



Chairman: Jay Stewart

Members: Ed Bedore, Ricardo Morales, Larry Ivory, Bill Black

### **Minutes – August 7, 2014 Meeting**

Present in Springfield: Jay Stewart  
Ed Bedore  
Larry Ivory

Present via Telephone: Rick Morales  
Bill Black

The Board started the meeting by confirming attendance at 10:05 a.m.

Member Bedore made a motion to allow Member Morales and Member Black to participate via telephone. The motion was seconded by Member Ivory.

The first item on the agenda was the approval of the minutes from the last meeting. Member Bedore made a motion to accept the minutes as printed and was seconded by Member Morales. The motion was unanimously approved.

The next item on the agenda was follow-up issues from prior meetings. Director Carter stated that there was no follow-up memo this month. All of the items for follow-up needed some extra space so all of the follow-up items have their own tab in the packet. The first one up is the follow-up on the Illinois State Police. Under that tab there is a chart that breaks out the average mileage per ISP units. He thinks there are about 10 categories and it provides that information on the number of vehicles and the average mileage. The second item for follow-up, Susan Florence with CMS, provided some photographs of Franklin Life and the kind of storage that is available in Franklin Life and when they talked last month about the amount of square foot that was noted as storage in the Franklin Life Building. She also provided some photographs that show what storage is on-site and he thinks a large part of that, from the pictures you see, 3-stories that were originally referred to as a vault in that building, which is windowless and a little shorter ceiling capacity around 8 feet or something like that. One of the floors is fenced off, gated for different units of not only police, but also local government.

Member Bedore stated that since we are on the Franklin Life building, he would like to note that at our last meeting CMS presented the Board with a goal of 755 employees for that building and he would like to remind everybody of the December 2012 meeting held by this Board in which Member Bedore stated that he realizes that there is space for radio rooms and interrogation, but hopes that CMS would be over 1,000 employees and the response from Mr. Nick Kanellopoulos at CMS was that the goal is to reach 1,000 employees. Member Bedore stated that he is not sure what happened between 2012 and 2014 because we lost 240-245 employees. He is not sure which is true anymore. Is it 755 or is your goal still 1,000. So when they come up maybe they can straighten him out. He was just going back to what CMS said in 2012.

Chairman Stewart stated that it might also be helpful whatever the numbers are, are they long term goals or short term goals. Is 1,000 long term or 1,000 short term or 755 or whatever the number may be. Obviously, the numbers shift a little bit over time, but Member Bedore pretty clearly stated that the 25% shift approximately and some projections are just that, projections, but that might be helpful. He knows often times his agency would determine a headcount where they are talking about the fiscal year, not necessarily multiple years and it is not clear to the Board when they hear 1,000 or 755 is that this year or is that what you want it to be in the end when you are all done whenever that time period is. As far as one can reasonably project in

*M:140807*

222 SOUTH COLLEGE STREET, SUITE 231, SPRINGFIELD, IL 62704  
Telephone: (217) 785-3988 Fax: (217) 557-9927 TTY: (888) 642-3450

the future he thinks that once you get past 10 year projections you are just making numbers up. That would be helpful for the Board to understand. If CMS is saying one thing and the Board does not read it that way then there is going to be confusion and if it changes, it changes. Shared terminology is often helpful and again, maybe it's just a number change, but as they address this it has come up several times and it could certainly come up with other facilities. Chairman Stewart stated that he has run into it, he knows everyone has run into it when you say something in your head and you are also adding a few extra words in there because that is how you all use it at your agency or his agency or whatever it may be and then the listener doesn't catch the subtleties because they are not exposed to it or maybe the number is just different he doesn't know, but he is just throwing it out there. He thinks that this is something that Member Bedore has returned to on more than one occasion and is pretty confident that he will continue to be very curious as to that issue with this building specifically, but he would argue that it could be applied to any particular facility when doing space projections. One year, five year, ten year and the Board may not always track which one CMS is using. His assumption is that the Board assumes that is what the numbers are going to be in the near future and maybe that is not an assumption they should have. He doesn't want to belabor that any further. Any other follow-up matters. Since Member Bedore stepped away the Board is going to table this momentarily until Member Bedore returns. Chairman Stewart stated that they will just jump around the agenda until Member Bedore returns.

Chairman Stewart stated that in previous meetings the Board has expressed concerns about the University of Illinois. Director Carter has re-drafted a letter from Director Carter on behalf of the Board to the U of I. It's in the packet and again, Board members were at those meetings it just tries to encapsulate the Board's concerns about the planning or the lack thereof by the University and at this point if the Board approves Director Carter will send the letter and if there are no objections, if someone would like to make a motion to approve the letter then Director Carter can finalize the letter and send it out. A motion was made by Member Ivory and was seconded by Member Bedore. The motion was unanimously approved.

Chairman Stewart explained to Member Bedore that they tabled the previous decision until he was able to return. He was just telling CMS that they will likely revisit this issue, but the issue at large is when they are doing these headcount calculations is it this year, next year, five year, ten year or whatever. Member Bedore stated that his only comment was that CMS at the last meeting said that their goal was to get up to 755. They're at 600 and something now so their goal was 755. Here two years ago the goal from CMS was 1,000. Chairman Stewart stated that if the numbers have changed and they know why or was the number just inaccurate. Whenever the Board gets these projections a little explanation what that projection is and when you are looking at it - it says 1,000 to the Board it means 1,000. He is aware that there could be some subtleties in there that aren't in there, but that is what the Board is looking to CMS to try and provide a little more context and if it has changed then that is ok, but a little explanation on why the number has changed to the extent CMS is aware, obviously, CMS cannot know all things. To Member Bedore's point, this is something that he thinks that he has brought up and other members of the Board have brought up about when there is an assertion of how much a space is used later on the Board, maybe not every time, is going to go back and see what was the space usage and if it is different then of course the Board's going to ask questions.

Director Carter stated that the next item that was requested for follow-up was some further elaboration or explanation on what the position called a "Day Porter" on some of the leases. CMS provided some information on that, which was included in the Board's packet and Rick Tate, Statewide Facility Manager with CMS is here today and can answer any questions the Board might have on that position.

Chairman Stewart stated that it looks like there are 17 of these positions at leased facilities, assuming that some may be at State owned facilities. He is assuming that all of the positions are bargaining unit covered positions. Mr. Tate replied correct. Chairman Stewart stated that he knows that the Board was looking specifically at State leased facilities, 17 it looks like here, even if you don't have an exact number, but do some of these types of positions exist at State owned facilities. Mr. Tate replied yes, there are AFSCME as well as Teamsters located at various State owned and leased facilities providing building and grounds labor. Chairman Stewart stated that it has been mentioned by members of the Board and by CMS the last several years there has been consolidation of real estate and facilities by the State, has the number of laborers in State leased facilities or in State owned facilities, has the number remained flat or has that number changed or do they have the same as they did 5-6-7 years ago. Mr. Tate replied that the numbers change through attrition,

not necessarily for operation purposes, but through attrition and not backfilling of those positions. Chairman Stewart asked if that was likely to continue on a forward looking basis. Mr. Tate replied that attrition continues and non-backfilling positions continue, so yes.

Member Bedore stated that the cost of these employees, are they on CMS' payroll. Mr. Tate replied affirmatively. Member Bedore asked if benefits and everything else is CMS. Mr. Tate replied correct. Member Bedore asked if the using agency is charged through the CMS indirect cost. Mr. Tate replied that the cost for the payroll are allocated through the FMRF per the facility or per the facilities they tend to, which could be more than just the headquarters they are located at. Member Bedore stated that there is a specific line that says, CMS Indirect Cost. He is asking is that in the CMS indirect costs. Mr. Tate replied affirmatively. Member Bedore stated that he wanted to clarify that when CMS states that their payroll and all benefits, pension, hospitalization is then charged to this indirect cost. Mr. Tate replied correct. Member Bedore stated that he realizes that they are talking about snowfall and things of that nature, but what do they do, clean up during the day? Mr. Tate replied that there are many issues that they could be dealing with, internal moves within a facility, they could deal with, as indicated before, urgent issues in terms of janitorial issues, spills, anything to maintain the integrity of the building throughout the course of the day, to address urgent issues associated with the tenants of that facility and clientele. Member Bedore asked if he could give an example of an urgent issue. Mr. Tate replied a spill in the elevator, a spill on the foyer in front of the elevator, moving desks from point A to point B, basic issues, day porter issues or just maintenance issues. Member Bedore stated that this is where he has the problem with it, the maintenance issues. Mr. Tate replied that maintenance issues depend on the urgency and the criticality part of how critical the issues are. Obviously, the lessor is responsible in most cases for repairing HVAC and things of that nature, but if it is a simple fix then the AFSCME trades address those issues just to make sure that buildings' continuity continue and operations are going smoothly, due to high volume high traffic. Simple as making sure there is toilet paper in the stalls. Member Bedore stated that he is just trying to comprehend what a person does for 8 hours. Mr. Tate replied that all he can say is that they provide those services as needed throughout the course of the day. They are also working off-site when time is required and address other urgent issues at other locations within that geographic area. They also deal with off hour's calls and alarm activations and things like that to be the first man on site to respond to those types of activations, boots on the ground. Member Bedore asked if they do minor repair to the building. Mr. Tate replied that it could be as simple as hanging up a picture or it could be replacing a towel bar. Member Bedore asked if State employees hanging up a picture, is that outside of AFSCME's rules, he doesn't quite understand. Mr. Tate replied that he was really referring to more like pictures in a reception area where the general public would attend to and not within the personal space to hang up an individual's picture. Member Bedore asked roughly what type of salary they are talking about. Mr. Tate replied that he did not have those numbers. He thinks \$58,000 is the base rate. Member Bedore stated \$58,000 and then you put on benefits, pension, so then you are talking about \$70,000 - \$80,000. Mr. Tate replied probably \$80,000. Member Bedore stated then we pay also \$2.27 for janitorial. Mr. Tate replied that through schedule J on the lease, correct. Chairman Stewart stated that he believes they are a little more focused on the leased facilities, but of the 17 positions how many facilities in total, it sounds like some have multiples and some just service one, but it might be helpful if the Board could get how many total facilities does the 17 touch, plus what's the total square footage of all of those facilities combined, like how much space are they responsible for maintaining or providing these services. Mr. Tate replied to bear in mind they are not dedicated exclusively to one building and if there is a....Chairman Stewart interjected that if they have a route, for lack of a better phrase, that they regularly attend to and geographically where are these, are they together or far apart. Mr. Tate replied that they could identify where they are consistently dedicated to it wouldn't be a problem and whether it is State owned or a leased facility. Chairman Stewart asked geographically where these are located, are they close together or far apart. It might help the Board get a better understanding of the time commitments too if they have several buildings spread out you are probably in transit a lot, then if it is one building you only do then it is a different animal to some degree. Mr. Tate replied for example, the ISP locations have dedicated staff and they're obviously isolated and scattered throughout the State. There is one person that maintains the entire facility. Chairman Stewart replied right. Mr. Tate stated that they would be glad to respond.

Member Ivory stated that he just has a couple of questions. He thinks the question that's at hand for him, at least from his side, is that when you run a company, you run a business and Mr. Tate you seem like a guy with a lot of experience. Mr. Tate replied that it's gray hair. Member Ivory stated gray hair means you've

been around for awhile at least. He thinks the challenge that he has is that as we take a look at the cost that the State has incurred and the taxpayers are incurring, is are we getting the best bang for the buck? If you were running your own company and this was your money he guesses the question would be that when you take a look at the numbers of people for 8 hours whether it is hanging a picture or whatever, is this the best we can do. Do you have any suggestions that you would make, if it was your own company, in terms of, how you better maximize the potential, reduce the cost, and create efficiency. Do you have any thoughts in terms of what you would suggest unless you think you are maxed out and you have done everything you can do, he would just be curious to hear what your thoughts are on that? Mr. Tate replied well, that's an age old question that they ask all the time, outsourcing versus the in-house. He means his contention is that in terms of the issue becomes that of ownership and a State employee assumes the ownership and responsibility to maintain those facilities versus an outside party who come in and goes out, and really doesn't have any invested interest in making sure the client are satisfied. One could argue that either side, but from his perspective as facility manager, having State employees dedicated to facilities is in the best interest of the State to ensure that we have consistent, continuous quality service. CMS outsources more than they do in-house, as far as outside vendors to maintain State owned facilities. Member Ivory states his question is only do you have any other ideas in terms of, because he thinks the challenge for him is when you're paying someone \$58,000 and they're hanging up a picture, obviously that's an expensive picture hanger. Mr. Tate replied that he doesn't want to lower it down to that level. They are providing lots of different services, for example on a snowy day to make sure that clients and employees are walking into a safe location you have to have somebody there that is responsible and dedicated to make sure the walk is clean. Member Ivory stated that he definitely appreciates that. The question is from your perspective with your experience and background do you think we are maximizing our potential and what you're saying is that you think so. Mr. Tate replied that he thinks it's a good hybrid mix to have outsourced and also the State employees dedicated to facilities, yes. Chairman Stewart asked if any Board members on the phone had any questions or comments.

The next item on the agenda was ISP Lease #3147 at 1810 S. Main Street in Morton. Director Carter stated that last month the Board voted to object to this lease based on some of the clauses that were contained in the contract. Ms. Susan Florence is here to elaborate, but he thinks that with them going back and re-working with the landlord they were able to achieve some savings, so this lease is back and this is more of a notification on savings that they did receive. Susan Florence, Lease Administrator with the CMS Bureau of Property Management stated that the landlord did offer some concessions. He did eliminate the tax and insurance escalation clause and offered one month's free rent each of the last five years throughout the term. Member Bedore stated each year for the last 5 years? Ms. Florence replied affirmatively. One month free each year for the last 5 years and that created over the term a savings of just over \$90,000. Member Bedore stated that he's glad that they got insurance knocked out, he thinks that should be part of their policy. He doesn't think they should see that in any lease. Member Bedore made a motion that the Board accepts the revised lease. The Chairman stated he thinks if the Board does nothing it goes through and he agrees with Member Bedore's statement the Board doesn't have to do anything and they approve of these changes in the contract and those are some substantial savings.

The next item on the agenda was DHS Lease #5113 at 915 E. 63<sup>rd</sup> St. in Chicago. Director Carter stated that again, this is a lease the Board objected to last month and as a supplement to your meeting packets the staff handed out this morning some savings that CMS was able to achieve negotiating with the landlord from the last meeting until today. So that is separate from the meeting packet and was handed out separately, and again, Ms. Florence will elaborate, but he thinks the lessor has agreed to take on garbage as well, as well as lowering the cost per square foot. Ms. Florence replied correct, they had previously, prior to posting the renewal, had gotten nearly a 4% reduction in the renewal rental rates. The lessor has given us an additional \$0.52, which brings the total to a 6.42% reduction and he's agreed to take over cost of garbage. Member Bedore stated that's a step in the right direction, but he has a problem with the square footage per person. He knows there has been some disagreement, or he should say a difference of opinion, in what the square footage per employee should be. Some say 275 some say 250, this is 314. He doesn't know how we can do this and one of the problems is that CMS has this building and it looks like a very well maintained building. It's in a very challenging neighborhood and he understands all that, but he also understand 5 years ago we spent almost \$500,000 for improvements, and one of the biggest items in that improvement list was the files. CMS put this file system in and it looks great and it's a wonderful system. It's on a floating floor or whatever and then on top of that we paid, he doesn't know what the amount is he had it all here somewhere. CMS had a



company come in, BSC, to come in and do the work on the files. They came in and they cataloged, they marked it, they did everything, we spent hundreds of thousands of dollars, and then you look at these pictures, and they have offices that are being used for files. That's why we're up at 314 square foot per employee. So even if he took their 275 they're nowhere near it and the reason is this. You're using office spaces for files. Ms. Florence replied that she thinks that's part of it, and she admits she's not been in this facility personally. When she got the photos she did contact DHS about files and high destiny and why aren't files being moved and she doesn't have that response yet, but she did contact them about that. Member Bedore stated that he thinks CMS has done a great job of getting the overall cost down, but he believes they can get this down, there has got to be a way of closing down areas or moving more people in if you could get rid of these files. The Board keeps hearing that this goes back to Governor Ryan, Governor Blagojevich, and Governor Quinn. They keep coming forward at these meeting and telling the Board we're going to eliminate files we're going to consolidate, we're going to digitize, we're going to do everything. CMS keeps coming here and telling the Board all these great things, we spend \$500,000, we bring in an outside firm to help us and then we wind up with this garbage, and then we're paying top dollar for storage space. Ms. Florence replied that she thinks part of the issue with the area per person, again not being in the facility, just looking at photos, is the way the facility is designed, and the way it's laid out in the bullpen area that has a lot of open space around it so it is not necessary.... Member Bedore interjected stating that we designed it. The State of Illinois, CMS, designed this. Ms. Florence replied 20 years ago, yes. Member Bedore stated yeah, well, CMS designed it and then modified it 5 years ago, so what we're just throwing more money at it. Well we can't have AFSCME employees doing this filing we'll just throw it in another office, we've got all this space why not use it, instead of saying, hey can we move more employees in here? There's got to be other agencies that they can consolidate or you've got to go to the owner and say we're not using this back half of the office when we moved stuff around, seal it off, we don't care, put up plastic, we're not paying for it. You know we're stuck with these buildings, what we went into 20 years ago and it's a great looking building, but we don't have those employees any more, they're long gone and what do we do to compensate for it, we use it as files, we use it as storage, and that's how we get 314 per square feet per employee. Member Bedore stated that even using your standard of 275 we're nowhere near it, and he is really having a problem with this one. Plus, you're paying two something for janitorial and you have a porter, and granted the landlord came down in their overall rate, well they should pay for all the utilities, we pay for all the janitorial even with a person on the State payroll. Well, he did have garbage, but that has been dropped, mat service, alarms, we pay for escalator of the property taxes. What does this owner pay for? He doesn't pay for anything. Member Bedore stated that he is sorry, granted the Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) is hard up for money and probably the University of Notre Dame as they are co-owners here with a group of other people, and being the former Treasurer of the CTA he shouldn't be fighting against the CTA, but he doesn't understand, what are their expenses? We pay for janitors, we pay for the utilities, we pay for everything, and plus we have a person on site to take care of things, minor things like to put up a towel bar, do this, do everything and shovel the snow during the winter. What does the owner do? My god, we should be being charged \$10 a square foot. At 900 E. 63<sup>rd</sup> St. in Chicago and we're going to be paying this amount for the owners to do nothing except collect the checks. Director Carter stated that this doesn't change any of Member Bedore's points, but the research he did with CMS and working with DHS it seems to him that the need is there and the goal was there to have almost as many as 20 employees. Is it fair to say that the budget just isn't there currently to have those, even though the need is there? Ms. Florence replied yes, she doesn't believe that DHS has any immediate plans to add staff here. They do have some attrition vacancies, this is a location where they don't have any immediate intent to hire. Director Carter states the need is there? Ms. Florence replied affirmatively, which was discussed before. This is a really high traffic area they get about 5,800 walk-ins a month, the current caseload, which I have here somewhere, is over 35,000 clients. Chairman Stewart asked annually? Ms. Florence replied current as of today, as of a month ago. Member Bedore stated that there is no question this area of the city of Chicago needs this service. He is not questioning that at all. Member Bedore stated that he doesn't even question the condition of the building, he just questions their utilization of this building and why CMS hasn't gone in there with their computer guys, and with their storage, and their file people. The Board used to get reports every month or so, the Board hasn't heard from anybody at CMS in months. It's got to be over 6 or 8 months about what they're doing. Obviously, they're not doing much when you see these pictures. So that's his argument with this lease. It's not the need, nobody's questioning the need, if anything else they probably need more employees, he does not doubt that. Ms. Florence replied that she believes that was Director Carter's point. Member Bedore stated that he is not arguing this, his point is its still 314 square feet per employee, and a lot of the office space is being used for storage, that's wrong. Why should we be paying \$20 for storage when we

can rent storage for \$6 and \$7 per square foot? That's his argument, so he doesn't want to hear anything that he's against this building or this facility, or what they're doing. He thinks they're doing an outstanding job, but he just doesn't think that CMS is utilizing this building properly. Chairman Stewart asked if any other members have any questions or comments on this particular lease. Director Carter stated that 54<sup>th</sup> Street was consolidated into this one, is that right? Ms. Florence replied that she's not sure. Member Bedore stated wasn't it from 59<sup>th</sup> and Ashland. Ms. Florence replied maybe, honestly she can't remember off the top of her head. Member Bedore stated that he remembers this, that it's terrible how he can remember these leases, holy jeez. Member Bedore stated that CMS did a great job 5 years ago. They moved from a facility that was underutilized into here and it is still underutilized because of files. Member Ivory stated that the question that he has is that Member Bedore makes a very good point in reference to utilization and becoming more efficient. Is there anything that CMS could begin to do that even if the Board approves this particular lease, CMS has a game plan and strategy as to what you can do to get rid of some of this space, but what he thinks the problem as you said is the economies behind it, you may need more employees, but you don't have the money for it so that's not really going to change much. Ms. Florence replied that's part of it, and part of it again is the layout of the building. It's not easy to just go in and close off a couple doors or put up a partition and cut a couple thousand square feet out of the building. That often requires construction and it requires a new configuration, it requires moving employees around it's not something that you can just go in today and close a couple of doors. That's something they're always looking at is ways to maximize the efficiency and use as well and use as little space as possible in some facilities it's just not a simple fix. Chairman Stewart asked if anyone on the phone had any questions or comments. Member Morales stated that he thinks it's been pretty well looked at. Chairman Stewart stated that at this point the Board can do nothing and it moves forward or the Board can vote to object, but if there were an objection and the lease is not approved, what would happen next? Ms. Florence replied that they would likely have to do a 364 day lease, and put it out on the street, put it out for bid. Chairman Stewart asked if they have any information or belief as to whether there is a useable facility. He's assuming this is one that the location is important as it serves the lone community. Ms. Florence replied exactly, the boundaries... Member Bedore interjected stating that it is on a transit and there is no question about it. Ms. Florence replied that she certainly is not over familiar with the area. She can't imagine there's a lot of office space in that line. That's not to say that they won't have more than one offer. Chairman Stewart stated that he knows they can't predict the future exactly. Member Bedore stated that he won't have any objection to this lease going forward. He has an objection, but he's not going to object to it, but he would like to see Will Walker from CMS at the next meeting, and he wants all these pictures given to him to ahead of time and he wants him to review and to go out there and say hey, I think we have to do something. Director Carter stated that since he is going to make the request isn't Doug Kasemis still in charge of the file reduction at DHS? Ms. Florence replied yes. Chairman Stewart stated that he believes that Doug is off to better opportunities. Ms. Florence replied that she wasn't aware of that, sorry. Director Carter stated that he will start with Mr. Walker. Chairman Stewart stated we're going to talk about the square footage issue more in general here in a little bit. It's safe to say this is in the future with 300 feet plus. Ms. Florence replied that she doesn't disagree. No further questions or comments were made.

The next item on the agenda was IEMA Lease #3504 at 1035 Outer Park Drive in Springfield. Director Carter stated that it's an Emergency Management lease in Springfield the information before the Board, the personal square footage per person is 252. The lease rate is at \$12.13. The information is in the packet and Ms. Florence is available for any questions. This does require a Certificate of No Objection from the Board. Member Bedore made a motion that the Board has no objection to this lease. The motion was seconded by Member Black. The motion was unanimously approved.

Chairman Stewart stated that the next issue the Board is going to talk about the specifics of E. 63<sup>rd</sup> Street, but square footage calculations, what are the triggers, what are the goals? He'll summarize briefly, he thinks Member Bedore has a few more concerns perhaps, but the issue of a topic that comes up maybe not every single meeting, but he would say it comes up pretty regularly, the short time he's been here and he thinks in a recent meeting it was raised, at least the Board was under the impression the square footage for space was 250 and perhaps CMS has a different metric, and the Board has an insert here in their packet, office space standard area allowance, other spaces trying to give the Board a flavor of what CMS is shooting for in its use of space etc. The Board can talk about specific numbers, his question is relevantly straight forward and he's not talking about specific recommended square footage for a particular category, but who determines what these numbers are and what the process is by what is determined and then more importantly how is it tracked,

in other words. He is pretty confident this isn't statute, the law says it has to be X. Chairman Stewart stated that his question is more specifically, is this in rule? An administrative rule that goes the whole JCAR process or is this simply internal metric CMS utilizes on a daily basis when it's doing its space evaluation, calculations and assessments. Ms. Florence replied that 275 has been our internal metric since at least 2009. She doesn't believe it's currently in rule and is not certain of that. She is not involved in the rule making process. She thinks CPO Matt Brown is here and can answer those kinds of questions.

Matt Brown, Chief Procurement Officer for General Services, stated that he has some information that he can share with the Board. He's not sure that he can paint the entire picture, but he should be able to bring the conversation current based on where some of these numbers are, what the metrics are, and where he thinks these discussions were previously. CPO Brown stated that he was going to start from a timeline perspective. He thinks the last time this was touched on was approximately January 2013. The fall prior to that in 2012 there was a series of discussions occurring, those discussions really surrounded the conclusion of the first set of administrative rules revisions since 2010. What was occurring at the time was a revision of the CPO's rules, not just mine, but all four CPO's in a variety of capacities as well as drawing distinctions to what agency rules might remain as new rule makings occurred. So very specific to this subject its Title 44 Article 5000 that deals with space standards and that was a CMS rule that's been on the books for quite some time. Associated with that rule making they have worked with CMS for several months to decide how much of 5000 would need to be incorporated into the CPO rules. So they meet with that responsibility and incorporated those changes into the CPO's rules, but Article 5000 remained on the books in an unedited fashion, so there is still some overlap, if you will, for that section. Now he thinks the relevant parts of the discussion for how they arrive at numbers, what the numbers mean in the way of operations. So, yes the space standards, at least today, are part of the administrative rules, they're held in Appendix A of Section 5000. As to the destination in the conversation if it's 250 or 275, the last conversations that were really going around the space standards associate a number of 250 as it relates to the current rules on the books. CPO Brown stated that he'll give the Board some basic descriptors. The starting point for an executive level officer commissioner etc. is 240 square feet and that goes up to 300. The top number associated with an administrator is 250 square feet and goes down. While those numbers move around based on various configurations in the building, that's a number that's been on the books for some time, one of the things that the rules don't contemplate is aggregation of space. The rules are written in a way we can presume that we can cordon off 250 square feet precisely here and 175 square feet precisely there and that has left CMS with a more operational requirement that they have been trying to meet, and as he understands that number that they're trying to sustain is 275 square feet as an aggregate. Now at the time there was also discussion while in a different, jurisdiction and very much exclusively metropolitan, they were also discussing the city of Chicago space standards, which were much tighter than standards in these other facilities. Those numbers in some cases were 30%-40% lower than the numbers that were on the books in these administrative rules. CPO Brown stated that he thinks that might answer most of the questions. One of the things in this conversation that just came up today is some basics about, and he knows that we had it in other conversations about file cabinet space. The current rules on the books speak to filing, they speak to things like field operations where you've got personnel who are in and out. All of those are areas that are designed to be addressed. He thinks the question is are we operating to a modern standard, or are we operating to one that is manageable. What is the delta on finding out how many of those uses are in one facility and what should that average number be. He can tell from his personal experience he relied often on a whole building design philosophy and tried to look into how complex some of these facilities can be and it's not easy work all the time, it can be somewhat challenging. So that's the information he was prepared to offer and he hopes that tied answers to questions the Board had, but he certainly would spend as much time as the Board would like on the subject. Member Bedore asked now these rules they're not part of JCAR, they've gone through JCAR already, right? CPO Brown replied no, this is a JCAR administered process. Member Bedore asked and it has been approved? CPO Brown replied not in the recent era, these rules, he believes he has a document here that references it, he believes the last update for this set of rules shows 2006, but that's also a working copy. We have not seen a revision post 2006 to this area. Member Bedore stated that going back the Board has gone through various Boards here; various Chairmen, and they keep spinning their wheels. July 2008 Chairman Healy asked if CMS has established space standards. Ms. Armstrong said at the time they do have rules, but have not been updated. Then on March 10<sup>th</sup> Chairman Vaught wanted to know where CMS was on rules, the rules process, and Mr. Kanellopoulos replied that one of CMS' attorneys, he knew this was trouble once the attorneys got involved, is working with JCAR and they will be sending a draft and it will be sent back with questions and

request blah, blah, blah. That was March of 2010. Then in July of 2010, this is after March, April, May, June, and July the CMS attorneys have had this Member Bedore asked what progress has been made on administrative rules? Mr. Kanellopoulos replied that unfortunately no progress has been made. And that's basically where we're at today, and he's tired of talking about this. Member Bedore stated that he really believes CMS, and keep the attorneys out of it, should sit down with the CPO and our staff, and let's get some things down on paper, and nobody is saying this is set in concrete, we understand there are circumstances, but he's tired of this for 7, 8, 9 years. He can go back, Mike Bass asked these questions, Rick Morales asked these questions, there was even questions being asked by Carmen Trish-Colvin. He means that's how far back we go. We've got Trish, we've got Rick, we've got himself, we've got Matt Brown, we've got Mr. Kanellopoulos, and we've got the attorneys from CMS. We are still talking about it, my god can't we get anything done in this State, can't we sit down and work something out. He is tired of it. Chairman Stewart stated to build on that, 2006 was that last time this issue has been addressed in a comprehensive fashion and since that time the State, through efforts of various parties, this Board included, has reduced space, and our headcount is down a lot from the 2006 calendar year. So on those facts alone, not even accounting for anything Member Bedore just said, the State is a different animal then it was from 2006 and he understands if we have the whole SB51, that wasn't present in 2006, which has changed how we procure everything, and he understands a lot of that takes some time to digest, but land use is a pretty basic function in State government, and he understands there's still a lot with SB51 we're working on the details, he understands that, but to Member Bedore's point he would argue if nothing else with the State's portfolio is changed drastically since 2006. The State's headcount has changed drastically since 2006. The physical situation is lean and probably going to be lean for a while, to be polite, and all those things combined, and he knows one just does not craft a rule overnight. Even if you do, JCAR often has many questions, but to Member Bedore's point, of the issues the Board has raised concisely, again maybe all the issues the PPB raised probably cannot be addressed through a rule, as specifically as he addresses it he sees that, but some of the basic issues, the higher level issues, could be addressed, and he always understands agency, he is in an agency and is reluctant to make a commitment rule, because god forbid the fact pattern come around tomorrow, which it will where the rule doesn't fit. Rules can be written in such a way to still give agencies flexibility, it doesn't require someone to put their name to it. Chairman Stewart stated that at his agency they do all sorts of stuff, and if he makes a decision he's going to be sued for it, that just comes with the territory. It doesn't prevent me from making the decisions anyways. They have rules and he can waive those rules, in many instances those rules can be waived by the Director, but he's got to write it down and he's got to sign it and if it all goes south no one else carries the heat, he does. Chairman Stewart stated that he does it all the time because you have to. The rules sometimes they cover 99% of the situations they don't cover the 1% you don't want to be an inflexible bureaucrat you can look at the bigger picture. So he understands agencies' sometimes inherent concern about trying to put too much operational matters in a rule for fear of then they're hamstrung by it. He would say he doesn't know if we're looking down to go to the most micro-granular level, we understand the agencies have to deal with the realities on the ground, but he can also say from the agency perspective rules can be written in a way that allow you to make an exception to your own rule. It's just someone's got to put their name to it. He thinks that's what higher level staff, which that's what pretty much everyone in this room is, that's why we're here to make decisions to be held accountable if they're right and if they're not right, so he encourages you, and he thinks it would be helpful because these issues aren't going to go away and for the Boards' purposes if there is a little bit of shared understanding up front, and it also allows you guys when you go to the market, when you go to the vendors, the lessor, and say this is kind of what we are stuck with guys, so the market can take that into account when they are bidding on leases or renewals. He knows that on a property to property basis there is individual negotiation, every piece of property is different, but there are some shared standards and he would argue how CMS is and the CPO and others involved in procurement to drive not just a better bargain in terms of dollars and cents, that's important, but also just better use of the space. If it's a cheap space and not used well he is not really sure how much the State really wins. If it's a little pricier space but there is high efficiency, high value then businesses make these decisions all day long, they don't just look at the dollars and cents. Here in Illinois, right now, we're very sensitive to that, but without some sort of, because we look at the budgeting for results, taking it back, we're all looking at metrics all of our agencies metrics, metrics, metrics, well this to him could be a part of that sort of thing. If you do come up with some goals, they don't have to be straight-jacketed standards, it allows CMS to measure its own conduct, its own performance. If it's a shifting standard then how can you compare? Chairman Stewart stated that he seconds Member Bedore's request that the PPB, the CPO's office, and CMS take a run at it versus in two years from now, oh nothing's been done and he is sensitive that he knows that CMS and the CPO have their plates full



and there has been a lot of rule activity, but we all know rules never really stop, they never stop. You're always going to have a busy rule agenda and perhaps this is something that should go in the queue, obviously maybe not the very next JCAR meeting, but if we're not meeting and talking about it sure as heck it's never going to get on the JCAR agenda if we just talk about it at the PPB meeting it's not going anywhere. Member Bedore stated that he appreciates everything the Chairman said besides just the space standards, he thinks we should be looking at other things that the State is paying for. He personally doesn't think that we should be paying an escalator for insurance, he just thinks that is a part of the owner's responsibility to provide insurance to his own building and the same way we should look at the real estate escalators, so there are other things to look at besides space. Ms. Florence stated that they have removed from their lease template, that's no longer the template we send out to perspective proposers, there is no option for escalators anymore. Now, in some of their existing leases that have been a long standing feature they try to negotiate those out, but are not always successful. Chairman Stewart stated that that's specific with those types of issues and we understand we have current leases, whatever changes we do or don't make in the future are not going to be reflected in current leases, they are what they are, but to Member Bedore's point he thinks the easiest one to grasp straight out or perhaps the hardest is the square footage, but these other issues of some of these other, and again at least come up with standards. He is sensitive to say absolutes, but maybe there are some absolutes we need to talk to and understanding always a waiver, case by case basis. He's a strong believer there needs to be a waiver authority where the State, due to market conditions, may not be able to meet all of its needs it would like and has to do a waiver, but then someone signs off on the waiver someone is responsible for it versus it's just an amorphous, it happened. Someone specifically, anytime there is a waiver or you deviate X number of standard deviations, someone just has to sign off for it and be accountable for it, again all of us do that at our jobs on a day to day basis already and it is just an extension of that. Chairman Stewart asked if there are any questions or comments on the phone. Chairman Stewart stated that Director Carter is going to follow up with the CPO's Office and CMS afterwards, at least start sending out some meetings to start a discussion, again if we don't discuss it here that's not going to get it done, it's too detailed. Member Bedore stated that he had one other comment, he wanted to thank Ms. Florence and he believes her name was Carol. Director Carter and I toured the Bloom Building a week or 10 days ago and he was encouraged from what he heard from CMS, obviously that building is underutilized to say the least. They even had the Director come out, they got off the elevator and she heard the commotion and talking so she came out and said that she knew who they were and the Procurement Board and all that. She was very nice about it and then her comment was, well I'm glad you're here because she walks out here and sees all this empty space and wonders what's going on. Member Bedore stated that he thought okay, we got the Director that is on our side and CMS was on our side also. They're working on a plan to move people in because it's obvious the building is well maintained, it's a great building but it is underutilized and CMS knows that, so does the agency and he is sure they're going to come back with a plan that is going to resolve that issue. Ms. Florence replied yes sir. Member Bedore stated that he wanted to thank her for her cooperation on that.

The next item on the agenda was the State subsidization policy resolution. Director Carter stated that it's over two tabs, the first tab being a review of the concession agreements currently in place that we're aware of. The resolution passed months ago and they asked the Board staff to take a look at those items and report back on the gross receipts. That's provided as well as a template, a start if you will, to a revision to our concession policy. Through working and crunching numbers, it was found that the resolution as passed would basically eliminate these types of concessions in buildings, at least based on the conversation we had initially, but he didn't believe that was the Board's intent. It was more to ensure that the State was receiving fair value for this type of agreement. The first tab is a review of applicable information for those types of agreements they are aware of and the second one is kind of a proposed change, or start if you will. Chairman Stewart asked if any Member has a question, comment or concerns. Member Bedore replied that he doesn't agree with this at all, he's sorry. What we're asking is that it now be based on their annual net profit, 5% blah, blah, blah. Well who's going to audit the net profit? My god we're opening ourselves up to... well did they charge stuff in their expenses to bring down their net profit for this building, just like the Department of Revenue with MCL. They could be, which we suspect, were charging things to the Department of Revenue operation and it just didn't make any sense. He thinks auditing this would be horrendous, annual profits, the fee would be based on 5%. We had it on gross receipts, now you're talking about annual profit, that to him, unless Member Ivory or somebody wants to go out every month and audit the books to see what their annual profit is, to him you're going to have hire an accounting firm to keep track of this. He totally disagrees with this. Member Morales asked why are we changing it. Member Bedore replied that he doesn't know why we are changing it. Director

Carter stated that he thinks if it's the Board's pleasure we don't change it at all. He thinks there should be an understanding of the two agreements we know about that are currently active and the one that was active and is no longer, but the agency and Revenue wishes and has the urge to have one back. Under the way they passed initially these types of agreements they would be done, they wouldn't exist anymore. Keep in mind these couple of agreements cover largely the State employees only, and he doesn't believe either of the two operating now are open to the public. Those historical sites and natural parks, those are excluded from the resolution, but as the way it sits these would cease to exist. Member Bedore stated that if you wanted, just to refresh everybody's memory on this, the Department of Revenue were giving MCL \$40,000, we were, the State Illinois taxpayers, were giving \$40,000 to MCL. We were giving them free electricity, free gas, janitorial. No wonder, sure MCL wants to come back, why not, and the Department of Revenue they didn't care. He's sorry if the employees at the Department of Revenue want to come up with the \$40,000 and pay for the natural gas, and pay for the electricity, and pay for the janitorial, yeah then they can have their cafeteria back. Himself as a taxpayer, why should he pay for subsidizing lunch for State employees, he doesn't think he should. So he doesn't care if these two outfits want to leave. The problem is, we saw it at the Department of Revenue, we saw it at IDOT, we have a beautiful kitchen over there at the IDOT building that had to close because State employees weren't utilizing it. They would come there with their brown paper bags and very few were buying lunch, so it had to close on its own way before the Board's provision went into effect. So he doesn't see any problem at all. You are worried about two concessionaires saying oh we're going to leave, god bless. Chairman Stewart asked if there were any other questions or comments. The Board can leave it and take no action and then it just falls away, unless someone wants to make a motion to approve he thinks we're at minimum tabling it, if not just leave it entirely. No further questions or comments were made.

The next item on the agenda is Legislation. Director Carter stated that he doesn't have anything further to report this moment. Member Bedore asked what happened to Capital Development Board agenda item. Director Carter replied that it has to be held a month, they didn't meet posting requirements.

Member Bedore stated that he knows it wasn't on the agenda, but he just wanted it to be brought out there and maybe in the coming month or two, it falls under procurement, under the idea that how much is a student is paying for their education at the U of I. CPO Bagby is here. There were some very interesting stories in the Chicago Tribune last week, 10% of the incoming freshmen are from China that have been accepted and the main reason is because wow, we get \$31,000 from these Chinese students. We even send professors over to China to do recruiting, probably at taxpayers' expense, but he's just curious on their procurement, is the \$31,000 covering it or are we subsidizing? Chinese students, are you and I as taxpayers subsidizing Chinese students? Interesting question and everybody is so proud that these students are paying \$31,000 and there were quotes in the paper from U of I saying, that's a major factor why we're recruiting. We need this extra money because we're not getting it from the Legislators. He's sorry if that's the case then we don't care about students from the State of Illinois we will send recruiters over to China because they pay more, but are they paying enough to cover the total cost of one year's education? He would like the PPB staff working with the U of I because he is sure that somebody has that number. What is the cost of educating a child for a year? He knows it's not on the agenda, but he is just asking because there are a lot of people that were really, really upset with that article and really upset with the University of Illinois and well they should. There are many students in this State that would love to get into the U of I, but if you're going to give your freshman class 10% new students coming in from China, he's not talking about India or any other Asian country he's talking about China itself, because we send recruiters and he'd like to know if we're subsidizing those students? Chairman Stewart stated that he thinks it would be helpful, just total cost of education of a typical student, in State, out of State, it costs the same to get a 4 year degree if you do it, the numbers are whatever they are, but if there is a recruitment cost for overseas students or out of State students. If there is a way to break that cost down that might be helpful, that would be a straight up procurement question the other thing is kind of a larger question, but we can see if we can get that out of the University. The typical cost, obviously the State kicks in some, but what is the total cost regardless of the source of revenue to pay for the cost for your typical 4 year undergrad, and if there are any recruiting that would probably be the big thing if U of I tracks it, that way out of State recruiting which can include international, but just out of State that might be helpful. At least give the Board some information to start with. Does any members on the phone have anything they want to add before we get ready to conclude the meeting? Member Black stated that he has talked to Director Carter about this and he is not insinuating anything went haywire, but some local units of government have

contacted him regarding the CMS proposal for bids for salt and the local governments use the State procurement, because they buy in such bulk, they can get their rock salt for the price during the winter and about 200 communities were not included. CMS didn't do that the salt suppliers did, but there is a question and many of them are now scrambling trying to find a supplier for rock salt at prices that are sometimes two and half times of what they paid last year, and they understand supply and demand, but the questions have kind of focused on from the time CMS knew that many communities would be excluded, specifically excluded by the vendor, to the time the municipalities, counties, etc. were notified seems to be, and he gets a different answer and doesn't know, 15 to 20 days and when you put them into August then they're really scrambling. He has talked to Director Carter and he said that he could look into this and see what factors precipitated this and if there is a way we can avoid it in the future, because some of the vendors are telling locals units of government, yes they will give them a 1000 tons or 2000 tons, but they must pay for it, so some of them are really scrambling and hoping that we have a mild winter and he thinks it should be something helpful just to review. They just don't understand why there was a particular delay in CMS knowing and the local units of governments being told we have a problem. Director Carter stated that someone has come forward to share some comments on that today. Member Black replied that he thinks it would be very helpful if those comments could be shared with their database of people who are now out scrambling to find salt it would be very helpful. Mitzi Loftus, Deputy Director of the Bureau of Strategic Sourcing at CMS stated that their staff is who actually does the leg work to go to the means of contracting the salt needs. They annually go out for a solicitation for their own State agencies as well as those local communities who choose to ask for their assistance. Last year they had a contract that had renewals, they went out to the locals and asked them if they would choose to go out for the renewal this year or if they wanted to be included in a new solicitation. So it's a survey that goes out every year just making sure that the locals who had been involved in the past wanted them to do anything on their behalf for the next year. It's usually around 800 locals that have used their services as far as salt is concerned. This year she thinks it was approximately 600 local and municipal governments that chose to be included in a new solicitation, either because they weren't eligible for a renewal or they chose not to do a renewal. Their stipulations in the contracts allow for an 80%-120% rule so they give an estimate and they can purchase down to 80% or up to 120% so if an entity would choose or have the need to go above that 120% they may have chosen to go out for a new solicitation so they could modify their needs. They went out and did the survey, they've got their requisitions, they went out for an IFB, she could give the actual dates later and will not talk about any specific dates, but she thinks it was in February when they went out to the locals asking them what they would choose to do whether it would be the renewal or go out for a new solicitation or to be on their own. It takes a substantial amount of time to compile that data and get the solicitation out on the street, as you know when the bids came in and because it's an IFB they could tell right away that they had roughly 250 locations of the 600 of the new solicitation that did not receive bids at all, none. Not that they were too high or too low, the vendors just chose not to bid on those locations at all for whatever reason. It took them maybe less than a week, several days for them to identify those locals that were not going to be able to have an award. They went out, she believes it was approximately a week, again she can give the Board exact dates later, they went out directly and sent a letter out to the 195 locals indicating that again, for whatever reasons, the vendors chose not to bid on their locations and that they strongly urge them, due to the salt shortage and the unpredictability of a vendor's response, they strongly recommended that in a time frame, they gave them 7 working days. They wanted to have a quick turnaround, so they gave them 7 working days to try to reach out to vendors themselves and try to secure their needs. Within 24 hours they were inundated with phone calls with various questions so she went out the next day and sent a clarification letter out to them indicating, first of all, that in order to try to make it more desirable for the vendors they were going to do a 100% commitment instead of the 80%-120% rule, so they clarified that to make sure that they knew that, and again, strongly recommended that they try to do this on their own and then plus they put together a comprehensive list of all potential salt vendors. Now they indicated to them that some of these contacts may be old and outdated, but it was what CMS had and wanted to make sure that the locals had everything that they had that CMS would've been going out to do if they were going out for them. So they had numerous phone calls back and forth, some sent in requisitions in anticipation of not being able to secure anything on their own. Then they had them actually come in and rescind that because they were able to locate their needs on their own. As it turned out they had about 85 locals of the 195 that decided to use CMS as their means to acquire their salt. Last Monday they actually posted the new solicitation, so from the time they opened the bids until the time their new solicitation went out it was probably less than 3 weeks, which was a really quick turnaround given that they had so many people calling and so many asking. She thinks it's about 70,000 tons and in the interim DOT and

the Toll Highway Authority have gone out and procured, they have gone out on their own and secured their salt needs. Ms. Loftus stated that they also have posted the renewal. The renewal, they also sent out an addendum that indicated the entities that have those renewals, the vendor and their respective prices and they also did for full disclosure and transparency so that the locals would know everything they could possibly know on the last solicitation, they went ahead and posted the bid tabulation sheet, which basically shows line by line, location by location, which vendor won and at what price. Member Black stated that he really appreciates her comments and he has no reason to doubt her, but he thinks the Board needs a synopsis of what you have done, because what you have explained is not exactly in sync with what some of the municipalities and counties are saying and he thinks we need to get that straightened out and it was also his understanding that at least 8 of the IDOT districts in the State did not receive a bid from their initial procurement, is that true? Ms. Loftus replied yes, that is correct, some DOT locations and some Tollway locations did not receive bids either, but they have since secured contracts for those needs. She can't speculate exactly what happened down in the communities, but she thinks they all talked to each other. They specifically only sent an email out to the 195 that did not receive bids, but then they started talking to each other and panic ensued and then she does believe DOT sent out some information to their districts and then the locals got a little confused as to whether or not they actually had been awarded a contract or not and as soon as they realized that confusion was out there they decided to go ahead and post the bid tabulations, so they could go out and look to see if they had a bid and that was within the timeframe of the request period that they asked them to respond. They have had a lot of calls from entities that were not the 195 sending in requisitions and then they at that point called them back and said look we're looking at the bid tabulations and you did receive an award, do you want to go out on this new bid for additional or did you mean to do this? So they have tried to clarify that as much as they can. They've had Representatives and Senators call and this is basically the same explanation that she has been able to give to them. Most of the questions that they have is why did a vendor chose community A that is next to community B and not give B a bid and their only answer to that is the vendors are under no obligation to respond to any bids that CMS puts out. They are given the opportunity to see what we have out there via the Illinois Procurement Bulletin and we just rely on them to respond, however they did take an extra step this time. She has spoken to her counterparts in all the surrounding mid-western states, and she's received several different vendors that they've had plus they also direct mailed the solicitation after it was posted to the Bulletin and they direct mailed and identified those vendors that they thought could potentially not know about it or had any desire to bid on it the first time. So they cannot guarantee any different response right now and/or the price. They did also in this particular solicitation include alternative methods if they choose to respond that way. Member Bedore asked if there has been any thought given to the idea that in order to bid for say a particular community like Effingham, you would bundle that community with two or three communities around it and it's a bid for all of them, not just for one. Ms. Loftus replied that they are certainly willing to look at any of those options in the future, when she's asked the other counterparts in the other States they do tend to do it location by location and also there are good portions of the midwestern states that do not actually do this service for the locals. They choose not to do that for the locals. She has had that same exact question from Senator Althoff, she believes. Member Bedore stated that it just sounded to him that these vendors are picking and choosing and what you would like to do is say ok if you want to be on the good side of Senator Black you would do Danville, but I don't want to do Champaign, but if you went out and said, ok this bid for this particular package is Danville, Champaign, Urbana, blah, blah, blah and its one bid, one package. Ms. Loftus replied that it is certainly an option that they will discuss in the future, and she does plan on following back up with the other state's that she's talked to just to see if they have even tried that and if there was any additional benefit to that or if it was a detriment. It hasn't in the past, this is kind of an anomaly, the only other time this has happened was in 2008. Member Bedore stated that he was just asking the question and doesn't know the answer. Ms. Loftus replied that there are probably a lot of different alternatives out there, it's just what might be the best practice. Member Bedore stated that he knows that in the city of Chicago when there were certain items that people didn't want to bid they bundled them together and if you want this one, you have to take this one. Ms. Loftus replied that she thinks one of our biggest issues this year is one of their biggest vendors has chosen not to respond to anything this year and that's Cargill. They haven't responded to Illinois, they didn't respond to the majority of Missouri and several of the other surrounding states. They're just tapped out, so again she thinks that it is supply and demand and you've got points definitely on the picking and choosing. Chairman Stewart thanked Ms. Loftus for taking the time to speak to the Board today on short notice. Member Black stated that he really appreciates the fact that she was there, and hopes she will prepare a synopsis. The local press is insinuating that the State made an error and he doesn't think from what was just said that is the case at all. He knows we all appreciate the fact



the you've done this and local government has their winter salt supply at a very favorable price because CMS does this master bid, but whatever happened this year is not well understood by some local government officials and the local press is insinuating that somehow the State dropped the ball, but he doesn't think that's the case at all and because they did therefore the local taxpayer is having to pay sometimes double the price per ton of rock salt than they did last year and he thinks you could probably get this cleared up with a synopsis of what has transpired. People tend to beat the State of Illinois up for anything and he wants to stop and find out what happened and let's stop this particularly the local, the smaller newspapers, and younger reporters who are saying this must have been a mistake by the State and now look what you're going to cost our community and from what you're telling us and what he suspects it's a little more complicated than just that. Ms. Loftus thanked Member Black for the support because their staff does work very, very hard on this and it is a very, very complicated procurement and they have also been working with, of course CPO Brown, on how to proceed with this and everything so she appreciates the support and will absolutely send the synopsis. She will work with Director Carter and Mr. Blount on the format that would be the best. Chairman Stewart stated that they will circle back after the meeting. Chairman Stewart thanked Ms. Loftus again and said that he is just going to blame the Federal Government just to blame someone else.

Member Bedore stated that he would like an update at the next meeting on the Veterans' Program. He doesn't believe the Board has to have anybody here, but he would like the numbers and in particular the numbers north of I-80 and south of I-80. The Board talked about this for a couple months running and it got dropped. Director Carter asked for clarification from Member Bedore that he wants the numbers only or does he want somebody here? Member Bedore replied that the number would be fine for him.

With no further business to discuss a motion to adjourn was made by Member Bedore and was seconded by Member Black. The motion was unanimously approved.