

From: Nick Lyon
To: Charles Overbey; Kim Stephen; Olga Dazzo; Susan Malkin; Tony Stamas
CC: Dean Kimmith; Farah Hanley; Penny Rutledge
Date: 7/13/2011 8:07 PM
Subject: Re: DCH Issues: MQCCC

MQCCC

I wasn't part of the conversation where \$300,000 might be sufficient to keep the Council viable. This was either a conversation with the Executive Office or a Legislator. I did talk to the MQCCC and they had stated I believe to Rep. Lori that they might be able to maintain the registry if they were provided \$600,000 gross, so \$300,000 GF. They would have to eliminate their provider support and customer service functions. I am not terribly comfortable with running a registry without these functions, but that was the conversation.

The union can not pay for the MQCCC. They are the employer of record as it relates to the state's relationship with the Home Help workers. Without the MQCCC we would have to negotiate directly with SEIU as we do state employees. (We treat Home Help workers as employees for tax purposes as well.) It would be a conflict of interest to have the union pay.

>>> Overbey, Charles (DTMB) 7/12/2011 3:49 PM >>>

Nick and Kim---Here is the status of ABW and the MQCCC. I have discussed both of these issues with SBO management.

ABW
 [Redacted text block containing several lines of blacked-out text]

MQCCC

.....Per my discussion with Nick, please scope out two questions:

1. What is the minimum amount the Council can function with? \$300,000 is the amount mentioned in one of the e-mail chains.
2. Can the union contribute funds to support the council? How much?

Thank you for your help. Please let me know if you have questions or want to discuss any of this.