

## **UTILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

The Indian River County (IRC) Utility Advisory Committee (UAC) met at 2:00 p.m. on Wednesday, March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2008, in Conference Room "B1-501", County Administration Building, 1801 27<sup>th</sup> Street, Vero Beach, Florida.

Present were; William Johnson, District 3 Appointee; Carlton Miller and John Tschinkel, Members-at-Large and Dr. Stephen Faherty, District 5 Appointee.

Absent were Chairman Andrew Allocco, District 2 Appointee; Mark Grossman, District 1 Appointee; and Robert Pickett, District 4 Appointee (all excused).

Also present were Commissioner Liaison Joseph Flescher; and IRC staff: Himanshu Mehta, Solid Waste Disposal District Director; Erik Olson, Director and Cindy Corrente, Assistant, IRC Utilities; Donna Starck, Assessment Coordinator, Solid Waste Disposal District (SWDD); Marian Fells, Assistant County Attorney, IRC Attorney's Office; and Maria Resto, Commissioner Assistant, District 2.

Others present were: Elizabeth Pollicck, Bernard Higgins, J. Victor Smith, Larry G Mullins, Ruby Piatt, Vonnie Dare, Dennis Powell, Victor L. Sims, Billy Owens, and John Kocka, SWDD employees; Steve Myer, Teamsters Local 769 and Ed Nelson, Countryside MHP.

### **Call to Order**

Vice-Chairman Tschinkel called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m., at which time it was determined a quorum was present.

### **Approval of Minutes of February 20, 2008**

Vice- Chairman Tschinkel asked if there were any changes or corrections to the minutes.

Mr. Miller pointed out page 4 paragraph 7 should read *on motion by Mr. Miller* instead of Mr. Carlton.

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Faherty, SECONDED BY Mr.**

**Miller, the members voted unanimously (4-0), to approve the minutes of February 20, 2008, as amended.**

### **Discussion on the CCC Bidding Process**

Mr. Olson welcomed those in attendance and explained the purpose of the meeting was to analyze and look into different options to enhance the level of service and reduce costs at the Citizens' Convenience Centers. He stated staff was directed to create a bid document which could be presented as a report card to compare prices between public and private industry. Mr. Olson indicated employees' wages and benefits as well as the economy current situation were going to be considered during the process.

Mr. Olson specified staff gathered different examples of bid documents and explained that due to the Citizens' Convenience Center unique services many of the elements in the documents were not comparable. He indicated bidders must provide the same levels of services as the ones currently provided at the Convenience Center and they should have a clear understating of the processes and related duties.

Mr. Olson urged the committee to provide recommendations and suggestion for the bid document within a timeframe of two weeks. He explained that once all the information was gathered and analyzed staff was going to present the results and a recommendation to the Commission.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the budget process and the committee timeline for submitting comments and recommendations.

Mr. Miller expressed concerns related to the accuracy of bids and the potential of having bidders deliberately underestimating prices and costs. He related a survey could provide better results for comparison purposes.

Mr. Olson concurred with Mr. Miller expressions, however explained the directive from the County Commission was to create a bid document for cost comparison purposes.

Mr. Johnson inquired if an Operations Manual with the procedures and processes for the Convenience Center was available. He explained the Operations Manual could be used as a guideline for the development of the bid

document. Mr. Olson responded all the information was contained in the budget document.

Mr. Tschinkel asked if the Convenience Center attainment of reduction in costs could be enough to negate the bidding process or make it less critical. Mr. Olson reiterated the Commission's directive of creating a bid document and providing the results and recommendations.

Lengthy discussion ensued about the development of the bid document and the committees' responsibilities and duties.

Mr. Mehta referred to the Customer Convenience Center Request for Proposal Outline, a copy of which is on file at the Commission Office. He indicated legal aspects were not included in the outline and explained the outline only contained general aspects of the Convenience Centers' operations. Mr. Mehta added the research for similar bid document to use as a guideline was proven to be very difficult due to the Convenience Center unique services and operations.

Mr. Mehta reviewed the information contained in the Customer Convenience Centers Request for Proposal, including the hours of operation and facility details; level of service; receipt and processing of household solid waste; receipt and processing of other solid waste activities; traffic control; equipment, vehicles and tools; and staffing.

Mr. Miller emphasized the importance of a detail description of the staffing and personnel element in the outline and ultimately the bid document. He indicated the staffing element of the proposal (Item 1.5) should include a detailed description of staff level of service, performance, and duties.

Mr. Mehta explained the contractor's obligations related to reporting requirements and the proposal evaluation procedures. He further explained the proposal evaluations would include an analysis of qualifications, financial capability, and prior experience in the field.

Attorney Fell advised the bid document should not be reviewed or released to the committee members before the bids were publicly open. She explained reviewing the bid document or RFP could unlevel the playing field and ultimately create a bid protest.

A long discussion ensued regarding the committee's input and review of the bid document.

Mr. Olson provided a summary of the bidding process for the county and explained that once the information was open for the public the committee could review it and provide a recommendation to the commission.

Mrs. Corrente suggested having a meeting to review staff recommendations and a summary of the proposals.

**ON A MOTION BY Mr. Faherty, SECONDED By Mr. Miller, the members voted unanimously (4-0), to have a meeting to review staff recommendations of the proposals.**

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 3:36 pm.