

**City of Fort Lauderdale  
Community Services Board  
July 9, 2012 – 4:00 P.M.  
City Commission Chambers, City Hall  
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301**

<b>MEMBERS</b>		<b>PRESENT</b>	<b>ABSENT</b>
Donald Karney, Chair	P	10	0
Richard Whipple, Vice Chair	P	10	0
Benjamin Bean	A	4	1
Margaret Birch	A	9	1
Earl Bosworth	A	9	1
Ann Clark	P	1	0
Wendy Gonsler (arr. 4:05)	P	8	1
Helen Hinton	P	7	3
Bradley Katz	P	4	0
Jasmin Shirley	P	9	1
Kenneth Staab (arr. 4:15)	P	9	1

**Staff Present**

Jonathan Brown, Manager, Housing and Community Development  
 Jeri Pryor, Federal Grants Administrator, Housing and Community Development  
 Michael Walker, City Procurement Office  
 Kyle Carter, City Procurement Office  
 J. Oppertlee, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**Communications to City Commission**

None.

**I. Call to Order / Roll Call**

- **Quorum Requirement – As of 7/9/12 there are 11 appointed members to the Board, which means 6 constitutes a quorum**

Chair Karney called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. and roll was called. It was noted a quorum was present.

**II. Welcome and Board / Staff Introductions**

- **New Member Ann Clark**

New member Ann Clark introduced herself at this time. She is a longtime resident of Fort Lauderdale and is serving on her first City advisory body. She was appointed by Commissioner Rogers.

Ms. Gonsler arrived at 4:05 p.m.

### **III. City Commission News**

Ms. Pryor advised that the Annual Action Plan, including the Board's recommendations for Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) and their recommended performance indicators, has been presented to the City Commission. The City Commission had extended their thanks to the Board for their work in determining these indicators.

Mr. Brown stated he had been contacted by two agencies that were unaware the Board had made their CDBG public service recommendations in April 2012. He recalled that in March, there had been discussion of the Board's intent to make these recommendations at the April meeting. Both agencies have stated they may protest the public service recommendations.

### **IV. Approval of Minutes Summary – June 11, 2012**

**Motion** made by Vice Chair Whipple, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to accept the minutes as they stand. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

The following Item was taken out of order on the Agenda.

### **VI. HOPWA Discussion**

- **HOPWA 101 Presentation**

Ms. Pryor advised that because many newer Board members were not present, this discussion would be deferred until the August meeting.

- **RFP – Status**

Ms. Pryor introduced Michael Walker and Kyle Carter of the City Procurement Office, who were in attendance to discuss the upcoming HOPWA RFP, the RFP scoring process, and the Board's role in scoring these proposals. Mr. Brown explained that they were present to answer any questions the Board might have regarding the procurement process.

Mr. Carter distributed handouts to the Board members on the RFP scoring process, stating that the RFP itself would be released to the public on Wednesday, July 11. When the bids are opened on August 14, the Procurement Office will put together a package containing all the proposals, which will be distributed to the Board members. An evaluation meeting between Procurement, Staff, and the Board will then be scheduled.

Mr. Walker explained that the documents included a Selection Committee Conflict of Interest Statement, which members may fill out if they have any conflicts related to the firms that placed bids. He pointed out that while members with conflicts are allowed to comment on the process, they may not be voting members of the Selection Committee.

He continued that full copies of the RFP proposal will also be provided, so the Board members may see what the City has requested from the vendors. They will receive copies of all the vendors' responses to the RFP, as well as a scoring sheet. All of the specific criteria included in the RFP are identified on this sheet, with their respective weighting factors included. Each criterion for each vendor must be ranked in order, so the Board can determine which vendor best meets each particular criterion for the RFP. The rankings will be collected by the Procurement Office.

Mr. Walker noted that there is also a space on the scoring sheet for member comments, which may be positive or negative. The vendor receiving the lowest average total score is considered to have the top ranking. The final scoring sheets are sent to the City Commission.

Mr. Staab arrived at 4:15 p.m.

Mr. Walker continued that the first page of the document provided to the members lists the various HOPWA grants that are identified in the RFP. The agencies will make requests for specific amounts of money from the City for each of these grants. The members' final rankings will determine which respondent(s) will receive funding. Mr. Brown clarified that while the members may give a particular respondent the highest ranking, they still have the flexibility to determine how much funding is provided to that respondent. They can also choose how many agencies they would like to fund with each type of HOPWA grant.

Mr. Walker advised that there are six different services funded by HOPWA grants, which means the scoring process must be completed six different times. This could mean the Board will fill out a large number of scoring sheets, depending upon the number of respondents for each of the six service categories.

Ms. Pryor explained that there may be multiple agencies applying for a small amount of funding in any given category. The Board must then decide whether some or all respondents receive funding. Before the proposals are sent to the members, Staff will review each category's budget and financial capacity and provide the Board with these notes. She pointed out that a respondent's budget may include ineligible items, of which the Board will be made aware.

Ms. Gonsher asked if funding in the various categories is based on cost per person or service hours. Ms. Pryor said the funding reflects direct cost reimbursement for what is necessary to operate a particular program. Some agencies may be more expensive to run than others; reviewing the respondents' budgets allows the Board members to see their direct costs. Each agency is required to provide a proposed, unduplicated count of how many clients they plan to serve with a specific amount of money; the budget breaks down exactly how the money will be spent on these clients. The respondents may also provide narratives of the services they provide.

Ms. Gonsher asked if an agency that submits proposals in four separate HOPWA grant categories, for example, is required to submit four separate proposals. Ms. Pryor advised that the members will treat each separate service category as if it is the only category for which a proposal was submitted, which will result in different scoring for the same agency across the different categories. The agency's budgets and services must be submitted separately for each category.

Mr. Walker stated that Procurement will work with Housing and Community Development Staff once the RFP is released. A member of Procurement Services will be present at the vendor presentation meetings to serve as moderator.

Ms. Shirley asked to know the deadline for submitting Conflict of Interest Statements. Mr. Walker observed that a member would not know if he or she had a conflict until they saw the RFP, as they would not know who the vendors were until that time. These forms will not need to be collected until the first meeting after the RFP has closed.

Mr. Brown asked if the Evaluation Committee will review the proposals with each agency independently, or if all agencies are invited to the same presentation. Mr. Walker said he would look into this for clarification, as there are conflicting opinions on a recently enacted State law addressing this.

Ms. Gonsher asked to know if there is a time period by which an agency must submit questions regarding the RFP. Mr. Walker said the draft RFP specifies that questions are due by July 20, although this date is subject to change. Questions, as well as answers from Staff, are posted publicly for reasons of transparency.

Mr. Brown suggested that any Board members' questions be sent to his office, and he would pass them on to Mr. Walker.

Ms. Pryor stated that she would send copies of the RFP to the Board members when the document is released to the public. She cautioned that the Sunshine Law prevents members from discussing the RFP, or other Board business, among themselves outside of an advertised meeting; however, if a member

needs to meet or speak individually with the Procurement Office, he or she may do so.

Ms. Pryor recalled that at the June meeting, there had been discussion of how much time would be allotted to the scoring process. She estimated that this would take more than four hours. Two meetings will be scheduled for vendor presentations, and a third meeting would be scheduled for scoring alone. Mr. Walker confirmed that this was up to the Board's discretion, noting that each vendor is allowed to make a timed presentation, with an additional time period in which the Board may ask questions of that vendor. He added that once the Procurement Office determined how many vendors had submitted bids, they would share this information with Housing and Community Development Staff and the Board in order to schedule meetings. A minimum of three days' notice is necessary to advertise a meeting.

Ms. Gonsler asked if a single agency applying in multiple categories would give a single presentation. Ms. Pryor confirmed this. She explained that scoring is based on the bids, while a presentation is intended to clarify or add information to the bids.

Vice Chair Whipple asked if the proposals were broken down in a similar manner to the CDBG. Ms. Pryor confirmed this as well, stating that each agency is asked to clearly label and indicate the correct categories under which their documents may be found.

Mr. Walker advised that once all vendors have made their presentations, the Board will meet once more to finalize their scores. He estimated that this would be a lengthy process, as there are likely to be several different scoring sheets to be filled out. The Board's discussion at this meeting would determine which vendors receive funding in the specific categories. While the ranking is ultimately based on an average of the scores, the funding allocations were more likely to be based on consensus among the Board members. She cautioned that there would be more proposals than there are funds to be allocated in any category.

The Board members thanked Mr. Walker and Mr. Carter for their presentation.

Ms. Pryor stated that the expected deadline for the RFP responses to be submitted was August 14. She asked the Board to consider potential meeting dates in September for the presentation and scoring meetings, pointing out that the second City Commission meeting is scheduled for September 18. This would be the target date by which the Board's RFP recommendations should be submitted for approval before the new fiscal year begins on October 1.

Ms. Gonsler suggested that Staff could send the Board five prospective meeting dates in September, and they could respond to determine the dates on which

most members are available. Ms. Pryor added that the same members must be available for all three meetings. Mr. Brown clarified that while three meetings are anticipated, this would ultimately be determined by the number of HOPWA responses.

Regarding the structure of presentations, Ms. Gonsher and Ms. Shirley stated that they preferred to allow more time for questions than for the presentations themselves, as the proposals and narratives will provide information on the respective agencies. Ms. Pryor advised that in her experience, the County typically allows each agency a three-minute introduction, followed by a 10-minute question-and-answer period.

Ms. Gonsher expressed concern that a single agency that applied under multiple different service categories would be granted the same amount of time as an agency that only applied for funds in a single category. Ms. Pryor suggested that one solution could be allowing a certain amount of time for presentation and questions per service category.

She continued that while the scoring meeting is open to the public, only Board and Staff members may participate in the discussion.

Chair Karney observed that he did not want to cut off agencies' presentations if they ran long. Ms. Pryor explained that the Procurement Office would moderate the meeting, and would make the necessary time limits clear to the agencies. She emphasized the importance of adhering to these limits, as allowing one agency even a slightly longer time to present could be considered giving them an unfair advantage, and could result in a protest.

The Board briefly discussed the time limits to be afforded for presentations and questions. It was determined that each agency would be allowed three minutes to make a presentation in a given service category, followed by 10 minutes for questions.

Pablo Calvo, member of the public, asked what would occur if the question phase for a given agency did not take the entire 10 minutes. Mr. Brown clarified that each agency is guaranteed three minutes for a presentation; the question-and-answer period is limited to 10 minutes as needed by the Board.

## **V. CDBG – Annual Action Plan Recommendation**

Mr. Brown stated that the Annual Action Plan will go before the City Commission at their July 12 meeting for its first public hearing. The only items not yet included in the Action Plan are the HOPWA recommendations: once these recommendations are made, the Action Plan will be amended to include the

Commission's final decision on HOPWA activities. He concluded that he would advise the Board of the outcome of the July 12 Commission meeting.

**VII. Good of the Order**

None.

**VIII. Items for the Next Agenda**

Ms. Pryor stated again that the HOPWA presentation deferred from today's meeting would be seen at the August meeting. She agreed to emphasize the need for newer Board members to attend this meeting.

Vice Chair Whipple requested that the procedures for the upcoming presentation and scoring meetings be reviewed at the Board's August meeting as well.

**IX. Communications to City Commission**

None.

**X. Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

[Minutes prepared by K. McGuire, Prototype, Inc.]