lease is $18.19 per sq. ft. It has been the rate since 2002. The proposed lease drops that to $17.25 per sq. ft. A separate parking lease was also eliminated that existed in the building, which cost the State $1.09 per sq. ft. per month. There is an estimated total cost reduction of 7.3% for savings of almost $250,000 in the first year. Included with the lease the lessor will carpet and paint throughout and install a master switch to help lower the cost of electricity by shutting off all unnecessary lighting in the building. Chairman Vaught asked how many moved in from the consolidated site. Mr. Kanellopoulos replied 80. Member Morales wanted Mr. Kanellopoulos to explain the parking and how it goes from 373 to 290. Mr. Kanellopoulos replied that the lessor is re-striping the lot and making the spaces wider. There will be no adding or subtracting of any spaces. Member Bedore stated that CMS was paying this rate for 373 spaces and now it is being reduced to 290. CMS was paying a $1.09 in the rate for additional spaces in a different lot. Mr. Kanellopoulos replied affirmatively. Mr. Kanellopoulos stated that the $1.09 was on top of the $18.19 because it was a separate lease. Member Bass wanted to clarify that CMS is not renewing the second lease for the parking. Mr. Kanellopoulos replied affirmatively. Member Bedore stated that in the current lease the $18.19 included janitorial and now janitorial is being covered by the State and you still say we have a savings. When you take $1.40 a way the rate goes to $16.79 and from that the proposed rate is an increase of $0.46 and the State is now covering the janitorial. Chairman Vaught stated that you have to look at the total cost, which shows the decrease from the previous lease. Member Bedore stated that it is an increase on the rate and not the total cost, and the State is still getting fewer parking spaces. Chairman Vaught asked why DCFS needs fewer parking when 80 people were just added. Mr. Chris Tower, representative for DCFS, replied that more staff is using public transportation. A motion to approve this lease was made by Member Morales and was seconded by Member Bass. With a vote of 3-2 with Member Bedore and Member Ferrer voting “no” the motion was approved.

Next on the agenda was DHS lease #5817 at 319 E. Madison in Springfield. In attendance were Mr. Tony Baptist with CMS and Drinda O’Connor with DHS. Mr. Baptist stated that the total square footage is 41,677. This is a five year lease with a 120-day termination notice. The base rent is $12.95 with an additional $1.07 for janitorial, which the lessor will provide. There are 102 staff member currently there now. DHS has received approval to hire additional staff which will bring the total headcount to 141 in the next 60 days. The current sq. ft. per employee is 336 and when all 141 are hired it will bring it down to 243 sq. ft. per employee. Chairman Vaught requested more explanation on the increase. Ms. O’Connor replied that their DD Division is getting 23 new staff plus 3 contractual and approval for that and the 23 are coming as the result of the HOWE closure. DHS Mental Health office is replacing 6 staff who are retiring and the same with the Alcohol and Substance Abuse Division who has one staff member retiring. DHS is looking at moving 6 additional staff from the Harris building and that accounts for the total. Member Bedore asked when the last increase was on rent. Mr. Kanellopoulos replied January 2002. Member Bedore made a motion to approve this lease and was seconded by Member Bass. The motion was unanimously approved.

Next on the agenda was DHS #5239 at 1107 W. DeYoung in Marion. Mr. Baptist stated that the total square footage is 10,875 of space. Lease #4121 is being terminated at 102 W. DeYoung also in Marion and will be relocated into this lease. Base rent is $11.50 for the term and the State will cover the cost of utilities. The total square foot per employee is 225. There is also a security guard that will be terminated on March 31, 2010 that will be taken out. Member Bedore stated that this is a 17% increase. If you take the total rent over term and add the two leases it is still less than the proposed lease by $203,000. Mr. Kanellopoulos replied that Member Bedore is correct. This lease was bid out and CMS received four responsive proposals and the incumbent lessor was the lowest bid received. CMS was able to achieve a lower rate than the one proposed in the RFI because it would have involved a build out of merging these two offices and was able to accommodate it in the existing space. Member Bedore stated that there is no doubt that there are reductions in the square feet and everything else, but there is also an 18% increase in the base rent. Member Bedore made a motion to reject this lease and go back and re-negotiate for a lower rate. The motion was seconded by Member Bass. With a 4-1 vote with Chairman Vaught voting "no" the motion was approved to reject this lease.

Next on the agenda was DHS lease #5323 at S. Western Blvd. in Chicago. This is a 43,228 sq. ft. office that has 124 employees. CMS is proposing a five year lease. The current lease has a rate of $17.93 per sq. ft. and the proposed rate is at $15.24 with a 1 ½ % increase in years 2-5. This is a very highly trafficked office and it is well utilized and asked the Board to approve this lease. Member Bedore made a motion to approve this lease and was seconded by Member Morales. The motion was unanimously approved.

Next on the agenda was Legislation. Director Matt Brown gave a brief summary. Director Brown stated two pieces of legislation have emerged and are not reflected in the summary document. They are Senate amendments that developed yesterday and today. The first amendment is for SB2887 and was passed unanimously out of committee to establish Procurement Policy Board review to leases that are competitively selected similar to what we do currently do with renewal leases. The other piece of legislation was SB375 and was posted as an amendment on the calendar yesterday. This is a bill to the Procurement Code that would require all contracts in excess of $250,000 in value to be re-bid at the next expiration of that contract. Member Morales asked what this bill would accomplish. Director Brown replied that it does two things. The most impact is that it halts renewal or extension not withstanding any other provisions of the Code. No contract entered into under this Code may be renewal or extended by the State if the total value of the contract for the initial and all of its renewed and extended terms exceed $250,000 and must be rebid at their next opportunity. No renewals shall be exercised under this law. It further states that a new contract must be let by competitive bid. This subsection does not apply to any emergency procurement or any procurement exempt under the Code. Chairman Vaught stated that many of the contracts have already been bid and have renewal clauses in them. Director Brown replied affirmatively. Chairman Vaught thought this has gone a bit far. Director Brown stated that the analysis the PPB was able to do resulted 1,000 contracts annually are issued in excess of $250,000 aggregate value. Predominately contracts of that size have renewal terms associated with them. Some of those 1,000 contracts a year are stand alone term contracts, but most are not. In the database over a four year data capture that in excess of 10,000 contracts to this value exist and if they have renewal options those are still active. Director Brown continued that there are 8,000 contracts that are in existence today with renewal options available to them currently that will be forced into a re-bid environment. Member Bedore wanted to know who sponsored the Bill. Director Brown replied Senator Kotowski. Member Bass wanted to know what the driving force was. Director Brown replied it is turnover. There has been no debate on the floor on this because it was a floor action that was sent back down to committee for discussion. Chairman Vaught stated that needs to be more discussion on this because there has to be a balance. Member Bass asked what the underlying bill was. Director Brown stated it was a shell bill that was Senator Cullerton's bill from last year. Director Brown wanted to know what the Board direction on SB2887 was. The Board replied they are in support of the bill. No further comments were made.

The next Board meeting is set for April 8, 2010 at 11:30 a.m. in Springfield.

With no other business to discuss Member Bedore made a motion to adjourn and was seconded by Member Morales at 1:30 p.m. The motion was unanimously approved.