

Sweatfree Purchasing Consortium Interim Steering Committee

August 5, 2009 1:00-2:00pm Eastern, 10-11am Pacific

Attendance

Roxana Dietz, State of Pennsylvania
Liana Foxvog, SweatFree Communities
Betty Lamoreau, State of Maine
Galen Leung, City of San Francisco
Farshid Yazdi, City of Los Angeles
Eric Dirnbach, Workers United (note taker)

Minutes Approval

The July 2009 minutes were approved.

Letter to the Department of Labor

The Consortium letter to the DOL was presented by Eric and discussed. Galen asked if we should reference the Michaud letter at the beginning and folks thought that was fine. The letter was approved, as amended. Chip Gavin will review for his approval and sign the letter on behalf of the committee.

Monitoring Option Discussions with Paul Stembler

Paul Stembler discussed the various monitoring options. Key issue is the legal authority for government entities to pay out money to other states. As an example in MN, there must be clear authority for paying money out. It can be considered as a debt on the books that can be repaid. Third party collection of money would involve holding them to a strict set of standards. Looking at the Options:

Option 1: Likely the cleanest option is for the Consortium to pay the bills since money is not moving in and out of states. Consortium must have strictest accounting and bookkeeping standards at the level of the strictest member. Spend a lot of time accounting for how the money is handled. Many examples of nonprofit orgs getting into trouble over this.

Option 2: There must be a contract between states and Consortium for the specific service the Consortium will provide. There must be a competitive open contract for this where money will be spent by the state. There may be problems getting repayment from states depending on financial situation.

Option 3: More complicated to have money flowing among states and it is sometimes difficult to count on prompt repayment depending on state financial situation.

Can the Consortium be the contracting agent with the monitor, as opposed to the state doing this? Issue is who creates the master contract – it must be a government entity.

Individual engagements with the monitor can be with the Consortium, in the name of the state, and this can be outlined in the contract. In the case of PA, it's possible to set up a restricted account to handle money from the 1% fee, which gives control over how it is used. It would be useful to see other examples of multi-state funded projects and how that is structured and paid for.

Lake Tahoe Meeting

The NASPO schedule has come out, and we need to find a time where we can meet outside of that. The agenda is here:
<http://www.naspo.org/userfiles/file/2009%20Annual%20Agenda%20-%20Draft%20v3.pdf> .
It seems like a packed schedule. Roxana now may not be attending, depending on funding. Sunday may be a possibility depending on when folks can arrive.

Next Meeting

September 2, 1-2pm Eastern, 10am-11am, Pacific.