



Chairman: Jay Stewart

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

### **Minutes – May 7, 2015 Meeting**

Present in Springfield: Jay Stewart  
Ed Bedore  
Larry Ivory

Present Via Telephone: Rick Morales

Absent: Bill Black

The Board started the meeting by confirming attendance at 10:00 a.m. Member Bedore made a motion to allow Member Morales to participate in the meeting via telephone and Member Ivory seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

The first item on the agenda was the approval of the Board meeting minutes from April 9, 2015. Member Bedore made a motion to accept the minutes as printed with Member Ivory seconding the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

The next item on the agenda was follow-up from the previous meeting. Interim Director Blount stated that in the Board's packet they will find the final version of the rules with all of the proposed changes to the original version, which are red, and unless any Board members have any additional changes the rules are ready to be filed, and this was after meeting with the Governor's Office, CMS, and the CPOs. Member Bedore stated that he has a comment on line 260-261 and then you go to line 304, why is there a difference? Interim Director Blount replied that it was an oversight and he will update it. Member Bedore stated that because we say a special meeting has to be held in Springfield or Chicago, a special meeting has all these other expectations, but an emergency meeting doesn't. Interim Director Blount stated that it was an oversight. Member Bedore replied ok. Chairman Stewart asked if there were any other concerns or comments from any other Board member. With the additional edit that Member Bedore has pointed out, is the Board prepared to move forward to file these? Member Bedore made a motion to file the rules as presented with the modification with Member Morales seconding the motion. The motion was unanimously approved. With a vote of 4-0 the rules will be filed with the edits suggested by Member Bedore.

Next on the agenda was the Veterans Business Update from CMS. In attendance from CMS was Ms. Kim McCullough-Starks. Ms. McCullough-Starks stated that she is the newly appointed Acting Assistant Director of CMS. This is her 37<sup>th</sup> day in that role, so she's happy to sit before the Board and is looking forward to the opportunity to work with all of them. As it relates to the Veterans Business Enterprise she can give the Board a numerical update on where they are from a performance perspective. She can also share with the Board the meetings that she has had within her 37 days. Ms. McCullough-Starks stated that she would first give the Board a little bit of her background. Her most immediate employer was AT&T, she was there for roughly 7 years doing community engagement work for the company. Prior to that she worked for the Metropolitan Pier Exposition Authority where she oversaw their diversity and inclusion programs, which includes contracting and employment. Ms. McCullough-Starks stated that she has significant experience in this space, and looking at the Veterans Business Program what she's found thus far is that they need to do a better job in terms of outreach for the program. Current they have roughly 118 vendors that are registered as VBEs with the State of Illinois. They have spent roughly 2.3% of the State's procurement dollars that were subject to the goal with veteran owned businesses. She had a meeting initially with the newly appointed Director of the

*M:150507*

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

Department of Veterans Affairs and talked about collaboration as it relates to outreach and in making sure they do a better job in promoting the program. Ms. McCullough-Starks stated that she would be happy to answer any questions that the Board has or receive any input or counsel from them on how they might move forward.

Member Bedore stated that he has a couple of comments. He would really appreciate having a written report showing the Board how many veteran companies have signed up and by area, because the last report they've had was months ago and he believes he thought at least two meetings ago the Acting Director of CMS said that he would provide an update, so he would appreciate getting an update on where they're at number wise, because as they have seen in the past, he believes they were in the 80s or so in numbers, but the majority were in Cook County or the surrounding six county region of Chicago. They are really lacking companies south of I-80 and he was just wondering if that still is the case. He would really like to see, and he thinks the Board would really like to see geographically where are they are registered, that's one comment. The second comment is have you been in contact with the CPO's office who did a fine job looking at this, because they had a meeting or two getting everybody together to see what we could do? Ms. McCullough-Starks replied that she is in constant contact with the CPO's office, not only about the Veterans Business Program, but also... Member Bedore interjected that he's sure she is on other matters, but how about for this particular matter. Ms. McCullough-Starks replied that for this particular matter they have not had an opportunity to discuss the VBE Program. Member Bedore stated that he would suggest that they did. Member Bedore stated that's all he has. Ms. McCullough-Starks replied that she appreciates the suggestion. Member Ivory stated that one of the things that he thinks would be good, as Member Bedore just stated, is that downstate and central Illinois seem to have a significant lack of veteran businesses. Member Ivory stated he would like see or make a suggestion that you should take a dive and try and figure out what you could do differently to change those numbers, because he thinks that what we'll probably find out, and this is just a guess, but he thinks he'll be pretty exact, is that there is probably not a significant number of people in central Illinois or in downstate Illinois, just like it is with minority firms. There probably is much bigger volume in northern Illinois and the rest of the State is lacking. It would be good to do a task force or something to come up with a game plan to really focus some attention, because he thinks that if we don't focus some real attention on it we're going to look back here another 6 months or more and we're still going to see numbers that none of us are happy with. Member Ivory stated that he would like to recommend that we do something there. Ms. McCullough-Starks replied absolutely and part of her conversation with the director of Veterans Affairs is exactly that, understanding where the veteran population is within the State of Illinois and identifying relationships with advocacy groups who especially are trying to ensure that veteran owned businesses have access to opportunities, so that is a part of the strategy where the initial discussion that she has had thus far, but she will come back to the Board with a plan focused around their outreach efforts related to veterans and the collaboration across departments of being able to capture them into their program. Member Bedore stated that he has a question and she might not be able to answer it, but something to look into. Do you believe that this is the best way of handling this program, where it's split between CMS and Veterans Affairs? It doesn't seem like anybody is responsible. You have CMS doing their thing, you've got Veterans Affairs doing their thing. Who is actually responsible? Who is in charge over this whole program? Member Bedore stated that he found over the years when you have two different departments handling the same program, sometimes it gets lost because there is not one person responsible. Ms. McCullough-Starks replied that is something worth investigating for sure. It's predominantly the reason why that department was one of the first departments that she has met with thus far, is to understand the relationship between our two areas and how they might have a more focused approach around attracting veteran owned businesses to the State procurement process, but she can come back to the Board once she's had an opportunity to really take a look at it and provide the Board with some input on how she it can best be handled, if that's alright with the Board. Member Bedore replied that's fine, because in the past the Board has had CMS at one meeting and then at another meeting they've had Veterans Affairs and to him it seems it's lacking a person responsible. Somebody that you could put up against the wall and say you're not doing your job, or you're doing a great job. Ms. McCullough-Starks replied that she understands and she'll take that request and will come back to the Board with a path forward. Member Morales asked how many people, and he knows that she is new to this and knows there are a lot of things to discover with the various programs and things that CMS is involved with, but with this particular one can you find out how many people are involved in this program that are actual veterans? Ms. McCullough-Starks replied that it is her understanding that they have to provide their DD214 to support that they are a veteran. Member Morales wanted to clarify his question, he means people on the CMS side who

work with the program that are actual veterans. Ms. McCullough-Starks replied absolutely, she can find that out and get back to the Board. Ms. McCullough-Starks asked if there are any other questions with respect VBE. (12:32) Member Bedore stated that 2 months ago, as he said the Acting Director was here and the Board was promised a full update and a full charge, we're going to move ahead, in our May meeting. Well now it will be June or July or August so he's a little disappointed the Board gave deference to the Acting Director by saying he needed 60 days to get his feet wet, well the 60 days are up and our feet are pretty dry. Ms. McCullough-Starks replied that with all due respect, she doesn't have to wait until the Board's next meeting to get back to them with a written strategy and report on where they are on the veterans program. She can get back to the Board in the interim with specific answers to the Board's questions and directly share their approach on how they're going to address it. So please don't take this as it's going to be an extended period of time before you get a response. Member Bedore replied that's fine and she could give it to the Board's director and he will forward it to all of us. Ms. McCullough-Starks stated that she also wanted to share with the Board that in regards to the Business Enterprise Program they are taking a look at where they are at in respect to the program. There are a number of different areas where they have over the years, she looked at a report that was from 2009 that talked about the deficiencies in the program. They still have those same deficiencies, today they're going to come back to the Board with a focused report in terms of how they are going to work with the CPO's office as well as the various agencies on projections in terms of procurement opportunities. She believes that the CPO in General Services, Matt Brown has already begun to do some of that work. They want to get out in front of the procurement opportunities so that they can make sure their outreach is tied to actual opportunities within State government and it gives small business owners an opportunity to ramp up and respond to bids. That is something that she wanted to share with the Board as one of their initiatives that the Board will see more traction on in the near future. They are also taking a look at the certification process to ensure it is more user friendly if you will, to the vendors to make the State procurement process more attractive and in addition to that, it is good if a minority contractor gets an opportunity to be on the front end and there is a commitment made to them to participate in the process, they'd like to see stronger activity around the back end. So in other words, tracking contracts on a regular basis to ensure that minority vendors are actually participating in the process and they're getting paid as a result to their performance on State contracts. Those are three areas in which the Board will see a stronger focus out of the BEP Program employees and will get regular updates from their office of the activity in that space. Member Ivory stated that he has received a number of calls in the IT space and it's kind of disconcerting to him when he gets a call saying there is a significant IT contract with no minority goals on it and he knows the CPO is here and you're here and maybe we might want to have Paul Cerpa in front of us also, but when he gets calls like that on a continuous basis and we have no minority goals and he knows no BEP goals and he knows that we are in that space, that's concerning. He's trying to figure out who is responsible for that and he would surely like for them to come before this Board at some point in time and explain why it's a consistent pattern of IT contracts and other contracts that should have a goal on it, but somehow seems to slip until someone calls me up and says Larry there is no goal at all. He's looking at the contract he's saying why don't we have a goal on this? When we have so much emphasis on IT and other areas of more inclusion, but he's not seeing it, so he surely would like to have someone at least come in and share with this audience here and explain why this is happening and who is going to be responsible to change it. Ms. McCullough-Starks replied that's a very challenging area within the BEP Program, they all recognize that and there is going to be significant focus in that area. As you know the State has a new CIO, Hardik Bhatt, and he also functions as the Bureau Chief of our BCCS Program. He is in complete alignment with respect to increasing BEP participation in the IT space. They can take a look back from a historical perspective on why those things happened, but she's a very glass half full kind of gal and so from that perspective she wants to look forward and she wants to look at ways to correct the behavior, if you will, in that space. So that's going to be her focus and she wants to understand how they got there, but when she comes to the Board she's going to talk about how they can move forward. Chairman Stewart thanked Ms. McCullough-Starks for coming to speak to the Board today and as you are moving forward looking at the plan on veterans, something that his agency does whenever they are asked to look at their performances if there are benchmark states, if you haven't done that already, maybe some of our surrounding states that are perceived to be doing a good job. You know that plagiarism is the sincerest form of flattery, so that's something they often rely on when faced with a question, what's Ohio doing, and what's going on in Wisconsin? It doesn't necessarily mean that they copy those, but sometimes it is helpful if someone's got a great idea, borrowing liberally is something that his agency has done on more than one occasion. Ms. McCullough-Starks replied that's great counsel, thank you very much.

The next item on the agenda was the Procurement Policy Board Resolution regarding Aaron Carter. Interim Director Blount stated that in the Board meeting packets there is a proposed resolution recognizing and thanking former Executive Director, Aaron Carter, for his many contributions to the Board and the State of Illinois. Chairman Stewart stated that everyone on the Board had an occasion to work with Aaron and he was the least amount of time, the other Board members who had more time, but Aaron did great work for the Board and he is certainly happy that this gesture of thanks to Aaron is in the form of a resolution so he is certainly supportive of this resolution. Member Bedore stated that as they said at the last meeting, they all chimed in and said what a great job that Aaron Carter did, which we all know he worked very hard and brought a lot of good to the State of Illinois and so he is fully supportive of this resolution. Member Morales stated that he agrees with Member Bedore's sentiments as well, Aaron was very efficient and took care of a lot of things for the Board and was very responsive and he really appreciates everything he has done. Mr. Ivory stated that he echoes the sentiments of the team, he did a great job for the Board. Chairman Stewart asked if anyone wanted to make a motion. Member Bedore made a motion that they pass the resolution unanimously and was seconded by Member Morales. The resolution passed unanimously.

The next item on the agenda was CMS Leased Property Insurance. In attendance was Susan Florence, Lease Administrator with CMS. Interim Director Blount stated that in the Board's meeting packets was information provided by CMS regarding the leased property insurance requirements, in addition to information on the flood at the Bucari Building in 2010 and Ms. Florence is here to respond to any questions or comments. Member Bedore stated that he noticed that the damage at the Bucari Building was roughly \$670,000 to restore. Ms. Florence replied she believes that is correct. Member Bedore stated that when you read that paragraph after B, it said this required coverage would not typically include repair or replacement of State-owned property unless the property is damaged through lessor negligence or some failure of the building. How broad or narrow is failure of the building, since there were flood waters what did the owners of building do to prevent water coming into the building? Ms. Florence replied that she doesn't think in the case of this particular flood there could have been much that they could have done to prevent water from coming into the building. She thinks that a failure of a building would be if pipes burst in the basement due to faulty plumbing or the building structure or building systems. Member Bedore stated that files are considered State property. Ms. Florence replied yes. Member Bedore stated that then we were responsible for it all, if that is your definition of failure of the building. No further comments were made.

The next item on the agenda was Lease Review for DCFS Lease 6270 in Marion. Ms. Florence stated that this is a DCFS lease located at 105 Airway Drive. The base rental term is \$12.25 per square foot flat for the five year term. The rent was flat for the initial five year term as well. The building is in good condition and no improvements are needed at this time. Ms. Florence stated that she would be happy to answer any questions that the Board might have. Member Bedore stated that the Board just approved some leases here in Springfield. Those leases were, when you include everything, two of them were \$13.78 and when you look at this lease and where you add janitorial, electric, and water it comes out to \$16.05. Ms. Florence replied that it does. This is an all electric building so the electrical cost is a bit higher than they would usually see. Member Bedore stated that he didn't care what the electrical costs are. Ms. Florence replied that it is included and that it is part of the total cost of the building. Member Bedore stated that is right compared to the total in Springfield. Is Springfield that much more depressed over Marion, Illinois? There is a difference of \$2.27 a square foot between Springfield and downstate Marion. Ms. Florence replied that the total cost is slightly above the regional portfolio range and it is well with the BOMA range, well actually below the BOMA range. Member Bedore stated that he understands, but he is comparing this building with a first class building in downtown Springfield and we are paying \$13.78 and this building we are paying \$16.05. Why are we paying \$2.27 more for a small little city in southern Illinois called Marion? That is his question. Ms. Florence replied that again she thinks that the rental rate is reasonable. There are other costs that add up to that total direct cost. It's a State-use janitorial contract and that's a bit higher and she understands his question. Member Bedore stated not to tell him that the janitorial cost is higher. The building here in Springfield has the same cost as the one in Marion, so we are paying more for a small little town with a prison in Marion, Illinois, compared to a first class building in Springfield and we're paying \$2.27 more. Ms. Florence replied yes. Chairman Stewart asked if any other Board member has any comments or questions on this lease. Interim Director Blount stated that this lease does require a Certificate of No Objection. Chairman Stewart asked if anyone wanted to make a motion for a certificate of no objection. With no one making a motion no certificate will be issued. Chairman



Stewart asked if there were any other facilities matters any member would like to raise at this time while they have a representative here. Member Bedore stated that he had some questions on lease and he gave them to Interim Director Blount, so he will be in contact with CMS to work out some of these questions.

The next item on the agenda was the Illinois Department of Human Rights and Interagency Committee on Employees with Disabilities (ICED). They requested to make a presentation to the Board to address accessibility challenges for disabled persons utilizing State-leased facilities. In attendance was Ngozi Okorafor, Chief Legal Counsel for the Illinois Department of Human Rights and Susan Allen, Disability Coordinator for the Department of Human Rights. Ms. Okorafor stated that Ms. Allen will be giving the presentation today, but wanted to explain that Ms. Allen is their Human Rights Specialist and their Disability Coordinator for the Department and she is also the representative for ICED and in the work that they did they received some concerns from other State agencies brought to ICED and in turn thought they should make this presentation to the Procurement Policy Board. Ms. Allen thanked the Board for this opportunity to address them. Ms. Allen stated that she has worked for 35 years for the Department of Human Rights. Her area of expertise is in disability compliance and she also serves on the Interagency Committee on Employees with Disabilities. The mission of this committee is to promote access and independence for people with disabilities. Their co-chairs are the Director of Department of Human Rights, who is Rocco J. Claps, and the Secretary of the Department of Human Services, Gregory M. Bassi. The issue they wanted to bring to the Board today is the accessibility of State-lease facilities. They have over 3,000 employees with disabilities in State government and we have over a million residents with disabilities in the State of Illinois and these individuals require a measure of access in the work place and in their use of State services. As you may be aware there is a variety of State and Federal laws that address this area. There's the Americans with Disabilities Act, there is the Illinois Human Rights Act, there is Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and there is a particular interest in the Environmental Barriers Act that she wanted to quote from that statute because it addresses their issue particularly. Section 5(e) of the Environmental Barriers Act says "no governmental unit may enter into a new or renewal agreement to lease, rent or use in whole or in part any building, structure or improved area which does not comply with the standards and the standards referred to the Illinois Accessibility Standards any governmental unit which on the effective date of this Act is leasing, renting or using in whole or in part any building, structure or improved area which not comply with these standards shall make all reasonable efforts to terminate such lease, rental or use by January 1, 1990". The Interagency Committee had been made aware by some State agencies and disability advocates that some State-leased facilities may not be in compliance with the Environmental Barriers Act creating problems for both the employees and the clients with disabilities. ICED is working with these agencies including Central Management Services, advocates and employees with disabilities to resolve this problem and on May 5, 2015 ICED met with CMS to discuss their leasing procedures. ICED and CMS re-evaluated CMS leasing procedures to confirm that the procedures in place by CMS will facilitate the leasing of ADA accessible property. ICED and CMS also agreed to develop better communication between the two entities to ensure that CMS is aware of any potential accessibility issues so it can be quickly resolved. Finally, ICED and CMS agreed that additional training for leasing agents may be beneficial. Because the Board plays an integral part in the State procurement process, ICED wanted to make sure that the Board is aware of these concerns and would like to obtain the Board's support and assistance to ensure all State-leased office space is accessible to people with disabilities. Thank you for your time and we appreciate the Board's attention to this matter.

Member Bedore stated that in their review of the various leases, how many leases did ICED feel do not meet their standards? Ms. Allen replied that they don't have any authority over leasing at all. They have a broad committee and basically the way the committee functions is to bring these issues to the agency that has authority in those areas and that's why they wanted to address the Board today. There were individual advocates, individual agencies that brought these issues to their attention, but they have no authority in this area at all. Member Bedore stated that he didn't say that they had authority, he was just wondering if they knew the number of leases that they felt did not comply. Ms. Allen replied that they don't have any sense of this and would like to say that it is possible that the State agency develops the problem on employment of a person with a disability that has specific needs and needs to have reasonable accommodation, but the brief answer is that they don't have a sense of the number of leases where this might be a problem, but what CMS did agree to do and had certainly always been willing to do is when the agency makes this concern to CMS then they would deal with the lessor to make sure it agrees with the lease and the provision of what it says that the building will be compliant with the Barriers Act. Member Ivory stated that the Board would obviously

support compliance with the law, but it would help the Board because he doesn't know if there is a problem or the intent is to help them understand that they see some things that could be problematic, but it seems that there is a system with CMS where people are complying. They haven't had where people have failed to comply at this point in time, it is just the matter of bringing it to the Board's attention. Is that the ultimate objective? Ms. Allen replied that she wouldn't exactly say this. She definitely wouldn't say that there were no issues in regards to barriers in State-leased facilities. What she is saying is that these problems hadn't been brought in specific nature to CMS and they have been given the opportunity to resolve that and that is what they want to put into place, that CMS is already making the determination that they are compliant with the laws and then with the agency that occupies them, there would be this procedure in place where they could get back to CMS and say, there is this problem, will you work with this lessor to make sure the problem is resolved? Member Ivory stated that he would assume that anytime CMS does a new lease or building that they are in compliance as a rule of thumb. Chairman Stewart asked if someone from CMS can confirm on a forward looking basis that there is a checklist as it were or a process in place on the front end for new leases on a forward looking basis. Ms. Florence nodded her head yes. Ms. Allen stated that is exactly what the committee wanted on a forward looking basis. Ms. Allen stated that's their interest here, that there is a checklist, which is being used, that individuals are being trained to use the checklist, and that the agency has some obligation as well and the agency has an opportunity to look at these issues and get back to CMS and say that this is their interest in this area. Chairman Stewart asked if there was a process in place or being developed in this area on a forward looking basis. Ms. Florence replied yes, and looking back they have always had a process in place to ensure compliance. CMS met with members of ICED and Human Rights two days ago. There apparently have been some reports to the committee about a handful of potential, unverified at this point, accessibility issues that were never brought to the attention of CMS so they have not had an opportunity to review or look into those. Any time those issues have been brought to them they certainly address those issues with the landlord to make sure they are in compliance. Chairman Stewart asked that once they had a chance to complete their backwards looking review, if CMS could give the Board an update, even if it's unfounded that's ok, but perhaps just give the Board an update on what they discover through the review and he agrees that a notice of concern doesn't mean there is a concern, but then again perhaps it is an indication of an issue, but he agrees that it sounds like forward looking they have a process in place. Ms. Florence stated that they are in the process of setting up some on-going training for their leasing reps and will be inviting the using agency's ADA coordinators to those trainings as well. Chairman Stewart stated that he is a big believer in checklists and at his own agency, for their own purposes are trying to put in more checklists just to make sure of consistency. Member Morales asked if there is any way the Board could get a copy of the checklist, he would love to see it. Ms. Florence replied yes. They are in the process of updating it, but she can give the Board the old and the new. No further questions or comments were made.

The next item on the agenda was the Board Policy Discussion on Amending Sole Source Procurements. In attendance was Matt Brown, Chief Procurement Officer for General Services, Ben Bagby, Chief Procurement Officer for Higher Education, Fred Hahn, Chief Procurement Officer for the Capital Development Board and Colleen Caton, State Purchasing Officer representing the Chief Procurement Officer for the Department of Transportation. Chairman Stewart stated that he can't speak for the other Board members, but for the first time since he has been here they have all of the CPOs at the panel at one time and he knows they're all very busy and appreciates them coming here today. Obviously, there has been some discussion on sole source and the Board just wants to hear what the various CPOs have to say about it. Chairman Stewart stated that he has no preference on the order, but since CPO Brown brought this issue forward, we can start with him and then other CPOs and representatives can chime in. Ms. Caton, representative from IDOT stated they don't do sole source at IDOT highway construction and she doesn't have a lot to offer on that. Chairman Stewart stated that there is nothing wrong with being succinct. Ms. Caton replied that they are lucky in that part. CPO Brown stated that as Chairman Stewart mentioned, this is an issue carried over from a previous meeting and he thinks in initiation of this conversation he was responding to staff inquires about sole source procurements that were happening in General Services Portfolio and what ways they may be able to affect a reduction of those sole sources, or diminish the exceptional nature of their use in either duration or time, given the fact that many of these decisions come on while they're under contract or are ongoing during the relationship with vendors, where they have a sole source relationship that perpetuates for a variety of reasons or changes for a variety of reasons. CPO Brown stated that he put together a response that effected the procurements in the General Services Portfolio, which he thinks may have served as the basis for this conversation, since then having to talked with Interim Director Blount, CPO Bagby and having met with them together with the understanding

of the other CPO's perspective may weigh in and it is certainly not the only way to solve a problem that was portrayed in the previous discussions. He thinks we are here to continue the collaborative process. CPO Brown stated that he doesn't have anything particular to add in addition to the conversation that was previously held. He knows that and he would support the notion that the types of sole sources that happen in the General Services portfolio are different than the types of sole sources that happen in the Higher Education portfolio. One size shoe doesn't fit all necessarily, but he does have a solution for the General Services portfolio and he is willing to consider the Board's input on how to try to perfect that, thank you.

CPO Bagby stated that after about 13,779 days, he's still getting his feet wet in procurement, including his relation to sole source. He would have added another day, but his first day was filling out personnel forms. CPO Bagby stated that he was in the meeting with CPO Brown and he wanted CDB and DOT here for a purpose. He thinks that it is to identify that CDB does something, DOT does something different, CPO Brown has a different environment and so does Higher Education, in that we made need to address what they do a little differently. CPO Bagby stated that he has a slightly different environment since he has construction and general service type activities. Certainly we all want to be within the statute and he thinks since each of them has a different environment and a different set of people they deal with, a different geography to deal with, different numbers of staff, he thinks they have to be able to look at their own organization and just decide what is the best thing to do, but he does think CPO Brown is right in the fact that when an issue like this comes up, hearing the other sides, what they might think, he thinks that does help them focus a little bit and determine whether something may need a statutory change, or is it really appropriate for a rule or should we write a policy and how strict of a policy after that. If you go back to the dot points, the very last one he agrees with because that says don't go on what the statute says you can do. After that he thinks he would really need to look at each transaction, case-by-case and maybe go back and look to see what was done in the past and see what kind of pattern they have. Last year they did 307 sole source transactions and this year to date it's about 261. It could be on the same track, but you never know what's going to happen at the end of the year. So they have sort of a steady state of numbers, but it is also difficult to go back and figure everything out. He thinks it's something that they can think about doing. It is nice to have consistency, SPO to SPO, University to University to some degree, General Services to Higher Education and the other CPOs as well. Chairman Stewart stated that at least you agree with the point that consistency is certainly desirable, but it can't be forced if it's not appropriate and obviously you all 4 have some similarities, but yes he agrees with CPO Bagby, particularly in your area, but in all the areas there's going to be shared similarity, but there is going to be stuff probably just passing or recommending a one size fits all policy probably would have some benefits and probably some un-intended consequences that would be highly negative, so he doesn't think the Board is going to opine that it should be the same for everybody.

CPO Fred Hahn stated that his position is similar to Ms. Caton's in that they don't do a lot of sole sourcing, in fact they have only done a couple. The most recent was about two years ago and just kind of an example of why it reflects their position. It was to rehabilitate some pumps, some large water pumps, to a power house at a correctional facility. The manufacturer of those pumps was out of business, the parts weren't made anymore, but somebody had bought-out that manufacturer. So they went to that entity and they did some economies analysis and ran a sole source. That's the one he recalls there may be two that they have done in 5 years, but with respect to changing that sole source contract, generally it is noted that construction is not necessarily a science, there is some art to it and we're going to have change orders. As people get into things and there are unforeseen conditions or something is discovered, there are going to be change orders. So he wouldn't necessarily agree on a sole source a change order should be limited to the small purchase, but gets looked at independently with the germaneness requirements.

Member Bedore stated that CPO Bagby said that they might end up with about 300 sole sources this year, CPO Brown what is the number in your area? CPO Brown replied that they are in that neighborhood but doesn't have a precise number with him today, but it is in the hundreds. He can tell the Board that before today's PPB meeting on a regular cycle, he signed 8 sole sources just this morning and he's signing 2 to 3 times a week based on the business cycle that sole sources are administered. So the basic math on that is well in excess of 200 probably 300. Interim Director Blount stated that it was 108 at the end of March. CPO Brown stated that it's a little down, that's good. Member Bedore stated that our goal is to have as few as possible. CPO Brown replied that is one of the philosophical questions that he knows and his belief and thinks the other CPOs might have opined on it in various ways in the past and today, is that the Board has an opinion

that they need to register with. In fact, sole source procurements uniquely are one of the processes where the Board prescribes the format for justifying sole source. They rely on documents that the Board establishes to fill that out. At least in the General Services portfolio he has relied on that document as the source of justification to say, we're in an exceptional situation, we're acting to execute contracts in a noncompetitive way and because that is exceptional, agency please tell us how you plan to get yourself out of this situation. How you plan to market research to find competition. How you plan to make decisions that are less proprietary to certain business models, etc. So they work very hard on how to accomplish that task and again, if maybe the temper for which they do that should change he would certainly ask the Board's involvement on that because they certainly rely quite heavily on the Board's involvement for the justification for how the State proceeds in this kind of contracting and he appreciates that. Member Ivory asked that when they're doing a sole source and he doesn't understand the process so maybe you can help him out, but is there at any point in time when they made a decision about sole source and there is a legitimate opportunity for people to object to the sole source at some point in time? CPO Brown replied absolutely. The sole source process requires a public hearing opportunity. Every sole source issued in the State must have one. The tool they use is a process that automatically schedules the hearing and should no one choose to take advantage of that opportunity for that hearing, ultimately to protest, they allow the hearing to recede and not be held. They don't want to wastefully hold hearings in front of empty rooms forcing people to show up to hear no testimony. So they give them that opportunity for hearing and should no one ask for that hearing, then they allow the hearing to recede, but there is a public hearing on each and every sole source contract in the State available. Member Ivory stated that how are they, again, he's getting an education, so there is an opportunity for people to protest or to disagree with staff's opinion and in reference to the sole source based upon their process. Once there is a protest is it an evaluation that they go back and do and say well there are 2 or 3 other people who they did not understand could do this work and therefore we're moving the sole source and we're putting it out for bid, but you have to have at least 2 or 3 people in order to do a normal bid? CPO Brown replied sure and there are really two ways that protest emerges. One is an objection in a public hearing and he has participated in a small handful in his time as CPO where there has been that kind of opposition. One of the solutions, the most immediate solution, is for a CPO to deny the sole source and say that it is no longer a sole source, it's denied and the agency immediately goes to competition. Other solutions, however, are effective. For example, a vendor may protest, but they're not protesting the nature of the company getting the contract they're protesting something else that is really important in the marketplace and then the CPO's need to figure out how to address that. They may actually approve a sole source based on the conduct of the hearing, but then limit it and say this sole source is only good for 6 months and agency you will be required at the end of 6 months to have issued a competitive solicitation or there are iterations of that, but usually the decisions are fairly swift and then either result in a denial of the sole source, which causes them to go out competitively or it forces a modification of the sole source that the CPO's authorize to condition. So they will then set the conditions by where the agency goes forward and where the agency has to stop and change its business plan. Member Ivory stated that his only other comment is that it would be nice if the Board could get some numbers, at least going back for a couple years, in terms of how many sole sources they did and how many have been overturned because it may be so insignificant, but to take a look at some trends and see if there is a sudden improvement of sole source that might have been to overturn that probably indicates that we might have something else that may be problematic and may be a deeper dive will require to see if there is something else we can do to make it better and to make it more proficient. CPO Brown replied absolutely, he would be happy to help in that effort however it unfolds. Member Bedore stated that the Board just heard the State in the general area has approximately 108 sole source contracts and Higher Education is projecting they will be close to 300. What's the big disparity between Higher Education and the rest of the State? CPO Bagby replied research hospitals. It's primarily medical devices that a physician or hospital says, that's the one that works for somebody who is left handed versus somebody who is right handed and you just don't argue much with that. Research needs for just regular scientific research where you have a tolerance level and because of the peer reviews that are already out there and the specification you can provide or find there is only one vendor that can meet this level of precision to do the research, and they also have a lot of IT maintenance of software, which really comes from the manufacturer only. Those will constitute the majority of those types of things.

Chairman Stewart asked if there were any other questions or comments. The Board will probably have some more follow-up on this. He agrees the general proposition we should try and keep the numbers down, but he thinks overall the trend lines have been down on sole source over the last several years if he recalls previous



presentations. There has to be some, for obvious conditions, like Universities and to him it's interesting and he's thinks CPO Brown has said this before, the majority of those sole sources are not contested through the protest process, which again we can get specific numbers, but that's his general recollection, a fairly small percentage where someone comes in and opposes it in a formal fashion at least. So again, there is sort of the overall objective of keeping them to a minimum, but then again procedurally there are ways to streamline. Understanding the difference between the 4 CPOs is something that we can continue to focus on. Are there any other questions on sole source? Member Bedore stated that the staff here should work with the 4 CPOs and come back with a program we all can understand and everybody can agree to. Chairman Stewart replied he thinks we have a little homework to do on our own end to, not just the CPOs so Interim Director Blount will coordinating with you and we'll have a future gathering in a meeting or two maybe just to close the circle. Understanding this is an on-going process he suspects there will be rules proposed to be amended or changed and obviously he doesn't know if we're going to get into that level of micro-management, but obviously we want to be sensitive to the differences between the CPO's, but sole source is something that does occur perhaps very in frequently or not at all, but at least two of three have had it happen at least once and so a good review will be a helpful thing because he knows it has been a topic the Board and others out there in the world, and you know sole source always raises a little more scrutiny than the other types of procurements by its very nature and taking a look back at it from time to time is a good exercise even if maybe at the end of the day, if they decide that most of the procedures are fine it certainly does help that we claim that they went through and did a review, had a fresh look at it regardless of what the outcome is. Chairman Stewart thanked the CPOs for coming here today and asked that CPO Brown could stay so they can roll right over into the next item on the agenda. Interim Director Blount asked for Mitzi Loftus to come up to assist CPO Brown with the e-Procurement discussion.

The next item on the agenda was e-Procurement. CPO Brown stated that as Interim Director Blount asked Ms. Loftus to join the conversation he will let her introduce herself, but representing CMS she's been an integral part of where e-Procurement has found itself. Mitzi Loftus, Deputy Director at CMS in Strategic Sourcing stated that yes, as CPO Brown has said, they worked over the last year and a half on requirements, solicitation, the award of the contract and their last step right now is get the Intergovernmental Agreement signed and they have a meeting tomorrow on that so they're heavily involved in the inter-dwellings of the vendors coming on board and meeting their requirements. Chairman Stewart stated that he has two quick questions, one specific and one a little more general, has Mr. Bhatt been involved in the process? CPO Brown replied absolutely. Ms. Loftus added that he is actually on the Executive Steering Committee. Chairman Stewart stated that he assumed, but just wanted to verify. CPO Brown stated that he can elaborate on that, the relationship between e-Procurement and the State's ERP system, which is a much larger IT improvement process for the State at large is one that has been intertwined since the inception of both concepts. Obviously, he's involved in e-Procurement at an executive level as ERP developed a year and half ago roughly. He participated on the Executive Committee for ERP and the CPO has been intricately involved in that from a Statewide prospective, so they're continually harmonizing these two systems because they will need to relate to one another. They have a very defined plan about how ERP and e-Procurement mind that relationship and don't create redundancy or overlaps or really waste people's time and energy from trying to accomplish two distinct tasks, so very much part of those processes. Chairman Stewart stated that obviously it's a complex topic, but if you had to describe, let's assume we are a year from now and we've executed on a plan as it's being crafted thus far, what's the result, what's the end product for the State, for the vendors? In a general sense you're moving forward down a process where you are working with CMS and the CIO and he knows that they are doing the ERP, but in terms of the e-Procurement describe if it all works out exactly as planned, what's it going to look like? Again, he knows that he may not know every aspect of it, but in general what do we have now and what's it going to look like and in what ways do we expect it to be better or more efficient or user friendly. CPO Brown replied that Ms. Loftus can help fill in the blanks if he misses anything along the way, but essentially they have a process today that operates out of many different systems. Half a dozen at least, sometimes more depending on how big of a net you want to cast to understand how people are measuring and conducting procurement. This e-Procurement initiative will demise all of those systems, every system except for the newly launched Illinois Procurement Gateway will be demised. The Gateway is actually being folded into e-Procurement to a degree and ultimately that could have a larger fold in with ERP, they're sort of the bigger fish gobbling up the littler fish depending on the nature of efficiencies in some of these relationships, but what we're doing is demising all of those old systems and what we're bringing forward is the following, in a single system the opportunity to track procurements cradle to grave, which not only gives

them a single place, a single opportunity to review all of those, but for the first time fully reportable. It actually establishes a receiving policy for the first time. The State of Illinois has been able to operate at large without a receiving policy. Now a receiving policy is fundamental in procurement, it's fundamental in fiscal operations, State laws actually compartmentalize that over time in a way that during receiving, if you will, they actually go to three or four different systems and say, okay we think we put this puzzle together now it is okay to pay a bill, or now it's okay to say we actually got all one thousand widgets we said that wanted, but it is very fallible today so they will have a receiving policy for the first time. We're also going to have interactivity with decision makers in procurement and agency processes. They will be able to do that in parallel for the first time so no more box cars, no more wait for one person to make a decision and that becomes untimely and then the next thing you know we're in between a 9 month procurement. So the theme the Board has heard him in the past say, in procurement we are best when we are on time, on target, on budget. This is a system that should allow them to do that. This is a very high level description that he is giving the Board, but it will tie to our financial systems. It will help us pre-populate our obligations with the Comptroller. We are working with the Comptroller's Office to insure that the processes that they put out through e-procurement are processes that they're comfortable with and that the agencies who are using these various financial systems, the accounting systems to do their work to see that it is appropriate. They have contracted with the vendors specifically, their e-procurement vendor has a mandate that this is something that they have to have, because they don't want to take any steps backward as they start to modernize their system. So those are really the high level touch points, but it's frankly capable of doing quite a bit more given the scale of modernization we expect to accomplish. CPO Brown asked Ms. Loftus is she would like to add anything.

Ms. Loftus stated that she would just like to add that the system that is used, and Interim Director Blount knows this quite well, the IGPS system that is used for equipment and commodities currently is the only system that shows any contract activity from master contracts. So they'll expand beyond the equipment and commodities that are used in IGPS to actually include all IT telecom facilities and everything will be in the system, you will be able to see the activity against master contracts or the activity that is outside a master contract, it will give them better ideas to what master contracts need to be created in the future. Also, the ability for the joint purchasing entities, the municipalities around, they will have more of a marketplace, an Amazon so to speak, to be able to go into this system and use their master contracts as opposed to having paper driven activity to the vendors and we will be able to see their activity as well for those who take advantage of it this of course, they can't mandate that they use it. Chairman Stewart asked if the vision for at least General Services, would there be any type of procurement not covered by the e-Procurement system? CPO Brown replied that the general answer is no. Every type of procurement they can conceive can go through this system. There may be very complex relationships occasionally some of their procurements in Illinois are driven specifically by statute. They will get a law every year or every other year that says go conduct a procurement in the following way, which sets aside their normal processes so they may have to consider how to deal with those when then emerge, but ordinarily they should be able to fold in all types of procurements to keep their daily capture and have the ability to see construction in this space for the first time. Not construction administration by any means, that's a whole different environment, but they can better understand construction, they can also, as Ms. Loftus stated, see our local government relationship first hand. They can't see those first hand today. Should those processes emerge and they believe they will, they'll have the first hand understanding about how expansive and how valuable State contracts are. CPO Brown stated that he will add that this is a scalable system. They bought a system that all of their entities can use. Should it come to pass that Higher Education wanted to use a system like this, the software is available to them. Now the programming might need to change and there's a cost for that and how that might relate to how Universities want to use such a system is an outbound consideration, but it is scalable and all they have to do is enroll membership for State employees or authorize users and there is no limit to that. Member Bedore asked if there has been a discussion with the other 4 CPOs to all be part of this program. CPO Brown replied that there has and he doesn't want to speak to what their considerations are. Each of them has some different challenges in their relationship to meet and in part he thinks they would like to benefit from seeing it launch in the General Services side to rather than be part of a pilot, figure out what they accomplished or didn't accomplish in their launch and how something might work easier, but again he would leave that for them to answer and how they might consider its value. CMS did think about the other CPO's when they negotiated with the vendor saying that they need this to be scalable. There are 4 CPOs in Illinois and should this become a system that they need to be using if it benefits them, then they want to bring them on at no charge. Ms.

Loftus stated that CDB sat in on a lot of their earlier meetings over a year ago and in one of their meetings yesterday with the vendor they did actually just say, remember we have to have a done all for CDB so they are planning on keeping them in the loop at this point. She hasn't spoken to CPO Grunloh, or CPO Bagby, but she believes they're open minded to it but they never sat at the table at the beginning. Ms. Loftus stated that she wanted to include one other thing that is of particular interest to the Board. They did try to incorporate some needs within their specifications and the contract that this will have the ability to track sub-contracting specifically for BEP, but not only for BEP because those aren't the only sub-contracts that they have. She has actually been working with Paul Cerpa and they're working on the vendor coming up with a demo to show him what might be available for him to see if that is going to accommodate his needs and if the system is very highly configurable as opposed to customizable and they plan on doing a lot of that obviously and incorporating a lot of the ancillary approvals, for instance, vehicle purchases. That's a completing separate paper document and they want to try to include that in an approval workflow as well as the printer attrition type approvals, so trying to incorporate any kind of approvals in the system that they possibly can. Member Bedore stated that he would assume that this would cover leasing and property. CPO Brown replied that in fact he had a conversation with Terry Schierholz a little over a week ago about planning a future opportunity to discuss how leasing will be represented in the system. In fact the Procurement Bulletin that they use today in General Services is one of the systems that will be demised and so if it's on the Procurement Bulletin it has to be in the new e-Procurement system. The question really is how much of it resides in the system versus how much of the process is outside. For example, the work that goes into preparing to lease a facility can be fairly complex and it may not be appropriate to try to do that level of complex work within a procurement system. They may do it outside the system and create an attachment that says by the way here's the file with the background for why they are procuring this lease. Chairman Stewart stated that he's a big believer in trying to modernize many systems in the State. In an agency we certainly could do better so he's glad to see we're moving down the path on this. He can imagine it would offer efficiencies and better understanding for vendors, for those who are seeking contracts and he does appreciate the sub-contracting piece and try and maybe use it as a way to track statutory obligations and MBE, veterans and that sort of thing. He's sure there's a lot of data we have that is locked up in paper and it's harder to access and the greater extent we can digitize that information there is probably uses we don't even know if we know or perhaps discover. Ms. Loftus stated that just so they don't oversell the whole sub-contracting piece, without an ERP system obviously there are a bunch of different interfaces. The main interfaces they have with IGPS today are AIS, which is one of the main accounting systems, PAAS which Public Aid, CARS which is DHS and of course the Comptroller. So until they have an ERP system with all those accounting systems that would interface to this, it will be relatively manual but at least the ability is there for interim solution if it happens to fit what the BEP program does. Chairman Stewart stated that he is sure it is better than what we have now. Ms. Loftus replied hopefully. Chairman Stewart stated that he does appreciate that there are moving parts beyond this and thinks everyone who has been through this with an IT upgrade that there are a few bumps along the road usually and appreciates her note of caution to temper the Board's expectations perhaps. CPO Brown stated that their timeline is within a year at this point. They have a one year roll out plan and he's more optimistic that they will be able to shave some time off that because of some strategic decisions that have been made about how turn the system on and how to collapse the other systems. So he thinks that they will be able to capitalize on that and certainly within a year's time they will have adopted, rolled out and trained the various users who will be required to do their government work through this system. Ms. Loftus stated that they have talked about this Executive Steering Committee and CPO Brown and herself are the executive sponsors and business owners, co-business owners, but they did make sure that they got people in the executive steering committee that would be a tie breaker if they can't agree to something, which so far it's been pretty smooth sailing, but in case there is a situation where there's something that CPOs feel strongly about it and CMS feels strongly a different way they do have a tie breaker group that is the Executive Steering Committee. Chairman Stewart thanked them and stated that they are looking forward to seeing that come to life and it's something he strongly encourages and is glad that the State is working together. Our partners at the CPO's office and CMS because it would probably, if it comes to fruition, well we will wait to see the results, but he would be very hopeful that it would lead to quite a few efficiencies and probably some benefits we cannot contemplate now. CPO Brown stated that he guesses this is worth a reminder, they have been working with Interim Director Blount and former Director Carter previously as long as this has been in concept the procurement tools the Board relies on as well are enveloped in this system so this Board is staked in e-Procurement from the fact that the Board has a great number of things that you accomplish through data and through these sorts

of things. So your representation in the Board's director has been available entirely and very helpful as they have experienced so far. Chairman Stewart asked if there were any other questions comments.

Member Bedore stated that he would just hope that as this program works forward, moves ahead, he would also really like to see the other CPOs not sitting on the sidelines and waiting until they're up and running. Obviously they have vested interest in this and they should be participating with this as it goes along as observers. So if this gets up and running and it's running well he doesn't want them to come in and be Johnny-come-lately on this. He thinks this should be Statewide. This is where we should be. We're no longer in the 1900 century so if there are some objections or some things that you're proposing be aware of it and should have comments now rather than wait until the system is up and running. Member Ivory stated that this was a number of years ago and it might have been before you were in your current role – is that when we were doing the disparity study it was just about embarrassing that we had to go back and try to find contracts and information, it was a tedious process and it was bad for the vendor who had the responsibility of doing the disparity study. This kind of helps resolve that problem, he assumes that we don't have to go back to the dark ages that this is a real aggressive move forward where we can get information at a much faster pace than what we were able to do in the past. CPO Brown replied it does and there are three layers of that sort of accountability that he would point to. One is that they will have spend analysis and they will be able to understand associated with the contracts that they issue, what's going on with them. Now the ones that interface with the accounting system will have more information to work with and ones that don't interface with the accounting system will be much more easier to align because they will have a contract inventory in the system and say here's the contract, let's call the Comptroller, let's see who's spending what and why. So it's the first layer they will actually be able to look at the contract and it's related spend. The second layer is that any contracting activity, whether it be sub-contracting or particular payables, etc., milestones can be managed in this system so that's the contract administration piece. Watching what they do with their decision making along the way that will emerge for the first time in a single place. The third he thinks is very specific to their comment, is that there is an opportunity to create areas of contract compliance where we're actually looking at the vendor and we're saying okay vendor, please tell us what is going on, have you used your sub-contractor lately, have you used them at all? Do you need to use them more? How much money have you spent given that you made a commitment to the State of Illinois to participate in the following way? The system does have that opportunity in it they just have to decide what levels they need to make that work and they also have some external systems that are going to collapse that still may help with gathering data for the disparity study and understanding their relationships with their vendors regardless of who they are. They need to better know how they interact with them and if the State is getting what they're paying for dollar for dollar. Ms. Loftus stated that it will be a little time before that data is able to be used in the system because really all they plan on converting and moving into the new system are those existing master contracts that they've got just because of the scope of trying to get all that together, because there is no one repository for that inventory right now. They figure they can start with that and have just a basic cut over and everything will start new in the system. So it might be year 1, 2, or 3 before all the contracts actually recycle through it, but it's definitely a way better situation than they have now. Chairman Stewart thanked them and the Board is looking forward on getting updates as they move forward in the process and he is personally looking forward to it. He thinks if it's done right it will be a big improvement for the State of Illinois. CPO Brown replied thank you and he concurs.

The next item on the agenda was Legislation. Interim Director Blount stated that the bill with the most immediate concern is HB3497, which is the CDB single prime bill that the Board opposed in March. The bill passed the House and was actually this morning held in the Senate Committee for further discussion to address some concerns from various groups. Chairman Stewart asked if the Board had their Senate Appropriation hearing yet. Interim Director Blount replied yes they did and it went very well. Chairman Stewart asked if there was someone from CDB who wanted to comment about legislation, if so they can come up now. Don Broughton, Administrator of Contracts, Jaclyn O'Day, Administrator of Legislative Affairs, and Jessie Martinez, Administrator of Fair Employment Practices were there to represent the Capital Development Board. Mr. Broughton stated that what they really want to do is just present themselves if the Board has any specific questions or concerns. Ms. O'Day and Mr. Martinez have been very much involved in negotiating and in discussing with different entities that have had concerns with the legislation for one reason or another. So they certainly are available to answer any questions the Board may have. Member Bedore asked what changes were made. Ms. O'Day replied that in the engrossed version of the bill that came over



from the House, there is a 5 year sunset that was put in the bill sunsetting single prime on December 31, 2020, but they are still in negotiations following legislation in the Senate. Member Bedore asked if she could go through that one more time, in English. Ms. O'Day replied that from the introduced version of the bill compared to the bill that passed the House and crossed over to the Senate, a sunset date was included in that legislation sunsetting single prime December 31, 2020. Ms. O'Day stated that she knows there was some discussion at the last meeting regarding minority/female participation as well as competition in terms of implementation of single prime and they are here to answer any questions if the Board wants them to go into any further detail. Member Ivory stated that they, Ms. O'Day and himself, have been in 4 or 5 meetings and Mr. Martinez and we could debate this and have a bunch of more questions, but he thinks there is a team of people from Senator Harris and Senator Radogno who are working with ABC and everybody else to try and find some common ground on this issue. He would simply state for the record that he is always a little bit concerned when someone lets the horse out of the barn and it's hard to try to put them back in the barn and as the legislation was presented before it really didn't have any authority for the PPB to have any input even though the Board has a 30 day window. The fact of the matter is that 30 day window would have been just a suggestion, the Board would have had no ability, and this is a new process in it of itself, single prime contracting has a lot of unanswered questions, but he thinks they have been over it enough and he thinks that the people who are going to be involved in this conversation throughout the State will hopefully come up with a compromise that really meets the need and really protects the interest of the State to make sure that we don't do something that later on becomes a bigger problem than what they anticipate so hopefully they have some real compromise. If you've got any particular thing that you would like to add to whatever has been discussed for the sake of the Board, but he's pretty familiar with the arguments on both sides of the issue. Ms. O'Day replied that she would just share that there are 48 other states that use single prime in some form or fashion and so that is why CDB has moved forward because we seem to be very successful in our pilot program, but they will certainly be involved in future negotiations as they move forward in the discussion about this legislation. Member Ivory stated that again, he should be careful because he doesn't want to get into a debate, but when we make the comment that 48 states are using the single prime contracting he thinks the perception sometimes is that's all they're using, so they're using single prime contracting, multiple prime contracting, and design-build too he's assuming, so it's not just that they're doing single prime contracting there are a number of things. It would be great if the Board knew the percentages of how much we're using single prime contracting and had some data to back up how they impacted minority participation. That would be helpful, but that might be challenging in the short time period that we are dealing with at the same time. Chairman Stewart asked if there were any questions comments from any members of the Board. Chairman Stewart stated that he appreciates them coming here today to share their thoughts and making themselves available for questioning and it sounds like the conversation will continue.

Chairman Stewart stated that the next meeting of the Board is scheduled for June 4, 2015 pending Board confirmation.

Member Bedore made a motion that the Board adjourns into Executive Session for the discussion of a personnel matter with Member Ivory seconding the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

\*\*\*

Chairman Stewart stated that they are back in open session. The last item on the agenda is the Executive Director appointment. Former Director Carter has moved on so the Board is now in a position to move forward to fill the position on a permanent basis. The Board will have a vote but at this time the Board plans on moving forward with Mr. Blount. Mr. Blount has been with at the Board for a number of years and has demonstrated mastery of the subject matter, has worked hard to improve his own abilities and skills. He has a high degree of institutional knowledge, which the Chairman believes is important for the Board to be successful in the future. There is a lot of change going on in State government these days and he believes it would serve the Board well to have a seasoned hand who doesn't need any training, has already established relationships with important stakeholders within this organization, with the CPOs, with members of the General Assembly and other stakeholders in the process. So if any other Board member wishes to make any other comments, but this is where he's at on the issue at this time. Member Bedore stated he has to agree

100%. He would like to make a motion. Member Ivory stated that he shares the sentiments of Member Bedore, Chairman Stewart and Member Morales also in terms of Mr. Blount being the person who is best suited for the job with his experience and background and they support that. He would suggest Member Bedore make the motion and he will second it. Member Bedore made a motion to appoint Mr. Blount as the Executive Director of the Procurement Policy Board with the salary that former Director Carter was receiving when he left. Member Ivory seconded the motion and the motion is unanimously approved.

With no further business to discuss a motion to adjourn was made by Member Bedore with Member Ivory seconding the motion. The meeting was adjourned.