



**Brain Injury Advisory Council Meeting
Nebraska VR Office
Lincoln, NE
March 8, 2019**

MEETING MINUTES

Public notice of upcoming meetings will be available on the Department of Education website under “conferences & meetings” at least 10 days prior to each meeting.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tiffany Armstrong, Jerry Bryan, Nancy Coffman, Tania Diaz, Mark Draper, Brett Hoogeveen, Dale Johannes, Carla Lasley, Brooke Murtaugh, Judy Nichelson, Peg Ogea-Ginsburg, Vaishali Phatak, Peggy Reisher, Kathy Scheele, Frank Velinsky

MEMBERS ABSENT: Michelle Hawley-Grieser, Kristen Larsen, Zoe Olson

STAFF PRESENT: Keri Bennett, Ashley Hernandez, Nancy Noha

VISITORS: John Ferrone, Shane Rhian, Will Schmeeckle, Chris Stewart

The meeting of the Nebraska Brain Injury Advisory Council commenced at 10:03a.m. Public notification of this meeting was made on the Nebraska Department of Education web site.

APPROVAL OF DECEMBER, 14TH MEETING MINUTES

The minutes from December 14, 2018 were reviewed. A motion was made by Mark Draper and seconded by Frank Velinsky to approve the December 14, 2018 meeting minutes as submitted. There were no objections to the motion. **The motion carried by unanimous consent.**

AGENDA APPROVAL

The agenda for the day was reviewed. Judy proposed having a working lunch instead of breaking in order to accommodate those traveling. A motion was made by Carla Lasley and seconded by Nancy Coffman to approve the agenda with the amendment of a working lunch. There were no objections to the motion.

The motion carried by unanimous consent

OPEN MEETINGS ACT

Judy Nichelson stated that the meeting was an open meeting and the Open Meetings Law was posted on the side table.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Tiffany Armstrong shared her opinions about the most recent RFP process by reading a prepared statement which is quoted here:

“I wanted to make a public comment to express my frustration and disappointment in our most recent RFP process. In the past, Council members have reviewed the RFPs to determine who we thought would

work best with the Council and VR in meeting the goals of the federal grant and have made recommendations to VR as to who it should contract with. However, VR now decided to change the process and Council members were not a part of reviewing the most recent RFP for Capacity Building. I don't feel that there was transparency with the Council in this process, but I feel that the Council needs to be aware when processes are changed that directly affect our Council and the federal grant that we are charged with advising towards. As the Council we spent a lot of time on sustainability planning then chose to contact with another organization to create the Master Work plan instead of having the same organization as we had for sustainability planning. The Council recommended a new organization as many members felt we did not have a sustainability plan we thought would carry us forward into the future. I find it ironic that the very next RFP after we chose to go with another organization, we were then not allowed to be a part of the RFP review process. As the Council that is supposed to advise toward the federal grant, I am disappointed that we were not allowed to advise in this RFP review process, which is the major component of this next grant cycle. I would hope going forward the Council will be included in all federal grant activities as charged to do so by the federal grant thus allowing us to fulfill our role as an advisory body to the TBI grant."

Brooke Murtaugh shared her opinions about the most recent RFP process by reading a prepared statement which was requested but not provided yet, so is summarized as follows. She shared she was disappointed that the Council's advice on the capacity building RFP was not sought and feels the Council, then, did not have a voice in the process. Brooke shared she was disheartened by all the hard work members have done over the last 18 months that now seems overlooked.

Keri Bennett thanked Tiffany and Brooke for the public comments and asked council members to be open to listening to Shane Rhian who will be presenting this afternoon in regards to the RFP process.

No additional public comment was shared.

MASTER WORK PLAN REPORT

Keri Bennett provided council members a copy of the working Google document *Visioning and Action Planning* for council review. Keri shared that the report will continue to be available to members and can be edited and updated. Keri discussed page 24's Venn diagram and the relationships that were clarified and contributed to by Nebraska VR, Brain Injury Advisory Council and Brain Injury Alliance. Mark Draper commented he felt Beth Morrisette was very masterful in collecting input and was very pleased with her facilitation which created a very nice document.

LIVING WITH BRAIN INJURY SURVEY RESULTS

Will Schmeckle provided a copy of survey data and reviewed key points of the "Living with Brain Injury Survey" results. Will summarized what the survey was, its purpose and barriers. Will reported 114 individuals with brain injury, 68 family members/caregivers and 46 brain injury service providers completed the survey. Will summarized key findings of the survey. Will discussed barriers with service providers. Will reported the number one reported barrier reported in the survey was, "providers not understanding brain injury." Quotes from survey responses regarding individuals with brain injury being misunderstood were shared. Will reported the survey results found care coordination services are the most needed type of services for individuals with brain injury. Will discussed survey findings of what services are "currently in need" and their barrier rates. Survey quotes regarding accessing services from individuals with a brain injury such as, "Each individual is unique. I think it would be beneficial to have a TBI survivor working at the departments dealing with TBI survivors," were shared. Survey results found 43% of respondents have experienced serious mental health issues. Will reviewed results regarding impacts on family members and caregivers of those with brain injury. Family member survey quotes were shared such as, "My son is falling through the cracks of support systems." Will also discussed key findings for brain injury service providers. Will reported that regardless of the service, individuals with a

brain injury feel that service providers do not understand brain injury. Service providers provided feedback on their perception of where they believe are the service areas with the highest gap ratings. Data regarding gaps in services were reviewed and quotes from service providers were shared. Will summarized data reflecting the survey finding that brain injury service providers are prepared to provide those services that are most needed for individuals with a brain injury if more funding is made available. Dale Johannes asked which agencies and service providers were included in the survey results. Will and Keri Bennett shared the survey was kept anonymous but stated the survey was sent out to a wide array of service providers and they made sure all related agencies were contacted while only 22 providers completed the survey. Mark Draper shared he wanted to thank Will for his quality ability to compile and break down the data to be very understandable and consumer friendly. Mark stated he appreciated the caution regarding the small sample size but stated he feels these findings are very on target. Will stated he will be presenting these results at the Brain Injury Summit and can include correlations with concussion findings. Brooke Murtaugh shared she would be interested to see which service providers are feeling uncomfortable with brain injury knowledge if those respondents were more in the medical, education or care models, or if those feeling the bigger gap are in a specific realm. Nancy Coffman shared she finds the gap with assistive technology decreases the number of respondents with brain injury who often struggle with screens and technology. Nancy also shared it is hard to compile information as every individual with brain injury is affected differently. Will shared only approximately a dozen individuals requested a paper copy of the survey. Frank Velinsky discussed services providers, particularly those not in the medical model are not expected to assess brain injury and it could be detrimental to lump those providers into that category in knowledge and training, when many providers in his opinion should not be expected or needing specialized medical training. Vaishali Phatak shared that when realizing many individuals are falling through the cracks, educators for example, should be provided some training in order to identify behaviors to refer for services. Keri Bennett shared that the new survey results are consistent with the 2010 findings. Nancy Coffman asked what will happen to new data coming from new survey respondents. Will reported the survey is still up and open for completion and data will continue to be added in for next year. Peggy Reisher asked if sharing this data and information with others outside the council is available. Keri Bennett stated this data could be utilized currently if it is shared as preliminary data. Brooke Murtaugh noted that as the findings have not changed much since 2010 and the same issues are persistent that is very impactful that very little has happened in 10 years. Frank Velinsky stated he feels nervous to share data at this point if the numbers are not yet finalized. Brooke questioned what number of respondents would be necessary to then be considered significant and able to share. Peggy Reisher discussed a conversation with Iowa and their number of respondents and use of data. Mark Draper discussed this survey population will be a significantly smaller population because it is a small numbered group to begin with. Members discussed the need to utilize this data with the assumption that this is a small sample that is consistent with trends. Members discussed that there is a much larger population of individuals with brain injury that are unable to complete a survey or even be identified. Frank Velinsky discussed his concerns regarding more rules and regulations regarding training. Mark Draper stated based on his experience working with the state legislature he feels it is crucial to share this data in order to support the findings and needs of the brain injury population. Vaishali Phatak clarified these data results are valid and the results are tenuous. Kathy Scheele stated data drives decisions.

BIAC OPERATIONAL PROCEDURE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Members were provided a hard copy of the proposed council Operating Procedures updates. Tiffany Armstrong reviewed and summarized with the council the proposed changes. Tiffany outlined the council membership clarifications and additions made to the operational procedures. Tiffany discussed the capability for council members to serve dual roles of membership. Brett Hoogeveen clarified that the requirement that the 50% or more of the top membership be individuals living with brain injury not to include family members or caregivers.

Tiffany asked for council input regarding term limits for members. Members discussed having new fresh ideas to the council would be positive with concerns of being able to continue to fill council membership following term expirations. Tiffany proposed the operational procedures in terms of membership should state *“Prior to a council member’s term expiration, the council chair or staff will ask the member if he or she desires to continue serving on the council, assuming the council member wants to continue. The council chair or staff will create a ballot that each council member will use to vote privately at the beginning of the meeting before a council member’s term expires, the council chair or staff will compile the results and report to the council by the end of the meeting. Renewal of council membership will be determined contingent on majority vote.”*

Keri shared she proposed to change the membership terms in the operational procedures to, *“One quarter prior to the end of each member’s third year of appointment, Nebraska VR will either invite the person whose term is expiring to begin a consecutive term, or inform that person that his or her service on the BIAC will end when the current term is completed.”*

Brett Hoogeveen shared he would not be in support of term limits as he feels that becomes an overly complicated system. Tiffany noted it is also proposed to add under Terms of Membership, *“In consultation with the BIAC Executive Committee, Nebraska VR may end a member’s service on the BIAC for failure to remain in active pursuit of the Vision, absenteeism from the BIAC and/or it’s committee meetings, misbehavior or any other reason by which the BIAC is negatively impacted by that member.”*

Brooke Murtaugh stated she agrees with Brett that it should remain the council’s responsibility for the council to vote regarding membership to provide check and balances with VR. Keri shared her motivation for offering the alternative was to alleviate the burden from the council from a high number of required membership votes.

Dale Johannes moved to maintain the current Terms of Membership voting procedure of: *“Prior to a council member’s term expiration, the council chair or staff will ask the member if he or she desires to continue serving on the council, assuming the council member wants to continue. The council chair or staff will create a ballot that each council member will use to vote privately at the beginning of the meeting before a council member’s term expires, the council chair or staff will compile the results and report to the council by the end of the meeting. Renewal of council membership will be determined contingent on majority vote.”* in the updated Council Operating Procedures, Tiffany Armstrong seconded the motion. There were no objections to the motion. **The motion carried by unanimous consent.**

Tiffany reviewed the attendance and resignation procedures as written in the updated operational procedures. Tiffany reviewed the remaining updates in the operational procedures document including the proposed addition of a council secretary. Members discussed the necessity of an executive committee and possible duplication. Keri Bennett shared that a secretary would offer additional support to the executive committee and be available if a recorder can no longer be funded. Tiffany discussed in her opinion at this time a secretary would not be necessary, stating the council could reassess at a later time if grant funds are no longer available. Members discussed opinions of it being unnecessary to add officers at this time. Nancy Coffman moved to remove the word “secretary” from the proposed Operations Procedures, Section D. Officers, Article #1 and removing all of line #4, eliminating a council secretary position from the proposed revisions, Mark Draper seconded the motion. There were no objections to the motion. **The motion carried by unanimous consent.**

Tiffany continued summarizing and reviewing the additional updates to the operational procedures document outlining the updates regarding the executive committee, meeting rules, schedule, procedures and conflict of interest. Keri Bennett reported the final draft of these operating procedures will be provided to the VR Director for final approval as VR sponsors the council.

Brett Hoogeveen moved to approve and adopt the updated Brain Injury Advisory Council Operating Procedures with the two amendments added today, Tiffany Armstrong seconded the motion.

VOTE:

Aye – Armstrong, Bryan, Coffman, Diaz, Draper, Hoogeveen, Johannes, Lasley, Murtaugh, Nichelson, Ogea-Ginsburg, Phatak, Reisher, Scheele, Velinsky

Nay – None.

Abstain – None.

Absent – Hawley-Grieser, Larsen, Olson

The motion carried.

PROPOSED COMMITTEES

Keri Bennett asked the council for any feedback regarding the proposed council committees that were shared with council members via email. Keri discussed the two work groups including the opioid work group are proposed as temporary. Tiffany Armstrong suggested the executive committee should be added to the committee listing. Keri reported her intent for the committee listing is to be an appendix to the operational procedures and could be maintained as a Google Doc so it is always available to the council as a tool. Keri stated an email will be sent later to request committee participation.

MEMBER PROFILE INFORMATION

Judy Nichelson shared thanks with council members for the provided profile information. Judy highlighted interesting characteristics of council members. Judy challenged members to learn this information about your fellow council members and get to know each other better.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS

Keri Bennett reviewed the requirement of members to annually declare conflict of interest. Members must annually declare any conflict of interest. Judy Nichelson asked members to make their declarations:

- Tiffany Armstrong declared Madonna Rehabilitation.
- Jerry Bryan declared no conflict.
- Nancy Coffman declared no conflicts of interest.
- Tania Diaz declared no conflicts of interest.
- Mark Draper declared no conflicts of interest.
- Brett Hoogeveen declared Quality Living Inc and Brain Injury Alliance.
- Dale Johannes declared Tabitha.
- Carla Lasley declared no conflicts of interest.
- Brooke Murtaugh declared Madonna.
- Judy Nichelson declared no conflicts of interest.
- Peg Ogea-Ginsburg declared no conflicts of interest.
- Vaishali Phatak declared UNMC and Nebraska Medicine.
- Peggy Reisher declared the Brain Injury Alliance of Nebraska.
- Kathy Scheele declared no conflicts of interest.
- Frank Velinsky declared no conflicts of interest.

Absent members will be contacted via e-mail for declaration of conflict of interest.

Council members not in attendance at the March 8th council meeting reported the following conflicts of interests electronically.

- Michelle Hawley-Grieser declared no conflicts of interest.
- Kristen Larsen declared Nebraska Council on Developmental Disabilities and DHHS.
- Zoe Olson declared no conflicts of interest.

LIVING WITH BRAIN INJURY SUMMIT

Keri Bennett shared an update on planning the half-day Living with Brain Injury Summit to be held at 1:00pm on March 27th prior to the Annual Brain Injury Conference. Keri shared there are great speakers and topics lined up for the summit as well as time for some small group work at the end of the summit. Keri and Tresa Christensen visited ESU and saw how the Zoom equipment will be utilized and be a great resource. Keri shared they will be practicing utilizing Zoom prior to the summit to be able to maximize participation for remote participants. Keri shared the objectives of the summit are to: 1. Share survey results. 2. Input for developing the state plan in regards to brain injury 3. Increasing advocacy efforts throughout the state. Keri stated interested individuals are still able to register for the summit. Keri shared individual Zoom tutorials are available for anyone registered if interested.

BIAC PUBLIC POLICY COMMITTEE UPDATE

Members were provided a hard copy of the public policy committee work regarding the 2019 state legislative session for review. Tiffany Armstrong summarized the committee's policy work and the letters that have been drafted. Tiffany shared the letters are available for review if any members would like them. Tiffany reported LB 60 was approved by the legislature and was forwarded to the Governor for signature. Tiffany stated all other current legislative updates are included on the document. Peggy Reisher reported the helmet bill is still stuck in committee. Council members thanked Tiffany for her work writing letters on behalf of the committee and council.

ANNUAL BRAIN INJURY CONFERENCE

Peggy Reisher reported the conference will be held March 27th & 28th in Kearney, NE. Peggy shared currently conference enrollment is approximately 172 and they would like to meet the goal of 200 participants. Nancy Noha shared a sign-up sheet for council members to man a BIAC booth during the conference. Peggy reported lodging accommodations for the conference are listed on the conference registration form and there should still be available rooms under the conference block of hotel rooms.

OUTLINE FOR ANNUAL BRAIN INJURY STATE PLAN DEVELOPMENT

Keri Bennett reported the Administration for Community Living requires that each state submit an annual state plan for brain injury services. Keri shared overall it was proposed in the grant narrative they would build that plan around the Voice-Generated Statewide Vision. Keri stated that is the outline she proposed they work to pursue based on the survey and resource facilitation data. Keri asked for council input if they support this format. Keri shared the state plan in her opinion will include a more detailed plan with action steps and great detail to be updated annually. Keri reported the state plan needs to be provided to ACL at the end of each grant year. Keri shared it makes sense to include what other state agencies are doing and how they are working to a common goal.

NDE POLICY & PROCEDURES

Shane Rhian, NDE Budget and Operations Officer presented regarding the RFP. Shane reported state statute drives the procurement process and there is a very specific process that must be followed regarding procurement for contracts when any project is estimated to cost over \$50,000. Shane summarized the outline of the procurement process including the presence of a scoring grid which is utilized to determine selection. All bidders must follow all the guidelines of the RFP. Shane reported the RFP ultimately becomes the contract. Shane discussed the RFP process is somewhat lengthy and challenging but it does alleviate many future problems and makes later work smoother. Nancy Coffman inquired if there is any consideration of past participation of contractors. Shane reported prior performance of a vendor may not be written into the scoring rubric but that information would be considered. Frank Velinsky asked what type of contracts are primarily done by NDE. Shane reported they primarily contract for educational services such as early child education daycare services for example as well as educational professional development etc. Mark Draper asked for clarification regarding the \$50,000 threshold. Shane reported the \$50,000 is the threshold for an RFP requirement for any single vendor's total services. Shane shared that

for vendor contracts under \$50,000 a more informal process can be conducted. Shane reported they rely on the state purchasing guidelines. Keri Bennett shared every contract requires a procurement process and justification, no matter the amount of the contract. Shane shared he only provides guidance and then the RFP and template is created by staff and it is reviewed by NDE Legal. Shane shared outside individuals can be involved in evaluation of any RFP process. Shane and members discussed protocol when only one response (to an RFP) is received. Shane reported the one response must be graded on the rubric and found insufficient before it could be declared a failed search. Keri shared that she consulted with Shane about whether or not to include the council members in the review team. Shane shared there could be a potential conflict of interest or even the appearance of a conflict of interest for council members if they have a relationship with the potential contractors. Shane discussed he is in the position to not put individuals in a risk of conflict and finds it is a much cleaner and easier process if that is not the case. Members discussed that there were other contracted services with an RFP in the past year but they did not meet the \$50,000 threshold. Shane discussed that a formal RFP must be done for anything above \$50,000, that RFPs can be done for lower amounts but are not required though have been done in the past. Brett Hoogeveen inquired if there are advisory councils involved with NDE and if they are not typically involved in the procurement process. Shane stated ultimately the contract is between the individual/contractor and NDE, not the advisory council. Nancy Coffman shared that she feels a lot of the policies and procedures are not addressing the people the policies are affecting. Shane discussed policy and procedures can feel very constraining and impersonal stating the procedures of procurement are written in statute that are responsible for tax payer dollars but are required to do so as a governmental agency. Dale Johannes requested additional information regarding consideration of a vendor's past performance. Shane discussed the process stating the scoring rubric of the RFP could include past performance written in the scoring or it may not be written in and used as a consideration for final selection with comparative scoring decisions. Members discussed with Shane funding disparities throughout the state. Tiffany Armstrong asked for clarification regarding the advisory council role as advising on a grant and how their advising capability has changed since previous year's process. Shane reported he was not involved in the contractor selection process stating NDE Legal was consulted and advised but was not directly involved. Keri Bennett stated the advisory council had input in planning and providing feedback in setting the goal for the TBI grant application. Keri stated she wanted to be sure there was no appearance of potential conflicts of interest for the council. Keri stated she utilized the stakeholder input as a guide and asked the council members to review the written RFP which was available to the public. Mark Draper asked council move further discussion of this to new business as it deviated from Shane's presentation. Council chair, Judy Nichelson, tabled the discussion until new business.

TBI NETWORK CAPACITY BUILDING PROJECT PRESENTATION

John Ferrone provided the council with a project summary handout outlining the Brain Injury Network Capacity Building Project. John stated he was disappointed to hear the Brain Injury Alliance proposal was not able to be reviewed. John discussed the term "network" and what that entails in regards to his proposal and contract. John reviewed key points of the project summary provided to council members. Mark Draper asked how the role of the BIAC is seen as part of this project. John stated he feels there will be complementary aspects the council will be doing and that the new entity could assist the council in potential funding needs. John stated he sees opportunities for collaboration from the council and the new entity. Keri Bennett clarified that the master plan BIAC recommendations preceded the RFP that was written for this project. Mark shared there should be some connectivity from the council master plan and John's grant project, stating he hopes the council work plan is not shelved. Keri shared the capacity building project can be incorporated into the BIAC master plan. John discussed there are two parallel forms of work between the council plan and the federal government grant. John stated this project is not competing with the council work plan. Mark stated he is hopeful that there will be an opportunity of interconnectedness. Dale Johannes questioned what strategies or funding sources will be utilized as noted in John's proposal for support groups. John discussed creativity would be needed and there are potential state agencies that would have interest in supporting such endeavors. John discussed the need to establish

value and described the project as a new business. Chris Stewart presented concerns of competition with the Brain Injury Alliance causing detriment to what the BIA is trying to do. Vaishali Phatak asked what the mechanism will be to keep the agencies from competing and moving in the same direction. John stated communication will be the key. Tiffany Armstrong referenced the council mission and the BIA as the voice of brain injury, stating this new project entity seems to be taking over as “the voice”. Members discussed disagreement regarding the home of the “voice of brain injury” and how it is presented potentially causing competing interests. Frank Velinsky discussed he feels we need to be patient with the proposals as he believes they have value for the state suggesting we move forward with the same goals. John shared this approach is directly following the driving entity that would be in the position to attract more funding and share funds with those agencies to continue increasing good work. Chris Stewart discussed the challenges of being voice driven by individuals with brain injury and not learning from the experiences of the work of the Brain Injury Alliance. Nancy Coffman discussed her recognition of the concerns of who is determined as the “voice entity” but shared she looks at the capacity building project as baby steps stating much more work will continue to be needed. Dale questioned the five brain injury support groups across that state John reported he will be meeting with, inquiring how they will be selected and how information will be gathered. John shared the support groups have already been selected and are being contacted for outreach to individuals interested to assist in building capacity. John discussed the evolution of attending support group meetings includes VR contacting individuals via letter for participation besides solely visiting the groups as those meetings have their own agendas. Tiffany Armstrong stated she has concerns on how the goals can be achieved within the allotted timeline, stating it is particularly challenging for individuals living with brain injury. John discussed the contract is one year with an option to renew, and meeting that timeline can be evaluated and assessed at the end of the year. Dale questioned how this information and work will be carried on at the end of the year or contract period. John discussed that ultimately the goal of this project is to have the entity be self-sustaining. John reported it will be a trusted known relationship that is contacting individuals for interest. John stated he would love to have the Capacity Building Project on a future BIAC agenda to have the new council present and collaborating. Brooke Murtaugh stated her employer has always referred discharging brain injury patients to BIA and asked how will that be affected or need to change with the proposed new entity. John shared the new association will belong to individuals with brain injury, and they will still value the BIA. John discussed what it means to be a member of this association: access to specialized networking boards; posting testimonials on their website; access to online resources and information, and possibly peer support. John discussed there are similarities between peer supporters and resource facilitation; they are different—not competing but helping each other. Peggy Reisher stated she hears of a lot of overlapping services and she fears the general public will be struggling to be able to see the differences between the association and the alliance, confusing individuals not knowing where to turn. John shared it will require clear communication and branding to eliminate confusion. Keri Bennett acknowledged there may be disappointment among the council members that the BIA’s proposal did not meet RFP requirements and could not be scored. She noted that the BIA has benefited from over \$955,000.00 in grants and contracts from the federal TBI grant funds since 2008. Discussion on this item was closed in order to move on to new business

NEW BUSINESS

Mark Draper requested that a discussion take place regarding response to today’s public comment. Mark discussed confusion regarding procedure and BIAC role in the RFP selection. Keri reported she was not on the evaluation team but did review the proposals to assure the proposals met all requirements. Mark presented concerns regarding the inability to share the process created a lack of transparency. Tiffany Armstrong stated the disappointment shared is not who was granted the contract but is due to concern about the lack of transparency, not having an opportunity to give recommendations regarding the process, and not knowing whether recommendations were considered by VR. Mark discussed the need for the RFP processes to be presented clearly for council members, stating in this case it caused a lack of advisory opportunity for the BIAC.

No additional new business was shared and BIAC member roundtable was suspended due to lack of time.

ADJOURN

The next meeting is scheduled for, June 7, 2019, in Lincoln. The meeting adjourned at 2:58p.m. with a motion made by Nancy Coffman and seconded by Brooke Murtaugh. There were no objections to the motion. **The motion carried by unanimous consent.**