

A.

1. Rich Capolupo called the meeting to order.
 - a. Rich introduced new members:
Sergio Flores
Regan Sabelhaus
Gabe Gonzales
 - b. Rich thanked everyone for their support regarding the Sub Contractors and indicated everything
Was just about resolved.
 - c. Introductions were made around the room.
 - d. The Sub Contractors Task Group was asked to align the rules with the audit check-list.
Group consisted of Sam Scaturro, Mitch Blum and Gary Manous
2. Rich addressed New Business.
 - a. Keith Cobley had submitted a request to make the Annual Audit priced on a flat rate.
A discussion ensued. Michael Daimiano said SSPC looks at their actual costs when determining
Each audits cost and that in some cases SSPC would be in the red if it was based on a flat rate.
The discussion was tabled until Keith could join the group as the overall consensus from the group was that they were satisfied with the existing fees.
 - b. Ideas were brought up that perhaps an incentive program could be developed to bring new
Contractors to the table to increase membership. Michael said he and Joe would canvas SSPC for types of incentives that could be developed.
 - c. Keith joined the group and explained his reasoning for the request of thee flat rate; which was the fact that they had written off \$40,000 in uncollected fees in 2017.
 - d. A Motion was made and seconded that Joe and Keith come back to the table with suggestions/proposal regarding rates.
3. Joe reported on DAC, wage and hour violations and it seemed it was the same contractors that were habitually making the errors.
 - a. Is there a way to enforce the issue if it is habitual and is there appropriate documentation o track these so it could be enforced. Perhaps a sliding scale of enforcement could be developed.
 - b. A Motion was seconded to create a Task Force to work with SSPC to develop a proposal to define a period of time with a base line to be defined, penalties that escalate when establishing a pattern of violation. VOTED and PASSED.
 - c. Joe indicated there had been an increase in minor violations. It was noted that there should be a cap on minor findings with guidelines to start corrective issues.

IT WAS DETERMINED THAT A CAP OF 5 OR MORE BE ESTABLISHED.
VOTED AND PASSED.

4. Jim King asked the question: How do you survive a bad coatings Inspector. A discussion ensued with Rich saying each situation is different and there was no way to intervene with established guidelines per job. Dan Zeratti indicated there are repeat offenders. He asked why the group could not come together and establish more serious guidelines for monitoring and enforcing. He also noted he would be retiring in the spring and his replacement on the committee should be named for his replacement.
5. As there was no other business the meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.