

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

GOVERNING BOARD FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION SCREENING COMMITTEE

SOUTHWEST FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

BROOKSVILLE, FLORIDA

OCTOBER 22, 2010

The Governing Board Finance and Administration Screening Committee of the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) met at 9:05 a.m. on October 22, 2010, at the District's headquarters in Brooksville. The following persons were present:

Finance and Administration Committee

Douglas B. Tharp, Chair
H. Paul Senft, Vice Chair
Judith C. Whitehead, Second Vice Chair

Governing Board

Ronald E. Oakley, Chair
Carlos Beruff, Member

Board's Administrative Support

LuAnne Stout, Administrative Coordinator

Staff Members

David L. Moore, Executive Director
William S. Bilenky, General Counsel
Elaine M. Kuligofski, Human Resources Dir.
Michael Molligan, Communications Director
Daryl F. Pokrana, Finance Director
Linda R. Pilcher, Assistant Finance Director
Steve Long, Contracts Manager
Lucy Petruccelli, Risk Management Manager
Don Wood, Human Resources Manager
Audra Owens-Powell, Sr. Human Res. Specialist

A list of others present who signed the attendance roster is filed in the permanent records of the District.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Tharp called the meeting to order and requested Ms. Stout to call the roll.

Chair Tharp pointed out that any decisions made by this Screening Committee will be brought to the full Governing Board to make the final decision. He said the Board has requested that this task be completed by next summer and noted there are constraints due to process requirements.

At Chair Tharp's request, Mr. Moore introduced staff in attendance, and thanked Board members for taking the time to participate on this committee. (Track 1 – 00:00/03:50)

2. Discussion of Proposed Scope of Work

Mr. Moore reviewed the staffing charts showing number of staff and number of reallocations and contractors by department. Discussion ensued regarding lapsed positions and outsourcing. Mr. Moore said staff is working to develop a document to explain staffing in relation to individual projects.

Regarding the draft request for proposal (RFP) for a workload and staffing analysis, Mr. Moore said the draft document has flexibility to do final presentations to the full Board by June 1, 2011. Chair Tharp said first the Board should determine if it is just a staffing study and then determine whether to do entire organization or portion. He said he wants to limit it to a staffing analysis to be done in a timely fashion. Ms. Whitehead voiced her agreement. Mr. Beruff said firms are available that can meet the timeframe. Chair Tharp said the consensus is to do a staffing analysis. (Track 1 – 03:50/25:10)

Mr. Moore said then the decision is to do the staffing analysis all at once or in portions. He noted there is a new norm now due to the economy. He said there are elements of the

organization that are sensitive to the economy (regulation, projects) and some elements are not (aquatic plant control). He said staff therefore feels the first phase should include those departments sensitive to the economy, such as Resource Regulation, Resource Projects, Finance and Office of General Counsel, which accounts for about 50 percent of the organization.

Mr. Beruff said he thought the second role of the RFP is a salary analysis. Chair Tharp said he would prefer to keep the RFP relative to staffing and let the respondents tell the Board how the economy affects staffing. Mr. Senft said he agrees with Chair Tharp to let the respondents tell the Board which areas of the organization require a detailed breakdown, and the staffing and salary should be separate studies. Discussion ensued. Mr. Beruff, Ms. Whitehead, Mr. Senft voiced their agreement with Chair Tharp for the RFP to be for a staffing analysis of the entire organization. (Track 1 – 25:10/44:13)

Mr. Oakley suggested that, if done in phases, then the first phase will show which areas need to be done next; if the second phase confirms the first phase, then no need to do a third phase. Ms. Whitehead said she understood the point of view of doing the analysis in phases. She noted that perhaps Board members will need to rethink the Board's focus on responsibilities. Messrs. Senft and Beruff voiced their disagreement with doing the analysis in phases.

In response to Mr. Oakley's question, Mr. Long said the RFP is written for the first phase to be done within a specific time period and then do additional targeted phases. Mr. Moore reviewed the phases outlined in the scope. Discussion ensued regarding respondents identifying departments for analysis and costs. Mr. Long noted the date for advertising the RFP is October 29, 2010, following direction by the Board at its meeting on October 26.

Mr. Senft said it is important the Board provides Mr. Moore and staff with the tools needed to do their jobs during these tough times. He noted he had another engagement to attend and apologized for leaving the meeting. (Track 1 – 00:44:13/01:02:22)

Mr. Long reviewed the timeline provided as a handout and noted it is an aggressive timeline to meet the June 1 deadline for a final report. He noted there are several holidays so the November 16 Board meeting is not possible. He said the December 14 Board meeting allows staff time to evaluate proposals for presentation to the Board. Discussion ensued regarding minority firms versus large firms' response time, changing timeframe from June to July 2011, and quality of response due to timeframe. Mr. Moore suggested a special meeting of the Screening Committee in early January 2011. Ms. Whitehead and Mr. Beruff voiced their agreement. Board members were in agreement with changing the timeframe from June to July 2011. Mr. Long said the RFP award would be early January for a July final report. (Track 1 – 01:02:22/01:10:50)

In response to Mr. Moore's query, Mr. Oakley said Mr. Senft's comments were to analyze the entire organization and the respondents tell the Board which area to review first. Chair Tharp and Ms. Whitehead voiced their agreement. Mr. Moore suggested requesting the respondents provide two proposals: (1) entire organization and (2) phases. Discussion ensued regarding wording for the RFP to provide two proposals and identifying costs for phases. Chair Tharp said that, since staff is having difficulty with wording the RFP, the easiest way is for respondents to do the entire organization by July 1. Messrs. Beruff and Oakley were in agreement. Mr. Moore said staff will present the Committee's direction to the Board next week. Mr. Long said the respondents may have more time to respond. Mr. Beruff suggested that if there are four or five respondents, the Board allow each to provide a 30-minute presentation. (Track 1 – 01:10:50/01:23:24)

The meeting was recessed for a five-minute break.

3. **Discussion of Proposed Request for Proposal (RFP) Approach**

Mr. Moore said there are two firms which know the District and they are Mercer and KPMG; both are on state contract. Mr. Long said state contract firms are already qualified and this allows the RFP to go directly to quotes by a minimum of three firms. Discussion ensued regarding using state contract firms or releasing the RFP for all to respond and criticism of the short timeframe being difficult for small minority firms. Mr. Beruff said his experience has been that state contract qualified firm quotes will be tighter. Messrs. Tharp and Oakley voiced their agreement to advertise the RFP for all firms to respond. (Track 2 – 00:00/05:00)

4. **Discussion of Ranking and Selection Process**

Mr. Moore said someone has to do the ranking of the respondents and the ranking must be defensible. He said that, normally, staff does the short list for Board members to review. He suggested the staff review be done by Gene Schiller, Daryl Pokrana, Lori Tetreault and Elaine Kuligofski. The Committee was in consensus that staff short list the respondents for oral presentations to the Board. The Screening Committee members decide the number of oral presentations based on the number of respondents. Mr. Moore suggested advertising a meeting of the Governing Board and Screening Committee for January 13, 2011, for oral presentations and cancel the meeting if unnecessary. The Committee was in agreement. (Track 2 – 05:00/13:30)

Mr. Moore noted that Mr. Combee's email relayed his comments regarding this process and a copy was provided to each Board member. Chair Tharp said he feels Mr. Combee will be comfortable with the Committee's direction.

Mr. Long reviewed the process for ranking each firm and the assigned points and weights. Discussion ensued regarding evaluations. Mr. Moore said staff will provide a proposed ranking system for the Board's consideration. (Track 2 – 13:30/19:15)

Chair Tharp asked whether all Board members received the draft proposal. Mr. Moore said it can be sent today in an email and mailed overnight to ensure each Board member receives it. He said the staff recommendation will be that this is the Committee's recommendation for Board consideration: (1) approve a RFP for a workload and staffing analysis, consistent with the timeline established by the Governing Board; and (2) authorize staff to evaluate and rank the responsive consultant proposals and authorize the Screening Committee to develop a short list of three or more respondents for oral presentations to the Governing Board for the Board's selection of the successful respondent.

5. **Adjournment**

Chair Tharp thanked everyone for their participation and adjourned the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:05 a.m. (Track 2 – 19:15/24:21)