

**MARTIN METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO)
LOCAL COORDINATING BOARD FOR THE TRANSPORTATION DISADVANTAGED
(LCB/TD)**

**Monday, June 07, 2010 - 10:00 A.M.
Martin County Administration Building
Growth Management Conference Room, 1st Floor
2401 SE Monterey Road
Stuart, FL 34996
(772) 419-4081**

1. CALL TO ORDER – 10:05 AM

2. ROLL CALL

Members in Attendance:

Mayor Michael Mortell, Chairman
Werner Bols, Vice-Chairman
Suzanne Desposati
John Haddox
Ellen Higinbotham
Cindy Barnes
Jody Ianuzzi
Hylan Bryan (late arrival)
Phyl Weaver

Excused Members

Angela Van Etten

Members Not In Attendance:

Krista McGovern
Larry Merritt (FDOT)

Staff in Attendance:

Beth Beltran, MPO/Transit Planner Manager
Boyd Lawrence, MPO Planner II
Margaret Brassard, Temporary Assistant for MPO Manager

A quorum was present for this meeting.

3. APPROVE AGENDA

Mr. Werner Bols moved to approve the Agenda. Seconded by Ms. Phyl Weaver. Motion carried unanimously.

4. APPROVE MINUTES

Ms. Cindy Barnes moved to approve the minutes from the March 01, 2010 meeting. Seconded by Mr. John Haddox. Motion carried unanimously.

5. AGENDA ITEMS

A. CTC Evaluation Report

MEMO: temp10LCBTDa04.01

Ms. Beth Beltran, MPO/Transit Planning Manager, introduced this Item. She stated that an annual evaluation of the Community Transportation Coordinator's (CTC's) performance shall be conducted in general and relative to the Commission for Transportation Disadvantaged (CTD) standards. The Evaluation Committee included two Martin MPO staff: Ms. Beth Beltran and Mr. Boyd Lawrence, MPO Planner II; and two Members of the LCB-TD: Ms. Angela Van Etten and Ms. Hylan Bryan.

Chairman Mortell suggested that, since Ms. Bryan was running a few minutes late, this Item could be delayed until her arrival. The Members concurred, and Item A was tabled until after the discussion of Item B.

B. CTC Performance Report

MEMO: temp10LCBTDa04.02

As background, the Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC) is required to provide the LCB-TD with a quarterly report on its performance. The report for today's meeting would review the quarter covering from January 01- March 31, 2010 and it would also include data covering April 2010. Ms. Lisa Sanders and Ms. Kim Matreci, with Medical Transportation Management (MTM) offered a presentation.

Ms. Matreci proceeded to discuss the Transportation Disadvantaged Quality Report consisting of data from January through April 2010.

Ms. Matreci explained that even though the number of "Total Requested Trip Legs" was 1,611; just over 880 trips were "Completed Trip Legs". Trip legs refer to anyone who has called in and requested a trip. Completed trip legs are trips that actually occurred. The number difference between the two resulted from some trips that were shifted to public transportation (Community Coach) and to the New Freedom program, and because some trips were denied.

Ms. Matreci stated that the number of "No Shows" was very low.

Ms. Matreci mentioned that MTM experienced phone issues, which have been addressed.

Ms. Matreci said that the overall ridership utilization by the TD population varies by areas, and the percentage depicted in the report may not be an accurate representation. It is however, based on completed trips. She said that the numbers are more accurate in the Medicaid section of the report.

Ms. Matreci reported that the complaints from the TD population and the Medicaid population were low. Ms. Matreci said that Ms. Lisa Sanders would be handling complaints, as part of her new duties as MTM Program Manager in Martin County.

Ms. Matreci said that the Indiantown shuttle to Stuart and its in-town shuttle, averaged a steady increase from month to month.

The trips under the New Freedom program also showed a steady increase. Ms. Matreci stated that the New Freedom funding source had provided MTM with the ability to shift and to provide additional trips for TD riders and for Medicaid riders. The numbers on the report reflect this, as it allows more daytime rides that are medical-related, while non-medical rides can take place in the evening and weekends.

Ms. Matreci handed out a list of codes used to enter data in the MTM system. Each code listed has a description of the trip situation, for the benefit of the Members (copy on file).

Ms. Jody Ianuzzi stated that the time it takes to make a reservation over the phone with MTM is very long. She suggested that rather than reconfirming all of the information listed on the system, MTM should only ask if there are any new changes to be noted.

Ms. Matreci stated that the last portion of the report contained the breakdown requested by the Board Members during the last LCB-TD meeting. She reported on TD trips status and Medicaid trips, by month and by transportation provider. These last two sections of the report consisted of codes for each monthly report as to the number of riders, and whether the riders were picked up or denied, and if denied, why they were denied.

A question raised about the five contractors that work under MTM; one being Ride Right, which is owned by MTM. Ms. Bryan stated that while conducting the CTC evaluation report, she received two comments saying that, at the time the contracts were signed, it was suggested to some of the providers that they would receive somewhere between 50 – 60 trips a month; however, they are only receiving 1-10 trips per month. Ms. Bryan said that, on the other hand, Ride Right trips have increased: in January 2010 it had 190 trips, in February it had 193 trips, in March it had 216 trips, and in April it had 304 trips; while the other four contractor's rides have greatly declined. Ms. Bryan asked to know the reason for the uneven distribution of trips among the five contractors. Ms. Matreci stated that the main reason is that Ride Right has the availability to perform the trips requested; they meet the schedule requirements.

Ms. Matreci added that Acadiana, one of the other contractors, has decreased ridership at their own request. Nevertheless, Ms. Bryan indicated that she has talked to a representative from Acadiana and that was not what she was advised, Acadiana was rather surprised at the drop in rides allocation. Ms. Matreci stated that MTM meets with the providers on a regular basis and would ask if they would like to take on more trips. Ms. Matreci said that if a provider wanted more rides, their vehicles and drivers would have to have full credentials and not all the transportation providers can meet these requirements and/or credentials. The drivers need to have clean background checks, the MVR driver's license, and to comply with high standard insurance requirements. Some of the providers cannot meet all of these requirements. Ms. Matreci stated that MTM's trip allocation system is "very transparent". Ms. Bryan requested that this issue is open to the Board for discussion. Ms. Bryan asked if any of the Members were aware that this was happening. Chairman Mortell suggested that MTM should finish their presentation and that the Members should discuss the trips allocations issue during the next Item in the Agenda: The CTC Evaluation Report. Ms. Bryan and the Members assented.

Ms. Matreci commented that Ride Right operates the vehicles for New Freedom and for the Indiantown in-town and the trips to Stuart. Ms. Matreci said that due to these shifts in rides, the public transportation provider, Community Coach, is receiving many new trips that are not

reflected in the report. She said that some of the rides from Acadiana, We Care, and the other providers have decreased, and one reason is that the rides have been shifted out to New Freedom & the Indiantown in-town/to Stuart rides.

Ms. Beltran stated that some trips are funded with monies other than TD monies. Ms. Beltran said that the quarterly report being presented by MTM shows TD and the Medicaid trips but it does not include data for all the services rendered via the CTC, MTM.

Ms. Lisa Sanders said that some providers have expressed the desire to only transport the medical population, or that they prefer to service only within Martin County; therefore, those types of rides would be shifted to another provider, which would probably be Ride Right. Ride Right has expressed a willingness to take on the "out of county" trips and the "extended hour" type of trips.

There being no further questions on the report presented, Ms. Cindy Barnes moved approval of CTC Performance Report for January 1 – April 30, 2010. Seconded by Mr. Haddox. The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Mortell resumed the discussion of Item A, as Ms. Bryan has joined the meeting.

A. CTC Evaluation Report (Continuation of the discussion of Item A)

MEMO: temp10LCBTDa04.01

Ms. Beltran recapped and stated that, when the TD Commission was formed, it was the State's intention to provide TD services throughout the State, that were both efficient and competitive. The CTC must ensure that they provide not only efficient transportation, but also competitive transportation. Ms. Beltran said that the *Evaluation Workbook for Community Transportation Coordinators* was used for guidance to evaluate the CTC in the following aspects: 1) Coordination, 2) Cost Effectiveness and Efficiency, and 3) Competition. The evaluation was conducted from May 11 to June 4, 2010. The Evaluation Committee Members met on May 11, 2010 to organize the process, and again on May 21, 2010 to review the status of the evaluation process. There were three meetings between the parties, one with MTM.

Ms. Beltran discussed the first step in the evaluation process, which was to review the findings from the previous year 2009 CTC Evaluation and to ensure that the areas of noncompliance were addressed. Additional evaluation tasks included rider surveys, vehicle inspections, onsite operator observations, and contractor surveys. Several handouts containing a Contractor Survey and a Rider Survey were distributed for the Members' review (copies on file).

The 2009 Evaluation Report findings/recommendations were addressed. Ms. Beltran said that first finding/recommendation was that MTM's must present all coordination and/or subcontractors (providers) contracts to the LCB-TD Board. The providers' contracts are to contain a copy of the fee schedule as part of said contract. Ms. Matreci stated that Ms. Sanders would have the fee schedules available for the Board's review.

The next finding/recommendation that Ms. Beltran discussed was that the CTC should have the responsibility for the transportation services for the transportation disadvantaged. They should hold regular provider meetings and they should offer marketing materials to publicize the service. MTM has been providing marketing material and a favorable response is being noted.

In regards of the next finding/recommendation, Ms. Beltran said that the research about the utilization of the school buses has shown that no one else in the State is taking advantage of this commodity. The administrative code states that the CTC should maximize the use of the school buses in the coordinated system.

On the last finding/recommendation listed, Ms. Beltran said that there were difficulties locating the correct contact person for the Martin County's Workforce Solutions, formerly known as W.A.G.E.S. MTM is in contact with St. Lucie County's Workforce Solutions Agency. Mr. Bols gave the name of Ms. Glenda Thompson whose telephone number is 772-335-3030, extension 412 as the contact for Martin County. MTM took note of this suggestion.

The findings for 2010 Evaluation Report were reviewed next. Mr. Lawrence conducted the Vehicle Inspection report for the transportation providers and distributed a handout reflective of the same (copy on file). All providers returned a favorable report. Mr. Lawrence also presented the Board with an On-Site Observation of the System report for Indiantown, Stuart and Jensen Beach. All of which were in compliance, with the exception of a couple of drivers who were not carrying proper photo identifications, and one possible uniform infraction. Mr. Lawrence said that the driver without proper uniform was a new hire and was wearing an acceptable solid colored polo shirt. He stated that these infractions will be properly cured in the near future without a great deal of difficulty.

Additional comments regarding the safety of the vehicles were brought up, but the matters were quickly placed at rest as those issues had been addressed in the On-Site Observation of the System report. Ms. Ianuzzi suggested that for the visually impaired, as well as for all other riders, those drivers who may not be in proper uniform or wearing a nametag, should verbally identify themselves to the riders. It was agreed that it would be a good procedure to adopt.

Ms. Bryan proceeded to comment on the Contractor Survey (copy on file). She thanked Ms. Sanders, of MTM, for being diligent and helpful throughout the process. Ms. Bryan stated that she tried to contact each of the four TD providers, except Ride Right (MTM owned), to obtain input for the Contractor Surveys. She was unable to get information from Checker Cab despite concerted efforts on her part. There were two main concerns among the remaining three providers (Acadiana, Community Coach, and We Care): 1) the decrease in ridership and, 2) the slow processing of payments for trips provided. As for slow payment, it was learned that there were some contract issues. Ms. Bryan contacted Ms. Barbara Kaufmann of Community Coach, to see why the MTM's contract with Community Coach had not been signed. Ms. Kaufmann stated that there are some questions with information contained in the contract, and that she had her attorney review it. Ms. Kaufmann said that Community Coach's attorney tried to contact the MTM's attorney but they declined meeting with Community Coach's attorney. Ms. Kaufmann also stated that Coastal Care Transportation from the Martin Memorial Hospital, would not sign their contract with MTM either because there are some concerns with it; which did not necessarily pertain to the services provided, but that the document was not contractually acceptable to sign. Ms. Bryan recommended obtaining a copy of the contracts and have both the CTC attorney and the MPO attorney review it and see if any of the contractual stipulations need to be amended or negotiated. Ms. Matreci stated that a standard contract was used; however, Ms. Bryan reiterated that neither attorney for the Council for Aging and the Martin Memorial Hospital would sign the contract due to liabilities outside of the duties that they would be performing. Ms. Matreci was not aware of why MTM's attorney would not meet with the attorney for Community Coach. Ms. Matreci stated

that she would follow up with MTM's attorney to get this meeting arranged in an effort to work things out and get the contract issues resolved.

Ms. Bryan motioned to have a copy of the contract and a copy of the fee schedule forwarded to the MPO attorney, who is the County attorney; and have them review any liability issues the MTM contract may have; and have the County attorney contact the two agencies that have refused signing the contract, in an attempt to reconcile the parties involved. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ianuzzi. There being no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Bryan continued discussing the Contractor Surveys' results.

Ms. Beltran commented on the issue of delayed payments, expressed by the providers. She quoted Section P - Item 8 on page 6 of the Memorandum of Agreement between the Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged (CTD) and MTM, effective until June 30, 2013, "...All bills shall be paid to subcontractors within seven (7) calendar days after receipt of said payment by the Coordinator, in accordance with Section 287.0585, Florida Statutes." Ms. Beltran stated that the number of providers has dwindled from seven to four, excluding Ride Right (MTM owned) from the equation. Ms. Beltran said that when she contacted former TD providers, she learned that the reason for the decrease in providers is due to the lengthy time it takes MTM to get the invoices paid; some up to four months from the time the service has been rendered. Ms. Beltran requested MTM's input on the subject. Ms. Matrecci indicated that MTM has a reconciliation process, where the invoices cannot be paid until both parties have signed off on the paperwork, indicating that the trip was scheduled and that it took place. Ms. Matrecci explained that MTM sends a list of the scheduled trips to each provider. The provider then, needs to contact MTM to advise which trips transpired; otherwise, MTM would only show the trip as "scheduled", and not provided. After any changes have been made to the list and it is submitted to MTM's Reconciliation Department, the entire process takes approximately two weeks to be completed. Ms. Matrecci stated that the process exceeds the seven-day limit as required in the Florida Statutes. Ms. Matrecci reiterated that MTM would not pay for trips until they have been signed off and considered a "clean claim". Ms. Sanders was under the impression that the seven-day stipulation was from the time *after* the invoice was properly signed.

Chairman Mortell pointed that there were two outstanding issues. The first one was to obtain clarification about the seven-day stipulation on the Florida Statutes. The second issue was, as inferred from the providers' comments gathered, that they were not being paid in *months*, not just weeks or days. Chairman Mortell said that there is a need to clarify what the expectations and requirements for timely invoice-processing are, in order to effect trip payment and to insure that the procedures are executed appropriately by the parties involved. Ms. Bryan suggested two remedies to the situation. The first one being that, once the procedure for invoice processing is identified and clarified, proper training should be offered to the providers so there are no gray areas in the process. Additionally, Ms. Bryan suggested that there should be a report or a backlog showing paid providers, presented to the MPO. Ms. Matrecci stated that MTM would be happy to provide not only an aging-type report containing the status of all outstanding invoices for the past 30, 60, 90 and 120 days; but in addition, they will supply a copy of their reconciliation process to the Board.

Ms. Matrecci said that MTM has a payment calendar schedule that goes out to all transportation

providers. This payment calendar schedule clearly states MTM's reconciliation process and it indicates when the invoices will be paid.

Since the Reconciliation Department is housed in St. Louis, MO, Ms. Beltran suggested that, from the providers' standpoint, there should be a liaison designated at the local level for Martin County. Ms. Matreci responded that even though no billing should be submitted through Ms. Sander's at the Martin County office, Ms. Sander's has access and is able to answer any questions the providers may have regarding the reconciliation process or its status. Ms. Bryan asked if it would be appropriate to consider Ms. Sanders as the official point person to contact. Ms. Matreci replied in the affirmative. Ms. Beltran commented that she could infer that Ms. Sanders was not alerted about the delayed-payment situation the providers are experiencing, in spite of MTM claiming that there is an aging report being distributed regularly. For this reason, Ms. Beltran suggested that the local designee should be more involved and should follow closely the status of this aging report. Ms. Matreci replied that these are parts of Ms. Sander's functions in her new role as MTM Program Manager.

No motion was requested; however, for the record, it was stated that, as a result of the Contractor Surveys conducted, it was learned that several providers were experiencing continued delays in the invoice processing. As a remedy measure, the Board requested that the outstanding issue of remitting payment within seven days should be clarified, that payment delays should be addressed by following up the payment status on the aging report, and requested a commitment to clear all backlog payments still due; that proper reconciliation-process instruction and/or training should be offered to the providers, and requested to provide a copy of the aging report to the Board.

Ms. Sanders stated that Cobblestone has asked MTM to have them removed from the contract. It was mentioned that Cobblestone refused the inspection of their vehicles.

Ms. Bryan proceeded to discuss the Community Coach Rider Survey (copy on file). She said that Ms. Van Etten and she interviewed twenty-two riders randomly. In general, the results of the surveys were very favorable. Many riders indicated a successful and positive impact in their lives and daily activities. It was noted that the bus service is a very valuable asset, and that the users take this service very seriously.

Discussion was made as to why other providers are not getting the number of trip assignments that Ride Right is obtaining. Ms. Matreci stated that Ride Right has increased their hours to accommodate the extended trips and early-hours trips. Ride Right also provides out-of-County trips, which some providers are not be willing to offer. Members commented that it was noted that some riders were denied their trip. Ms. Matreci responded that the reasons for denial were lack of funding, no space available and/or because the service requested would be outside of the area served.

Ms. Matreci commented that the cost of Medicare rides, i.e. for dialysis, chemotherapy and for other ailment, raises very quickly and MTM often exceeds the monthly funding amount available by the fifth day of the month. Dialysis trips are being given priority due to its critical nature. This, in turn, triggers denial of trip requests early into the month. Ms. Matreci said that a lot of funding gets used up by the dialysis trips alone. The Members expressed concern with this situation. Ms. Ianuzzi stated that the burden should be placed on the Dialysis Center as they are a for profit organization. Ms. Bryan suggested that, on behalf of the LCB-TD Board, the Dialysis

Centers should be contacted to request some kind of partnership in order to alleviate the current dialysis trips situation, perhaps suggest to them to provide their own transportation. Ms. Bryan said that the Dialysis Center should be made aware that one hundred percent of all of the public Transportation Disadvantaged dollars are going the Dialysis Center's targeted population, and these funds are depleted by the fifth day of every month.

Ms. Matrecci said that they have worked with Dialysis Center staff before and they have been helpful by truly evaluating the patients to assess whether they need the transportation service regularly. Case Workers at the Dialysis Center help determine if the dialysis patients have any other means of transportation and to consider exhausting these means prior to requesting MTM's services. Ms. Bryan stated that having a letter sent to the Dialysis Centers would be in the best interest of the community given the current situation with the dialysis patients as the main users of the service.

Whenever possible, MTM has asked the riders to use other means of transportation when the request is for a non-medically necessary trip, to free up the services for other users and because funding is limited.

Ms. Ianuzzi had to be excused from the meeting. Before she left, she requested that agenda packages sent to her should be saved in a "Searchable Document" form so it would be compatible with her computer screen-reader program for the visually impaired.

It was also suggested gathering information, on a statewide basis, in a joint effort with the LCB-TD Boards to submit information to the State in an attempt to procure State funds for the special needs users, such as the dialysis patient population.

MPO Staff recapped the discussions on Item A, and requested that MTM will follow up and present to the LCB-TD Board at its August 23, 2010 meeting, the actions taken on the following findings/recommendations; which include pending items rolled over from the 2009 CTC Evaluation, and items from the 2010 CTC Evaluation:

- ✓ Include the Fee Schedule within the providers' contract
- ✓ Establish coordination with Workforce Solutions
- ✓ Address findings regarding the late payments to contractors. This recommendation includes instruction/training to the providers as to what MTM's invoice reconciliation process is, define the payment process for accurateness, provide an aging report as part of MTM's performance report, and clarify the "seven-day payment" stipulation of the Florida Statutes to ensure that the CTC is compliance with the transportation agreement.
- ✓ The providers will require photo identifications and/or nametags for the drivers.
- ✓ Recommendation that the MTM attorney look at the contract to resolve the issues raised by Counsel on Aging and Martin Memorial Hospital.

Ms. Bryan moved approval of the CTC Evaluation Report with recommendations as stated by MPO Staff for submittal to the TD Commission. Motion was seconded by Ms. Ellen Higinbotham. There being no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

C. Transportation Disadvantage Service Plan (TDSP) Update

MEMO: temp10LCBTDa04.03

Ms. Beltran provided background. She said that the Commission for Transportation Disadvantaged requires a Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan (TDSP) in order to meet the requirements to maintain eligibility for State funding. Ms. Beltran stated that Chapter 427, F.S. requires that a TDSP have a major update every five years with a minor update annually. The TDSP is developed jointly between the Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC) and the Designated Official Planning Agency (DOPA), which is the MPO, under the guidance and approval of the Local Coordinating Board for the Transportation Disadvantaged (LCB-TD). Ms. Beltran stated that the current 2009 - 2013 TDSP was approved on April 21, 2009 by the LCB-TD. Ms. Beltran introduced Ms. Lisa Sanders who would present the changes in this year's update.

Ms. Sanders proceeded to discuss verbiage changes/additions that were necessary in order to bring the TDSP up-to-date (copy of the revisions on file). Some of the changes/additions to the Plan were: preventive maintenance language was added to MTM's contract, bus stop signage has been installed in Indiantown, weekend and evening services were begun in January, 2010; adopting the list of service improvements for the new year 2013/2014, which was kept consistent with the previous year; among other updates.

Ms. Matrieci commented that MTM completed an audit last week. The audit was from the Quality Assurance Review for the TD Commission. She said that during the exit interview, the auditors deemed that the current Beneficiary (Rider) In-Take Form that is currently used to determine if someone qualifies as transportation disadvantaged and/or Medicaid, is not sufficient. The auditors felt that MTM was not capturing enough documentation and/or information to make this determination. MTM has fifteen more days in which to respond to the auditors' recommendation. Ms. Matrieci stated that they have not yet responded, and they wanted to present to the Board an additional step in the process that they would like to implement. This addition would be the Level of Need (LON) Assessments Policy (copy on file). MTM believes that the implementation of the LON Assessments Policy will serve as a corrective action. Ms. Matrieci asked that the LON Assessments Policy be added to the TDSP as an additional step to the initial Beneficiary In-Take Form, in order to provide a more accurate view as to the disability level of the individual requesting service. A copy of said policy was provided to the Board Members for review.

Mr. Werner Bols motioned to approve the MTM's LON Assessments Policy pending approval of the auditor that this addition will satisfy the audit exception. The motion was seconded by Ms. Higinbotham. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Sanders concluded the TDSP update review, including mention of the updated list of providers and the reduced number of vehicles from seventy-two to fifty-seven vehicles.

Ms. Beltran stated that the *Billing* section of the TDSP currently says, "...MTM submits payment based on their payment schedule to a transportation provider once all invoices are signed off by transportation provider for services rendered." MPO Staff suggested modifying this wording to reflect the previous Board's discussion, as follow: MTM submits payments based on their payment schedule and in accordance to the prevailing Memorandum of Agreement with the Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged (CTD). Ms. Beltran said that revisions to the

Billing section should also be considered once clarification is obtain in regards to the seven-days payment deadline established in the Florida Statutes.

Mr. Bols made a motion to approve the 2010 Update to the Transportation Disadvantage Service Plan (TDSP) for Martin County with the conditions set forth by MPO Staff. Seconded by Ms. Bryan. There being no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

6. NOTED ITEMS (Copies on file)

A. TD Quarterly Progress Report

B. MTM Service Announcement - MTM announces Saturday transportation services to the residents of Indiantown with disabilities, low-income and elderly seeking integration into the work force and /or full participation in society (copies on file). Ms. Sanders said that this service will be effective on June 19, 2010.

7. COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS

None

8. COMMENTS FROM FDOT

None

9. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

10. NEXT MEETING

August 23, 2010

- Regular meeting at 4:40pm
- Public Hearing at 6:00pm

11. ADJOURN

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 11:55am.

Recorded and Prepared by:



Margaret Brassard, Temporary Assistant for MPO Manager
and Lisandra Bonet, Administrative Specialist II



Date

Approved by:



Mayor Michael Mortell, LCB/TD Chairman

Werner Bols, Vice Chair



Date