

MEETING MINUTES

January 16, 2013

GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE FOR THE PURCHASE OF COMMODITIES AND SERVICES FROM THE HANDICAPPED

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Cedric Greene at 10:00 a.m. January 16, 2013 at the WVARF office located at 400 Allen Drive, Charleston, West Virginia.

ATTENDANCE:

Committee: Cedric Greene, (Chairperson); William "Bill" Monterosso, Executive Director; Everette Sullivan; Brenda Bates; Jan Smith; Phillip Mason; Mike Sheets, Executive Secretary; Carol Jarrett, Recording Secretary.

WVARF Staff: William "Bill" Monterosso
Cyndi Auth, Director of Customer Relations
Mark Jackson, Business Liaison, WVARF
Gary Wolfe, Business Liaison, WVARF

Absent: Phillip Mason
Mark Jackson, Business Liaison, WVARF
Gary Wolfe, Business Liaison, WVARF
Jan Smith attended by conference call

Guests: Joyce Birley, Goodwill Industries of Kanawha Valley

COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT:

Mr. Greene, has everyone had an opportunity to look at the December's minutes?

MOTION #1

Ms. Bates made a motion to approve the minutes. Ms. Smith seconded. Motion passed.

Mr. Greene, Bill and I spoke yesterday for about 30 minutes. He will bring that information to you when he gives the Executive Director's Report.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY'S REPORT:

\$5,055.00 -	Annual Allocation
82.11 -	A/P Current Expenses (Act.130)
537.90 -	Disbursement
<u>126.86 -</u>	Transfer Out
\$4,308.13 -	Balance Remaining

In addition to that, this will be my last formal meeting. Don Arrick is taking over duties of the Executive Secretary. I want to extend my thanks and appreciation to the Committee, I have enjoyed serving with you and getting to know the new administration of WVARF and wish you all the best.

Mr. Greene, we would like to thank Mike for all of his hard work and being accessible, but he is not going anywhere he is just going to be right there in Purchasing so he can still answer questions and assist us. I welcome Don Arrick and we appreciate you and we look forward to working with you; however, I don't recall seeing you at the Purchasing Division.

Mr. Sheets, he took my old job as Contracts Manager. He has been hiding upstairs in the penthouse.

Mr. Greene, Mike we appreciate all your hard work and we look forward continuing to work with you but we will default to Don first and beat him up the next six months. It is always good to have change, new perspectives, an opportunity to grow and learn, different responsibilities and duties, build a resume and change is always good.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

Mr. Monterosso, I just want to echo Cedric's comments about Mike not going anywhere and we appreciate Don coming on board. We had a great meeting yesterday, Cedric, Mike, Don and I and I do want to continue this relationship and working together. The partnership will continue to grow.

I wanted to bring you up-to-date from the last meeting. The 941's, those have always been on time and that is no longer an issue, that is the payroll liability. The 990's and all the backup information we had to dig a little deeper into how much health care we pay, and it is quite extensive, but that has all been done. Suttle and Stalnaker is getting ready to submit that today or definitely by tomorrow. So, that is done. I am getting ready to draft justification as to why it was late and we have good justification and I am not too concerned about it. If there are penalties to be paid then so be it. At least it is done.

We took the recommendation to have a calendar for triggers and flags so we won't make the same mistake twice. It wasn't really a mistake, but none the less it is what it is and we are responsible for that so we will make sure that doesn't happen again.

Just a few updates this month. Over the last couple of weeks we have had several committee meetings, finance committee, government relations committee, rehab committee, membership committee. As it relates to government relations committee that focused on the legislative event that we are going to have and that will be February 20th which happens to be and I happened to do this purposely, the date of our next Governor's Committee meeting which is also the date as our Board meeting. Cedric and I shared this a couple of weeks ago and reinforced it again yesterday, it is important that the Governor's Committee will be part of the agenda. It will begin at 10:00 like we always do but in the capacity of the full board, so they can see how it is conducted and if any questions, put a face with a name and really move toward saying our objective is the same and our goal is the same which is to create opportunities for those that need it, to be accountable. To make sure we are being strategic in nature and creating as many opportunities as possible. I know that was a good decision and it has never been done previously and it makes sense.

Had a meeting with Jan Pack and I cautioned them and I said I am not soliciting anything from you, I am not guaranteeing anything from you and I am not going to spend a penny on you, I'm just wanting to reach out to someone in the profession as it relates to where I want to go as an association as far as standardization making sure that we have the best equipment available so the CRP's can be as efficient as possible which means that state agencies reduce money, reduce cost which also increases opportunities for the CRPs to increase profit. If you are more efficient you increase your volume and you should be having more contracts. That was a positive meeting.

Had a great meeting with Mike and met Don yesterday for the first time and we talked about a few things. The flow of contracts and it has been brought up a couple of times and we are going to put the stake through the heart of this and put it through us, as far as what information does Purchasing need. Not from a posture we want to give you as little as we can, we will give you everything, but how can we eliminate what's the value of state agencies getting the whole kitten caboodle. Everyone has agreed that there isn't any value in that it is up to us from WVARF's perspective to make sure auditing which hasn't been taken place in the last administration but we are gearing up to start having those audits on a consistent basis. Make sure state agencies are getting what they need, performance is up to standard, CRPs are doing what they said they are doing in the contracts, that way we can do business and the focus is on the performance and the quality as opposed to how many spoons, how many forks, how many knives, whatever the case may be. That was a positive discussion. Mike came in with some additional information for me this morning which was positive. But we will still find a way to give purchasing information as they need so we are protecting their interest as well.

We also talked about the 4.1%. WVARF was calculating it wrong and WVARF was getting more money than we should with the 4.1%. Cyndi did a little background research and I inquired by calling SUPRA, I called NISH and I called New Jersey, Texas and a few other places and it is a mathematical equation. How the formula is currently set up, if I say the contract is \$1,000, logic will tell you and Cedric and I talked about this yesterday and there are six or eight of us here and if I said ok what is 4.1% of \$1,000, typically the majority if not all of us would probably say $\$1,000 \times .041 = \410.00 or $\$40.10$. I didn't say I was a mathematician I just said it was a math problem which gives me problems. The way the formula is derived, instead of doing 4×4.1 it is $\$1,000$ divided by $.959 = 95.9\%$ which is the same, right? Why wouldn't it come out the same? Because you are dividing the cost ---- what it means is, by doing the division model it cost the state a \$1.75 more per \$1,000 dollars. It doesn't affect the CRPs. If it is \$1,000 the CRPs get \$1,000, we get \$40.10, but if it is a \$1.75 per \$1,000 it would be \$42.10 or whatever that math comes out to be which is a little bit higher. \$1.75 per \$1,000 doesn't sound like a lot but if you add a couple more zeros to that \$1,000 it becomes pretty substantial. Now, I could say we are going to continue to do that because it is supported by NISH, it is supported by SUPRA. The majority of the state use programs throughout the nation use the 95.9 but in an attempt to continue moving forward and building goodwill we are going to change that formula to go to the $\times 4.1$. The only thing it impacts is us, but I'm stubborn enough to believe that credibility and trust is more important to me than \$1.75. I'm also stubborn enough to believe as we continue to move forward and we look at efficiencies and processes and improvements and holding everyone accountable that the contracts will increase, so the \$1.75 will be made up two or three folds by creating more opportunities for individuals with disabilities and improving those contracts. So, we will change the division model to the multiplication model.

The other thing we talked about which was positive because you can't have a lot of positive things happen to you if people don't trust you. One of the dilemmas we will be faced with come January, 2014 is the Affordable Health Care Act issue. And, how are the CRP's going to absorb this and everyone is worried as nothing has been promulgated and nothing has been formalized. I called SUPRA and I have a great relationship with SUPRA now and I talked to the President and I said I am either going to be your new best friend or your biggest pain in the neck and she said "you are doing good so far Bill, don't push it." She is a wonderful resource and she has her hands in every single state and if I say I need this, she pulls it for me.

The SUPRA Conference is going to be well worth it. Even if I didn't do anything but just pay dues I have already gotten my money back from the information that I am gathering. I was trying to get what's a head cost and rather than belabor this, there is none, so what we agreed on, WVARF and Purchasing and it makes sense. One option was to look at what would be the cost for CRPs that have 50 employees or greater? What is the talk at least out there that an employer would have to pay per employee January, 2014 when the Affordable Health Care Act comes into effect? There is none. What we were trying to do was to pro rate stuff and trying to guess, makes no sense. Purchasing educated us as well saying costs are firm over the life of the contract. The life of our contracts is typically for one year. So, if we did a guessing game and came in low, shame on us and if we came in high, shame on us again because we are not going to charge things that are too much, we would have to give money back – it would be an administrative nightmare. Through Mike's wisdom what we are going to do is do a six-month contract, when we do these renewals at the firm cost up to December 31st. Come January when we know what those costs are we will further extend the contract with the true cost, so no CRP is going to lose profit or absorb additional cost that is thrown on them. So that is a positive. That relieves a lot of stress off us and it leaves a lot of administrative nightmares.

There will be some administrative work but that is what we are here for and that is what we do. CRPs will have some work to do. We had a lot of different discussions as to how this will impact the temp contract, janitorial contract so this is significant. Having Mike and Don understand the tone and the posture of where we are, it is a relationship, a partnership. We never go there asking for anything typically, we go there to get an understanding. Mike said sorry we give you bad news all the time you come over here, but we keep going over there.

Ms. Bates, I don't know if you have checked into this or not, the Medicaid buy-in. Because you know with the CRPs the difference is that individuals with disabilities are eligible for Medicaid. Many times if they are still on SSI and also that they can buy in to the Medicaid buy in which is a lot cheaper even if the employer helped pay the premium for the state. Jan have you looked into that?

Ms. Smith, no not as much as I should have and I am interested but don't know enough yet.

Ms. Bates, that might be something you would want to put on your agenda for your next Board meeting is the Medicaid buy in and get someone to come in and talk about that because it is a huge thing in terms of individuals with disabilities and knowing that if a person is on Medicaid what does that mean in terms of the Affordable Health Care Act, if they are already on Medicaid. Because a lot of people are under the wire, they are on Medicaid even though they are working. A lot of individuals with disabilities stay under SGA. That is something to look into Jan and Bill for folks because it will save everybody, the CRPs, the state, everyone a lot of money and the state is already putting a lot of money into Medicaid, so we want to make sure we cross our t's and dot our i's. You have individuals without disabilities who are included if you have over 50 employees, just something to consider. I just wanted to make sure you all have the information.

Ms. Smith, I think it would be excellent to put on one of our meeting agendas to have an expert come in. We need an expert then we can refer back to.

Mr. Monterosso, that is on the April agenda.

Ms. Bates, the Medicaid buy in the maximum, I was on the committee that got that passed through the legislature and at that time the maximum premium was like \$48.00 per month and that is if you made \$50,000 a year or something like that. The premium is on a sliding scale and based on the income of the individual. I don't know how we go about that, it is interesting, because you get into HIPPA issues too. Who is on Medicaid, who has insurance but I am sure the law provides for you knowing if people have some other way of having insurance. It will change what CRPs pay.

Mr. Monterosso, we started on this path of reaching out to a couple of experts as it relates to – what's that threshold that if an individual who has a disability and is receiving SSI, what is that true threshold of when that individual taps into their benefits and beyond that when we are looking at workload capacity, how do we get the CRPs to fully maximize the usage of those individuals with disabilities. I understand we are all businesses and we have to operate as a business but we need to maximize the use of those individuals to give them as many opportunities so they are moving in an upward path and we are creating career ladders as opposed to stagnant just being at the same job for thirty years. We are still heading down that path but not direct as it relates to the Medicaid buy in. An individual from DC will be here on

April 1st, as he is an expert on the Affordable Health Care Act and CRPs will know exactly how it is going to impact them. All of you are welcome to attend.

You have all met Sheila Bowyer, she is part-time and she had to go out-of-town. In the midst of that we brought in another temp who has some really good skills. We have another temp here that is helping us with technical when it comes to the website. By the end of this month we will have the website completely loaded. By the next Board meeting it will be up and running. I confirmed that with him this morning. We will have the legislative information on there, a lot of good topics and what we do as an association and as a State Use Program. Brenda keeps reminding me to use the word State Use Program. We are reaching out to all State Use Programs and hoping they will be part of the association. I have been working and saying what can we do to add true value to the association members that other state use organizations that are outside that association. We are trying to bring more people into the family.

One other update that is important. The CNA Committee - I now have a legislator on board, John Allen, who is a delegate. Jerry Carper has agreed to serve and he has been with DRS for a long time. He is a wealth of knowledge with programs as it relates to individuals with disabilities.

I am one short and I need an attorney. Does anyone know of a good attorney? I was hoping to get Booth Goodwin but he can't as he is federally bound not to participate on any committees' to the extent that he had to resign from his sons PTA group because there could be a potential conflict. I am optimistic we will have a meeting February 21st to renew the CNA Committee.

CONTRACT PRESENTATIONS:

Ms. Auth, the first one is the Meadowbrook Rest Area and that is where we left off last month. They were to have opened last month, but it is still not open. We have the Rest Area that we discussed last month. We sent out three with your packet yesterday. It is still not open. Jan, have you heard anything?

Ms. Smith, they are having a meeting tomorrow but they still haven't said when. They are going to review opening and review aspects of it.

Ms. Auth, they are waiting on some hand rails and other items to complete. We did put a start date of next Monday. I have worked with the Op Shop and have also met with Jim Hash and the engineers on-site. We have made a few changes with this contract as we discuss the fair market price. The property was 46 acres but the lawn which is being cared for was estimated at 23 acres so that adjustment was made. The other thing is the number of days a week cleaned. When we went back to talk to Jim Hash asking the reason for that it was to look at some contingencies at the Welcome Center, extra days and things like that. There is a section H to include additional labor and we have done that. We went with the same staffing that was with the Burnsville site which is the same size. We have worked with Jim Hash and we will be monitoring this contract to make sure that is covered correctly. In addition we proposed an increase in gas and oil and we went from \$95.00 to \$100.00 per acre. This was also discussed with Jim Hash as well.

Ms. Smith, I would like to tell the Committee, the professionalism and the way that everything is being looked at is magnificent. I have argued some of these points in the past and have asked for things to be more standardized and I am very glad to see that is what WVARF is doing because that presents professionalism. We are charging the best prices for the state of West Virginia. I am impressed with what WVARF is doing and the direction we are moving in.

Mr. Monterosso, we couldn't come up with this if we didn't have the partnership with Purchasing Division and Department of Administration (DOA) but creating those same partnerships with CRPs. It was refreshing to go to Jan and say, I know they have approved this contract in the past for years and it was 46 acres but the reality of it is, it is only 23 acres and come to an agreement, yes it is the right thing to do which continues to build credibility and trust and reduces the cost for the state. The CRP doesn't lose anything because they are not maintaining more than they should and that gives us an opportunity to say what is the fair price so the individuals are getting paid the right rate and the CRPs are making a dollar.

Ms. Smith, the Committee needs to know that when they changed the acreage there was a discussion with the comptroller locally and because of some other things we deal with, he said leave the contract as it stands. That was not us or WVARF trying to get something over on the State of West Virginia, it was his decision that would remain.

Mr. Sullivan, how did you come up with the acreage not being as much as it was, who determined that?

Ms. Auth, part of it was on-site looking at the drawings and things that they had and discussions with the people there, technology with Google and Google Earth with land marks, and discussions with Eric Freeman with the Op Shop. A combination of those things came to that determination. We are proposing this contract with a start date of next Monday and running through the end of this fiscal year for a price per month of \$26,828.75.

Ms. Smith, I need to abstain from voting on this.

MOTION #2

Ms. Bates, I make a motion this contract be approved. Mr. Sullivan seconded. Motion passed.

Ms. Auth, the next contract is WV Geological & Economical Survey at Morgantown. We had one CRP respond to the RFI and that was PAC Enterprises in Morgantown. This facility is for janitorial services to begin February 1st through the end of the fiscal year. Mark Jackson did a survey and they are looking at approximately 6,034 square feet. It is a much larger facility and they are looking mainly at common areas where they are wanting janitorial to be done. Basically what they are looking for is 12 hours, two (2) people, once a week for six (6) hours to complete the work. The cost per month is \$541.03. With the previous contract as well as the others here we have changed how we are going with 4.1% multiplication method rather than division.

MOTION #3

Mr. Sullivan made a motion to approve the contract. Ms. Bates seconded. Motion passed.

Ms. Auth, the next one is the Office of Education Performance Audits. It is my understanding this group is moving to a new building. They have not had janitorial with us, the previous janitorial was provided by the landlord. They are associated with the DHHR office in Winfield. Goodwill of Kanawha Valley will be the CRP for this contract. We are looking at beginning services January 28th and they have to have additional remodeling done. This will go through the end of the fiscal year. This is a daily contract to provide work. The monthly fee is \$855.80.

MOTION #4

Mr. Smith made a motion to approve the contract. Ms. Bates seconded. Motion passed.

Ms. Bates, Jan I just had a question, Meadowbrook isn't going to open for the upcoming holiday weekend on Saturday?

Ms. Smith, we have missed so many holidays, I don't think they care.

Mr. Monterosso, does the state when they do contracts with contractors have, if you are not on time, is there a penalty cost for every day?

Mr. Sheets, liquidated damages provision.

Ms. Smith, they gave them an extension.

Mr. Sheets, I am not familiar with that project off hand, but often almost every case there should be liquidated damages provision in the contract.

Ms. Auth, in addition to the three that was sent out, there are two others I would like to discuss. One is for Office of Education here in Charleston for nutrition. We had worked up the contract and we had it ready but they made a last minute request that we look at doing it based on their fiscal year which indicated to us it was going to run January – December. I said we could accommodate that if that is what they requested. Goodwill will be the provider for that and they priced that, if we can do that. What we are proposing is February 1st through December 31st. That is a once a week cleaning for \$309.77 per month and going through the end of this year.

Mr. Greene, so you are presenting that one?

Ms. Auth, I would like to, we would like to get started on that.

MOTION #5

Mr. Sullivan made a motion to approve the contract. Ms. Smith seconded. Motion passed.

Ms. Auth, the next one is DHHR in Calhoun County. We do have temporary janitorial service in there right now. This particular contract had been serviced by a WVARF employee. When we took over state use there was an agreement with DHHR to maintain benefits at a certain level for their employees they had working through DHHR to continue employment there. The person at this site retired in December so we released it for RFI and put it into the context of traditional janitorial contract for a savings of about 50% for the state agency.

Ms. Greene, so DHHR had an employee

Ms. Auth, this was some time ago but they had been covered under WVARF with additional benefits.

Mr. Monterosso, about 15 years ago, or a long time ago, when WVARF had the presort, WVARF had this janitorial contract. The employee worked for DHHR cleaning and DHHR wanted those two employees to stay working so WVARF took them under our payroll. One of the two has retired, currently one is remaining.

Mr. Greene, you guys pay their salary?

Mr. Monterosso, we get reimbursed by DHHR.

Ms. Auth, SW Resources out of Parkersburg is going to be the provider for that and they are providing temporary services currently. We look to start this coming Monday in regards to this traditional janitorial contract. It is for daily cleaning at the rate of \$1,649.24 a month.

Ms. Bates, how many responses did you get from the RFI?

Ms. Auth, we had none. JCDC which also would be somewhat nearby doesn't do that type of work. We had made calls to Clay County as well.

Ms. Bates, you did put an RFI out?

Ms. Auth, yes.

MOTION #6

Mr. Bates, I move the contract be approved. Mr. Sullivan seconded. Motion passed.

Mr. Greene, one last comment on this DHHR. So they are not a state employee, they are your employee?

Mr. Monterosso, correct, the agreement, years and years ago was that holidays, and that employee would get all the benefits that the state agencies would get.

Mr. Greene, do you all have an agreement?

Mr. Monterosso, yes

Mr. Greene, I would like to see that agreement. I am telling you right now, this whole thing sounds japed up. It does not seem proper. The problem with it is, when this employee reaches what they perceive in their head as the rule of 80 along with all other state employees then they go to CPRB to file for retirement, and I don't know if they are a state employee. They may think they are and they may think they rate retirement.

Ms. Bates, they are under PEIA, as WVARF is.

Mr. Greene, yes but paying into a retirement plan? I would just be curious, because you all brought it up, I didn't bring it up and now that you bring it up I am just curious, is that proper. It doesn't sound right. You can sign agreements until the cows come home but that doesn't make it proper. This just seems it could be a problem when these people start retiring. Because you all know and DHHR knows, doesn't mean the employee knows. That is the reason the legislature passed saying a temp employee couldn't work more than 1,000 hours because these temp employees work ten years for the state and in their mind they are thinking they are a state employee and paying into a retirement. What these employees were doing, they had been down there for years, 10, and 15 years as a temporary but from their perspective they are thinking they are a state employee like the person right next to them. Then when they go to retire, it falls apart on them, you're not a state employee, and they weren't paying into the retirement plan when all the time they thought they were. Then we got sued and that is when they came up with the new 1,000 hours. When you all say you are being reimbursed.....

Mr. Monterosso, Joyce Wysong was here when this happened; she could probably bring some clarity to it.

Ms. Wysong, it was in 1990 we took over the DHHR janitors, the state asked us to take them over to get them off their payroll and on to ours to do the benefits or whatever with the understanding as the people retired, quit, died or whatever that we would go to a CRP which is what has happened. It got down to where we had two individuals left and that was Wilma and Clifford and now we are down to one, Clifford and he is in Philippi. The understanding was that we would treat them as employees, they would have the same benefits that they would have had if they stayed with the state. That is why they have the retirement, health, and all that.

Mr. Sullivan, who is paying for that?

Ms. Smith, I have been around since then and that is exactly how it happened.

Mr. Greene, who is paying for the retirement?

Ms. Wysong, it is included in the billing that we do.

Ms. Bates, DHHR is paying WVARF and they are paying as if contracting for that employee rather than having that employee as an FTE. That is what's going on.

Mr. Monterosso, so the employee, like Wilma retired, how many years roughly did she work in that capacity.

Ms. Wysong, she was with us for about 22 years and who knows how long before that.

Mr. Monterosso, so when she retired is she getting a retirement check from the State of West Virginia?

Ms. Wysong, she was with DHHR prior to coming to us, so if she left her retirement in, then yes she would get whatever portion she worked there plus the retirement from Fidelity that we have. But, it wouldn't have gone into the state retirement.

Ms. Bates, so they were paid out of two retirements. Are they full time or part-time?

Ms. Wysong, full time.

Ms. Bates, so it is a full time contracted employee through WVARF.

Ms. Wysong, my understanding is that we were approached at that time to do it.

Mr. Greene, pull this agreement and look at it. This is definitely different.

Ms. Bates, how many employees do you have in this situation – all over the state?

Mr. Monterosso, only one.

Ms. Auth, I have one other item that just came up in the last day or so. The addition of three floor mats to the statewide contract.

Mr. Monterosso, Michael Hagg currently has the statewide contract for floor mats. He wants to add three more sizes. He wants to add 4 x 10, 4 x 20 and 3 x 4. Go to the last column and the 4th column over on the left - one over \$11.04 would be the direct cost for the 4 x 10. The total cost is the last column which includes WVARFs 4.1% and the CRPs 9.5 which is \$12.54. So you are looking at \$1.50 difference. He wants to add those three floor mats to the statewide contract. The 3rd, 4th and 5th pages are the back up. Copies handed out to all present.

Ms. Bates, I always refer to Purchasing for those pricings.

Mr. Greene, has this information gone to you Mike?

Mr. Sheets, I don't believe it has.

Mr. Monterosso, I think that is what we are asking for. This is new to me so I don't know what the proper procedure is to process this.

Ms. Bates, it has to come to the Committee and the Committee has to approve it but it is good for us to know what Purchasing's position is.

Mr. Greene, every time we have done this it has always backfired on us.

Ms. Bates, sometimes with Purchasing Division there doesn't seem to be any problem with these mats, but with purchasing there may be 20,000 of them purchased and we don't know about it and there is a contractor out there that could lose or a private person, just issues out there that we don't know about but Purchasing does. Always defer to Purchasing on those then if Purchasing is ok with it then I'm ok with it.

Mr. Sheets, one thing that jumps out right away is that there is no information from their vendors. It is a spreadsheet and it is good to know the breakdown but they can put down the cost assuming they are purchasing it from somewhere but there is not an invoice showing their actual purchase cost to back that up.

Mr. Monterosso, these pages are the direct cost.

Mr. Sheets, but we don't have anything from their vendor showing what they paid. That is the kind of back-up we would typically look for.

Ms. Bates, before you bring to us, you would go to Purchasing and see what back-up they would need and then get their buy in and then bring to us so we would know it is not something that would be a big issue.

Mr. Sheets, I would add another layer to that starting with the rule for adding products to the statewide contract and make sure you are in compliance with that rule. There are several requirements within that.

Mr. Greene, I know with the cotton with JCDC, that went on for a while until we got the correct paperwork.

Ms. Bates, it is the backup documentation, what seems easy often times is not. We won't be able to move on this today.

Mr. Monterosso, I am calling Mr. Michael Hagg. Mr. Hagg, I am here in the middle of the Governor's Committee and presented your information on the floor mats and just so we are on the same page, I am going to put you on speaker. One of the question, and this is the first time I have had to present a new product here and I was asking if this is the right way and they actually said the preference of the Governor's Committee is to go to the Purchasing Division first to make sure it is legit and that there are no other private parties or other scenarios out there and then bring it to the Governor's Committee. Mike Sheets is here from Purchasing and he had a question regarding the direct cost and asked if there is anything from the vendor as to their cost. I just wanted to make sure if you had any additional questions so this will have the best shot of getting added.

Mr. Hagg, what is the question?

Mr. Sheets, basically on the costing, to verify the base cost from your supplier, we would like to see an invoice for each size perhaps showing the costing and make sure they are in compliance with the rule in terms of presenting new items for inclusion.

Ms. Bates, the Purchasing Division is requesting those two things. Before the Committee can act on this you need to do that for us as we need to work with Purchasing ahead of time to be sure we have all the backup information prior to presenting it to the Committee.

Mr. Hagg, ok.

Mr. Monterosso, between now and the next meeting we will try to get this on the next meeting. I'll go back and look at the rules to make sure we are in compliance and if you could provide me with the vendor costs back up support; I can set up a time to meet with Mike and Don. Don Arrick is the new Executive Secretary of the Governors Committee so I will meet with them and make sure we have our ducks in a row so we can present at the next meeting.

Mr. Hagg, ok.

Mr. Monterosso, since it is in front of you and you have the information, if I meet with Purchasing would it be acceptable if I sent it out to the Committee electronically or do you want to wait another month?

Mr. Greene, that is fine, I don't mind doing that if the Purchasing Division signs off on it. Just don't send out to the Committee, just send it to me. As soon as you get from Purchasing, send it to me and I'll get it out.

CONTRACT COMPLAINTS:

Ms. Auth, Friday of last week we received a letter from Robin Perdue with the Grievance Board indicating a 30-day written notice to terminate the janitorial. It was dated the first of the month and she indicated their landlord is assuming their janitorial for that location. We notified Goodwill of Kanawha Valley as they provide those services. They requested we bring that up today. Joyce Birley is here from that organization. They were concerned about the process.

Mr. Sullivan, why is the landlord taking this over?

Mr. Monterosso, that is my question. I have put Mark on this to inquire. If I am a landlord why would I say I am going to take over the cleaning without increasing cost of rent or something.

Ms. Bates, if it is a state building, that is one thing; but, you have to get the landlord to agree as part of the contract.

Mr. Greene, Cyndi brought up the Grievance Board janitorial contract and that they had not received a 30-day notice. I have this for action with Mr. Lawrence, Cabinet Secretary, West Virginia Department of Revenue. I will have a report by next week.

FINANCIAL REPORT:

Mr. Monterosso, we are right on target at 39-40%.

Ms. Bates, as long as you are careful with what's in the state use and what is in the association part, percentage wise. Anything within that you can move around.

OLD BUSINESS:

Mr. Greene, I think the old business was the 941 and 990 forms and we are good there.

NEW BUSINESS:

None

PUBLIC COMMENT:

None

Mr. Greene, I would like to say, Jan you weren't here so you missed out and a couple of others missed out also but Mr. Monterosso and his staff fed us in December. We had a Christmas luncheon and we had a really nice time. We went downstairs and ate. I had a meeting and also Brenda had a meeting, but as we were leaving we smelled the aroma from the food coming through the vents and I called someone at my office and I said someone else is going to have to take care of what I was supposed to do as I am staying here with Brenda as we are staying here for lunch. I am telling you, they had a spread and we had everything but liquor, it was above board. We just want to thank you Mr. Monterosso, when someone invites you to their home or invites you to eat with them that means they like you a little bit. We really do appreciate that and also to those who put that together.

Also, what Jan stated, I would simply say it seems like people are defined lanes of traffic and it appears and it seems it is working. Your contract people are going out selling, they are explaining and Ms. Cyndi is fitting in well and speaks well of the contracts and we are putting things in their right line items. Change is always difficult but I think it is always good as well. I think you guys are doing a real good job. No one is going to say you guys are not passionate. You are engaged and that is half the battle. We, as a Committee, we appreciate that and we appreciate Mike's good work and we will miss you immensely. Just because Don comes don't mean you can't come as well Mike, just if you decide to come on December 20th for our luncheon. We thought we would go somewhere to eat, but no, we will be here December of this year.

Ms. Bates, where is the February 20th meeting going to be?

Mr. Monterosso, February 20th is the Legislative event and it will be held at the Embassy Suites. We will still do our meeting. After that, as a Committee we can stay or go.

Mr. Greene, our December 18th meeting which will be the Christmas luncheon and that will be here. Jan, if you don't come here I will just have to tell you about it like I just did.

Ms. Smith, I will see you next month for sure.

MOTION #7

Mr. Sullivan moved to adjourn. Ms. Bates seconded. Motion passed.

COMMITTEE MEETING DATES FOR 2013

February 20, 2013

March 20, 2013

April 17, 2013

May 15, 2013

June 19, 2013

July 17, 2013

August 21, 2013

September 18, 2013

October 16, 2013

November 20, 2013

December 18, 2013