



July 2019



<https://www.cgccnigp.org/>

Newsletter Editor: Tonia Lawson

Independence Day is annually celebrated on July 4 and is often known as "the Fourth of July". It is the anniversary of the publication of the declaration of **independence** from Great Britain in 1776. Patriotic displays and family events are organized throughout the United States.



Best Practices to Stay on Budget

"I was hoping to have to spend more money," said no one ever.

Agencies and organizations spend a lot of time creating budgets to ensure they're financially stable and responsible. While you never want to get on the wrong side of your finance department, cost overruns for construction projects are common. There can be a lot of moving parts and parties to a repair or renovation project, and it's not hard to creep beyond the original scope. Here are four best practices to remain on budget and avoid cost overruns.



1. Rely on Accurate Data
2. Hire the Right People for the Job
3. Ensure a Clear Scope of Work
4. Manage Change Orders with Erase

OMNIA PARTNERS

There's Power in the Partnership

National IPA and U.S. Communities are now OMNIA Partners, Public Sector – the nation's largest cooperative purchasing organization.

Together we connect thousands of educational institutions and public agencies for combined purchasing power. All contracts available through OMNIA Partners, Public Sector are competitively solicited and awarded by a lead public agency. View our expanded contract portfolio @ omniapartners.com/publicsector.

WEX to Acquire Fuel Card Business of EG Group, Go Fuel Card

WEX, a leading financial technology service provider, announced today that it plans to acquire the fuel card business ("Go Fuel Card") of EG Group, an



independent fuel station and convenience retailer in Europe. The anticipated transaction is subject to completion of employee information and consultation processes, and other approvals, as appropriate. Read more at:

<https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20190325005206/en/WEX-Acquire-Fuel-Card-Business-Group-Fuel>.

Industry-Leading Suppliers





WELCOME BACK!

Jack Allen
Fleet Financial Coordinate
Okaloosa County BOCC

To Use Own Employees or Outside Service?

Should your organization use your own employees to do maintenance on our property or buy from service suppliers?

This is a decision that organizations of all types must make – from large corporation to small businesses. Although financial matters are important, the proper decision is based on more than that.

Companies alternate from doing the work in-house to outsourcing. That is sometimes about the differences in cost and sometimes about dissatisfaction about the way the work was done. Janitorial services are often problematic.

When you use in-house employees, their total costs must include the costs of all fringe benefits before comparing it to the outside supplier's charges.

To do the work inside, first you must have the required skill levels in-house, such as plumbing knowhow and electrical knowledge. Outside suppliers will usually have backup workers ready to do the job, whereas backups may not be available internally. However, you can normally find outside help on a one time basis when necessary.

Any contract placed with an outside service should be carefully written with specific duties spelled out. The agreement should be cancelable at any time for nonperformance or unsatisfactory work. An outside service should provide written evidence of insurance for liability for injury to workers and for damage to the buyer's property. A buyer should never accept or sign a contractor's agreement without carefully reading it and having it reviewed by their legal counsel, if not knowledgeable about such contracts.

American Purchasing Society Vol. 47, Report #4, April 2019

pro·duc·tiv·i·ty (noun)

the state or quality of producing something, especially crops.

- the effectiveness of productive effort, especially in industry, as measured in terms of the rate of output per unit of input.

NIGP Forum
August 25-28, 2019
Austin, TX



The Annual Forum is the largest North American educational conference exclusively for individuals in public procurement. This is a once a year opportunity to engage in professional development and network with others in public procurement and the supplier community. This year's event will take place in Austin, TX.

Our products exposition provides an opportunity to discover the latest products and services available to the government from a vast array of suppliers. The educational component of the conference covers the latest hot topics, best practices, resources and skills to help improve job performance and provide professional development.

Procurement Dictionary Terms

MATERIAL VARIANCE/MATERIAL DEVIATION - A variance or deviation in a response from specifications of conditions that allows a responder a substantial advantage or benefit not enjoyed by all other responders or that gives the state something significantly different from what the state requested in the solicitation document.

MATERIALS MANAGEMENT - Embraces all functions of acquisition, standards, quality control and surplus property management.

MULTIPLE AWARD - Contracts awarded to more than one supplier for comparable supplies and services. Awards are made for the same generic types of items at various prices.

OPTION TO EXTEND/RENEW - A provision (or exercise of a provision) which allows a continuance of the contract for an additional time according to permissible contractual conditions.

SCOPE OF WORK (SOW) – The division of work to be performed under a contract or subcontract in the completion of a project, typically broken out into specific tasks with deadlines.

(News Service of Florida - Excerpts from April 5, 2019)

TALLAHASSEE --- Florida's Constitution is in the cross hairs. A little more than two years ago, voters overwhelmingly approved a constitutional amendment that broadly legalized medical marijuana. In November, nearly two-thirds of Floridians signed off on an amendment to restore the right to vote to certain felons who've completed their sentences. Backers of both proposals maintain that the constitutional changes don't require action from the Legislature. But Republican lawmakers are pushing a pot proposal and a voting-restoration measure that have sparked intense debate and, in one case, focused a national spotlight on Florida.

In the voting-rights skirmish, proponents of what appeared as Amendment 4 on the November ballot are likening House and Senate bills to Jim Crow-era policies designed to keep black voters from participating in elections. State Rep. James Grant, the House bill sponsor, is accusing Amendment 4 backers of pulling a bait-and-switch on voters. In an "I'm rubber, you're glue" vein, both sides accuse each other of politicizing the issue. Caught up in the clash are about 700,000 felons who --- depending on how legislators handle the issue --- might be able to vote in next year's presidential election. Republicans and Democrats consider the Sunshine State critical for a White House victory.

Senate President Bill Galvano rejected arguments of critics who accuse Republican lawmakers of trying to use the legislation to protect President Donald Trump in 2020. "I would say that they're wrong. I would say that we're trying our best to genuinely implement policy and enact policy ... that meets the intent of the voters," he said.

FORAY OVER FELONS' FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS - Whether felons who've completed their time behind bars or on probation should have voting rights restored if they haven't paid off all of their financial obligations has become a flashpoint as lawmakers grapple with carrying out Amendment 4. Grant, a Tampa Republican who is a lawyer, has crafted a bill that's shot him into the national spotlight, infuriated advocates of the amendment and spawned hundreds of phone calls and emails to legislators urging them to kill the proposal. The constitutional amendment granted restoration of voting rights to felons "who have completed all terms of their sentence, including parole or probation." It excluded people "convicted of murder or a felony sexual offense." Grant's definition of what it means to have completed sentences has created the firestorm.

Under the House proposal (HB 7089), felons would have to pay all court fees, fines and restitution to be eligible for the automatic vote restoration. The House proposal defines "term of sentence" as including "any cost of supervision or other monetary obligation," a sticking point for proponents of the amendment. "If it is in the four corners of the sentence, it is the sentence," Grant told the House State Affairs Committee prior to a party-line, 15-6 vote Thursday

on the bill. The House measure would also require full payment of restitution or other financial obligations that have been converted to civil judgments, another point of contention for proponents of the amendment.

Cecile Scoon, a lawyer and an officer with the League of Women Voters of Florida, argued that the House measure would also allow state agencies, such as the Department of Corrections, to levy fines against felons, which they would have to pay to be eligible for the automatic vote restoration. That's not what voters who supported the amendment envisioned, she said. "This is why people are offended. This is redefining what is Amendment 4 and going well outside what was said when the people voted," Scoon said.

Lance Wissinger, a convicted felon, said the House plan creates two classes of felons. "What we are doing right now with the bill seems like it is targeting a certain demographic. It seems like it is going after people with low income, and it's not giving everyone the opportunity to have their ability to vote back," Wissinger said.



Words of Wisdom: Embrace Change

Always be willing to learn. In an ever-changing industry, complacency is death.

Kyle Morris
Logistics Solutions Manager
Ward Transport & Logistics

Stay adaptable as changes occur all the time.

Carolyn Harris
Supply Chain Logistics Coordinator
Morton Salt

Expect the unexpected. Learn to prioritize early and often. The only constant is change.

Matt Gleisberg
Director of Operations
ModCloth

Be flexible and willing to adapt to change as the industry is constantly evolving. Stay engaged with the technological advancements impacting the industry and learn the systems that are optimizing the way we use data to make informed decisions and better service customers.

Mark Casiano
Senior Vice President
Odyssey Logistics & Technology

Understanding “EDGAR” When Using Purchasing Cooperatives

by Micki Morris

The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) are federal regulations that govern all federal grants awarded by the U.S. Department of Education. The regulations require that purchases made with federal grant funds follow the procurement procedures set forth in the federal Uniform Administrative Requirements, located in 2 CFR Part 200. While non-federal entities were given a series of one-year “grace periods” during which to complete implementation of the procurement and contracting procedures set forth in 2 CFR Part 200, all non-federal entities, including public school districts, were required to become fully compliant by the start of their 2018 fiscal year.

The Uniform Administrative Requirements explicitly the use of interlocal agreements for the procurement or use of common or shared goods and services, in order to foster greater economy and efficiency. In many states, many local governments utilize such interlocal agreements to join government purchasing cooperatives. In a typical purchasing cooperative, one or more governmental entities (referred to as “lead agencies”), competitively procure and award unit price or catalog discount contracts for a variety of goods and services. The governmental entities who have executed interlocal agreements are the “members” of the cooperative. In the federal procurement context, the contracts awarded by purchasing cooperatives are more commonly referred to as “advance contracts” or “indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity (IDIQ) contracts.” This difference in nomenclature between state/local and federal purchasing terms has proven to be a source of confusion when discussing compliance requirements with federal officials from various agencies.

Local Education Entities (“LEA”s), such as public school districts, must comply with the most restrictive procurement rules as between EDGAR and the LEA’s applicable state rules. Purchasing cooperatives should therefore be able to demonstrate to their members that the contracts awarded by the cooperative have been procured in compliance with the most restrictive EDGAR rules. Such compliance, as a minimum would include evidence that the purchasing cooperative engaged in the following actions required under 2 CFR Part 200:

- Conducted an Independent Estimate prior to the solicitation;
- Sought competitive bids/proposals in a manner which ensured full, open and fair competition and did not utilize prohibited geographical preferences;

- Took affirmative steps to encourage participation by small, minority and women-owned businesses;
- Performed a Cost Analysis/Price Analysis, as applicable, prior to awarding the contract to the vendor;
- Incorporated all applicable contract provisions into the award, and obtained required certifications from vendors; and
- Required it’s awarded vendors to retain all financial records and supporting documents for a period of three years following the end of the contract award.

LEAs should consult with their legal counsel to ensure whether the above types of documentation provided by a purchasing cooperative will be sufficient for a given type of purchase or contract. In some situations, depending on the contract type and amount, the LEA may be required to perform other actions, including its own Independent Estimate or Cost/Price Analysis, or obtain additional documentation from a vendor to ensure compliance with EDGAR or the regulations of other federal agencies.

More information concerning 1GPA’s compliance with EDGAR may be found at: WWW.1GPA.ORG.

MICKI MORRIS IS AN ATTORNEY

*WITH THE FIRM OF ROGERS,
MORRIS AND GROVER, L.L.P.,*

LOCATED IN TEXAS. THE

*FOREGOING ARTICLE IS INTENDED
TO BE USED SOLELY FOR GENERAL
INFORMATION PURPOSES AND IS*

*NOT TO BE REGARDED AS LEGAL ADVICE. IF SPECIFIC LEGAL ADVICE IS
SOUGHT, PLEASE CONSULT AN ATTORNEY.*



Congratulations to Kristin Smith for passing her Purchasing Card Professionals exam to obtain her Purchasing Card Professional Certification!

To highlight the importance of monitoring your Purchasing Card program, Cindy Davison with Escambia County School District has some interesting results of some recent reports she prepared for Districts P-Card program. Cindy used their 18/19 fiscal year as the basis and discovered that \$60,051.91 worth of fraud was prevented through various methods-whether by restricting MCC codes, blocking international purchases, bank process, etc. These transactions may have been “tried” but **did not** go through. Cindy then ran a second report for fraud that did get through the prior methods and discovered that the District only had to request credit for \$4,487.14 for a variety of oddball items (vitamins anyone?). **Good Job Cindy!**