

ACTIONS FROM THE OCTOBER 24, 2012 PROCUREMENT ACTIONS REVIEW AND APPROVAL COMMITTEE MEETING

Committee Members: Gus Pego (Present), Harold Desdunes (Present), Debora Rivera (Present), Alicia Trujillo (Absent)

Meeting Date	Item	Proposed Action	Committee's Decision	Comments	Project Manager
10/24/2012	Consultant Selections Committee	Final Selection		None	
10/24/2012	Consultant Selections Committee	Shortlist Selection		None	
10/24/2012	Procurement Awards Committee	Award Contract		None	
10/24/2012	Old Business			None	
10/24/2012	New Contract for Public Information Services for Construction Projects in Miami Beach	Advertise Contract	Approved	Use a request for proposals (RFP) to procure a new contract for public information services for construction projects in Miami Beach and the surrounding areas. Original amount \$350,000. Contract term three years. Using the RFP method best allows the district to examine the qualifications, capabilities, experience and references of the proposers to find the one who best would meet the district's needs. Proposers would be rated on a technical proposal (with a maximum score of 100 points) and on a visual presentation (with a maximum of 100 points) which will demonstrate the proposer's media and visual graphic capabilities. Proposers must achieve a combined score of at least 140 points for the technical proposal and visual presentation in order for the district to open their price proposals.	Kathy Yeomans
10/24/2012	BDT89	Amendment	Approved	Amendment 1. Public communications for Monroe County. Sandra Walters Consultants. Original and current contract amount \$270,000; 80% of contract committed; requested amount \$300,000. Three year contract, executed on March 20, 2012, and due to expire on March 20, 2015. The amendment will raise the budgetary ceiling and provide funding for public information services in Monroe County and for extensive outreach targeting the visitors to that county. These funds will cover salaries and marketing costs. The contract supplement is in the Consultant Acquisition Plan (CAP), but this action is coming to the committee because the contract has a budgetary ceiling. This is the district's first contract with this firm, and the firm is doing the work well.	Kathy Yeomans

10/24/2012	BDT38	Amendment	Approved	Amendment 3. Districtwide environmental compliance monitoring. Metric Engineering, Inc. Original contract amount \$200,000; current amount \$232,000; 99.5% of contract committed; requested amount \$150,000. Two year contract, executed on November 8, 2011, extended for one year, and due to expire on November 7, 2014. The budgetary ceiling for this contract was set at \$350,000 to accommodate the \$200,000 planned for the first year and the \$150,000 planned for the second year. However, \$32,000 had to be added to the contract for additional work. This amendment will raise the budgetary ceiling to \$382,000 to allow the \$150,000 in the district's CAP for the current fiscal year to be added to the current contract amount.	John Palenchar
10/24/2012	MIC Business/Update			None	
10/24/2012	Joint Participation Agreements			None	
10/24/2012	Locally Funded Agreements			None	
10/24/2012	CIGP			None	
10/24/2012	Construction Supplemental			None	
10/24/2012	PARA Committee Procedures			Find out if District Secretary Gus Pego is a member of the Procurement Actions Review and Approval (PARA) Committee.	
10/24/2012	Contract Budgetary Ceiling			Debora Rivera suggested that the budgetary ceiling for a contract should be set for the amount needed to do the work, not just the amount available to put on the contract. The contract amount is not the same as the budgetary ceiling. If the estimate changes or the contract has an overrun, the contract manager can request an increase in the budgetary ceiling. Kathy Yeomans indicated that for new contracts the Contractual Services Unit does set the budgetary ceiling as Debora suggested.	
10/24/2012	Contract Management			The districtwide contracts could have a term of five years, but the district executes them with a term of two years so the district can stop using a contractor if it does not perform well. However, renewing the contract or procuring a new contract every couple of years requires more paperwork over the course of five years than having one five year contract. If a contractor isn't performing well, the contract manager should not wait until submitting grades to indicate that there is a problem. The contract manager should notify Gus Pego, Harold Desdunes and Debora Rivera. Contractors often visit these people and ask 'how are we doing?'	

10/24/2012	Process Review			<p>In the past there have been problems with insufficient oversight of contracts. However, information about projects and contracts is spread over various computer systems. It takes a lot of time for contract managers and the staff of the Professional Services Unit (PSU) and the Contractual Services Unit (CSU) to prepare forms, enter data into multiple systems and collect data from multiple systems to procure, manage and monitor contracts. The statutes and rules for professional services and contractual services contracts are different; employees not familiar with this become upset with PSU and CSU staff members. Also there is no good way to look up how much of a contract's funds have been committed. Sarah prepares a spreadsheet every six months showing any contracts with no activity. Brian Arena would like to have one system which would guide project managers to fill out needed forms. Elizabeth Leopold reported that District One has a regular review of contracts which may have funds roll forward. The PSU and CSU will look for ways to make the processes more efficient and bring recommendations to the PARA Committee. Debora Rivera will take to the Innovations Team the idea of <u>having one computer system with all the contract</u></p>	
10/24/2012	Meeting Time			<p>The meeting began at approximately 10:05 AM and ended at approximately 10:45 AM.</p>	