

State Rehabilitation Council (SRC)

May 27, 2015

9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

MINUTES

Utah State Board of Education

Main Conference Room

Conference calls: 1-877-820-7831 269450#

Next Meeting: Wednesday, May 27, 2015

PRESENT:	Kelly Boehmer	Sharon Brand	Karim Mardanolou
	Ron Campbell	Melissa Freigang	Lester Ruesch
	James Harvey	Rylee Williams	
	Evelyn Owen		
PHONE:	Kent McGregor	Merina Pope	
EXCUSED:	Jan Carter	Melissa Schindler	Amy Powell
	Susan Loving	Tammy Wood	Sandy Terry
USOR Staff	Stacey Cummings	Jennifer Roth	Aaron Thompson
	Gordon Swensen	Eric Roux	Lynn Nelsen
GUESTS:	Ralph Glathar	Frank Cowan	
USILC:	Tom England	Brooke Wilson	13 Members
AUDITORS:	Internal Legislative Auditors (2)		
	Interpreters		

WELCOME/MISSION STATEMENT

Sharon Brand, Chair, welcomed Council members and called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. The mission statement was read by Lester Ruesch. Sharon requested any amendments or corrections to the April 2015 minutes as presented to the Council. Page 7 paragraph 3 was changed to read \$5.74, instead of 5.74%. No other corrections were given. Motion was made to approve the minutes as amended. Motion seconded by Melissa Freigang. All were in favor, none opposed. Executive Committee Elections will be conducted in the June meeting. Open positions are Vice Chairman, Secretary and Member-at-Large. Sharon welcomed USILC members to our joint meeting and Rylee's team of counselors from the Downtown District observing the meeting.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR UPDATE AND REPORT
AND FINANCIAL REPORT**

**STACEY CUMMINGS
JENNIFER ROTH**

Stacey Cummings, Interim Executive Director, stated we are in process of trying to finish our FY16 budget so we can submit it in June to the USOE Board for approval. We're waiting to hear the new Executive Director announcement as well as the director of DSBVI. There are 2 handouts of budget information. The Monthly Budget Summary was presented to the finance committee of the Board of Education last month.

On your handouts, half way through the columns under the column header "Payroll Indirect and BASE Obligations", it used to just say BASE obligations, and these were encumbrances that had been built into BASE. There is a 2 week time lag between employees' pay date and pay period end date, so when we say this information is as of April 30 2015, it only covers the first payroll period and not through April 30. In the "Payroll Services" line is an estimate for the payroll going through April 30th 2015. On the bottom line we talk about other charges and pass-through which is an estimate on indirect costs that had not been paid as of April 30th but for which we have incurred costs. The Board asked that we include the wording "Estimated Budget Summary" because of this. Kent commented the Braille done on the charts was well done and he was able to interpret those accurately. We will continue to send out the charts early so they can be brailled. Question was asked what is the lag time in terms of payroll and salary. This meeting is the last of the month, and we can't run the numbers until after the end of the month. We are about 1 month behind as far as what is on your handouts. For payroll, the lag is about 2 weeks. Stacey said we run this report at the end of every month and we submit it to the Board once a month. The case service numbers are run every week. This is the \$6.3 million we're tracking. Melissa said she wanted to make sure she understood the timing of the reports. When this committee meets the numbers will be not up to date. If anyone wants the most current report, Lynn could email it to you if you request it.

Jennifer said when we prepare this report for the Finance Committee it is more timely for them than when we report it to the SRC. The numbers the SRC sees at this point is an estimate of the 2 numbers that have an asterisk by them due to payroll. (See charts below)

The other handout is the tracking of the case service budget which is done weekly. Jennifer pointed out there are 2 sections that say "Cumulative Authorized as of 5/5/2015". This is an error on Jennifer's part and it should read "Cumulative Authorized as of 5/12/2015". At that time we had authorized 19% of the supplemental budget of the \$6.5 million. As of last night, we have authorized \$1.5 million or about 23.6% of the budget. We are at 10 out of 15 weeks through our spending time frame and our target could be at 67% spending. We have a little under \$5 million remaining of the supplemental money. Ron asked why there would be such a difference. Was the estimate of \$6.3 million too much? Stacey replied it's a combination of things. The estimate was high because we have not maintained the level of spending we had before, plus we estimated for extra time - we estimated for more weeks than we needed. Also, part of it is the time of year, part of it is Order of Selection (OOS), causing intake and assessment costs to drop. Aaron added that leading up to suspension of paid services counselors were trying to authorize services before the OOS, creating less disruption to clients in plan.

PBAA PED Office of Rehabilitation											
Object_Category_Name	Working Budget	Adjusted Budget	Actual Expenditures as of 4/30/15 - SFYTD	Payroll, Indirect, & Base Obligations as of 4/30/15	Obligations in Iris as of 4/30/15	Total		Budget Remaining			
AA Personnel Services	37,441,950.06	35,055,246.32	27,490,105.15	1,857,973.60	*	29,348,078.75	84%	5,707,167.57	16%		
BB Travel/In State	229,959.56	224,959.56	114,411.82			114,411.82	51%	110,547.74	49%		
CC Travel/Out of State	144,120.22	149,120.22	67,076.80			67,076.80	45%	82,043.42	55%		
DD Current Expense	6,993,608.35	6,993,608.35	5,052,512.65	228,428.98		5,280,941.63	76%	1,712,666.72	24%		
EE Data Processing Current Expense	791,258.68	791,258.68	613,607.93	3,935.43		617,543.36	78%	173,715.32	22%		
FF Data Processing Capital Expenditure	780,654.28	780,654.28	590,584.71	146,090.49		736,675.20	94%	43,979.08	6%		
GG Capital Expenditure	561,032.49	561,032.49	555,720.66			555,720.66	99%	5,311.83	1%		
HH Other Charges/Pass Through - Case Services (7203) - Old Year (T624)	-	1,502,545.34	1,357,825.16			39,244.01	93%	105,476.17	7%		
HH Other Charges/Pass Through - Case Services (7203) - Current Year	17,862,355.21	18,020,335.72	14,506,769.43			3,060,308.91	97%	453,257.38	3%		
HH Other Charges/Pass Through - Case Services (7203) - Supplemental	-	6,514,000.00	36,704.68			844,601.94	14%	5,632,693.38	86%		
HH Other Charges/Pass Through - Case Services (7203) - DDS	3,092,866.05	3,092,866.05	2,902,314.98			2,902,314.98	94%	190,551.07	6%		
HH Other Charges/Pass Through - Independent Living (7512)	3,531,930.00	3,531,930.00	2,278,774.42			2,278,774.42	65%	1,253,155.58	35%		
HH Other Charges/Pass Through - ASPIRE Pass thru to Other States (7521)	4,884,684.00	4,884,684.00	1,606,291.41			1,606,291.41	33%	3,278,392.59	67%		
HH Other Charges/Pass Through - Everything Else	2,478,570.84	2,495,582.84	1,382,575.85	565,939.25	*	1,948,515.10	78%	547,067.74	22%		
TA Trust & Agency Disbursements	-	-	450.00			450.00	#DIV/0!	(450.00)	#DIV/0!		
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	78,792,989.74	84,597,823.85	58,555,725.65	2,802,367.75		3,944,154.86	77%	19,295,575.59	23%		
Points to Consider											
* Estimates for payroll and indirect costs incurred but not yet paid/recorded as of the date of this report.			1 -	The portion of this spreadsheet that has the black border around it represents total paid client services for Vocational Rehabilitation for SFY15, including the supplemental appropriation.							

				6 / 15 wks			7 / 15 wks			8 / 15 wks	
				40.00%			46.67%			53%	
	Budget	% of Budget	Cumulative Authorized as of 4/28/2015	% of District Budget	% of Total Expenditures	Cumulative Authorized as of 5/5/2015	% of District Budget	% of Total Expenditures	Cumulative Authorized as of 5/5/2015	% of District Budget	% of Total Expenditures
District 10	432,749.38	6.6%	19,190.02	4.43%	2.42%	27,621.93	6.38%	2.76%	47,500.93	10.98%	3.84%
District 15	712,025.62	10.9%	44,730.73	6.28%	5.64%	68,527.91	9.62%	6.84%	78,002.88	10.96%	6.31%
District 20	716,335.24	11.0%	82,451.18	11.51%	10.39%	86,285.05	12.05%	8.61%	101,891.00	14.22%	8.24%
District 25	492,197.97	7.6%	69,430.15	14.11%	8.75%	81,460.41	16.55%	8.13%	107,034.71	21.75%	8.66%
District 30	819,432.23	12.6%	103,933.57	12.68%	13.10%	130,769.32	15.96%	13.06%	159,921.45	19.52%	12.93%
District 40	805,060.00	12.4%	66,039.05	8.20%	8.32%	78,338.15	9.73%	7.82%	97,011.19	12.05%	7.85%
District 45	595,059.90	9.1%	62,197.92	10.45%	7.84%	76,428.14	12.84%	7.63%	89,080.03	14.97%	7.20%
District 50	655,766.01	10.1%	83,236.11	12.69%	10.49%	117,249.68	17.88%	11.71%	149,318.55	22.77%	12.08%
District 55	503,665.22	7.7%	101,574.21	20.17%	12.80%	149,860.45	29.75%	14.96%	170,740.57	33.90%	13.81%
District 60	630,245.43	9.7%	106,334.79	16.87%	13.40%	117,194.14	18.60%	11.70%	146,959.73	23.32%	11.89%
District 80	151,463.00	2.3%	54,215.16	35.79%	6.83%	67,873.15	44.81%	6.78%	89,011.69	58.77%	7.20%
	6,514,000.00	100.0%	793,332.89	12.18%	100.00%	1,001,608.33	15.38%	100.00%	1,236,472.73	18.98%	100.00%
	Weekly Authorizations	Budget Remaining									
3/20/2015	83,898.80	6,423,031.70									
3/27/2015	102,937.01	6,320,094.69									
3/31/2015	106,199.89	6,213,894.80									
4/7/2015	81,819.65	6,132,075.15									
4/14/2015	117,812.12	6,014,263.03									
4/21/2015	130,847.81	5,883,415.22									
4/28/2015	162,748.11	5,720,667.11									
5/5/2015	208,275.44	5,512,391.67									
5/12/2015	234,864.40	5,277,527.27									
5/19/2015											
5/26/2015											
6/2/2015											
6/9/2015											
6/16/2015											
6/23/2015											
6/30/2015											

When we got the supplemental funding there was a dip in terms of authorizing services. We are also being more efficient by using comparable benefits. A good example is Workforce Services and utilization of TANF funds which provide benefits to mutual clients. Spending has picked up recently and can be attributed to summer school, VR assessment fees for clients finishing their training, and more job placement services. Going into the 3rd quarter we usually have many new referrals, but OOS has caused a decrease. Ron wanted to know what impact this has had on new clients who need paid services, and what is the likelihood that they'll receive what they need per district? Aaron replied that if someone applies for services and is determined eligible they go on the OOS waiting list as all categories are closed. They're not meeting with the counselor, but the counselor is doing a check-in call and is providing information and referral services. That can assist in meeting needs. Currently there are over 3000 on the waiting list. Counselors are monitoring them to see if anything has changed with their needs, interests or disabilities. We've received feedback from District Directors that individuals want to stay on the waiting list. Ron asked if there was an estimate of when we can open the OOS. Aaron replied there are many factors to consider, i.e. looking at our resources, developing our budget, determining if we'll get re-allotment, and also our spending patterns with clients in plan. Counselors have submitted budget projections estimating needs of clients in plan for the next year. We're a few months away from being able to lock down a possible date of opening up categories. We want to make sure we can provide services to those already in plan. Ron said if clients can't get on VR today they may move on and get into a cycle of poverty that we could have avoided by providing services. Hopefully we can open the OOS sooner than later. Aaron said no one wants to put people on the waiting list but we want to serve them appropriately when we move them into planned services. We want to maintain relationships with our community partners especially the schools. Rachel Anderson works with schools and reports regularly to SRC. She is letting people know they should apply as soon as possible so they can move into plan when we're ready to open categories. We want clients to know what we're able to do, and we don't want to open categories without the financial resources to help them. Jennifer is providing the most accurate understanding of our spending. She is identifying trends, what we're spending on different categories, and providing the most accurate assessment of our resources. Stacey added that we could go back to the legislature with our numbers, and they'd think we overestimated and we still don't know what we're doing. We will report to the Social Services Committee and the Executive Appropriations Committee at their Interim meetings in June. They will want to know where we're at, where we're going, what are we going to do and why. We were told we have statutory authority to carry the appropriation forward unless someone within the legislature decides against it. We will make a case that we are being frugal, appropriate, and are using comparable benefits. We really want to carry that money into fall, which is our most expensive time of year.

Jennifer said it looks erroneous because at the end of the calendar year we had been averaging authorizations of approximately \$525,000 a week. When we put together our estimate to the legislature, \$6.3 million was conservative at the time. Stacey said we were being as conservative as possible and at same time asking for an amount of money that we might actually get. Melissa wondered if the savings from efficiently and effectively working with our partners would help us go off OOS sooner? Stacey said the longer we spend less money, the more money will be freed up in next year's budget to open up categories. We will open the most significant disabilities categories first, but we can also open a category partially. Right now we're not sure we'll get reallocation or not. In addition to saving the money we have, whether or not we get reallocation will be the biggest factor in opening up categories and to

what degree. We're providing services for, approximately 15,000 clients who are in plan, which is still a significant number of individuals who need our paid services. Melissa asked if the resources from partners are ones that we typically get annually. Will these continue forward or are they a one-time thing? Stacey stated it would be a combination of both. There was extra money in TANF funding this year, and DWS has been helpful in providing ways to pay for services, providing training and special grant programs that might not be available next year. Other comparable benefits like Pell grants, low cost clinics, dental care, and free mental health, are things that will continue and we encourage their use. Counselors have discovered resources they didn't know were out there. We'll get a new state allocation at the beginning of July, but can't justify any additional FTE's.

Kent asked Stacey if he could be informed by email when new DSBVI Director and new Executive Director for USOR are selected. It will be forwarded to Lynn to send out as quickly as possible. Scott Jones was appointed to Associate Superintendent of USOE. He will be over internal accounting and IT operations within USOE. We feel great about him being there as someone who has knowledge of USOR operations.

DIRECTORS REPORT

AARON THOMPSON

Last month Aaron went to a learning collaborative meeting as part of a project we're doing with University of Massachusetts and the Rehabilitation Technical Assistance Center. Kyle and Aaron presented on our Client Engagement Study several months ago, and this was a follow up meeting for other members of the project. There are 12 other states who have different projects, ranging from retention and recruiting, OOS, revising job descriptions, and revising policies on job placement services. Aaron's presentation was about the Client Engagement Study. This project has been going on since last August. The data collection and assessment phase has just been completed. The next step will be a core leadership retreat with our District Directors, to present information and get their feedback. This will look at strategies of how people can be successful as they advance through VR. It will also look at things we need to change with policies and procedures that are barriers to employment. We need to amend and extend the contract so we have approval for the core leadership retreat. Aaron co-facilitated a break-out session on OOS in Massachusetts to share what we've learned, and there was great interest. Under WIOA, there is 15% reserve specifically for pre-employment transition services, and many were concerned that putting aside that amount of money might push them into OOS.

Aaron is going to be presenting Classification Tools in a webinar in September. Last month there were notices of WIOA rule proposals and drafted regulations. These are currently open for public comments and also comments from state VR agencies. Comments are due by June 15, and Aaron and Stacey are reviewing all draft documents. There is a lot of information and program changes in terms of operation at an administrative level. How counselors work with clients will remain the same, but under WIOA there are changes with Unified State Plans, common measures, and program outcomes. We're having meetings with DWS regarding the draft regulations and laying groundwork for developing the Unified State Plan. There is clear verbiage about the role of SRC remaining in an advisory capacity and assisting in developing the VR section of the Unified State Plan. These are federal regulations. The regulations will come out in early January and be finalized by June 2016, 18 months after WIOA was signed into law. Question was asked if the Unified State Plan addresses the role of Independent Living?

Aaron will look into this. It has been helpful identifying students' requirements and how pre-employment transition services are used. One of the key things we're working on is tracking pre-employment transition services through service codes, as well as counselors' documentation of their time with students with disabilities. We're looking at clarification of homemaker closures and unpaid family workers. Those were previously allowable successful employment outcomes, but they are no longer allowable. The new goal is that clients must meet the guidelines of Competitive Integrative Employment. Another key thing is a checkpoint with District Directors and Supervisors to get feedback from community partners and clients. For the 2nd quarter our referrals are only down about 4.7% so the 3rd quarter might be more telling. We are 8% down from FY13. We had a staff check-in at the last State Administrators Meeting (SAM) and got feedback on how staff is doing with all the changes that have occurred over the last few months. Our staff is doing an excellent job being engaged and providing services. To date we have 1924 successful employment outcomes.

Sharon asked if those on OOS are being tracked as far as the number of people calling in to the wait list. There is no tracking system other than counselors monitoring phone calls every 90 days and documenting conversations in the case management system for changes in address, phone numbers etc.

Ron wondered how the wait list will affect customer satisfaction. He thinks there should be a component on the Customer Satisfaction Survey that includes those on the waiting list. No one is in the Quality Assurance position right now. We're using the FTE vacated by Kevin John to fill this job. Aaron stated we're doing checkpoints and getting direct feedback from those on the wait list. When we implemented OOS on March 2nd there were approximately 2000 people moved onto the list and now there are 3000. It was noted that it looks like UCAT is safe from funding cuts.

UPDATE ON EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SELECTION PROCESS

SHARON BRAND

Sharon said there were 33 applicants for Executive Director and these were pared down to 8 people and ranked. The ranking was done independently and was sent in and calibrated. Sharon is trained as a recruiter and only found 5 that could fill the bill. From that they narrowed it down to 3 candidates that came in for an actual interview. 2 are from out of state, (Texas and Idaho), and a 3rd candidate had involvement with community development and case management through the Department of Labor. The selection committee has come to consensus but we will not know until next week. Sharon had assistance from Kris Fawson in Ron's absence. Kent asked what a behavioral interview process was. Sharon stated each candidate was asked to take 2 projects; one they were successful on and one that they weren't successful on and present it like a book. This was a great way of showing how they organize people, manage people, budgeting etc. so that at end of process you have actual examples.

RECAP

Aaron gave brief recap for USILC members after the break. Key points:

- Stacey Cummings is Interim Executive Director
- Interviews for USOR Executive Director have taken place

- Reviewing the current budget, we're using supplemental funding with the goal of carrying over the supplemental funding into FY16
- We're preparing our USOR budget to submit to the Board for approval
- We're reviewing WIOA draft regulations, organizing and submitting comments that are due by June 15. We are meeting with DWS because we have to have a Unified State Plan.
- Aaron described how we're monitoring the OOS wait list and how we're outreaching to individuals on the list. We don't have a set timeline for opening up the first category, but we want to make sure we're within federal regulations
- As of yesterday we have placed 1924 individuals in competitive employment outcomes

Ron asked about WIOA regulations, and Aaron said it's more an interpretation of legislative intent. We expect to have legislation where tweaking will be done. As council members we should review the WIOA regulations ourselves especially the part that has to do with the SRC role. Aaron will forward notices of the proposed rules so SRC can look at the section specifically regarding the SRC Board. Lynn will resend out the email on WIOA regulations

USILC PRESENTATION

LESTER RUESCH, BROOKE WILSON, DEBRA MAIR

Lester spoke about the role of USILC. Independent Living federal requirements are a combination of new codes, and text that was added by WIOA is underlined in the handout. The purpose of Independent Living is to promote self-determination and consumer control. Independent Living centers were started by people with disabilities in the 70's when they were being denied access to services. It grew to become a national organization that still holds to consumer control and is consumer driven. The majority of members and the board of directors must be people with disabilities (51%). Lester emphasized that Independent Living involves:

- Consumer control
- Peer support
- Self help
- Self determination
- Transition from care centers to community-based residences
- Equal access
- Transition for youth with significant disabilities
- Individual and system advocacy

USILC is frequently asked if they are a residential facility. They are not. Independent Living's mission is the opposite - to provide support to individuals so they can be successful in their own homes and communities. Independent Living was moved from RSA to Department of Health and Human Services. This established a new Independent Living Administration.

There are two important issues to be addressed:

- Regulations need to be rewritten and expanded because of WIOA
- Indicators for minimum compliance for the Statewide Independent Living Centers (SILC) need updating

SILC must be organized and maintained for a state to receive any monies for Independent Living. Members of the council shall be appointed by the State Board of Education in Utah

rather than by the Governor. The membership on the council should represent a cross section of statewide people with disabilities. They may not be state employees or center employees.

Council makeup must include a Director of a local Independent Living Center. Other members shall be:

- Parents' of individuals with disabilities
- Individuals with disabilities
- Advocates for people with disabilities
- Representatives from business
- Representatives from organizations providing services to people with disabilities
- Other appropriate individuals

We do not have a center for Independent Living on American Indian Tribal land. If one were established we would be required to have a member from that Center as well. We used to have a Section 121 member, but are no longer are required to have this representative. We provide services to all counties in the state so all American Indian people should be able to access services. If we had a center on Tribal land the funding may come from Title 121. Ron would like USILC to look into it to see if there is funding for a Tribal Land Center so that Federal funds are not lost.

Kent asked if Independent Living was trying to make sure people from the Senior Blind Community are represented? Lester replied it will be looked into.

Duties of Independent Living:

- Development of statewide Independent Living plan to be jointly developed by statewide Independent Living Council and directors of Independent Living Centers
- Provide long term community based services and supports
- Submit reports and keep records
- Conduct resource development to support activities described in the plan
- Ensure Independent Living meetings are open to the public

Another new agenda is that the council may, unless prohibited by state law, work with centers for Independent Living to coordinate services with public and private entities and we can conduct our own resource development. We may now fund raise, which we had not been able to do previously. USILC is its own non-profit, under 501-C3 status.

Brooke said they are writing the next 3-year state plan that will go into effect October 2016. They will go to each center for public input and she invited participation in public hearings via websites and various other modes. Look for announcements on when the schedule for public input is.

The state plan shall describe how the state will provide Independent Living services that promote full access to community life for people with significant disabilities. It must be signed by 51% of the Directors of Centers for Independent Living.

Debra Mair is on her last term as a member of USILC and she is also the Director for the Utah Center for Independent Living. Her goal is to provide services for people with disabilities so they may be more independent. USILC meets with people to write up a plan about their goals and what areas they want to be more independent in. People leave USILC with new skills and

are more independent than when they started. No matter where you go in the country you can expect these services. Self-advocacy is stressed. Peer support is central, as is consumer control, and every center has classes to develop life skills. There are 14 locations throughout the state of Utah. One of most important functions is to develop leadership skills in youth. The State Plan contains information for transition-age youth, ages 14-22 on how to gain skills to be more independent. Also included in the State Plan is that USILC is to help people living in nursing homes return to living in the community. In Utah there is a program in rural centers to service people, but this service isn't readily available. USILC also lends Assistive Technologies to the community through their loan bank program. They also provide information on housing. Ron wanted to know if the staff USILC hires are Occupational Therapists? This is not the case. Independent Living has the philosophy that people with disabilities are not sick, so they've moved away from the medical model. Ron asked about how much volunteer work is done or is it mostly paid staff? Most work is provided by paid staff. Lester added VR and Independent Living have a lot of individuals in common and we work jointly with each other. Their state funding comes through VR. Lester said a representative from Independent Living must be included on the SRC Board. Ron wondered if we could have the yearly meeting at one of the USILC centers next year. Lester said that would be a good idea and there would probably be a skills center that we could meet in. It will be looked at in Executive Committee and Sharon will bring it to the Board for discussion.

OPEN DISCUSSION/PUBLIC COMMENT

Sharon moved forward to open discussion and public comments.

Kent said Bill Gibson's retirement party is scheduled for tomorrow at DSBVI. Evelyn Owen of CAP said there are fewer clients applying for help at the Disability Law Center. Evelyn was able to visit Sharon at her place of employment and was impressed with how they're trying to build business relationships within the community.

Sharon requested everyone get the nomination form for Executive Committee members back to Lynn a week before next Council meeting. Please ask people before nominating if they want to be on the council, have an actual interest and will commit to being here for most every meeting. We are looking for a Vice Chair, Secretary and Member-at-Large. When Kent's term expires after next year we will have 2 Members-at-Large on the Council as there will be no past chair. It was noted that when you become Chair, there are national meetings to attend that represent the state. Next meeting we will bring nominations to the floor.

At the last meeting there was an open discussion about self-employment and Melissa said she had opportunity to do due diligence, and said there was a lot of pre-work that goes into it before the placement. No motions were requested.

Coming up in February are the nominations for new council members. The term for serving on the SRC Board is for 3 years. Council Members can serve 2 terms. After 6 years of service they can be nominated again for services after a 1 year break. Members can serve an additional 3 years, but must have a year's break in between.

There were no further comments and the meeting was adjourned at 11:20. Next meeting will be June 24th, 2015. Submitted by Lynn Nelsen.

