

City of San Antonio



Minutes Audit and Accountability

Monday, November 1, 2021

2:00 PM

City Hall Complex

Members Present: Councilmember Clayton Perry, Chair, Councilmember Jalen McKee-Rodriguez, Member, Priscilla Soto, Citizen Member, Judy Treviño, Citizen Member

Members Absent: Councilmember Manny Pelaez, Member

Approval of Minutes

1. **Approval of the Minutes of the September 22, 2021 Audit and Accountability Council Committee Meeting.**

Citizen Member Trevino moved to approve the Minutes of the September 22, 2021 Audit and Accountability Council Committee Meeting. Citizen Member Soto seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously by those present.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

Staff Briefing

2. **Briefing on Procurement Overview and Annual High Profile Forecast for Fiscal Year 2022**
[Ben Gorzell Jr., Chief Financial Officer; Troy Elliott, Deputy Chief Financial Officer, Finance]

Troy Elliott, Deputy Chief Financial Officer, provided an overview of the Annual High Profile Forecast for FY 2022. Elliott reviewed the various methods of solicitation which were utilized

by the City of San Antonio. Elliott provided a summary of the various City Preference Programs to include the Local Preference Program, Veteran Preference Program, Small Business Economic Development Advocacy Program (SBEDA) and the Disadvantage Business Enterprise Program (DBE) but concentrated on the Local and Veteran Preference Programs.

Councilmember McKee-Rodriguez entered the meeting at this time.

Elliott provided an overview of the High Profile process and what defined an item as high profile. Elliott stated that the high profile items could be reviewed at the Audit and Accountability Committee level or reviewed by the full City Council at a B Session Meeting. Elliott provided details on which solicitations were presented at the different levels. Elliott provided specifics on the high profile forecast process and coordination and stated that 63 items were selected as high profile with seven selected for presentation at B Session and 56 selected for presentation at the Committee level. Elliott provided examples of the items to be presented at upcoming B Sessions and Audit and Accountability Council Committee Meetings.

Chair Perry asked when the presentation would be provided to the full City Council. Elliott mentioned that it would be provided on November 3, 2021. Chair Perry asked of the status of the procurement study requested by a fellow Councilmember. Ben Gorzell, Chief Financial Officer stated that no action had been taken regarding the potential study but could be discussed at the full City Council briefing.

Chair Perry requested that staff provide additional information on State requirements and Federal legislation for procurements. Chair Perry stated that it would be prudent for staff to include small and local businesses for certain Federal or higher valued solicitations. Assistant City Manager Jeff Coyle stated that this had been discussed at the State legislature and was vetoed. Chair Perry requested that the conversation continue to identify lower or certain type contracts to be considered for small business participation.

Chair Perry asked when the \$1 million contracts were identified as High Profile. Elliott stated that he would provide that information. Chair Perry asked that the dollar amount be reviewed since \$1 million did not purchase as much as it used to. Gorzell clarified that the \$1 million threshold was not the only criteria for an item to be considered high profile and at times it was public interest or contentiousness that made an item High Profile. Chair Perry asked that additional information be provided to the full City Council on all preference programs.

Councilmember McKee-Rodriguez asked for clarification on the items selected for B Session briefing and if staff requested further guidance if others should be included. Gorzell stated that seven proposals would be brought before City Council at a B Session and the remainder would be presented to the Audit and Accountability Council Committee.

Citizen Member Soto asked if a project term in excess of 10 years was common. Elliott stated that projects requiring an investment in infrastructure and equipment could have a term of 10 years+.

Citizen Member Treviño requested clarification on Items identified to be presented at B Session which did not meet the \$25 million threshold. Elliott stated that these Items were historically

high interest.

No action was required for Item 2.

CONSENT AGENDA

Pre-Solicitation High Profile Items

3. **Briefing on the release of a solicitation for one contract to provide the Aviation Department with Airport Terminal Planning Services in the estimated total value of \$2,500,000.00 for an initial term of 1 year with 2, 1-year options to renew.** [Jeff Coyle, Assistant City Manager; Jesus Saenz, Director, Aviation]
4. **Briefing on the release of solicitation for one contract for Custodial and Supplemental Conversion Services at the Alamodome in the estimated total value of \$5,500,000.00 for a 3-year term with 2, 1-year renewal options.** [Alejandra Lopez, Assistant City Manager; Patricia Muzquiz Cantor, Executive Director, Convention & Sports Facilities]

Post-Solicitation High Profile Items

5. **Approval to proceed with scheduling three contracts for City Council consideration to provide the Public Works Department with on-call building commissioning services, in the estimated total value of \$2,400,000.00 for an initial 1-year term with 3, 1-year options to renew.** [Roderick Sanchez, Assistant City Manager; Razi Hosseini, Director, Public Works]
6. **Approval to proceed with scheduling one contract for City Council consideration to provide the Public Works Department with construction services for the District 4 Heritage Community Center for an estimated total value not to exceed \$6,400,000.00 until project completion. Project completion is estimated for April 2023.** [Roderick Sanchez, Assistant City Manager; Razi Hosseini, Director, Public Works]

Final Internal Audit Reports

7. **Acceptance of the Office of the City Auditor report AU21-012 of the Economic Development Department's Economic Incentive Monitoring** [Kevin Barthold, City Auditor]
8. **Acceptance of the Office of the City Auditor report AU20-006 of the Center City Development Office (CCDO)'s Riverwalk Leases** [Kevin Barthold, City Auditor]
9. **Acceptance of the Office of the City Auditor report AU21-032 of the Information Technology Systems Department (ITSD) Security Awareness Training 2021** [Kevin Barthold, City Auditor]
10. **Acceptance of the Office of the City Auditor report AU20-011 of the Finance Department Citywide Payroll Process** [Kevin Barthold, City Auditor]

11. Acceptance of the Office of the City Auditor report AU21-016 of the Fire Department's Mobile Integrated Health Program [Kevin Barthold, City Auditor]

12. Acceptance of the Office of the City Auditor report AU21-027 of the Public Works Department Storm Water fee-in-lieu-of (FILO) Program [Kevin Barthold, City Auditor]

Councilmember McKee-Rodriguez moved to approve the Consent Agenda Items. Citizen Member Treviño seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously by those present.

ITEMS FOR INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION

Pre-Solicitation High Profile Briefings

13. Briefing on the release of a solicitation for one contract to provide security officer services for the City of San Antonio in the estimated contract value of \$40,000,000.00 for an initial period of 3 years with 2, 1-year renewal options. [Ben Gorzell, Jr., Chief Financial Officer; Craig Hopkins, Chief Information Officer, Information Technology Services]

Patricia Boozer, Chief Security Officer, ITSD, provided an overview of the Pre-Solicitation Briefing for Citywide Security Officer Services. Boozer presented the project specifics, solicitation overview, solicitation requirement criteria and project timeline and stated that the contract start date was expected to be in May 2022.

Chair Perry asked if the item had been solicited before and why it was being brought forward again. Boozer stated that the item had been released before but ITSD thought it best to review the City Tower opening needs in order to meet all identified scope requirements. Gorzell added that events at the U.S. Capital prompted staff to consider additional security needs at City Tower and City Hall. Gorzell stated that a concierge and screening scope of work was needed to address security gaps. Chair Perry expressed concern that the prior solicitation had been open for 9 months and wanted to make sure that the additional scope was being addressed. Boozer stated that the proposed solicitation was more specific and would identify other needs. Perry asked if the cost would be greater for the new scope. Boozer stated that the overall price would be impacted due to enhancements.

No action was required for Item 13.

Post-Solicitation High Profile Briefings

14. Approval to proceed with scheduling one contract for City Council consideration to provide municipal commercial garbage collection, disposal and recycling services to various departments throughout the City in the estimated total value of \$4,500,000.00 for an initial term of 3 years with 2, 1-year options to renew. [Ben Gorzell, Chief Financial Officer; Troy Elliot, CPA, Deputy Chief Financial Officer]

Troy Elliott, Deputy Chief Financial Officer, provided a briefing on the post solicitation for

municipal commercial garbage collection, disposal, and recycling services. Elliott stated that the Request for Proposal (RFP) was valued at \$4.5 million with a term of three years with two, one-year renewal options. Elliott clarified that the initial expected cost was lower than the true cost of the contract due to increased costs of doing business which was expected to be an increase of 6%.

Elliott provided an overview of services provided and stated that two proposals were received for the solicitation. Elliott reviewed the submission and evaluation process for the two vendors.

Chair Perry asked if City was constructing a recycling facility. Elliott responded this contract is separate and apart for City services provided by a vendor. Chair Perry asked how the awarded vendor was awarded preference points. Elliott stated that the awarded vendor received points due to local presence.

Councilmember McKee-Rodriguez moved to approve and recommend Item 14 to the full City Council for consideration. Citizen Member Treviño seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously by those present.

- 15. Approval to proceed with scheduling eight contracts for City Council consideration to provide the Public Works Department with a Job Order Contracting (JOC) Program for construction services not to exceed the amount of \$96,000,000 for an initial term of 2 years with 2, 1-year options to extend; and for the approval of increasing the JOC Program threshold requiring Council action.** [Roderick Sanchez, Assistant City Manager; Razi Hosseini, Director, Public Works]

Razi Hosseini, Public Works Director, provided an overview of the post solicitation process for the Public Works Job Order Contract Program. Hosseini stated that 23 proposals were received and the evaluation committee recommended eight vendors for the award. Hosseini reviewed the solicitation requirements, scoring, due diligence process and the Job Order Contracting (JOC) Program enhancements to include Local Government Code requirements. Hosseini provided an overview of the current approval process requirements for JOC award at the department, Executive Leadership Team and full City Council levels and recommended increased levels of dollar amount approvals. Chair Perry stated that the dollar amount limits for the award should be reconsidered since the cost of doing business was higher than in years prior. Perry requested additional information on staff's requirements. Chair Perry noted that increased term contracts could be considered.

Councilmember McKee-Rodriguez stated that staff needed to be conscious of firms cutting corners on projects. Hosseini stated that pricing was only 15% of criteria consideration and that construction experience and understanding of JOC programs totaled 40% of solicitation consideration. Councilmember McKee-Rodriguez asked for clarification on the approval process for items valued at \$250,000. Gorzell provided clarification on the approval process.

Councilmember McKee-Rodriguez moved to recommend and forward approval of the eight (8) recommended firms for the JOC Program to the City Council for consideration. Citizen Member Soto seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously by those present.

Final Internal Audit Report

16. Acceptance of the Office of the City Auditor report AU21-F01 of the Airport Police Operations Follow-up Audit [Kevin Barthold, City Auditor]

Mark Biegler provided an overview of the Audit Report of Airport Police Operations and stated that the Airport Police met all the requirements of the Audit and conducted an excellent finding. Chief McManus added that Police staff worked very closely with the Audit staff to meet the identified issues and all items had been addressed.

Citizen Member Treviño moved to accept the Office of the City Auditor Report AU21-F01 of the Airport Police Operations Follow-Up Audit. Councilmember McKee-Rodriguez seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously by those present.

17. Acceptance of the Office of the City Auditor report AU20-012 of the Finance Department Accounts Payable Process [Kevin Barthold, City Auditor]

Gabriel Trevino, Audit Manager, provided a summary of the Finance Department Accounts Payable Process. He stated that the division had adequate processes but recommended additional steps be taken to meet identified gaps.

Chair Perry asked if a slide presentation could be provided in the future of Audit Report findings for public viewing. Biegler stated that it would be provided in the future. Councilmember McKee-Rodriguez stated that a summary could be provided.

Councilmember McKee-Rodriguez moved to accept the Office of the City Auditor Report AU20-012 of the Finance Department accounts payable process. Citizen Member Treviño seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously by those present.

18. Acceptance of the Office of the City Auditor report AU21-015 of the Finance Department's P- Card Program [Kevin Barthold, City Auditor]

Mark Biegler provided an overview of the Finance Departments P-Card Program and scope of items reviewed. Biegler identified gaps in the approval process, training requirements, monthly transaction pending items review, analysis of credit card user limits, and P-Card reoccurring charges. Biegler stated that the department worked closely with the Audit Department and addressed all items.

Chair Perry asked how all identified items would be addressed and noted that he understood the challenges with P-Card program. Elliott stated that the department was taking on a more proactive rather than reactive approach to meeting training requirements and review processes. Perry asked of the P-Card staffing approval process. Elliott reviewed the various staff and levels for P-Card approval process and the number of cards issued to staff. Gorzell also provided additional clarification on controls in place and how the department was addressing any issues.

Councilmember McKee-Rodriguez moved to accept the Office of the City Auditor Report

AU21-015 of the Finance Department's P-Card Program. Citizen Member Treviño seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously by those present.

AUDIT PLAN

19. Briefing on the FY 2022 Audit Plan Status Update. [Kevin Barthold, City Auditor]

Mark Biegler provided a brief overview of the FY 2022 Audit Plan Status and noted that items were progressing as scheduled. Perry requested that the diagram provided to the Committee be provided to the full council.

Councilmember McKee-Rodriguez asked if audit items could be completed sooner than anticipated. Biegler stated that items could be adjusted since some items required less time to complete but by the same notion, other items could require additional time based on findings and circumstances. Biegler also clarified that audit items could be addressed sooner as available. McKee-Rodriguez asked that the Ready to Work Program Audit be addressed sooner in the calendar.

No action was required for Item 19.

20. Briefing and discussion of tracking and reporting management action plan status for outstanding audit recommendations. [Kevin Barthold, City Auditor]

Mark Biegler stated that the item addressed the Committee's request for tracking and reporting management action plan status for outstanding audit recommendations. Perry stated that he was pleased with the proposed chart but asked staff to make it easier to read by the general public. Biegler provided additional clarification on the chart and stated that staff would work on simplification of the chart. Biegler stated that the report would be provided on a quarterly basis.

McKee-Rodriguez asked for clarification on the chart report and provided feedback on the chart for consideration. Biegler provided response of chart information and stated that feedback would be considered for implementation.

Executive Session

An Executive Session was not held.

Consideration of items for future meetings

Rescheduling the November 24, 2021 meeting to November 15, 2021.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 3:55 PM

Respectfully Submitted

Clayton H. Perry, Chairman

Debbie Racca-Sittre, Interim City Clerk

*****DISCLAIMER!!!***** THE FOLLOWING IS AN UNEDITED ROUGH DRAFT TRANSLATION FROM THE CART PROVIDER'S OUTPUT FILE. THIS TRANSCRIPT IS NOT VERBATIM AND HAS NOT BEEN PROOFREAD. THIS IS NOT A LEGAL DOCUMENT. THIS FILE MAY CONTAIN ERRORS. THIS TRANSCRIPT MAY NOT BE COPIED OR DISSEMINATED TO ANYONE UNLESS PERMISSION IS OBTAINED FROM THE HIRING PARTY. SOME INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN MAY BE WORK PRODUCT OF THE SPEAKERS AND/OR PRIVATE CONVERSATIONS AMONG PARTICIPANTS. HIRING PARTY ASSUMES ALL RESPONSIBILITY FOR SECURING PERMISSION FOR DISSEMINATION OF THIS TRANSCRIPT AND HOLDS HARMLESS CAPTIONSOURCE, LLC FOR ANY ERRORS IN THE TRANSCRIPT AND ANY RELEASE OF INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN.

*****DISCLAIMER!!!***** SACC, TRANSCRIPT OF AUDIT AND ACCOUNTABILITY MEETING

PERRY: ALL RIGHT. IT'S 2:04 AND WE'RE GOING TO GO AHEAD AND GET THIS MEETING STARTED HERE FOR THE AUDIT AND ACCOUNTABILITY MEETING. WE DO HAVE THREE MEMBERS HERE, AND CAN WE TAKE ROLL CALL, PLEASE?

CLERK: YES, SIR. [ROLL CALL]

CLERK: SIR, WE HAVE A QUORUM.

PERRY: ALL RIGHT. GREAT. THANK YOU. THANK YOU VERY MUCH, AURORA. I WANT TO GO AHEAD AND GET STARTED HERE WITH APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES, IF -- ASSUMING EVERYBODY GOT A CHANCE TO REVIEW THOSE AND WOULD LIKE TO HEAR A MOTION TO ACCEPT THOSE AND A SECOND.

STUDENT: I'LL MOVE.

PERRY: OKAY. THANK YOU. AND A SECOND? ALL RIGHT. WE'VE GOT A FIRST AND A SECOND. AND ALL THOSE IN FAVOR, SAY AYE. (AYES).

PERRY: ALL RIGHT. GREAT. LET'S MOVE ON. AURORA, DO WE HAVE ANYBODY HERE FOR PUBLIC COMMENT?

CLERK: NO, SIR, THERE'S NO ONE SIGNED UP FOR WRITTEN OR PUBLIC COMMENT.

PERRY: ALL RIGHT. GREAT. I THINK WE HAVE A STAFF BRIEFING AT THIS TIME, AND IF WE CAN GO AHEAD AND GET STARTED WITH THAT, THAT WOULD BE GREAT.

ELLIOTT: YES, SIR. GOOD AFTERNOON, CHAIR, MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE. MY NAME'S TROY ELLIOTT, I'M THE DEPUTY CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER. THIS ITEM WILL BE WALKING Y'ALL THROUGH A PROCUREMENT OVERVIEW AND THE 2022 ANNUAL HIGH-PROFILE FORECAST. HISTORICALLY EACH YEAR WE BRING -- WE COME BEFORE Y'ALL WITH A FORECAST OF ALL THE HIGH-PROFILE PROCUREMENTS. TYPICALLY, THAT'S IN THE FORM OF A BIENNIAL FORECAST. WE'RE GOING TO CHANGE IT UP A LITTLE BIT TO BE RESPECTFUL OF YOUR TIME AND THE COUNCIL'S TIME, WE'RE GOING TO DO IT ONCE A YEAR. WHAT WE FOUND WAS THAT TYPICALLY IN THE FIRST SIX MONTHS, WE'VE IDENTIFIED THE MAJORITY OF OUR HIGH-PROFILE CONTRACTS DURING THAT FIRST SIX MONTHS. TYPICALLY, DEPARTMENTS ARE LETTING THOSE CONTRACTS BASED ON THE AVAILABILITY OF THEIR NEW BUDGET, SO WE'RE GOING TO COME TO YOU ONCE A YEAR IN THE TERMS OF FORECAST. PRIOR TO GOING THROUGH THAT FORECAST, THOUGH, I'D LIKE TO PROVIDE THE COMMITTEE AN OVERVIEW OF PROCUREMENT, HIGH LEVEL. WE'LL BE DOING THIS AT THIS COMMITTEE MEETING AND IN B SESSION POTENTIALLY LATER ON THIS WEEK. I WANTED TO DO THAT, JUST GIVEN SOME OF THE NEW MEMBERS WE HAVE ON COUNCIL TO PROVIDE THAT HIGH-LEVEL OVERVIEW. WHAT IS PROCUREMENT, AND THEN DIVE INTO THE HIGH-PROFILE PROCESS AND INTO THE FORECAST ITSELF. I'D LIKE TO GO THROUGH THE SOLICITATION TYPES AT A HIGH LEVEL, THEN TALK ABOUT THE PREFERENCE PROGRAMS, TALK ABOUT THE HIGH-PROFILE PROCESS, AND, YOU KNOW, REALLY WHAT DISTINGUISHES THE HIGH-PROFILE CONTRACTS WHEN THEY GO TO THE AUDIT COMMITTEE OR WHEN THEY GO TO THE CITY COUNCIL IN TERMS OF A B SESSION. AND THEN GET YOUR INPUT AND FEEDBACK ON WHAT WE HAVE -- WHAT WE ARE RECOMMENDING AS THE HIGH-PROFILE FORECAST IN TERMS OF WHAT GOES TO THE AUDIT COMMITTEE AND WHAT'S GOING TO THE FULL COUNCIL. BEFORE DOING THAT, I'D LIKE TO WALK Y'ALL THROUGH, AS I MENTIONED A HIGH-LEVEL -- WHAT ARE THE SOLICITATION TYPES THAT WE AS A CITY TYPICALLY UTILIZE IN THE TERMS OF OUR PROCUREMENTS. AND YOU'RE GOING TO HEAR A BUNCH OF ACRONYMS. WE HAVE OUR INVITATION FOR BIDS, WHICH IS IFB, A REQUEST FOR OFFER OR RFO, A REQUEST FOR COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSALS OR AN RFCSP, AND REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS, RFQ AND REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS. WHAT IS AN INVITATION FOR BID? IT'S WHAT WE REFER TO TYPICALLY

AS A LOW-BID CONTRACT. IT'S AWARDED TO THE LOWEST RESPONSIBLE BIDDER, AND RESPONSIBLE BIDDER IS KEY. YOU HAVE HAD TO MET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE BID. CHANGES TO THE BID PRICE IS NOT PERMITTED. THIS IS A STATUTE-DRIVEN PROCUREMENT, AND AS CITY COUNCILMEMBERS, YOU DO HAVE THE DISCRETION TO REJECT ALL THE BIDS, BUT DO NOT HAVE THE DISCRETION TO PICK ONE BIDDER OVER ANOTHER FROM AN AWARD'S STANDPOINT UNLESS THEY DON'T MEET THE DEFINITION OF RESPONSIBLE BIDDER. WE TYPICALLY USE AN INVITATION FOR BID FOR OFFICE SUPPLIES, VEHICLES, FURNITURE, AUTO PARTS, THINGS THAT ARE VERY, VERY SPECIFIC AND THAT WE CAN QUANTIFY IN TERMS OF REQUIREMENTS. AND WE USE THAT FOR THE TYPE OF ITEMS. THE NEXT ITEM IS A REQUEST FOR OFFER. WHENEVER WE TALK ABOUT A REQUEST FOR OFFER, WE TYPICALLY USE THAT REQUEST FOR OFFER TO GO TO A COOPERATIVE OR FOR AN EXEMPT PURCHASE SUCH AS SOLE SOURCE. WE USE THAT REQUEST FOR OFFER TO BASICALLY GET A QUOTE BACK FROM THE VENDOR, BUT ALSO TO BIND THEM TO OUR TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR THINGS LIKE INDEMNITY AND THINGS OF THAT NATURE. TYPICALLY WHEN WE USE A REQUEST FOR OFFER, THEY'RE GOING TO BE FOR SOME OF THOSE SPECIALTY ITEMS LIKE BUNKER GEAR, FIRE TRUCKS, RESCUE EQUIPMENT, THINGS THAT ARE VERY, VERY SPECIALIZED AND THAT ARE VERY DIFFICULT TO PROCURE THROUGH A LOW BID TYPE ITEM. THE THIRD ITEM IS A REQUEST FOR A COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSAL. THIS IS VERY MUCH LIKE A LOW-BID CONTRACT, BUT SOMETIMES REFERRED TO AS A BEST VALUE CONTRACT. WE WILL USE THIS IN ADDITION TO PRICE TO LOOK AT OTHER CRITERIA SUCH AS EXPERIENCED BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS OR PROPOSED PLAN. THIS IS GOVERNED BY STATUTE AND WHEN WE TALK ABOUT THIS, YOU WILL BEGIN TO NOTICE SOME OF THOSE DIFFERENCES AS WE TALK ABOUT LOCAL PREFERENCE AND VOSBP AND THINKING OF THAT NATURE. SO IT WILL PLAY A PRIMARY ROLE IN OUR PREFERENCE PROGRAMS. THIS IS A DISCRETIONARY SOLICITATION, SO CITY STAFF AND COUNCIL, WHEN THIS IS BROUGHT TO YOU, FROM A POLICY STANDPOINT, IF -- I DON'T KNOW, WE ARE AS STAFF RECOMMENDING AN AWARD, COUNCIL CAN DETERMINE THAT BEST VALUE MAY BE BETTER WITH A DIFFERENT VENDOR. TYPICALLY, IT'S GOING TO BE USED IN INSTANCES OF JANITORIAL, LANDSCAPING, ELECTRICAL, PLUMBING, A LOT OF OUR ANNUAL CONTRACTS SUCH AS HVAC SERVICES AND TECHNOLOGY SERVICES. REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS IS TYPICALLY GOING TO BE USED IN OUR PLANNING AND ARCHITECTURAL, A & E TYPE CONTRACTS. IT'S USED WHEN WE'RE LOOKING AT COMPETENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS. ONCE WE DETERMINE OR HAVE MADE A SELECTION BASED ON COMPETENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS, THEN WE CAN

TALK PRICE AFTER THAT. BUT INITIALLY, IT'S JUST BASED ON THEIR COMPETENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS. THIS IS ALSO GOVERNED BY STATUTE AS WELL. AND THIS IS DISCRETIONARY IN NATURE. THE ONE THAT EVERYBODY, I THINK, IS MOST FAMILIAR WITH IN ADDITION TO INVITATION OR LOW BIDS IS OUR REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS. THIS IS DISCRETIONARY, IT IS NOT GOVERNED BY STATUTE. PURELY DISCRETION. WE DO HAVE A FAIRLY RIGOROUS PROCESS IN PLACE TO MAKE SURE THAT OUR PROPOSALS AND THE AWARDS THAT WE RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL, EVERYBODY'S BEEN TREATED FAIRLY AND EQUITABLY. THIS IS GOING TO BE IN A LOT OF YOUR AREAS LIKE PROFESSIONAL AREAS, FINANCIAL ACCOUNTING, CONSULTIVE-TYPE SERVICES, MARKETING, MEDICAL AND THINGS OF THAT NATURE. I WANTED TO KIND OF GIVE YOU AN IDEA OF THOSE FIVE PRIMARY SOLICITATION TYPES, WHAT IS THE VOLUME IN EACH OF THOSE AREAS IN TERMS OF CONSTRUCTIONS -- I'M NOT GOING TO GO THROUGH ALL OF THESE -- GOODS AND SERVICES, BUT YOU CAN SEE OUR INVITATION FOR BIDS BETWEEN CONSTRUCTION, GOODS FOR SERVICES, IT IS PROBABLY THE LARGEST CONSUMPTION OR LARGEST SOLICITATION TYPE. ABOUT 53% TO THE TUNE OF ABOUT 374 MILLION. AND THEN YOU CAN LOOK DOWN THROUGHOUT THE REST OF THE TABLE TO SEE WHERE WE SPEND THE MAJORITY OF OUR TIME ON ON THESE SOLICITATION TYPES. TOTAL VALUE FOR '21 WAS CLOSE TO \$690 MILLION BETWEEN ALL THE SOLICITATION TYPES THAT WE UTILIZE. I'D LIKE TO SWITCH GEARS A LITTLE BIT AND TALK A LITTLE BIT ABOUT OUR PREFERENCE PROGRAMS. WE HAVE FOUR PRIMARY PREFERENCE PROGRAMS THAT WE UTILIZE HERE AT THE CITY AND THAT HAVE BEEN ADOPTED VIA COUNCIL POLICY. WE HAVE THE LOCAL PREFERENCE PROGRAM, WE HAVE OUR VETERAN-OWNED SMALL BUSINESS PREFERENCE PROGRAM, OUR SMALL BUSINESS ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADVOCACY OR SBEDA AND DBE. FOR PURPOSES OF THIS PRESENCE TAKES, I'M GOING TO FOCUS PRIMARILY ON THE FIRST TWO, LOCAL PREFERENCE AND VETERAN-OWNED. I THINK COUNCIL'S BEEN -- HAD SEVERAL PRESENTATIONS ON SBEDA LATELY. THEN OUR DBE PROGRAM IS PRIMARILY GOING TO BE UTILIZED IN OUR FEDERAL PROGRAMS, PRIMARILY AT THE AIRPORT AND SOME OF OUR PUBLIC WORK PROGRAMS THAT HAVE FEDERAL FUNDING. THE FIRST ONE AT THE LOCAL PREFERENCE PROGRAM, THIS IS ADMINISTERED BY THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT. THE ORDINANCES -- OUR POLICIES WERE ADOPTED BY CITY COUNCIL BACK IN MAY OF 2013. IT'S BEEN REVISED SINCE THEN. IT'S BEEN STRENGTHENED SINCE THAT 2013 ORDINANCE TO ADD SOME THINGS IN THERE THAT WE FOUND WERE KIND OF LOOPHOLES THAT COULD BE USED TO -- VENDORS TO PLAY WITH. ONE OF THE BIG PRIMARILY CRITERIA OF THE LOCAL PREFERENCE PROGRAM IS

BUSINESSES MUST BE LOCATED WITHIN THE SAN ANTONIO LIMITS. WE'VE HAD DISCUSSIONS ABOUT THIS IN THE PAST AND WE'RE TALKING ABOUT AND REFERRING TO SAN ANTONIO LIMITS. FOR EXAMPLE, YOU COULD NOT BE A BUSINESS THAT RESIDES IN ALAMO HEIGHTS BECAUSE THEY'RE NOT IN THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO LIMITS, SO YOU HAVE DOUGHNUT HOLES THAT THE PREFERENCE PROGRAM WOULD NOT BE APPLICABLE TO. YOU ALSO HAVE TO BE ESTABLISHED PLACE OF BUSINESS FOR AT LEAST ONE YEAR WITHIN THE SAN ANTONIO LIMITS. THIS BASICALLY PREVENTS -- THIS CRITERIA BASICALLY PREVENTS A BUSINESS FROM COMING IN, SETTING UP A BUSINESS OR A LOCATION OR HEADQUARTERED HERE AS A RESULT OF A SOLICITATION, SO THEY NEED TO BE HERE ONE YEAR, AND THEY CAN'T REALLY PLAY WITH THE -- PLAY THE SYSTEM WHEN IT COMES TO SOLICITING OR DOING BUSINESS WITH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO. THIS IS A SELF-CERTIFICATION PROGRAM, MEANING WE ASK THEM IF THEY'RE LOCAL. THERE'S A FORM THEY FILL OUT, HOW MANY EMPLOYEES THEY HAVE, WHERE THEY'RE HEADQUARTERED, THINGS OF THAT NATURE, AND THEN WE WILL VALIDATE THE AWARD WITH MY COMPLIANCE RESOLUTION GROUP TO MAKE SURE THEY ARE INDEED LOCAL BEFORE WE MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL. THE PRIMARY GOAL OF THE LOCAL PREFERENCE PROGRAM IS TO REWARD OUR LOCAL BUSINESSES FOR THEIR EMPLOYEES THAT ARE HEADQUARTERED HERE, OR FOR THE BUSINESSES THAT ARE HEADQUARTERED HERE AND THEIR EMPLOYEES LIVE, WORK AND PLAY HERE, THEY CONTRIBUTE TO THE LOCAL ECONOMY, SO WE WANT TO INCENTIVIZE THAT, AND THAT'S WHAT OUR LOCAL PREFERENCE PROGRAM DOES. THERE'S REALLY THREE PRIMARY COMPONENTS TO THE LOCAL PREFERENCE PROGRAM. THEIR FIRST PIECE, BY COUNCIL POLICY AND ORDINANCE, WE HAVE A 3% PREFERENCE PROGRAM -- OR A 3% PREFERENCE FOR LOW-BID ITEMS, MEANING THAT IF A LOCAL VENDOR IS WITHIN 3% OF A NONLOCAL VENDOR, IN THEIR PRICE THE LOCAL VENDOR IS HIGHER, WE WILL GO AHEAD AND AWARD THEM THE CONTRACT, EVEN THOUGH THEY ARE HIGHER THAN OUR NONLOCAL VENDOR, THEY HAVE TO BE WITHIN 3%. THIS IS ALSO A STATE STATUTE ITEM. THERE ARE SOME DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE 3% AND STATE STATUTE, AND SOME INSTANCES IT DOES ALLOW US TO GO UP TO A 5%, BUT VERY LIMITED INSTANCES. ON DISCRETIONARY SOLICITATIONS, YOU KNOW, PRIMARY FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES, REVENUE CONCESSION CONTRACTS, WE HAVE A POINT STRUCTURE IN PLACE. WE PROVIDE 10 POINTS TO LOCAL BIDDERS AND BUSINESSES THAT ARE HEADQUARTERED HERE IN THE CITY LIMITS, AND THEY'VE BEEN HERE FOR ONE YEAR OR MORE. THEY CAN HAVE FIVE POINTS IF THEY HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL OR SIGNIFICANT BUSINESS PRESENCE, MEANING THEY HAVE

100 OR MORE EMPLOYEES, OR 20% OF THEIR WORKFORCE FULL-TIME, PART-TIME, AND CONTRACT EMPLOYEES ARE REGULARLY BASED HERE IN THE CITY. SO THEY HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO GET 10 POINTS FOR THOSE BUSINESSES THAT HAVE 100 OR MORE EMPLOYEES, THEN THEY CAN GET FIVE POINTS. FOR CONSTRUCTION SOLICITATIONS, THERE IS -- BY STATE STATUTE, THERE IS NOT A LOT OF OPPORTUNITY UNDER A PREFERENCE. I BELIEVE IT'S UNDER 100,000 -- [INAUDIBLE SPEAKER] -- SO IT'S VERY, VERY LIMITED TO WHERE YOU CAN PROVIDE A LOCAL PREFERENCE ON CONSTRUCTION. IT'S BETWEEN 50 TO \$100,000. THERE IS, HOWEVER, IN WORKING WITH PUBLIC WORKS, THERE'S 20 POINTS FOR KNOWLEDGE OF LOCAL CONDITIONS, AND I THINK WE'VE HAD THIS CONVERSATION WITH THIS -- WITH THIS COMMITTEE BEFORE, AND WHEN THAT CAN BE APPLIED. THE NEXT ITEM IS THE VETERAN-OWNED SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAM, WHICH YOU WILL HEAR US FROM TIME TO TIME REFER TO AS VOSBP. THIS IS ALSO ADMINISTERED BY THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT. IT'S BEEN ADOPTED AND APPROVED BY CITY COUNCIL SINCE JANUARY 15 OF 2014. ONE OF THE PRIMARY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THIS PREFERENCE PROGRAM AND THE LOCAL PREFERENCE PROGRAM IS WHERE LOCAL HAS A GEOGRAPHIC LIMITATION OF CITY LIMITS, THE VETERAN-OWNED SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAM DOES NOT HAVE ANY GEOGRAPHIC LIMITATION AT ALL. SO IF YOU'RE A VETERAN-OWNED BUSINESS IN THE UNITED STATES, YOU CAN BECOME ELIGIBLE FOR THE FIVE POINTS -- FIVE-POINT PREFERENCE FOR DISCRETIONARY CONTRACTS. YOU CAN BE CERTIFIED BY THE SBA OR SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION OR OTHER ENTITIES THAT HAVE THE SAME CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS. AND THIS IS WHERE IT KIND OF GETS TRICKY. WHERE IS IT APPLICABLE AND WHERE IS IT NOT? SO AS I MENTIONED, YOU HAVE SOME ITEMS THAT ARE GOVERNED BY STATUTE. YOU HAVE SOME ITEMS THAT ARE NOT. SO WHERE AN INVITATION FOR BID IS SPECIFICALLY ALLOWED VIA STATUTE, YOU CAN SEE ON THE LOCAL COLUMN, THE CHECKMARK INDICATES THAT IT IS APPLICABLE AND WE CAN USE IT IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES. VOSBP ON THE OTHER HAND, OR VETERAN-OWNED SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAM, IS NOT SPECIFICALLY ALLOWED BY STATE STATUTE WHEN IT COMES TO OUR INVITATION FOR BIDS OR LOW-BID CONTRACTS. SO WE CANNOT APPLY THE VOSBP TO OUR LOW-BID CONTRACTS. SIMILARLY FOR REQUEST FOR OFFER, REQUEST FOR COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSALS IS -- AS I MENTIONED, IS A STATUTE-DRIVEN -- STATUTE-DRIVEN, GOVERNED PROCUREMENT SOLICITATION TYPE. IT IS NOT ALLOWED BY STATUTE FOR LOW BID AND NEITHER IT IS FOR VOSBP. THEN FOR REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS, IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES, IT IS

ALLOWABLE. SO WHENEVER WE BRING YOU A HIGH-PROFILE CONTRACT, WE'RE GOING THROUGH A HIERARCHY AND WE'RE LOOKING AT ALL THESE DIFFERENT PIECES TO SEE WHERE IT'S APPLICABLE AND WHERE IT'S NOT. THE NEXT ITEM I'D LIKE TO TALK ABOUT IS THE ACTUAL HIGH-PROFILE PROCESS AND THEN MOVE INTO THE ACTUAL HIGH-PROFILE FORECAST. DEFINITION, I THINK, THAT ALL OF YOU, OR MANY OF YOU, ARE FAMILIAR WITH IS THE HIGH-PROFILE DEFINITION. WHAT IS A HIGH-PROFILE CONTRACT? IT IS A DISCRETIONARY CONTRACT THAT'S VALUED OVER \$1 MILLION. YOU CAN ALSO HAVE A HIGH-LEVEL COMMUNITY INTEREST OR OTHER EXCEPTIONAL INTEREST OR IT CAN BE HIGHLY COMPLEX OR TECHNICAL IN NATURE OR HAS CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS THAT ARE NONSTANDARD OR COMPLEX. IT CAN MEET ANY ONE OF THESE ITEMS AND IT WILL BE DETERMINED TO BE A HIGH-PROFILE CONTRACT, WHICH YOU WILL SEE IN THE HIGH-PROFILE FORECAST. THERE WILL BE TIMES WHEN THERE ARE ITEMS THAT DON'T MEET THE MILLION DOLLAR THRESHOLD, BUT BECAUSE THEY HAVE A HIGH-LEVEL COMMUNITY INTEREST, WE'LL BRING THIS FORWARD TO THIS COMMITTEE BECAUSE THERE'S EITHER HIGH-POLICY ISSUE OR HIGH-POLICY ITEM THAT COUNCIL WOULD LIKE TO SEE OR THERE'S A HIGH-LEVEL COMMUNITY INTEREST OR HIGHLY COMPLEX OR TECHNICAL IN NATURE. AS I MENTIONED IN THE BEGINNING OF THE PRESENTATION, THE HIGH-PROFILE PROCESS IS REALLY DIVIDED INTO TWO PIECES. THERE'S THOSE HIGH-PROFILE CONTRACTS THAT GO TO THE AUDIT COMMITTEE AND THEN THERE'S THOSE HIGH-PROFILE CONTRACTS THAT GO TO THE B SESSION, THE FULL COUNCIL. IF YOU MEET THE HIGH-PROFILE DEFINITION, TYPICALLY IT WILL GO TO THE AUDIT COMMITTEE; HOWEVER, THERE ARE CERTAIN ITEMS THAT ARE HIGH-PROFILE IN NATURE THAT WILL BE SELECTED FOR A FULL B SESSION PRESENTATION. HISTORICALLY, WE HAVE GONE BACK AND SEEN -- OR LOOKED AT WHERE WOULD THINGS REQUIRE A B SESSION PRESENTATION, AND THERE WERE A COUPLE OF FACTORS THAT WERE COMMON TO THOSE SOLICITATIONS. IF THEY HAVE A FINANCIAL VALUE OVER \$25 MILLION, THEY ARE HIGHLY SENSITIVE FROM A POLICY STANDPOINT OR FROM A PUBLIC SAFETY IMPLICATION STANDPOINT, TYPICALLY HAVE A CONTRACT TERM IN EXCESS OF 10 YEARS, HIGH-LEVEL COMMUNITY OR STAKEHOLDER IMPACT OR INTEREST, AND THEN PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT. WHERE HAVE WE SEEN THINGS IN PAST THAT COUNCIL THAT HAVE LIKED TO HAVE SEEN COME TO THEM FROM A POLICY STANDPOINT OR HAVE BEEN OF SPECIFIC INTEREST TO THEM, OR TO Y'ALL, IN PAST HISTORY. SO IF IT MEETS ONE OF THOSE CRITERIA, TYPICALLY THEY WILL GO TO THE FULL COUNCIL IN TERMS OF A B SESSION. IF IT GOES TO THE FULL COUNCIL IN TERMS OF A B SESSION, IT WILL NOT COME TO THE

AUDIT COMMITTEE, SO WE DON'T HAVE THAT DOUBLE -- DOUBLE IMPACT. ALL OTHER ITEMS WILL GO TO THE AUDIT COMMITTEE. SO TYPICALLY WHEN IT'S GOING TO THE AUDIT COMMITTEE OR TO THE B SESSION, I THINK YOU'RE ALL FAMILIAR WITH THIS PROCESS, WE WILL BRING FORWARD TO YOU A PRESOLICITATION BRIEFING. AFTER THE PRESOLICITATION BRIEFING AND GETTING YOUR INPUT, IT WILL BE GOING OUT ON THE STREETS FOR A SOLICITATION AND EVALUATION PHASE. AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE SOLICITATION AND EVALUATION, WE BRING IT BACK TO THIS COMMITTEE IN A POSTSOLICITATION BRIEFING, BRIEF YOU ON THE RESULTS OF THE ACTUAL EVALUATION, SOLICITATION AND A RECOMMENDED AWARD. WE DO NOT PROVIDE YOU ALL WITH THE NAMES OF THE AWARDEE, WE DO THAT AFTER THE PRESENTATION TO THE AUDIT COMMITTEE IN THE FORM OF A MEMO TO KIND OF KEEP THE PROCESS PURE. AFTER WE HAVE GONE THROUGH ALL THOSE STEPS, THEN THIS BODY RECOMMENDS IT TO THE FULL COUNCIL FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION. IN THE EVENT THAT IT MEETS ONE OF THE CRITERIA I TALKED ABOUT ON THE RIGHT SIDE, IT WOULD BYPASS THIS COMMITTEE AND GO FULL -- DIRECTLY TO THE FULL COUNCIL. THE HIGH-LEVEL, I WANTED TO PRESENT WHAT'S IN EACH OF THESE STEPS, SO WHEN WE ACTUALLY BRING A BRIEFING TO THIS COMMITTEE AND TO THE FULL COUNCIL, THERE ARE GOING TO BE SOME OF THOSE COMMON BRIEFING ELEMENTS, I WON'T GO THROUGH ALL OF THEM, BUT WE'LL TALK ABOUT THE SOLICITATION TYPE, CONTRACT VALUE, THE TERM, EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SBEDA SUBCONTRACTING AS WELL AS THE PREFERENCE PROGRAMS. WHEN WE BRING THE PRESOLICITATION FORWARD, WE WILL TALK ABOUT THE CURRENT CONTRACT STATUS, WHO ARE GOING TO BE THOSE EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND GET YOUR FEEDBACK, WHAT WE DID FROM A VENDOR OUTREACH, HOW WE ADVERTISED IT AND TALK ABOUT THE TIMELINE AS FAR AS THE PROCUREMENT ITSELF. WHEN WE COME BACK TO YOU IN THE POSTSOLICITATION BRIEFING, OF COURSE, WE BRING THE EVALUATION MATRIX, WE BRING YOU OUR DUE DILIGENCE BETWEEN KEVIN AND I AND BRIEF THE COMMITTEE ON THE RESULTS OF THAT DUE DILIGENCE. MOVING INTO THE ACTUAL HIGH-PROFILE FORECAST. AS I MENTIONED, WE ARE GOING TO START PRESENTING THIS FORECAST ANNUALLY. WE'RE HERE TODAY WITH THE AUDIT AND ACCOUNTABILITY, AND WE'LL GO THROUGH THAT FORECAST AND STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS AS FAR AS WHAT WOULD BE PRESENTED TO THE AUDIT ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE AND WHAT WE ARE RECOMMENDING TO GO TO THE FULL COUNCIL. WE'RE LOOKING AT THE CITY COUNCIL SESSION LATER THIS WEEK NOVEMBER 4TH IN WHICH WE WOULD DO A VERY SIMILAR PRESENTATION TO THIS.

IF THERE ARE ANY CHANGES BASED ON THE FEEDBACK YOU GIVE US, WE WOULD INCORPORATE THAT INTO THIS PRESENTATION AND SHARE IT WITH THE FULL COUNCIL. HIGH-PROFILE CATEGORIES, AS I MENTIONED, CITY COUNCIL B SESSION WOULD BE THOSE SELECTED FOR PRESENTATION TO THE FULL COUNCIL, AND THEN WE HAVE THOSE TODAY THAT ARE BEING RECOMMENDED TO THE AUDIT AND ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE, IN THE TERMS OF A INDIVIDUAL ITEM OR A CONSENT ITEM. COORDINATED THIS FORECAST WITH ALL THE DEPARTMENT HEADS, THE CITY DEPARTMENTS, EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP TEAM AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT IN TERMS OF THE AVAILABILITY FOR SBEDA. WE IDENTIFIED 63 HIGH-PROFILE PROJECTS, SEVEN ARE SELECTED TO GO TO THE FULL COUNCIL FOR A B SESSION. AND THEN WE'RE RECOMMENDING 56 FOR THE AUDIT AND ACCOUNTABILITY, 22 ON INDIVIDUAL AGENDA AND RECOMMENDING 34 ON THE CONSENT. ONE THING THAT'S IMPORTANT TO REMEMBER, FOR EXAMPLE, ON THE SEVEN SELECTED FOR B SESSION, THAT WILL BE TWO PRESENTATIONS FOR A TOTAL OF 14 IN THE TERMS OF A PRESOLICITATION AND COMING BACK TO THE FULL COUNCIL IN A POSTSOLICITATION FOR THE B SESSION. THIS STARTS THE ACTUAL FORECAST. THIS FIRST AREA ARE THE ITEMS THAT WE AS STAFF ARE RECOMMENDING FOR THE FULL PRESENTATION TO THE FULL COUNCIL IN A B SESSION. AVIATION HAS A BULK OF THE SEVEN, WITH THE TERMINAL B AND A BEVERAGE -- FOOD AND BEVERAGE CONCESSIONS. AS I MENTIONED, THE FIRST -- THESE ARE ITEMS HAVE BEEN AN INTEREST TO THE COUNCIL IN THE PAST. AND THEN WE ALSO HAVE THE TERMINAL A/B TRAVEL RETAIL PRIME CONCESSION, TAXI WAY RECONSTRUCTION AND THE BAGGAGE HANDLING SYSTEM EXPANSION. I'M NOT GOING TO GO THROUGH EVERY DETAIL ON THE SLIDE, BUT YOU CAN SEE THE PROPOSED TERM AND THE ESTIMATED VALUES OF EACH OF THOSE HIGH-VALUE CONTRACTS TO THE RIGHT OF THE SLIDE. EVERYTHING I'LL MENTION THAT IN YOUR PACKAGE OR IN THE AGENDA ITEM, THERE WAS A MORE DETAILED EXCEL SPREADSHEET THAT HAD ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN ADDITION TO THESE ITEMS YOU'RE SEEING ON THE SLIDE. THE NEXT TWO ARE FROM ITSD AND SUSTAINABILITY, THE ONE FOR ITSD IS OUR UPGRADE TO OUR EXISTING FINANCIAL SYSTEM, OUR ERP SYSTEM. TO THE TUNE OF ABOUT 40 MILLION. THE NEXT ITEM IS THE ONSITE SOLAR AT CITY-OWNED BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES. WE DON'T HAVE AN ESTIMATED VALUE FOR THIS YET, BUT THIS IS SOMETHING THAT WE THOUGHT WOULD BE OF INTEREST TO THE FULL COUNCIL IN TERMS OF SUSTAINABILITY. THIS NEXT CUM OF SLIDES ARE GOING TO BE THE ITEMS THAT WE ARE RECOMMENDING TO THIS COMMITTEE. THESE ARE THE ITEMS THAT WE'RE RECOMMENDING FOR INDIVIDUAL BRIEFINGS,

WE HAVE ANIMAL CARE AND AVIATION, OUR COMMUNITY SPAY/NEUTER SURGERIES. LEASE AGREEMENT FOR THE PETCO SPAY AND NEUTER FACILITY, AGAIN, WITH AVIATION, PROGRAM MANAGEMENT SERVICES, OUR DUTY HIVE FREE SPECIALTY STORE, AND ADVERTISING AND MARKETING SERVICES. FOR FINANCE, FROM MY DEPARTMENT, WE ARE GOING TO BE RECOMMENDING THREE HIGH-PROFILE CONTRACTS TO BE PLACED ON THE INDIVIDUAL -- THE INDIVIDUAL AGENDA ITEM. THEY ARE THE EXTERNAL AUDIT CONTRACT, OUR MERCHANT BANKING SERVICES, WHICH IS GOING TO BE OUR CREDIT CARD PROCESSING TO OUR MAJOR BRANDS, MASTERCARD, VISA AND DISCOVER, AND THEN OUR DEPOSITORY BANKING AND LOCKBOX SERVICES. FOR ITSD, OUR PHYSICAL SECURITY INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AND OUR SECURITY OFFICER SERVICES, WHICH IS ACTUALLY ON TODAY'S AGENDA FROM A PRESOLICITATION STANDPOINT. NHSD, OUR HOUSING BOND GAP FUNDING, HOME OWNERSHIP HOUSING DEVELOPMENT GAP FUNDING, RENTAL HOUSING DEVELOPMENT GAP FUNDING, AND THEN FOR PUBLIC WORKS, WE HAVE THE WORLD HERITAGE, THE CONTRACT FOR A NEW FACILITY TO PROVIDE AN ORIENTATION CENTER, AND WE HAVE SOUTH ALAMO STREET IMPROVEMENTS TO THE TUNE OF 8 MILLION. CONTINUE WITH PUBLIC WORKS, WE HAVE THE ALAMODOME 2025 NCAA FINAL FOUR IMPROVEMENTS, OUR BOND MASS SELECTION FOR CIVIL ENGINEERING SERVICES, BOND MASS SELECTION FOR ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES AND THEN ALSO FOR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES. WITH SAPD, OUR IN-CAR REPLACEMENT OR IN-CAR VIDEO SYSTEM. FOR SOLID WEST WAIST, WE HAVE OUR HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE COLLECTION AND TRANSPORTATION, OUR BIKE MASTER PLAN UPDATE. ALL THOSE ITEMS ON THOSE PRIOR SLIDES WOULD BE PRESENTED AND WE'RE RECOMMENDING COME TO Y'ALL IN TERMS OF INDIVIDUAL PRESENTATIONS. THIS NEXT SLIDE IS GOING TO BE YOUR CONSENT ITEMS. PRIMARILY LISTING WITH ANIMAL CARE, AVIATION, BESD, CCDO AND CSF. I WON'T GO THROUGH THOSE IN DETAIL, BUT THESE WOULD BE ITEMS ON THE CONSENT AGENDA THAT WE WOULD RECOMMEND TO BE FAIRLY ROUTINE IN NATURE, NOT -- THAT ARE NOT HIGHLY COMPLEX OR DO NOT HAVE HIGH AMOUNTS OF SIGNIFICANT INTEREST. THIS IS THE BALANCE OF THE CONSENT ITEMS WITH HR, WE HAVE OUR VOLUNTARY DENTAL INSURANCE, WE HAVE QUITE A LONG LISTING FOR ITSD, LIBRARY AND PARKS. THEN HERE, WRAPPING UP WITH PREK, PUBLIC WORKS AND SAN ANTONIO POLICE DEPARTMENT. THAT WRAPS UP MY PRESENTATION. IF THERE'S ANY ITEMS, WE HAVE A NUMBER OF STAFF HERE TO PROVIDE CONTEXT OR INFORMATION OR ANSWER QUESTIONS. IF THEY'RE NOT HERE, THEN WE CAN GET BACK TO Y'ALL WITH

A RESPONSE. AS I MENTIONED, REALLY LOOKING FOR Y'ALL'S THOUGHTS ON DID WE HIT THE MARK AS FAR AS OUR -- OUR RECOMMENDATIONS ARE THERE THINGS YOU'D LIKE TO SEE MOVED AROUND A LITTLE BIT.

PERRY: OKAY. GREAT. HEY, THANKS, TROY. GOOD INFORMATION. LOOKING AT THIS, I THINK THAT'S GREAT. WHEN IS THIS GOING TO COME TO THE B SESSION TO GO THROUGH THE PROCESSES AND HOW WE DO OUR BUSINESS HERE?

ELLIOTT: IT'S CURRENTLY SCHEDULED -- THIS SAME PRESENTATION WOULD BE DELIVERED LATER ON THIS WEEK, I BELIEVE, ON THE FOURTH.

PERRY: OKAY. OKAY. I'M -- I'M JUST TRYING TO -- THERE'S BEEN A CALL BY ONE OF MY COLLEAGUES TO DO A STUDY ON OUR PROCUREMENT PROCESSES, AND I'M -- I'M TRYING TO FIGURE OUT DO Y'ALL HAVE ANY THOUGHTS ABOUT WHAT -- WHERE THIS IS GOING TOWARDS ABOUT DOING A PROCUREMENT STUDY ON WHAT THAT WOULD BE GETTING AT OR GETTING -- TRYING TO GET TO?

GORZELL: SO, CHAIRMAN, WE HAVE NOT HAD ANY ADDITIONAL CONVERSATION -- [INAUDIBLE] BUT I THINK THE B SESSION CONVERSATION THIS WEEK WOULD BE A GOOD OPPORTUNITY TO DO THAT SO TROY WILL, AGAIN, WALK THROUGH KIND OF AT A HIGH LEVEL AS HE DID TODAY THE DIFFERENT PROCUREMENT LEVEL TYPES WE HAVE, WHAT WE'RE DOING -- YOU KNOW, WHAT YOU SAW IS A LOT OF INVITATION FOR BID BUT YOU SAW THE OTHER CATEGORIES AS WELL, SO WE'RE CERTAINLY OPEN TO HAVING THAT CONVERSATION TO LOOK AT IF WE WERE TO DO A STUDY, WHAT WOULD THAT SCOPE LOOK LIKE AND HOW WOULD WE NARROW THAT. SO I EXPECT THAT WILL BE PART OF THE CONVERSATION ON WEDNESDAY. REALLY WHAT WE'RE LOOKING FOR FROM DAY AND ON WEDNESDAY WITH THE COUNCIL'S B SESSION IS YOU'VE GOT THE THREE CATEGORIES, YOU'VE GOT THOSE PROCUREMENT ITEMS THAT WE'D LIKE TO TAKE FORWARD TO FULL B SESSIONS, YOU'VE GOT SOME THAT WE'D LIKE AS INDIVIDUAL ITEMS IN FRONT OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE, AND THEN WE'VE GOT ITEMS THAT WE WANT TO LIST AS CONSENT. AND SO WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO GET IS FEEDBACK ON THAT LISTING TO MAKE SURE WE'VE GOT THEM CATEGORIZED CORRECTLY. OBVIOUSLY, THERE'S A LOT ON THESE LISTS AND AS WE BRING THEM FORWARD, WE'LL GO INTO MORE DETAIL ON WHAT THE SOLICITATION IS, WHY WE'RE DOING IT, WHY WE'RE RECOMMENDING WHAT WE ARE.

PERRY: OKAY. THANK YOU. WE'LL SEE HOW THIS B SESSION GOES AND WHERE THAT DISCUSSION GOES AS WELL, BUT YOU HIGHLIGHTED WHICH ARE STATE STATUTE DRIVEN. COULD WE ALSO ADD IN THERE WHAT THE STATE STATUTE IS CALLING FOR, JUST A COUPLE OF BULLETS, WHAT YOU CAN AND CAN'T DO BY STATE STATUTE. RIGHT NOW, YOU HAVE -- YOU HAVE IT LISTED ON THERE, THERE'S A STATE STATUTE GOVERNING IT, BUT WHAT IS IT ACTUALLY -- WHAT IS IT ACTUALLY CALLING OR PUSHING FOR IN THOSE DIFFERENT TYPES OF CONTRACTS. I THINK THAT WOULD HELP EXPLAIN IT A LITTLE BIT MORE ON WHAT FLEXIBILITY WE HAVE. AND THEN I KNOW I'VE BROUGHT THIS UP A NUMBER OF TIMES ABOUT VETERAN-OWNED SMALL BUSINESSES, AND, YOU KNOW, US NOT BEING ABLE TO INCLUDE THOSE IN SEVERAL CONTRACT TYPES. WE TALKED ABOUT MAYBE THIS WOULD BE AN ITEM FOR THE IGR TO BRING UP AT THE -- YOU KNOW, AS A LEGISLATIVE ITEM. AND I THINK Y'ALL PROPOSED THAT ONE OTHER TIME SOMEWHERE IN THE PAST. CAN YOU EXPLAIN WHAT HAPPENED THERE?

ELLIOTT: YEAH, AND I CAN'T REMEMBER WHICH LEGISLATIVE IT WAS --

PERRY: THERE'S JEFF, THE MAN WITH ALL THE ANSWERS UP THERE AT THE STATE.

COYLE: WE DID PURSUE IT DURING A PAST LEGISLATIVE SESSION. IF I'M CORRECT, TROY, IT WAS THE REQUEST FOR COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSALS, BECAUSE WE WANTED TO BE ABLE TO HAVE PREFERENCES. I'LL GO BACK AND VERIFY FOR CERTAIN, BUT I'M PRETTY SURE WE GOT THE LEGISLATION PASSED AND IT WAS VETOED BY THE GOVERNOR FOR NOT WANTING TO GIVE ADVANTAGES TO BUSINESSES -- HIS ARGUMENT WAS THAT HE WANTED THE LOWEST COST DEAL TO BENEFIT THE TAXPAYER AND NOT AWARD ANY HIGHER VALUE CONTRACTS THAT MAY NOT BE AS ECONOMICALLY EFFICIENT, FOR LACK OF A BETTER WORD. THAT'S MY RECOLLECTION. IT'S BEEN SEVERAL SESSIONS NOW, BUT I CAN VERIFY THAT AND SEND SOMETHING TO YOU.

PERRY: IF YOU COULD, JEFF. I MEAN, EVEN WITHIN THOSE CONTRACT TYPES THERE -- AND I UNDERSTAND WHERE HE'S COMING FROM ON LARGE TICKET ITEMS, BUT YOU CAN PUT -- GRADUATE A SCALE WITHIN THAT CATEGORY ALSO ON SMALLER TYPE -- SMALLER CONTRACT VALUES UNDER THOSE TYPES OF CONTRACT VEHICLES, AND MAYBE THAT'S A WAY TO APPROACH IT TO CHANGE THE -- CHANGE

THE TWIST ON IT A LITTLE BIT.

COYLE: TO NARROW THE TYPE OF CONTRACTS THAT IT COULD APPLY TO.

PERRY: RIGHT. NOT JUST MAKE IT FOR ALL CONTRACTS, BUT, YOU KNOW, A NICHE IN THERE, YOU KNOW, SMALLER CONTRACTS UP TO A CERTAIN LEVEL, THAT KIND OF THING.

COYLE: OKAY.

PERRY: BUT I WOULD REALLY LIKE TO TAKE A LOOK AT THAT AGAIN AND MAYBE MAKE ANOTHER RUN. WE'VE GOT TWO YEARS TO PUT IT TOGETHER.

COYLE: SURE.

PERRY: BUT, YEAH, I WOULD LIKE TO TAKE A LOOK AT THAT AGAIN.

COYLE: AND I WILL GO AND VERIFY. IT HAS BEEN SEVERAL YEARS, SO I'M GOING BY MEMORY. BUT THAT'S MY RECOLLECTION, CHAIR.

PERRY: OKAY. THANK YOU. THANK YOU, JEFF. THE HIGH-PROFILE CONTRACTS, WHAT WAS THE THRESHOLD, AGAIN, A MILLION DOLLARS AND ABOVE?

ELLIOTT: YEAH, IT'S A MILLION DOLLARS.

PERRY: AND WHEN IS THE LAST TIME -- WHEN DID WE PUT THAT INTO EFFECT, THE MILLION DOLLARS THRESHOLD?

ELLIOTT: IT'S BEEN SOME TIME. I'M NOT SURE I CAN PICK THE EXACT DATE. IT'S BEEN SEVERAL YEARS.

PERRY: OKAY. WELL, THE QUESTION IS, IS THAT SOMETHING THAT WE NEED TO TAKE A LOOK AT AGAIN? IS IT TOO LOW? DOES THAT FORCE TOO MUCH BUREAUCRACY IN THIS OR SHOULD WE RAISE THAT SOME TO GET THAT OUT OF THIS PROCESS OF GOING THROUGH THIS COMMITTEE? YOU KNOW, A MILLION DOLLARS DOESN'T GET YOU MUCH ANYMORE NOWADAYS, AND TO FORCE THIS WHOLE PROCESS ON THOSE

SMALLER-TYPE CONTRACTS, I'M JUST WONDERING IF WE SHOULD TAKE ANOTHER LOOK AT THAT. CAN Y'ALL TAKE A LOOK AT THAT AND KIND OF DO AN ANALYSIS ON THAT, ON SHOULD WE RAISE THAT AND WHAT SHOULD WE ACTUALLY RAISE THAT TO?

ELLIOTT: YEAH, IT'S BEEN SOME TIME. I THINK WE LOOKED AT IT PROBABLY THREE YEARS AGO, AND WE CAN DUST THAT OFF AND BRING IT BACK TO THE COMMITTEE.

PERRY: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. I THOUGHT WE DISCUSSED THAT BEFORE, BUT THAT'S BEEN A WHILE BACK.

ELLIOTT: YEAH, WE HAVE DISCUSSED IT.

PERRY: IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN B.C., ACTUALLY, BEFORE CLAYTON.

ELLIOTT: I THINK THAT ONE MIGHT HAVE BEEN A.C., AFTER CLAYTON, BUT --

PERRY: OH, REALLY? OKAY. ALL RIGHT. REMEMBER, I'M A LITTLE OLD.

GORZELL: WE'LL GO BACK AND LOOK AT IT, BUT I DO WANT TO CLARIFY ONE THING, THAT WHEN WE'RE LOOKING AT THOSE, IT'S NOT ONLY THE DOLLAR DEFINITIONS. SOMETIMES THERE MAY BE ITEMS THAT EITHER ARE REALLY TECHNICAL --

PERRY: YES, RIGHT.

GORZELL: -- OR THERE MAY BE A LOT OF COMMUNITY INTEREST, AND WE'RE GOING TO WANT TO BRING THOSE FORWARD AS HIGH-PROFILE. BUT WE WILL LOOK AT THAT DEFINITION AND REVISIT THAT.

PERRY: YEAH. OKAY. GREAT. I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM WITH THAT AT ALL. I'M JUST WANTING THE RUN-OF-THE-MILL CONTRACTS OUT THERE, THAT, YOU KNOW, AGAIN, A MILLION DOLLARS IS KIND OF LOW. AND HAVE WE BENCHMARKED WITH OTHER CITIES TO SEE WHAT THEY'RE DOING AS FAR AS PROCESSES, IF THEY'RE DOING SOMETHING BETTER THAN US AS FAR AS THE ACTUAL PROCESS THROUGH THIS COMMITTEE?

ELLIOTT: WE HAVE. WHEN WE WERE ACTUALLY DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM IN ITS INCEPTION. WE HAVE NOT DONE IT IN SOME TIME, BUT SOMETHING WE CAN GO BACK AND BENCHMARK AGAIN.

PERRY: THAT WOULD BE INTERESTING TO SEE WHAT OTHER CITIES ARE DOING IN RELATION TO THIS PROCESS. IS IT STRICTER? IS IT LESS STRICT? ARE -- DO THEY HAVE SOME OTHER IDEAS OUT THERE THAT WE COULD IMPLEMENT HERE TO STREAMLINE OUR PROCESS? AND, AGAIN, TO ME, IT'S ALL ABOUT REDUCING THE BUREAUCRACY OF GETTING A CONTRACT THROUGH THE SYSTEM. AND I TOTALLY UNDERSTAND FOR CERTAIN TYPES AND FOR CERTAIN THRESHOLDS, ABSOLUTELY, BUT IS THERE SOMETHING ELSE OUT THERE WE CAN DO TO MAKE IT A LITTLE BIT EASIER TO GET THROUGH THE SYSTEM? AND I -- YOU FOCUSED IN ON VETERAN-OWNED SMALL BUSINESSES, BUT WE HAVE OTHER SMALL BUSINESSES THAT WE GIVE POINTS TO OR WE INCLUDE IN THESE DIFFERENT TYPES OF SOLICITATIONS. I THINK IT WOULD BE HELPFUL TO LIST THOSE OUT ALSO ON THIS, AN NOT JUST FOCUS IN ON THE VETERAN-OWNED, BUT TO INCLUDE ALL THESE OTHER -- YOU KNOW, SERVICE DISABLED, WOMAN-OWNED BUSINESSES, ALL OF THOSE CATEGORIES AND WHERE DO THEY FIT IN ON ALL THESE DIFFERENT CONTRACTS AND STUFF. AND THEN THAT'S -- THAT'S KIND OF ALL OF MY QUESTIONS. SIR, DO YOU HAVE ANY?

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: THANK YOU, CHAIR. SO WHAT YOU WERE LOOKING FOR WAS DIRECTION ON THE LIST OF INDIVIDUAL ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION VERSUS THE CONSENT AND WHETHER ANYTHING NEEDED TO BE ADJUSTED?

GORZELL: YES, SIR, THAT'S CORRECT. SO REPRESENTED THREE CATEGORIES, THERE'S SOME SOLICITATIONS THAT WE WANT TO TAKE TO A FULL B SESSION, SO THEY WOULDN'T ACTUALLY COME TO AUDIT COMMITTEE. WE HAD, WHAT, SEVEN. SORRY, I LOST MY PAGE. LET ME FIND THAT REAL QUICK.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: FOR SURE. AND FROM WHAT I WAS READING AND EVERYTHING YOU HAD SAID, EVERYTHING LOOKED APPROPRIATE -- APPROPRIATELY DESIGNATED.

GORZELL: THERE ARE SEVEN. THEY'RE ACTUALLY ON SLIDES 22 AND 23 THAT WE WANT TO TAKE TO A FULL B SESSION SO THEY WOULDN'T ACTUALLY COME TO AUDIT COMMITTEE. WE WOULD WALK YOU THROUGH THE ENTIRE SOLICITATION PROCESS IN B SESSION. THERE'S A SECOND CATEGORY THAT WOULD COME TO

AUDIT AND ACCOUNTABILITY, BUT THEY WOULD BE INDIVIDUAL ITEMS THAT WOULD PRESENT TO YOU ALL. THAT'S ON SLIDES 25 THROUGH 29, AND THEN THE BALANCE, OR WHAT WE'RE PLANNING TO DO IS JUST PUT THEM ON CONSENT. YOU ALWAYS HAVE THE ABILITY TO PULL THEM AT THE AUDIT AND COMMITTEE.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: AND WE DO.

GORZELL: SO IF YOU SAW SOMETHING THAT WE MISSED OR POLICY ISSUE OR SOMETHING YOU WANTED TO VISIT, YOU COULD ALWAYS PULL IT, BUT IN ORDER TO KIND OF KEEP -- THERE'S JUST SUCH A LARGE VOLUME OF CONTRACTS, WE'RE JUST TRYING TO PUT THEM IN CATEGORIES SO WE CAN EFFICIENTLY MOVE THEM THROUGH THE PROCESS.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: FOR SURE.

GORZELL: THAT'S WHAT WE'RE LOOKING FOR FEEDBACK ON TODAY.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: FOR SURE. WAS THERE ANYTHING ELSE THAT YOU WERE LOOKING FOR FEEDBACK ON?

GORZELL: NO, SIR.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: OKAY. WELL, SOUNDS GOOD TO ME. THANK YOU. [INAUDIBLE SPEAKER]

[INAUDIBLE] ON 17, YOU HAVE ON HERE WHAT REQUIRES B SESSION, YOU HAVE THE CONTRACT TERM IN EXCESS OF 10 YEARS. IS THAT COMMON? BECAUSE I LOOKED AT THE OTHER CONTRACTS, ALL THE ONES YOU LISTED AND I DIDN'T SEE ANY OTHER THAN FOR SEVEN YEARS. YOU HAD A COUPLE THAT HAD THREE ONE-YEAR EXTENSION. IS THAT WHAT WOULD QUALIFY AS A 10 YEAR?

ELLIOTT: THERE ARE SOME CONTRACTS, TYPICALLY AT PROBABLY THE CONVENTION CENTER OR THE ALAMODOME IN TERMS OF CONCESSION CONTRACTS THAT THEY MAY HAVE A SIGNIFICANT INVESTMENT IN INFRASTRUCTURE OR EQUIPMENT, AND TYPICALLY THOSE MAY BE IN EXCESS OF 10 YEARS. THERE ARE NOT A WHOLE LOT, BUT THERE ARE SOME THAT WILL EXCEED THAT THRESHOLD.

QUICK QUESTION ALSO ON SELECTED FOR B SESSION, THERE ARE A FEW THAT DON'T RISE TO THE THRESHOLD OF 25 MILLION UNLESS WE'RE LOOKING AT THEM AS A GROUP. IS THAT THE THOUGHT PROCESS THERE?

ELLIOTT: IT'S NOT THE PROCESS. BASICALLY WHAT I MENTIONED KIND OF WE HAVE SOME EXPERIENCE WITH SOME OF THESE CONTRACTS. IN THE PAST, WHEN WE LOOK AT THE AIRPORT, ESPECIALLY WHEN IT COMES TO CONCESSIONS, THOSE HAVE BEEN AREAS THAT THE COUNCIL HAS HAD AN INTEREST IN, AND SO BASED ON THAT HISTORICAL EXPERIENCE WE HAVE, WE'RE RECOMMENDING THOSE HERE. SO BASICALLY, PROBABLY MEETS THE CRITERIA MORE PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT THAN ANYTHING ELSE.

THANK YOU.

PERRY: OKAY. ANYTHING ELSE? ALL RIGHT. I THINK THAT WAS JUST FOR A BRIEFING AT THIS POINT IN TIME. AND WHEN DO YOU NEED TO HAVE ANY INPUTS ON -- IF WE WANT TO ADD ANY -- YOU KNOW, MOVE THINGS AROUND ON THE LIST THAT YOU'RE CURRENTLY SHOWING OR ADD TO THE LIST FOR THIS YEAR?

GORZELL: WELL, I THINK FOR THE TWO SIDES MEMBERS, IF WE COULD GET THAT BEFORE -- WHEN ARE WE GOING ON WEDNESDAY.

ELLIOTT: THURSDAY.

GORZELL: THURSDAY? BEFORE THIS THURSDAY IF WE COULD GET IT -- IF Y'ALL HAVE ANY CHANGES OR SUGGESTIONS, IF WE COULD GET THAT. FOR THE COUNCIL, YOU GET TO ENJOY TROY'S PRESENTATION A SECOND TIME ON THURSDAY, SO YOU CAN GIVE US YOUR FEEDBACK THEN AS WELL.

PERRY: GREAT. GREAT. WELL, THANK Y'ALL VERY MUCH. ALL RIGHT. NO ACTION ON THAT ONE. LET'S SEE. WE HAVE ANOTHER ONE -- ANOTHER -- THE SECURITY OFFICER SERVICES.

GORZELL: DID YOU WANT TO -- BEFORE WE GO TO THE END OF THE INDIVIDUAL, DID YOU WANT TO COVER THE CONSENT? DID Y'ALL WANT TO APPROVE THE CONSENT

ITEMS? WE HAVE --

PERRY: SURE. WE CAN DO THAT. ABSOLUTELY. SO HOW MANY ITEMS DO WE HAVE FOR CONSENT?

CLERK: SIR, I BELIEVE THERE ARE ONE, TWO, THREE, FOUR, FIVE, SIX, SEVEN, EIGHT, NINE, 10 ITEMS. TWO, FOUR, SIX, EIGHT, 10 ITEMS.

PERRY: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. ARE THERE ANY THAT ANYONE WANTS TO PULL FROM CONSENT AT THIS POINT IN TIME? NO? OKAY. CAN I HAVE A MOTION TO APPROVE?

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: I MOVE TO APPROVE THE BALANCE OF THE CONSENT AGENDA.

PERRY: AND A SECOND.

I'LL SECOND.

PERRY: ALL RIGHT. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY AYE. (AYES).

PERRY: ALL RIGHT. GREAT. CONSENT AGENDA IS APPROVED. NOW LET'S GO TO THE INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATIONS, 14 THROUGH 18. OR DID I -- AM I MISSING ONE, NUMBER 13 HERE? IS THAT A SEPARATE ONE THAT WE NEED TO TALK ABOUT?

GORZELL: SO, CHAIRMAN, WHAT I HAVE IS CONSENT WAS ITEMS 3 THROUGH 12.

PERRY: OKAY.

GORZELL: AND THEN ITEM 13 IS YOUR FIRST INDIVIDUAL ITEM, AND THAT WOULD BE THE PRESOLICITATION BRIEFING ON OUR SECURITY OFFICERS SERVICES.

PERRY: YEAH. LET'S DO THAT. I GOT A PAGE AHEAD. THAT'S WHY I WAS MESSED UP HERE. I'M ON TRACK NOW.

GORZELL: ACTUALLY, COUNCIL CAN WE SKIP THIS ITEM -- OR, CHAIR, CAN WE SKIP THIS ITEM AND GO TO ITEM NUMBER 14?

PERRY: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. SOUNDS GOOD. LET'S DO IT. SOMETHING ABOUT GARBAGE COLLECTION HERE. RECYCLING.

CLERK: BEN, WILL THAT ITEM NOT BE CONSIDERED OR JUST CONSIDERED AT A LATER DATE -- AT A LATER TIME?

GORZELL: THE PERSON PRESENTING ISN'T HERE AT THE MOMENT. THEY SHOULD BE HERE SHORTLY, SO WE -- IF THE CHAIR'S OKAY, WE CAN TAKE IT BACK --

PERRY: ABSOLUTELY. ABSOLUTELY.

GORZELL: THANK YOU.

PERRY: THAT'S NOT CRAIG HOPKINS, RIGHT? [LAUGHTER]

GORZELL: I DID NOT SEE PATSY BACK THERE. COUNCILMAN, CHAIR, IF YOU WANT TO GO BACK TO ITEM 13, WE CAN DO THAT.

PERRY: YEAH, LET'S GET BACK ON TRACK. Y'ALL ARE CONFUSING ME. NO PROBLEM.

GORZELL: AT THIS POINT, I'M CONFUSING MYSELF, SIR.

PERRY: COME ON UP.

GORZELL: PATSY BOOZIER IS OUR CHIEF SECURITY OFFICER, SO SHE'LL BE MAKING THE PRESENTATION TODAY.

PERRY: OKAY. GREAT. SORRY WE SKIPPED OVER YOU.

OH, THAT IS PERFECTLY FINE. WELL, GOOD MORNING. YES, THIS IS THE SECURITY OFFICER SERVICES RFCSP, SO WE HAD PUT THIS OUT FOR SOLICITATION LAST YEAR AND IT WAS CANCELED IN FEBRUARY. NOW WE'RE BRINGING IT BACK. WE WENT THROUGH AND WE DID A COMPLETE ASSESSMENT OF -- WE SPOKE WITH COUNCIL, WE SPOKE WITH OUR CUSTOMERS, WE LOOKED AT THE SCOPE AND THE -- JUST KIND OF THE ENVIRONMENT AS WE WERE GOING FORWARD, AND THAT'S HOW WE CAME AND WE ADDED -- WE ADDED SOME -- IT'S NOT JUST ALL IN THE

SOLICITATION. IN ORDER TO GET THE FULL SCOPE OF WHAT WE NEEDED, WE ADDED SOME INTO OUR OWN SECURITY SERVICES, SOME INTO THIS SOLICITATION, WHICH IS FOR THE CITYWIDE SECURITY OFFICERS, AND ALSO SOME JUST IN THE PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES THAT WE HAVE WITHIN THE ELECTRONIC COMMUNITY AS WELL. SO FOR THIS PARTICULAR ONE, THIS IS TO PROVIDE THOSE SECURITY OFFICERS THAT MANAGE THE POST AT ALL OF OUR CITY FACILITIES. SO THE SOLICITATION TYPE IS AN RFCSP. IT HAS AN ESTIMATED VALUE OF \$40 MILLION. IT'S THREE YEARS WITH TWO ONE-YEAR RENEWAL OPTIONS, AND THE CURRENT CONTRACT THAT WE CURRENTLY HAVE IS UNDER AN EXTENSION, AND IT EXPIRES ON APRIL 30TH OF 2022. AND THESE SERVICES ARE FOR GUARD AND SECURITY SERVICES, LIKE YOU HAVE AT THE FRONT DESK HERE AT CITY HALL, CITY TOWER, LIBRARIES, DSD, ALL OF THE LOCATIONS WHERE WE HAVE SECURITY OFFICERS. THE NUMBER OF VENDORS THAT ARE ON THE REGISTRY'S 163. WE ALSO HAVE A TARGETED VENDOR OUTREACH FOR 12 COMPANIES, AND IT HAS BEEN -- HAD NUMEROUS ADVERTISEMENTS FOR THESE SERVICES, AND THEN ON THE -- YOU CAN ALSO SEE WHO THE EVALUATION AND VOTING MEMBERS ARE. EACH ONE HAS A PART AND RECEIVES THESE TYPES OF SERVICES. THE EVALUATION CRITERIA IS BASED ON EXPERIENCE, BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS. ALSO ON THE -- THEIR PROPOSED PLAN OF HOW THEY'RE GOING TO STAFF AND PROVIDE THESE SERVICES, PRICE. THERE IS AN SBE PRIME PROGRAM FOR 15 POINTS, AND THE -- ALSO FIVE POINTS FOR THE MDBE. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS IS A 10% ON THE SBEDA, LOCAL PREFERENCE, THE VETERAN'S OWNED, SMALL BUSINESSES AND THE AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS ARE NOT REQUIRED FOR THIS CONTRACT. THE GOAL-SETTING COMMITTEE MEMBERS ARE TROY ELLIOTT, CRAIG HOPKINS, DR. ANITA KURIAN, SHUCHI AND LINDA LOPEZ-GEORGE. WE LOOK TO DO PRESOLICITATION BRIEFING TODAY, OUR RELEASE DATE OF NOVEMBER 5TH, AND THE GOAL-SETTING COMMITTEE WAS DONE FEBRUARY 7TH OF 2020. WE ALSO, UNDER THE POSTSOLICITATION, THAT WOULD BE -- WE WOULD HAVE THE EVALUATION COMPLETED BY FEBRUARY 16TH OF 2022, SO THAT IS A VERY TIGHT SCHEDULE, AS YOU CAN SEE GOING INTO THE SOLICITATION. THE CONTRACT WOULD BE NEGOTIATED BY THE 25TH OF FEBRUARY, AND THEN THE POSTSOLICITATION BRIEFING WOULD BE MARCH 23RD, WITH IT COMING TO COUNCIL ON APRIL 14TH OF 2022 AND CONTRACT START DATE OF MAY 1ST OF 2022. ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS?

PERRY: SURE. OKAY. TELL ME ABOUT THIS -- THIS WENT OUT BEFORE, RIGHT?

YES, SIR, IT DID.

PERRY: AND WHY DID IT GET CANCELED?

AGAIN, IT WENT OUT LAST YEAR, AND THEN IN FEBRUARY, IT WAS AROUND THE TIME THAT WE WERE STARTING TO BUILD CITY TOWER, CITY HALL WAS OPENING UP. THERE -- WE NEEDED -- WE WANTED TO STOP AND LOOK AT THE SCOPE OF SERVICES THAT HAD BEEN IN THAT SOLICITATION SO THAT WE COULD SEE IF WE WERE COVERING ALL OF THE REQUIREMENTS THAT WAS NEEDED BY OUR CUSTOMERS, BY THE CITIZENS SO THAT -- SO WE WANTED TO MAKE SURE -- LIKE, FOR EXAMPLE, WE HAD -- WE HAD JOB DESCRIPTIONS WITHIN THE SOLICITATION, BUT NONE OF THEM WERE -- SEEMED -- WE DIDN'T HAVE ONE THAT WAS, LIKE, FOR A CONCIERGE, LIKE SOMEONE WHO WOULD BE AT CITY TOWERS WHERE YOU'RE DEALING WITH A LOT OF THE PUBLIC, AND THEM COMING INTO THAT FACILITY, AND A CONCIERGE MIGHT BE SOMEONE -- BY LAW, WE'RE REQUIRED TO HAVE ALL OF OUR SECURITY OFFICERS IN A UNIFORM, BUT THIS -- BUT UNDER A CONCIERGE TITLE, THEY COULD BE IN A UNIFORM THAT IS A SUIT; THEREFORE, THEY -- AND THEY'VE BEEN TRAINED IN THINGS LIKE CUSTOMER SERVICE, DEESCALATIONS. WE ADDED A LOT OF TRAINING REQUIREMENTS THAT WE HAD NOT HAD IN PREVIOUS SOLICITATIONS. SO IT WAS MAINLY A CHANGE IN SCOPE OF SERVICES TO MAKE SURE THAT WE COULD HANDLE ALL DIFFERENT SITUATIONS.

GORZELL: AND, CHAIR, LET ME JUST ADD A LITTLE BIT, BECAUSE I THINK YOU'LL RECALL CONVERSATIONS THAT WE BRIEFED THE COUNCILMEMBERS INDIVIDUALLY, SO WE HAD AN RFCSP OUT, WE WERE AT THE POINT WHERE WE WERE WRAPPING THAT UP IN THE DECEMBER/JANUARY TIME FRAME. AND WE HAD THE EVENTS HAPPEN AT THE U.S. CAPITOL, THAT REALLY CAUSED US TO STEP BACK AND TAKE A LOOK AT NOT ONLY THE NUMBER OF FACILITIES THAT WE WERE OPENING, CITY HALL, CITY TOWER, OTHERS, BUT REALLY LOOKING AT THE SCOPE OF SERVICES UNDER THIS CONTRACT, LOOKING AT OUR PROTOCOLS FROM A SECURITY STANDPOINT AND SAYING, DO WE NEED TO DO THINGS DIFFERENTLY? AND SO WE ENDED UP CANCELING THAT SOLICITATION. WE ACTUALLY HAD INDIVIDUAL BRIEFINGS WITH ALL THE COUNCILMEMBERS TO GET YOU ALL'S FEEDBACK IN TERMS OF SECURITY, NOT ONLY CITY FACILITIES, FIELD OFFICES AND AS PATSY MENTIONED, THERE WERE A NUMBER OF THINGS THAT CAME OUT OF THERE THAT LED TO THINGS THAT WE'VE DONE INDIVIDUAL AT YOUR FIELD OFFICES, YOU KNOW, MAYBE

CAMERAS OR OTHER THINGS THAT MAYBE WERE GAPS THAT WE'VE TRIED TO FILL IN. LOOKING AT CITY HALL AND CITY TOWER IN TERMS OF SOME THINGS THAT WE'VE DONE A LITTLE BIT DIFFERENTLY, AND THEN LOOKING AT HOW THIS CONTRACT IS STAFFED. AS PATSY MENTIONED AS WE WENT THROUGH THAT, AND YOU LOOK AT THE LARGE NUMBER OF FACILITIES THAT WE HAVE, YOU KNOW, THEY RANGE EVERYTHING FROM THE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, TO LIBRARIES. AND WHAT WE NEED IS DIFFERENT BASED ON THE FEEDBACK THAT WE GOT, IN SOME CASES MAYBE IT IS MORE OF A CONCIERGE-TYPE SERVICE. MANY OF OUR BUILDINGS, THESE ARE THE FIRST ENCOUNTERS THAT SOMEONE FROM THE PUBLIC IS GOING TO HAVE LIKELY IS GOING TO BE AS THEY WALK INTO THE BUILDING FROM THE SECURITY PERSONNEL UNDER THIS CONTRACT. SO PATSY WENT IN WITH A TEAM AND THEY'VE ADDED A NUMBER OF DIFFERENT JOB DESCRIPTIONS, EVERYTHING FROM CONCIERGE TO SCREENERS. IN SOME CASES THEY'RE JUST SCREENING PEOPLE AS THEY ENTER THE FACILITY, TO UNARMED SECURITY OFFICERS TO ARMED SECURITY OFFICERS. WE'VE ADDED ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS ON TRAINING THAT WE WANT THEM TO HAVE AS THEY'RE PART OF OUR CITY FACILITIES. WE LOOKED AT CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS, SO ONE OF THE THINGS WE WANTED TO MAKE SURE WE SHORED UP WAS IF THERE WAS AN EVENT ACTUALLY HAPPENING, WE ALSO WANT TO MAKE SURE THIS CONTRACTOR HAS A SOLID CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS IN PLACE SO THAT'S NOT A GAP WE'RE TRYING TO FILL IN THE MIDDLE OF AN EMERGENCY AS WELL. SO THERE WERE A NUMBER OF THINGS THAT WE TRIED TO STEP BACK AND TAKE A LOOK AT, AND THOSE ARE THE THINGS THAT HAVE BEEN BUILT INTO THIS SOLICITATION GOING FORWARD. AS PATSY MENTIONED, WE HAD EXTENDED THE CURRENT CONTRACT BY A YEAR THROUGH -- SHE HAD IT ON HERE, MAY OF -- OR ACTUALLY THROUGH APRIL 30TH OF NEXT YEAR, SO THE TIMING WOULD BE TO GET THIS OUT, GET IT EVALUATED, GET IT SELECTED SO THAT WE HAVE ENOUGH TIME TO IMPLEMENT THE NEW SERVICES.

PERRY: OKAY. WELL, MY CONCERN IS THAT WE HAD A SOLICITATION OUT THERE FOR OVER NINE MONTHS THAT PEOPLE WERE PUTTING TOGETHER A PROPOSAL ON THIS, SO HOW MUCH DIFFERENT IS THIS RFP THAN THE ORIGINAL ONE THAT WENT OUT THAT -- I MEAN, DO YOU THINK THEY'LL BE ABLE TO SALVAGE WHAT THEY PUT TOGETHER FOR THE FIRST SOLICITATION OR THROW IT OUT THE DOOR, WASTE THAT MONEY AND PUT TOGETHER ANOTHER WHOLE SOLICITATION FOR US?

I THINK THEY'LL BE ABLE TO HAVE SOME LENIENCY. AGAIN, WE'VE ADDED SOME JOB CATEGORIES SO THEY'LL NEED TO MAKE SURE THEY HAVE STAFF AND TRAINING PROGRAMS THAT CAN HANDLE THAT. LIKE WE ADDED DEESCALATION TRAINING, SO THAT OFFICERS WOULD BE TRAINED IN HOW TO DEESCALATE A SITUATION. THAT'S JUST AN EXAMPLE. BUT THE BULK OF THE SERVICES, I MEAN, IT'S -- YOU KNOW, IT'S SECURITY STAFF. SO IF -- IT -- MORE THAN LIKELY THEIR CURRENT EMPLOYEES COULD BE RETRAINED IN SOME OF THE AREAS IN WHICH WE'RE NOW LOOKING FOR.

PERRY: SO IS THIS GOING TO -- YOU THINK THIS WILL -- YOU THINK THE COST ON THIS RFP IS GOING TO BE MUCH GREATER THAN THE LAST -- LAST CONTRACT THAT WE ISSUED? OR HOW MUCH DID WE AVERAGE -- WHAT WAS THE VALUE OF THIS LAST -- THE CURRENT CONTRACT?

WELL, THE CURRENT CONTRACT, I THINK, WAS -- TROY, HELP ME HERE, WASN'T IT, LIKE, 30-SOME MILLION OVER THE LENGTH OF THE CONTRACT? BUT, AGAIN, IF YOU REMEMBER DURING THE PANDEMIC -- THE REASON IT'S KIND OF A HARD WAY TO ANSWER BECAUSE DURING THE PANDEMIC, WE HAD TO BRING IN ADDITIONAL STAFFING, LIKE WE STAFFED UP TWO OF THE HOTELS THAT WERE BEING USED WITH FOUR OFFICERS A DAY. WE OPENED UP NEW -- THE NEW -- YOU KNOW, CITY TOWER WAS A NEW FACILITY, SO AS WE GO FORWARD AND WE ESTIMATED THIS OUT, THEN THERE WAS THE CHANGE IN NUMBERS THAT WOULD -- THAT WOULD AFFECT THE OVERALL PRICE.

PERRY: OKAY. WELL, I JUST -- YOU KNOW, FROM A CONTRACTOR'S STANDPOINT, YOU KNOW, I HATE TO PUT IN THAT AMOUNT OF TIME, NINE MONTHS, TO PUT A PROPOSAL TOGETHER AND THE CUSTOMER JUST CANCELS IT, AND THEN HAVE TO START OVER. AND PROPOSALS AREN'T CHEAP, AS YOU KNOW.

I DON'T THINK THEY'LL HAVE TO START OVER. I THINK THEY'LL JUST HAVE TO ENHANCE WITH THE NEW REQUIREMENTS.

PERRY: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. OKAY. AND THEN ON YOUR SCHEDULE, WHY ARE WE -- YOU MENTIONED THAT WE'RE SQUEEZING THE AMOUNT OF TIME ON THIS PROPOSAL. WHY ARE WE SQUEEZING IT?

WELL, THIS IS LIKE OUR THIRD EXTENSION, JUST BEING ABLE TO GET EVERYTHING

BACK ON SCHEDULE, SO THIS EXTENSION EXPIRES ON THE 30TH OF APRIL. SO IF WE WERE TO GIVE MORE TIME, WE WOULD HAVE TO PUT ANOTHER CONTRACT EXTENSION IN PLACE. SO THE GOAL IS NOT TO DO THAT, IT'S TO GO AHEAD AND GET IT EVALUATED AND AWARDED.

PERRY: OKAY. THINK WE'LL BE ABLE TO MAKE IT?

I THINK WE CAN.

PERRY: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. THAT'S ALL MY QUESTIONS. THANK YOU. ANY OTHER QUESTIONS? THIS IS A BIG CONTRACT, SO IS THIS GOING FORWARD.

GORZELL: SO THIS IS A PRESOLICITATION BRIEFING, SO AS PATSY MENTIONED, WE WOULD ISSUE THIS ON NOVEMBER 5TH. WE'LL BE BACK TO THE COMMITTEE EARLY NEXT YEAR.

PERRY: BUT IS THIS GOING TO COUNCIL, THIS -- AT THIS AMOUNT?

GORZELL: ONCE WE GET THE SOLICITATION BACK AND OBVIOUSLY WE GO THROUGH THE EVALUATION, WE'LL MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO YOU ALL AS THE AUDIT COMMITTEE. YOU'LL REVIEW THE PROCESS. THEN WE'LL MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL ON AN AWARD. WE'RE ANTICIPATING THAT WOULD HAPPEN ON APRIL 14TH.

PERRY: ALL RIGHT. GREAT. ALL RIGHT. THIS IS GOING TO REQUIRE ACTION HERE.

GORZELL: NO, SIR. THIS IS BRIEFING ONLY.

PERRY: THIS IS BRIEFING?

GORZELL: YES, SIR.

PERRY: I KEEP GOING TO THE WRONG ONE. OKAY. ALL RIGHT. GREAT. ANY OTHER QUESTIONS? ALL RIGHT. LET'S MOVE ALONG TO ITEM NUMBER 14. NOW, THIS ONE I KNOW HAS ACTION. RIGHT? OKAY. ALL RIGHT. I'M BACK ON TRACK. THANK YOU, TROY.

ELLIOTT: THERE WE GO. THIS ACTION IS AN ACTIONABLE ITEM. IT IS A POSTSOLICITATION, AND THIS IS A BRIEFING FOR MUNICIPAL COMMERCIAL GARBAGE COLLECTION, DISPOSAL AND RECYCLING SERVICES. WE SOLICITED PROPOSALS. WE CAME TO THIS COMMITTEE IN PRESOLICITATION AND GOT FEEDBACK FROM THIS COMMITTEE. I'LL ACTUALLY HIGHLIGHT SOME OF THOSE AREAS THAT WE GOT THAT FEEDBACK AND PROVIDE SOME OF THE -- SOME OF THE CHANGES OR THE ANSWERS TO THAT COMMENTARY. BUT THIS -- WE SOLICIT PROPOSALS FROM QUALIFIED FIRMS FOR PROVIDING MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE SERVICE TO INCLUDE REFUSE COLLECTION, DISPOSAL, RECYCLING COLLECTION AND PROCESSING SERVICES AT VARIOUS CITY LOCATIONS. THIS IS AN ANNUAL CONTRACT. SO THIS CONTRACT WILL BE AVAILABLE TO DEPARTMENTS THAT CURRENTLY HAVE EXISTING SERVICE, BUT IN THE EVENT THERE WAS ANY NEW LOCATIONS, THIS CAN PROVIDE THAT SERVICE AS WELL. THIS SOLICITATION TYPE IS A REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL. ESTIMATED VALUE IS 4.5 MILLION. AND, CHAIR, I NEED TO CORRECT ONE STATEMENT WHERE WE MET AND BRIEFED YOU ON THIS ITEM INDIVIDUALLY, I HAD MENTIONED TO YOU THAT THE PRICE WAS A DECREASE. AS WE FINISHED OUR TABULATION, IT'S ACTUALLY GOING TO BE AN INCREASE IN VALUE. WE DID CONTACT THE RECOMMENDED VENDOR AND TALKED THROUGH HIS PRICING. UNFORTUNATELY, I THINK IT'S -- IT'S TIMING. IN TALKING TO HIM, I THINK, LIKE OTHER ORGANIZATIONS, HIS ORGANIZATION EXPERIENCING HIGHER INCREASE IN STEEL PRICES, IN WHICH THESE METAL CONTAINERS ARE FABRICATED FROM. AND ALSO HIS LABOR IS GOING UP AS WELL. SO WE'RE LOOKING AT ABOUT A 6% INCREASE. WHEN WE LOOK AT THE EVALUATION MATRIX BY CONTRAST, THE SECOND RANKED VENDOR, THEIR PRICE CAME IN ABOUT 41% HIGHER THAN THIS PROPOSAL. SO I WANTED TO MENTION THAT TO YOU AND MAKE THAT CORRECTION. WHEN WE HAD CONVERSATIONS WITH COMMITTEE IN THE PRESOLICITATION, WE HAD AN ORIGINAL TERM THAT WAS MUCH LESS THAN THIS. WE CAME BACK WITH FEEDBACK FROM THE COMMITTEE AND EXTENDED IT TO THREE YEARS WITH TWO ONE-YEAR RENEWAL OPTIONS, SO ESSENTIALLY A FIVE-YEAR CONTRACT. WITH RESPECT TO COMMERCIAL GARBAGE COLLECTION, THE CONTRACTOR UNDER THIS AWARD WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR FURNISHING ALL THE CONTAINERS, SUPPLIES AND LABOR NECESSARY TO FILL THE CONTRACT. THIS PROVIDES COMMERCIAL GARBAGE COLLECTION AT 100 LOCATION, FRONT-LOAD CONTAINERS THROUGHOUT THE CITY AT A VARIETY OF DEPARTMENTS SUCH AS THE CONVENTION CENTER, ALAMODOME. WE ALSO HAVE 16 LOCATIONS OF OPEN-TOP

CONTAINERS THAT ARE CURRENTLY IN SERVICE, AND THESE ARE ON AN ALL-CALL BASIS. AS FAR AS RECYCLING COLLECTION, WE HAVE 28 LOCATIONS THAT UTILIZE FRONT-LOADER OR COMPACTOR CONTAINERS FOR THE RECYCLING SERVICES THAT WE CURRENTLY UTILIZE. AND, AGAIN, THIS CONTRACTOR'S RESPONSIBLE FOR PROVIDING THE LABOR, EQUIPMENT, AND ALSO FOR THE LEGAL DISPOSAL OF THE NONRECYCLABLE WASTE AT A STATE-APPROVED FACILITY. AS FAR AS THE RECOMMENDED AWARD, WE DID RECEIVE TWO SOLICITATIONS. VENDOR A, WE LOOK AT THE SUBTOTAL, THEY'RE VERY CLOSELY ALIGNED IN EXPERIENCE, BACKGROUND, QUALIFICATION, PROPOSED PLAN. VENDOR A CAME IN AT THE SUBTOTAL OF 57.86 VERSUS 55.28. AS I JUST MENTIONED TO YOU, WE SAW SOME -- SOME BIG VARIANCES IN PRICING. 20 POINTS WAS PROVIDED -- WAS AWARDED TO VENDOR A, AND THEN THEY ALSO RECEIVED FIVE POINTS, AS I JUST WENT THROUGH THAT LOCAL PREFERENCE PROGRAM FOR HAVING SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS PREFERENCE. THEY GOT THE FIVE POINTS FOR A TOTAL OF 82.86 POINTS OVER VENDOR B OF 74.42. WHEN WE DID OUR DUE DILIGENCE, JUST KIND OF WALKING YOU THROUGH THIS, WE NOTIFIED 81 VENDORS THAT ARE REGISTERED IN OUR VENDOR REGISTRY THAT SAID THEY'RE INTERESTED IN THIS TYPE OF WORK. AT OUR PRESUBMITTAL CONFERENCE, WE HAD FOUR FIRMS ATTEND, RECEIVED TWO RESPONSES. AS WE DO OUR DUE DILIGENCE, WE DID NOT FIND ANYTHING THAT CAME TO OUR ATTENTION AS WELL AS KEVIN AND HIS GROUP DID THEIR DUE DILIGENCE ON POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS AND THINGS OF THAT NATURE AND THEY DID NOT FIND ANYTHING AS A RESULT OF THEIR DUE DILIGENCE REVIEW EITHER. MUCH QUICKER THAN MY LAST PRESENTATION. THAT CONCLUDES MY PRESENTATION.

PERRY: YEAH, REALLY. I'VE JUST GOT A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS ON HERE. ISN'T THIS IN CONJUNCTION WITH -- AREN'T WE ACTUALLY -- THE CITY CONSTRUCTING SOME KIND OF RECYCLING FACILITY SOMEWHERE THAT THEY'RE GOING TO USE?

ELLIOTT: YES, SIR. AND THIS IS SEPARATE AND APART. THIS IS SPECIFICALLY FOR CITY SERVICES PROVIDED BY A VENDOR.

PERRY: RIGHT.

ELLIOTT: AND THE REST WILL BE CITYWIDE SERVICES.

PERRY: OKAY. GOT YOU. AND THEN ON THE TABLE, AND WE JUST TALKED ABOUT THIS, ON THE FIVE -- FIVE POINTS ON THE LOCAL PREFERENCE PROGRAM, A GOT FIVE POINTS, B DIDN'T GET ANY. WHAT -- WHAT DID THEY DO TO GET THE FIVE POINTS?

ELLIOTT: AGAIN, WHEN IT COMES TO LOCAL, THEY HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO EARN A FULL 10 POINTS, THAT IF YOU'RE HEADQUARTERED IN THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO FOR A YEAR OR MORE, THEN YOU'RE AWARDED THE FULL 10 POINTS. TO ACHIEVE THE FIVE POINTS, YOU HAVE TO HAVE ONE OR TWO CRITERIA, 20% OF THEIR WORKFORCE HERE OR 100 OR MORE EMPLOYEES. AND THE REASON WHY WE DID THAT IN DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM OR RECOMMENDING THAT TO COUNCIL, IS WE HAVE A LOT OF BIG BUSINESS IN SAN ANTONIO THAT MAY NOT BE HEADQUARTERED HERE, BUT THEY HAVE A SIGNIFICANT BUSINESS PRESENCE WITH A LOT OF EMPLOYEES HERE WHO, YOU KNOW, WORK AND PLAY HERE, THEY PAY TAXES, PAY SALES TAX. AND SO WE WANTED TO REWARD THEM FOR THAT LEVEL OF PARTICIPATION.

PERRY: OKAY. SO WHAT WAS THE CRITERIA THAT GAVE THEM THE FIVE POINTS.

ELLIOTT: 100 EMPLOYEES OR MORE.

PERRY: OKAY. SO THEY'RE NOT HEADQUARTERED HERE IN SAN ANTONIO.

ELLIOTT: NO, SIR.

PERRY: SO I'M ASSUMING THAT B DIDN'T HAVE OVER 100 EMPLOYEES HERE LOCAL.

ELLIOTT: THAT'S CORRECT. THEY WERE NOT HEADQUARTERED HERE, NOR DID THEY HAVE 100 OR MORE EMPLOYEES HERE.

PERRY: OKAY. I GOT YOU. PRETTY BIG POINT SPREAD THERE, AND I DON'T HAVE ANY OTHER QUESTIONS. DO Y'ALL HAVE ANY QUESTIONS? GREAT. ALL RIGHT. THIS ONE DOES REQUIRE AN ACTION, AND THAT'S TO -- LET'S SEE. WHAT IS THE ACTION HERE, TO SEND TO COUNCIL A SESSION?

GORZELL: SIR, THAT'S CORRECT. YOU WOULD BE FORWARDING THIS

RECOMMENDATION FORWARD TO THE FULL COUNCIL.

PERRY: OKAY. CAN I GET A MOTION FOR THAT.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: I MOVE TO SEND THIS TO FULL CITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION.

PERRY: AND A SECOND?

I'LL SECOND.

PERRY: ALL RIGHT. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY AYE. (AYES).

PERRY: ANY NAYS? NOPE. ALL RIGHT. WE'LL SEND THIS TO A SESSION. ALL RIGHT. GREAT. THANK YOU. LET'S MOVE ON TO NUMBER 15 HERE. [INAUDIBLE SPEAKER] PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT. TODAY I WILL BE PROVIDING YOU POST SOLICITATION BRIEFING FOR JOB ORDER CONTRACTING OR COMMONLY KNOWN AS JOC PROGRAM. JOC DELIVERED A METHOD ALLOWS FACILITY PROJECTS TO BE CONSTRUCTED THROUGH A READILY AVAILABLE, COMPETITIVELY-AWARDED CONTRACT. AS FACILITY IMPROVEMENT NEEDS ARE IDENTIFIED, A TASK ORDER IS ASSIGNED TO JOC CONTRACTOR, EXPEDITING THE DELIVERY OF THE REPAIR OR MINOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECT. ON MARCH 25, 2021, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT ISSUED A REQUEST FOR COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSAL TO CONTRACT WITH QUALIFIED FIRMS INTERESTED IN PROVIDING JOB ORDER CONTRACTING SERVICES TO THE CITY. SERVICES INCLUDE MAINTENANCE, REPAIR, RENOVATION AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION ON CITY FACILITIES SUCH AS BUILDINGS AND PARKS. SOLICITATION TYPE FOR THE RFCSP, THE VALUE IS 96 MILLION, THE TERM IS TWO FOR INITIAL YEAR AND TWO ONE ADDITIONAL YEARS. WE RECEIVED 23 PROPOSALS AND WE'RE RECOMMENDING EIGHT TO BE AWARDED. THIS IS THE RECOMMENDED EIGHT CONTRACTORS WE ARE RECOMMENDING TO AWARDED. THE EVALUATION CRITERIA WAS 25 POINTS FOR EXPERIENCE OF RESPONDENTS, SUBCONTRACTORS AND KEY PERSONNEL OF JOB CONTRACTING. ANOTHER 25-POINT FOR UNDERSTANDING A JOB PROGRAM AND PROPOSED PROJECT MANAGEMENT. 15-POINT FOR CONSTRUCTION EXPERIENCE IN SAN ANTONIO REGION. 15-POINT WAS THE PRICE, AND 20-POINT FOR SBEDA WHICH IS 10 -- FIVE-POINT FOR SBE, 10-POINT FOR WOMEN OR MINOR-OWNED BUSINESSES AND ANOTHER FIVE-POINT FOR ESBE. THIS -- ANOTHER FIRM HAD SENT PROPOSAL FOR US, BUT WE ARE NOT

RECOMMENDING AT THIS TIME TO BE SELECTED. THIS IS MORE FIRM, AS I MENTIONED, 23, WE HAD RECEIVED PROPOSAL. WE ARE RECOMMENDING ONLY EIGHT OF THEM. DUE DILIGENCE, FINANCE AND OTHER DEPARTMENT, DUE DILIGENCE RESULTING NUMBER OF THE VENDOR, NOTIFIED 2435. NUMBER OF THE VENDOR OR PRECONSTRUCTED ATTENDED 39, AND AS I MENTIONED PREVIOUSLY, 23 SUBMIT FOR THIS PROGRAM. THE RESULT OF MINIMUM REQUIREMENT REVIEW, NO MATERIAL FINDING. RESULT OF DUE DILIGENCE REVIEW, NO MATERIAL FINDING. GOING FORWARD WE ARE RECOMMENDING TO ENHANCING OUR JOB ORDER CONTRACT. ACCORDING TO SECTION 2269.403 IN TEXAS LOCAL GOVERNMENT CODE, ANY TASK ORDER THAT EXCEEDS HALF A MILLION DOLLARS MUST HAVE GOVERNING BODY APPROVE, IN THIS CASE CITY COUNCIL. PER 2007 CITY ORDINANCE, ANY TASK ORDER EXCEED 100,000 REQUIRES CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL. PUBLIC WORKS RECOMMENDING THE TASK ORDER AMOUNT ISSUE UNDER A JOB ORDER CONTRACT REGARDING THE COUNCIL APPROVAL TO INCREASE FROM 100,000 TO \$250,000. CONSTRUCTION AND LABOR MATERIAL HAVE INCREASED SIGNIFICANTLY SINCE 2007. THIS ALSO WILL PROCESS AND STREAMLINE THE DELIVERY OF THE PROJECT, WE DON'T HAVE TO SPEND SIX TO EIGHT WEEKS TO GO THROUGH THE COUNCIL PROCESS APPROVAL OF THIS. AND ALSO IT ALIGNS WITH ACCEPTABLE PRACTICE ACROSS THE TEXAS CITY. ON FUTURE SLIDE, I WILL BE SHOWING HOW MUCH OTHER CITY DOES ON THIS JOB ORDER CONTRACT. WE HAVE LOOKED OVER TO SEE WHAT WE HAVE DONE IN THE PAST FEW YEARS EXCEED 100,000. IN 2019, WE HAD 15 PROJECTS EXCEED 100,000. IN 2020, THAT WENT FROM 15 IN 2013 TO 28, THAT'S ALMOST 50% MORE BECAUSE OF THE PRICE INCREASING. IN 2021 WAS -- AS OF MARCH, IS ANOTHER 15, ALTOGETHER IN LAST TWO YEARS, WE HAD 58 PROJECTS EXCEED OVER 100,000, THAT MEANS 58 TIMES WE HAD TO PREPARE REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION TO GO THROUGH THE COUNCIL AND GET THEIR APPROVAL. THIS ALSO TAKES A LOT OF STAFF TIME. BETWEEN 2019 AND 2021, AS I MENTIONED, WE HAD 58 EXCEED THE 100K MAXIMUM LIMIT. WE CALCULATE STAFF TIME OF \$162,400, AND ON TOP OF THAT BETWEEN SIX AND EIGHT-WEEK DELAY. IF WE INCREASE FROM 100,000 TO 250,000, WE ARE ANTICIPATING SAVING OF 84,000 FOR DURATION OF THE TIME WE HAVE DONE. IF WE HAD INCREASED THIS LAST TWO, THREE YEARS, WE WOULD HAVE A \$48,000 SAVING. THE REQUEST FROM COUNCILMAN PERRY WAS WHAT'S OF OUR APPROVAL PROCESS TODAY? FOR JOB ORDER CONTRACT, IF THEY ARE UNDER 100,000, DIRECT APPROVES IT. IF THEY ARE OVER 100,000, CITY COUNCIL APPROVE. WE CONSTANTLY BRING THESE TO COUNCIL. GOODS AND NONPROFESSIONAL

SERVICES, UNDER 100,000 -- UNDER \$3,000 DEPARTMENT HEAD APPROVED. GOODS AND NONPROFESSIONAL SERVICES, OVER 50,000, GOES TO THE DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF APPROVES, IT'S CHIEF OF FINANCE APPROVES IT. GOODS AND NONPROFESSIONAL SERVICES, SEEDS \$50,000, CITY COUNCIL APPROVES IT. PROFESSIONAL SERVICES UNDER 25,000 APPROVED BY DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR, PROFESSIONAL SERVICE OVER 50,000, APPROVED BY EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICE OVER 50,000 IS APPROVED BY CITY COUNCIL. AS YOU CAN SEE, CITY OF AUSTIN, TWO YEARS INITIAL, AND TWO RENEWAL, VERY SIMILAR TO OUR DURATION, 135 MILLION AND HOURS IS 96 MILLION. STAFF HAS AUTHORITY TO PROVE ANYTHING AS MUCH AS 450,000. ANYTHING ABOVE THAT IT WILL GO TO CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL. CITY OF HOUSTON HAS THE SAME LIMIT, 450,000. HOUSTON AVIATION HAS SAME LIMIT, 450,000. CITY OF DALLAS, THEY GO AT MAXIMUM LIMIT, HALF A MILLION DOLLARS. CITY OF FORT WORTH, 300,000. AND, OF COURSE, WE ARE THE LOWEST ONE, BASICALLY ONE YEAR AND TWO ADDITIONAL ONE YEAR ON THE EXISTING 100,000. THIS IS A BRIEFING. END OF MY BRIEFING AND I'M AVAILABLE TO ANSWER ANY QUESTION YOU MAY HAVE.

PERRY: GREAT. THANK YOU, RAZI. JUST A COUPLE OF NOTES HERE, AND I -- I WOULD REALLY SUPPORT RAISING THOSE LIMITS ALSO. AGAIN, SOMETHING TO SAVE ON BUREAUCRACY AND GETTING THESE PROJECTS DONE AND OUT THE DOOR MORE QUICKLY, AND IT'S NOT A MATTER OF TRUST OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT; IT'S -- YOU KNOW, THERE'S DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DIFFERENT LEVELS TO SIGN OFF ON THESE THINGS. AND, AGAIN, WE CAN -- YOU KNOW, A LOT OF THIS STUFF GETS AUDITED AT THE END OF THE YEAR THAT, YOU KNOW, IF THINGS AREN'T GOING CORRECTLY, YOU KNOW, WE CAN MAKE THOSE CORRECTIONS OVER TIME. BUT, YEAH, I FULLY SUPPORT RAISING THOSE LIMITS. DID YOU HAVE -- I KNOW YOU SAID THE ONE OF THEM -- I GUESS WHAT I'D LIKE TO SEE IS THAT CHART THAT YOU HAVE THE CHECKS BY EACH ONE OF THE DIFFERENT TYPES. WHAT ARE YOU RECOMMENDING? BECAUSE RIGHT NOW IT'S SHOWING WHAT YOU CURRENTLY HAVE, BUT COULD WE GET A CHART THAT BACKS THAT UP SHOWING WHAT YOU'RE RECOMMENDING IT BE RAISED TO? DO WE HAVE THAT AVAILABLE?

HOSSEINI: I THINK WE ARE RECOMMENDING THE SAME APPROVAL PROCESS. THE ONLY INCREASE TO BE ON THE DOLLAR FIGURE BECAUSE OF JUST THE COST OF CONSTRUCTION.

PERRY: YES.

HOSSEINI: HAS INCREASED IN LAST 13 YEARS OR 14 YEARS, IS THAT TODAY'S BUYING POWER OF 100,000 IS NOT THE SAME AS 2007.

GORZELL: RAZI, CAN YOU GO BACK TO SLIDE 8 REAL QUICK. I THINK THAT'S WHAT YOU'RE ASKING... YES.

PERRY: YEAH. RIGHT NOW, FOR EXAMPLE, THE 100,000, YOU WERE -- YOU WERE SAYING RAISE THAT TO 250?

HOSSEINI: CORRECT.

PERRY: ALL'S I'M SAYING IS LET'S HAVE ANOTHER SLIDE THAT SHOWS THE INCREASES THAT YOU'RE RECOMMENDING. I'M NOT SAYING CHANGE THE PROCESS.

HOSSEINI: OKAY.

PERRY: BUT LET'S SHOW WHAT THOSE RECOMMENDED NEW AMOUNTS. ARE YOU RECOMMENDING ANY OTHER CHANGES OTHER THAN JUST THAT ONE ON THE TASK ORDERS?

HOSSEINI: CORRECT. ONLY ON THE DOLLAR FIGURES.

PERRY: OKAY. FOR JUST TASK ORDERS. NOTHING ELSE ON ANY OF THOSE OTHERS.

HOSSEINI: CORRECT.

PERRY: WELL. IF WE CAN JUST SHOW THAT, HERE'S WHAT WE'RE RECOMMENDING. IF IT'S JUST THE ONE, YOU CAN JUST USE THIS CURRENT SLIDE, JUST MAKE THAT NOTE ON IT.

HOSSEINI: AND ALSO, COUNCILMAN, MOST OF THESE PROJECTS WE WORK WITH THE COUNCIL WHO HAPPEN TO BE IN THEIR DISTRICT VERY CLOSELY. IF WE ARE DOING LIBRARY RENOVATION IN YOUR DISTRICT OR THE PARKS, IT'S NOT REALLY DONE BY STAFF. DIRECT COUNCIL IS INVOLVED.

PERRY: RIGHT. ABSOLUTELY. I APPRECIATE THAT. THE OTHER COMMENT WAS -- DO WE -- I THINK WE DISCUSSED THIS, WHETHER THIS WAS TWO OR THREE YEAR INITIAL, IS THIS --

HOSSEINI: YES. WE HAVE. ORIGINALLY WE DISCUSSED THIS -- WE CHANGED AT YOUR RECOMMENDATION, TWO FIRST INITIAL YEAR AND TWO ADDITIONAL ONE-YEAR, ALTOGETHER FOUR YEARS. LAST TIME WE HAD THREE YEARS ONLY.

PERRY: OKAY. I THOUGHT WE TALKED ABOUT CHANGING THAT TO THREE-YEAR INITIAL TERM WITH TWO ONE-YEAR OPTIONS MAKING IT FIVE YEARS. BUT IF WE'VE ALREADY GONE THROUGH THE PROCESS WITH THIS, I -- YOU KNOW, AFTER THIS CONTRACT, LET'S LOOK AT THAT REALLY CLOSELY, WHETHER WE SHOULD MAKE THIS A FIVE-YEAR CONTRACT, YOU KNOW, IN LINE WITH A LOT OF THESE OTHER CONTRACTS THAT WE'VE HAD. WE'VE CHANGED -- WE'VE MADE THEM ALL A LITTLE BIT LONGER INSTEAD OF THESE SHORTER CONTRACTS, A LITTLE BIT LONGER. NUMBER ONE, TO SAVE ON THE, AGAIN, THE BUREAUCRACY OF HAVING TO GO OUT WITH RFPS AND THE WHOLE PROCESS, BUT ALSO YOU DO GET BETTER PRICING WITH LONGER TERM CONTRACTS THAN SHORTER TERM CONTRACTS.

HOSSEINI: COUNCILMAN, WE ARE OPEN FOR THAT. THE ONLY CHALLENGE IS WHEN YOU MAKE THE CONTRACT DURATION TOO LONG, THOSE NEW FIRMS COMING UP, THEY DON'T HAVE A CHANCE TO PUT THEIR FOOT IN THE DOOR UNTIL FIVE YEAR EXPIRE.

PERRY: GOT YOU. AND I TOTALLY REALIZE THAT, BUT THERE'S A BALANCE OUT THERE SOMEWHERE, AND, YOU KNOW, AGAIN, LET'S TRY TO DRIVE DOWN THE COST OF WHAT WE'RE ADDING TO THESE CONTRACTS AND HAVING THAT EXTRA YEAR, TO ME, WOULD HELP DO THAT. SO THAT'S ALL MY COMMENTS. THANK YOU, SIR. ANY OTHER COMMENTS? YES, SIR? RODRIGUEZ THANK YOU. MY MIC HAS BEEN ON THIS WHOLE TIME. I WOULD SAY THAT SO THE \$96 MILLION, THAT'S A HEFTY AMOUNT OF FUNDING, AND I THINK WE SEE THAT QUITE FREQUENTLY, THERE'S A LOT OF MONEY THAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT, AND I'M WONDERING WITHIN THE SCORING RUBRIC, IS THERE A QUALITY CHECK OR ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT THAT WE LOOK AT PREVIOUS WORK OF -- OF THE APPLICANTS AND -- BECAUSE -- AND I'LL SAY THAT MY CONCERN IS THAT SOMETIMES PEOPLE CUT CORNERS. I'M SEEING THAT A

LOT IN DISTRICT 2, PEOPLE -- AND IT'S A NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF JOBS, RIGHT, BUT WE WANT TO MAKE SURE WE'RE GETTING THE HIGHEST QUALITY POSSIBLE, ESPECIALLY WHEN WE'RE SPENDING THIS MUCH MONEY. SO CAN YOU WALK ME THROUGH THAT.

HOSSEINI: YEAH. ONE OF THE ADVANTAGES OF COMPETITIVE PROPOSAL, PRICE IS REALLY SMALL FACTOR. I MENTIONED PRICE WAS 15%. QUALITY OF THE WORK IS REALLY A MAJOR FACTOR. 96 MILLION IS REALLY NOT GOING BY FOR ONE FIRM. EACH FIRM IS GOING TO HAVE ONLY 3 MILLION PER YEAR, BUT FOUR YEARS, DIVIDE THAT ONE BY FOUR. THEN MULTIPLY BY EIGHT WE ARE PROPOSING, AND WE DON'T HAVE ANY FUNDING FOR THIS PROGRAM ANYWAY. WHEN PROJECT IDENTIFIED BY DIFFERENT DEPARTMENT, THEY HAVE TO BRING FUNDING TO THIS JOC TO TAKE CARE OF THEIR BUSINESS ROOF REPLACEMENT, ADDITION, PAINTING, REPLACING CARPET, SO ON.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: THANK YOU. AND SO WITH THAT PART, THE QUALITY OF WORK, WOULD THAT -- WHICH GRADING CRITERIA WOULD THAT FALL UNDER, WOULD THAT BE THE EXPERIENCE OR --

GORZELL: RAZI, WHY DON'T YOU BRING SLIDE 3 UP AS AN EXAMPLE. SO WHILE RAZI'S GETTING THAT, I BELIEVE, COUNCILMAN, IT WAS UNDER ITEM NUMBER C, WHICH HAD 15 POINTS ASSIGNED TO IT. IS THAT CORRECT, RAZI?

HOSSEINI: YEAH, IT'S SLIDE NUMBER THREE IS EXPERIENCE OF RESPONDENT, THE PRIME. AND ITS JOBS. AND HE KEY PERSONNEL IS GETTING 25-POINT. NOT JUST EXPERIENCE IN THE CONSTRUCTION, EXPERIENCE ALSO ON THE JOC. JOC IS A SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT THAN TYPICAL CONSTRUCTION. MOST OF THE TIME WE ARE WORKING ON THE BUILDINGS ALREADY OCCUPIED, IN LIBRARY, FIRE STATION AND OTHER. THEY REALLY HAVE TO HAVE EXPERIENCE TO WORKING ON THE BUILDING OCCUPIED. THEN WE HAVE UNDERSTANDING OF JOB PROGRAM AND PROPOSED MANAGEMENT. HOW ARE YOU GOING TO MANAGE? THAT'S ANOTHER 25-POINT. THEN WE HAVE CONSTRUCTION EXPERIENCE AND INTERNAL REGION. NOT NECESSARILY THEY HAVE TO WORK FOR US, WE WANT TO KNOW THEY KNOW ABOUT THE CODE REQUIREMENT, THE [INDISCERNIBLE] REQUIREMENT AND OTHER, WHEN THEY CAN WORK WITH -- THAT'S ANOTHER 15-POINT. PRICE IS ONLY 15-POINT. IT'S VERY SMALL. 15% OF THE 100-POINT. THAT'S THE REASON WE DIDN'T

SELECT THESE FIRM BASED ON QUALIFICATION.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: FOR SURE. AND I JUST WANT TO CLARIFY. MY PROBLEM ISN'T NECESSARILY WITH THE PRICE, IT'S JUST I WANT TO EMPHASIZE HOW IMPORTANT I THINK THE QUALITY OF WORK IS. AND SO I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THAT'S ALWAYS A KEY COMPONENT IN OUR DECISION-MAKING. THE SECOND QUESTION I HAVE IS ABOUT THE CONSIDERATION OF THE THRESHOLD FOR THE JOC TASK ORDERS TO GO TO COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL. THAT'S NOT SOMETHING WE'RE -- THERE'S NO ACTION ON THAT, WE DON'T HAVE TO SEND ANYTHING. ARE YOU GOING TO COME -- OR HOW DO WE MAKE THAT CHANGE?

GORZELL: COUNCILMAN, I WAS ASKING ANOTHER QUESTION BACK HERE. WAS THAT ON THE \$250,000 QUESTION?

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: YES, SIR.

GORZELL: I THINK AS PART OF THE ITEM GOING FORWARD, YOU WOULD ALMOST HAVE AN APPROVAL OF EIGHT FIRMS THAT PUBLIC WORKS IS RECOMMENDING.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: OH, I DO SEE THAT. MY BAD.

GORZELL: THE SECOND PART, WE WOULD THEN ASK YOU ALL AT THE COUNCIL LEVEL TO GIVE US THAT AUTHORITY TO GO UP TO 250,000. COUNCILMAN, I DO WANT TO HIGHLIGHT ONE OTHER THING THAT RAZI MENTIONED, ON ITEM C, TO YOUR POINT ON THE QUALITY, I BELIEVE ITEM C, RAZI, WE WERE LOOKING AT PAST PERFORMANCE AS WELL. SO THAT ISSUE THAT YOU BROUGHT UP, SO IF WE'VE HAD ISSUES WITH QUALITY OF CONSTRUCTION OR QUALITY OF PROJECTS NOT BEING DONE, THAT SHOULD HAVE REALLY WORKED ITS WAY INTO THE SCORING IN ITEM C AS WELL, NOT JUST KNOWLEDGE OF SAN ANTONIO REGION, BUT HOW HAVE THEY DONE ON WORK FOR US. SO THAT WAS WORKED IN THERE AS WELL.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: WONDERFUL. THANK YOU. AND THIS IS JUST -- I JUST WANT TO KNOW, FOR VENDOR A, THEY GOT 24.5 OUT OF THE 25 POINTS FOR A. WHAT MIGHT GET THEM THAT EXTRA HALF OR WHY WERE THEY DOCKED THE HALF A POINT.

HOSSEINI: MORE THAN 24?

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: YEAH, THEY'RE AT 24.5, WHY NOT 25. WHAT IS THAT?

HOSSEINI: SOME OF THE MEMBER ON THE COMMENTS THEY ARE JUST VERY TIGHT AND THEIR STANDARD IS VERY HIGH, THEY DON'T WANT TO GIVE 25 POINTS.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: OKAY. I APPRECIATE THAT.

HOSSEINI: YOU ARE DEALING WITH A TOUGH COMMITTEE, COUNCILMAN.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: WONDERFUL. THAT WAS MY CURIOSITY TALKING, SO I APPRECIATE IT. I MOVE TO SEND THIS FOR COUNCIL APPROVAL.

PERRY: OKAY. OKAY. LET'S SEE IF THERE'S ANY OTHER COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS ON THIS ONE. OKAY. WE'VE GOT A MOTION. CAN I GET A SECOND? ALL RIGHT. AND ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY AYE. (AYES).

PERRY: ALL RIGHT. GREAT. WE'LL MOVE THIS ONE ON FORWARD. THANK YOU, RAZI. APPRECIATE IT. YEAH, IF YOU HAD ME ON ONE OF THOSE COMMITTEES, YOU'D NEVER GET A 25, I GUARANTEE YOU. ALL RIGHT. LET'S SEE. I THINK NUMBER -- LET'S SEE. WHAT ARE WE UP TO NOW? 16. OKAY. IT'S -- THIS IS NUMBER 16, THAT'S THE NEXT ONE, RIGHT? YEAH. OKAY.

THAT WOULD BE ME. SO THIS IS A FOLLOW-UP OUT OF THE AIRPORT POLICE OPERATIONS AND, AGAIN, THIS IS THE FOLLOW-UP AUDIT. THE INITIAL AUDIT WAS COMPLETED LAST YEAR. WE ISSUED THE REPORT IN JULY OF LAST YEAR IN THAT AUDIT. WE FOUND MAJOR ISSUES IN SIX DIFFERENT AREAS, AND SO THE OBJECTIVE OF THIS AUDIT WAS TO DETERMINE IF MANAGEMENT ACTION PLANS HAD BEEN EFFICIENTLY AND SUFFICIENTLY IMPLEMENTED. AND WE ARE HAPPY TO REPORT THAT OUR CONCLUSION WAS ALL SIX OF THOSE AREAS WERE VERY WELL ADDRESSED AND THE AVIATION POLICE DEPARTMENT WENT ABOVE AND BEYOND OUR EXPECTATIONS ON THAT. AND WE JUST WANTED TO POINT THAT OUT TO THE AUDIT COMMITTEE TODAY, THAT THEY REALLY DESERVE KUDOS OUT THERE. EVEN WENT TO THE EXTENT OF APPOINTING A QUARTERMASTER TO OVERSEE THE INVENTORY PROCESS, AND THAT'S THE STORAGE -- THAT INCLUDES THE TRACKING AND STORAGE AND MAINTENANCE OF INVENTORY ITEMS. THEY APPOINTED A

TRAINING SERGEANT TO TRACK TRAINING, ENSURE ALL OFFICERS COMPLETED THEIR REQUIRED TRAINING, AND THEY APPOINTED AN INTERNAL AFFAIRS SERGEANT TO TRACK COMPLAINTS AND ENSURE THAT COMPLAINTS WERE PROPERLY AND PROMPTLY COMPLETED. SO WE JUST WANTED TO GIVE A SHOUTOUT TO THOSE FOLKS OUT THERE. AND I APOLOGIZE TO THE CHIEF, THE LONG WAIT UP TO THIS POINT, BUT ANYWAY, WE JUST WANTED TO SAY THAT EVERYTHING LOOKS REALLY GOOD OUT THERE.

PERRY: OKAY. GREAT. CHIEF, YOU GOT ANYTHING TO ADD TO THAT? [INAUDIBLE SPEAKER]

CHIEF MCMANUS: I WOULD ONLY ADD THAT, YOU KNOW, WE WORK WITH AUDIT TO ADDRESS THESE ISSUES. WE'RE THANKFUL THAT THEY POINTED THEM OUT. THERE WERE A NUMBER OF PEOPLE THAT GOT TRANSFERRED AND DISCIPLINED FOR THOSE FINDINGS AND WE DID WORK HARD TO MAKE SURE THAT THEY WERE RECTIFIED BEFORE YOU GUYS CAME IN AGAIN. SO...

AND EVERYTHING LOOKED GREAT.

PERRY: YEAH. I REMEMBER THAT AUDIT. THAT WAS A PRETTY TOUGH ONE. SO, MAN, IF YOU'RE GETTING KUDOS, CHIEF. GOOD JOB. TAKE CREDIT WHERE YOU CAN. GREAT. THANK YOU. THIS DOES REQUIRE AN ACTION HERE TO ACCEPT THE REPORT, IF I CAN GET A MOTION.

SO MOVED.

PERRY: OKAY. AND A SECOND.

SECOND.

PERRY: THOSE ALL IN FAVOR SAY AYE. (AYES).

PERRY: ALL RIGHT. GREAT. LET'S MOVE ON TO NUMBER 17.

NUMBER 17, THAT AUDIT WAS MANAGED BY GABRIEL TREVINO, AND HE IS HERE TO DO THAT PRESENTATION.

TREVINO: HELLO. MY NAME IS GABE TREVINO, I WAS THE AUDIT MANAGER ON THE AUDIT OF FINANCE ACCOUNTS PAYABLE. I'LL BE GIVING YOU A BRIEF SUMMARY. THE OBJECTIVE WAS TO DETERMINE IF CONTROLS OVER THE CITY'S ACCOUNTING -- ACCOUNTS PAYABLE PROCESS ARE ADEQUATE AND EFFECTIVE. OUR SCOPE WAS FISCAL YEAR 2018 AND '19. IT INCLUDED PAYMENTS MADE BY CHECK, ACH AND WIRE PAYMENTS. WE REVIEWED THE PROCESS STARTING WITH THE PURCHASE APPROVALS AT THE DEPARTMENT LEVEL TO POSTING OF INVOICES, TO THE APPROVAL OF PAYMENTS. WE ALSO REVIEWED USER ACCESS FOR APPROPRIATE SEGREGATION OF DUTIES WITHIN SAP AND THROUGHOUT THE ACCOUNTS PAYABLE PROCESS. OVERALL, THE DESIGN OF THE ACCOUNTS PAYABLE PROCESS IS ADEQUATE. PROPER APPROVALS WERE OBTAINED AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION IS MAINTAINED IN SAP. HOWEVER IMPROVEMENTS CAN BE MADE IN MONITORING AND TRACKING OR TAKING ADVANTAGE OF EARLY PAYMENT DISCOUNTS. OVER FISCAL YEAR 2018 AND '19, WE FOUND THAT 395,000 IN POTENTIAL EARLY PAYMENTS DISCOUNTS WERE NOT TAKEN. WE RECOMMENDED THAT FINANCE REASSESS PROCESSES TO ENSURE EARLY PAYMENT DISCOUNTS ARE TAKEN ADVANTAGE OF WHEN AVAILABLE. ADDITIONALLY ESTABLISH PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR EARLY PAYMENT DISCOUNT ACTIVITY. FINANCE AGREED WITH OUR OBSERVATIONS AND HAS DEVELOPED POSITIVE ACTION PLANS. AND FINANCE IS HERE TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS, BUT THAT CONCLUDES MY PRESENTATION.

PERRY: DID YOU HAVE ANY SLIDES THAT YOU COULD PUT UP HERE SHOWING WHAT THE FINDINGS WERE AND WHERE EVERYBODY -- WHERE WE'RE AT WITH THE FINDINGS?

TREVINO: I DON'T --

PERRY: I KNOW WE USED TO GET THOSE SLIDES FROM KEVIN. AND THAT'S BASICALLY FOR THOSE IN THE AUDIENCE -- OR VIEWERS ON THIS TO SEE WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT.

GORZELL: CHAIR, WE CAN CERTAINLY FOLLOW UP WITH KEVIN ON THAT. BUT I THINK HISTORICALLY THEY HAVE VERBALLY PRESENTED THOSE REPORTS. AM I CORRECT, MARK, I THINK THAT HAS BEEN THE PRACTICE.

PERRY: WELL, I GUESS WE'RE TALKING ABOUT THE REPORTS THAT WE SEE -- THAT WE SEE ON THE COMMITTEE THAT SHOWS THAT, BUT I'D LIKE TO COME UP WITH SOMETHING SO THAT THE VIEWING PUBLIC, SINCE THIS IS BEING SHOWN, CAN ACTUALLY SEE WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT. YOU KNOW, SOMETHING SIMPLE, NOTHING COMPLEX OR ANYTHING, BUT TO ACTUALLY SHOW THAT DURING THE BRIEFING. BECAUSE NOT EVERYBODY IN HERE GETS THAT, AND CAN SEE WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT. SO IF WE CAN GET THAT, THAT'S GREAT. OKAY.

GORZELL: SURE. I'LL RELAY THAT TO KEVIN.

PERRY: OKAY. GREAT. THANK YOU. ANY COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS? YES, SIR?

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: I AGREE WITH THAT. I THINK EVEN JUST THE SUMMARY THAT WE CAN DOWNLOAD HERE, I THINK EVEN THAT SHOWING IT UP ON THE SCREEN WOULD BE APPROPRIATE. DO WE NEED -- THIS ONE'S ALSO ACCEPTANCE.

PERRY: WELL, DO WE HAVE -- MRS. TREVINO OR MRS. SOTO, DO YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS ON THIS AUDIT? OKAY. GREAT, IF NOT --

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: I MOVE TO ACCEPT.

PERRY: THERE'S A MOVE HERE. CAN I GET A SECOND.

SECOND.

PERRY: ALL RIGHT. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY AYE. (AYES).

PERRY: ALL RIGHT. GREAT. WELL, LET'S -- THANK YOU VERY MUCH, SIR. LET'S MOVE ON TO NUMBER -- LET'S SEE. 18.

SO THIS IS THE AUDIT OF THE FINANCE P-CARD PROGRAM, AND OUR AUDIT OBJECTIVE WAS TO DETERMINE IF THAT PROGRAM WAS BEING MANAGED IN COMPLIANCE WITH POLICIES AND PROCEDURES. AND THE PURPOSE OF THE PROGRAM IS TO PROVIDE A MORE EFFICIENT AND COST EFFECTIVE WAY OF PURCHASING NONBIDDABLE AND SMALL DOLLAR VALUE ITEMS. DURING OUR AUDIT, THERE WERE 372 CARDHOLDERS, AND THEY WERE SPREAD ACROSS 33

DEPARTMENTS. AND THE CREDIT LIMITS FOR THOSE CARDHOLDERS RANGED FROM ABOUT \$500 FROM THE LOW END TO ABOUT \$10,000 TO THE HIGH END. AND WE HAD A HALF A DOZEN CARDS WHERE THE LIMITS WERE -- RANGED FROM ABOUT \$20,000 UP TO 80,000, JUST TO PUT IT INTO PERSPECTIVE A LITTLE BIT. FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020, WHICH IS OUR SCOPE PERIOD, 22,400 TRANSACTIONS, AND APPROXIMATELY VALUE OF \$5.9 MILLION, WHICH IS ACTUALLY DOWN A LITTLE BIT FROM 2000 -- OR 2019 AND THAT WAS DUE TO THE PANDEMIC. OUR SCOPE WAS FINANCIAL YEAR 2020, AND OUR CONCLUSION WAS THAT THE PROGRAM IS MANAGED IN COMPLIANCE WITH POLICIES AND PROCEDURES. ACTUALLY, IT'S WORKING QUITE WELL. WE DID HAVE A COUPLE OF AREAS, THOUGH, WHERE WE FOUND THAT CONTROLS COULD BE ENHANCED. THE FIRST AREA IS THE GENERIC P-CARD AREA. AND WE HAVE TWO DEPARTMENTS IN THE CITY THAT USE GENERIC CARDS. ONE IS THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND HOUSING SERVICES DEPARTMENT. THEY HAVE SEVEN CARDHOLDERS -- SEVEN USERS, I SHOULD SAY, AND THREE CARDS. AND THEN THE EMERGENCY OPERATION CENTER UNDER THE FIRE DEPARTMENT HAS 52 USERS, AND THEY SHARE 12 CARDS. AND WHAT WE'VE FOUND WITH THE GENERIC CARDS IS THAT THOSE DEPARTMENTS ARE SUPPOSED TO GENERATE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE USE OF THOSE GENERIC CARDS, AND THEN THOSE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES ARE APPROVED BY THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT. WHAT WE FOUND THAT IN THE CASE OF THE EOC, THEY HADN'T UPDATED THEIR POLICY SINCE 2009, AND THEN IN SOME CASES, THOSE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES WEREN'T BEING ADHERED TO. AND THEN WITH THE EOC, WE ALSO FOUND THAT A NUMBER OF USERS WERE NOT GETTING THE REQUIRED ANNUAL TRAINING. ANNUAL TRAINING IS REQUIRED EVERY YEAR FOR CARDHOLDERS AND OTHER PEOPLE LIKE THE APPROVERS, FOR EXAMPLE, OF THE PROGRAM. AND WE FOUND THAT SOME OF THOSE TRAININGS HAD NOT BEEN TAKEN FROM THOSE USERS, I BELIEVE 19 OF 52 USERS HADN'T HAD TRAINING, EXTENDING BACK TO 2019, SOME EXTENDED BACK TO 2016. A COUPLE USERS DIDN'T HAVE ANY TRAINING AT ALL, AT LEAST WE COULDN'T FIND ANY DOCUMENTATION OF ANY TRAINING. THE SECOND AREA THAT WE FOUND THAT WE FELT COULD USE SOME IMPROVEMENT WAS THE MONTHLY MONITORING PROCEDURE. SO TYPICALLY FINANCE DEPARTMENT WOULD SEND OUT MONTHLY -- A MONTHLY REPORT TO ALL THE USER DEPARTMENTS SHOWING WHICH TRANSACTIONS HAD BEEN DECLINED, STATEMENTS THAT HAD NOT BEEN APPROVED AND ALSO TRANSACTIONS THAT HAD SALES TAX ASSOCIATED WITH THEM. AND THEN THE EXPECTATION IS THAT DEPARTMENT WOULD RECTIFY THOSE ISSUES AND SEND THE RESPONSES BACK TO THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT. AND WE

FOUND THAT THAT WASN'T BEING DONE ON A CONSISTENT BASIS. WE ALSO NOTED THAT AN ANALYSIS HAD NOT BEEN PERFORMED OF THE USERS CREDIT CARD LIMITS AND THE USERS AVERAGE MONTHLY PURCHASES. SO, FOR EXAMPLE, I MIGHT HAVE A LIMIT OF \$10,000, BUT MY AVERAGE MONTHLY PURCHASES MIGHT ONLY BE \$2,000. SO THERE WOULD BE AN \$8,000 GAP IN BETWEEN MY LIMIT AND WHAT I WAS ACTUALLY DOING, SO WE THOUGHT IT WOULD BE A GOOD IDEA TO TAKE A LOOK AT THAT AND COMPARE THOSE TWO AND MAYBE RATCHET DOWN THOSE LIMITS WHERE IT MAKES SENSE TO RATCHET THEM DOWN, JUST TO ENHANCE THE CONTROLS A LITTLE BIT. AND THEN THE FINAL AREA THAT WE FOUND WAS SOME DEPARTMENTS WERE USING THE P-CARD FOR RECURRING PURCHASES, AND WE FELT THAT THAT MIGHT BE BETTER HANDLED THROUGH A DIFFERENT METHOD, SUCH AS MAYBE ACCOUNTS PAYABLE DEPARTMENT OR PURCHASE ORDER. SO THAT DOES IT FOR MY PRESENTATION. FINANCE DEPARTMENT AGREED WITH OUR RECOMMENDATIONS AND CAME BACK WITH SOME VERY GOOD MANAGEMENT ACTION PLANS AND TROY HERE, I BELIEVE, WILL RESPOND TO ANY QUESTIONS YOU MAY HAVE.

PERRY: WELL, YEAH. P-CARDS, I TOTALLY UNDERSTAND WHY WE HAVE THOSE, BUT, YOU KNOW, IF PEOPLE AREN'T BEING TRAINED, WE DON'T HAVE THE RECORDS. DID Y'ALL GO BACK AND CROSS-CHECK RECEIPTS AND RECORDS AND THAT KIND OF THING TO MAKE SURE THAT THEY WERE AUTHORIZED?

WE DID THAT, YES. WE DID A SAMPLE OF 50, I BELIEVE IT WAS, AND WENT THROUGH THOSE AND WE DIDN'T FIND ANY ISSUES IN THAT AREA.

PERRY: OKAY. WELL, THAT'S GOOD. BUT WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO FROM HERE ON OUT ON THAT, TROY?

ELLIOTT: WELL, THANKS, MARK. WE ARE GOING TO INSTITUTE THE TRAINING WHERE NECESSARY AND FOR THE TWO DEPARTMENTS MARK REFERRED TO FOR NHSD AND THE EOC, WE'RE GOING TO HELP THEM REFRESH THEIR POLICIES, SO THEY HAVE UPDATED POLICIES. WE'RE -- IN CERTAIN CASES WHERE MARK TALKED ABOUT THE DECLINES, WE'RE GOING TO PUT THE NECESSARY REPORTING IN PLACE AND ASK FOR THE RESPONSES. THE ONE AREA THAT WE'RE PROBABLY GOING TO BE MORE PROACTIVE THAN REACTIVE IS ON THE AUTHORIZED CREDIT LIMITS FOR EACH CARD. HISTORICALLY, WE'D WAIT FOR THEM TO COME TO US. WE'RE ACTUALLY GOING TO

LOOK BACK HISTORICALLY AT THOSE, HOW MUCH OF THAT THEY CONSUMED COMPARED TO THOSE CREDIT LIMITS AND THEN HISTORICALLY IF THEY'RE NOT MEETING THOSE CREDIT LIMITS, WE'RE JUST GOING TO GO THROUGH AND NOTIFY THEM THAT WE'RE REDUCING THEIR CREDIT LIMITS. AND ALSO IN THE CASE THAT THEY'RE NOT UTILIZING THOSE CARDS, THEN WE'LL DEACTIVATE THEIR CARDS. SO WE'RE GOING TO PUT THE TRAINING IN PLACE, GOING TO PUT THE POLICIES IN PLACE AND BE MORE PROACTIVE IN OUR MONITORING OF THE CARDS. YEAH, WE -- THERE WAS -- WE DID HAVE -- WE DID HAVE A MINIMAL IMPACT OVER THE LAST TWO YEARS JUST DUE TO COVID, JUST WITH THE FIRST -- THE TEAM BEING DISPERSED AND REMOTE WORKING. WE DID WORK WITH -- WE HAVE A TEAM IN FINANCE. WE DID GO THROUGH AND MAKE SURE THAT AS PEOPLE WERE REMOTING, WE HAD CLOSELY MONITORED THOSE CARDS TO MAKE SURE THERE WAS NO UNAUTHORIZED USE, AND WHERE WE NEEDED TO, WOULD DISCONTINUE THOSE CARDS.

PERRY: OKAY. DO Y'ALL -- IT WOULD BE GREAT TO -- I HAVE NO IDEA WHAT THE SCOPE OF THE ENTIRE CITY STAFF IS, AND THIS IS JUST ONE SMALL PART. DO WE HAVE P-CARDS THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE COMMUNITY HERE?

ELLIOTT: WE DO. WE HAVE A CENTRALIZED UNIT IN FINANCE THAT ACTUALLY ADMINISTERED THE P-CARD PROGRAM, SO WE HAVE COMPLETE OVERSIGHT. THEY LOOK AT YOUR CREDIT LIMITS, CAN INCREASE THOSE OR DECREASE THOSE IF THERE'S TRANSACTIONS THAT ARE DECLINED AND NEED TO BE APPROVED, WE'LL GIVE SPECIAL PERMISSION TO APPROVE THOSE OR OVERRIDE THOSE. WE ALSO HAVE SUPERVISORS OR ADMINISTRATORS IN EACH DEPARTMENT THAT MONITOR THE P-CARD UTILIZATION, AND SO THEY LOOK AT -- THEY REVIEW -- REVIEW THE TRANSACTIONS AND APPROVE THE TRANSACTIONS. SO IN EACH DEPARTMENT, THERE'S MULTIPLE HANDS WATCHING THAT AS WELL.

PERRY: OKAY. DO YOU SEE ANY PROBLEMS LIKE THEY WERE HAVING AT THE EOC AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS HERE IN THE CITY?

ELLIOTT: THERE'S ONLY TWO DEPARTMENTS THAT HAVE A GENERIC CARD JUST BASED ON THE NEED BECAUSE THEY'RE -- TO BE RESPONSIVE IN EMERGENCY, THEY NEED THAT GENERIC UTILIZATION. IT CAN'T BE TIED TO A BEN GORZELL OR TROY ELLIOTT. SO NEED THE RESPONSIBILITY TO BE ABLE TO HAND THOSE CARDS OFF TO

BE RESPONSIVE RATHER THAN TIED TO ONE PERSON. SO IT'S ONLY NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING AND THE EOC THAT HAVE THAT FLEXIBILITY, AND WE MONITOR THOSE. AND WE'LL ACTUALLY TIGHTEN THAT WITH THE TRAINING AND THE POLICIES.

PERRY: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. GREAT. IT WOULD JUST BE INTERESTING TO KNOW HOW MANY TOTAL CARDS, NOT JUST FOR GENERAL, BUT HOW MANY TOTAL CARDS THERE ARE FOR THE CITY AND WHAT THE YEARLY EXPENDITURE IS, BECAUSE THAT DOESN'T COME UP DURING BUDGET DISCUSSIONS, THAT'S ONE OF THOSE THAT ARE ON THE SIDE -- AT LEAST I'VE NEVER SEEN THAT IDENTIFIED.

ELLIOTT: IT WOULDN'T BE IN THE BUDGET DISCUSSIONS BECAUSE IT'S GOING TO BE WITHIN EACH INDIVIDUAL LINE ITEM IN A DEPARTMENT'S BUDGET.

PERRY: I GOT YOU.

ELLIOTT: THERE'S ABOUT 375 CARDS CURRENTLY WITH A SPEND OF ABOUT 5.2 MILLION.

PERRY: ALL RIGHT. I GUESS -- I DON'T KNOW, IS THAT GOOD OR BAD OR, YOU KNOW. I GUESS IT'S GOOD. BUT -- FOR 12,000 PEOPLE IN AN ORGANIZATION TO HAVE THAT MANY, I DON'T HAVE ANYTHING TO REFERENCE THAT TOWARDS.

GORZELL: WELL, CHAIR, AGAIN, I THINK WE'RE TRYING TO GET TO THAT POINT YOU MADE EARLIER AND ELIMINATE SOME OF THE BUREAUCRACY AROUND WHAT WE'RE DOING. SO THESE ARE VERY SMALL DOLLAR PURCHASES.

PERRY: SURE.

GORZELL: WE'RE TALKING ABOUT \$5 MILLION, BUT THAT WAS OUT OF TROY'S EARLIER SLIDE 600 SOME ODD MILLION DOLLARS IN PROCUREMENTS WE DID LAST YEAR. SO, AGAIN, SOME THINGS WE NEED TO IMPROVE, THANK MARK AND THE TEAM FOR IDENTIFYING SOME AREAS WHERE WE CAN MAKE SOME IMPROVEMENTS, BUT THERE ARE A LOT OF CONTROLS IN PLACE. THERE'S SOME ADDITIONAL THINGS WE CAN DO TO ENHANCE THAT TO MAKE SURE WE DON'T HAVE ANY ISSUES WITH WHAT THOSE CARDS ARE BEING USED FOR GOING FORWARD, SO I FEEL PRETTY COMFORTABLE WITH THE PROCESS AND THE

PROGRAM.

PERRY: GOOD. YEAH, LET'S CREATE MORE BUREAUCRACY FOR SOMETHING THAT WAS MEANT TO CLEAR A LOT OF THE BUREAUCRACY. BUT I --

GORZELL: IT WON'T -- WE WON'T -- IT WILL BE JUST FOR CLARIFICATION MORE CONTROLS FROM A FINANCIAL SIDE, JUST TO MAKE SURE.

PERRY: I GOT YOU.

GORZELL: AND WE'LL USE THE SYSTEM WHERE WE CAN. SO MARK'S POINT ABOUT, YOU KNOW, MONITORING SOMEBODY'S MONTHLY EXPENDITURE VERSUS THEIR CAPACITY, THAT'S AN EASY THING THAT WE CAN DO WITHIN THE SYSTEM.

PERRY: GOT YOU.

GORZELL: SO WE'LL DO THAT. AND THEN I THINK, JUST COUNCILMAN, ON -- OR CHAIRMAN, ON THIS -- ON THESE AUDIT ITEMS, WE'LL WORK WITH MARK AND KEVIN AND WE'LL FIGURE OUT A WAY TO SUMMARIZE THE AUDIT REPORTS TO YOUR POINT, NOW THAT WE'RE TELEVISIONING THESE, SO THAT PEOPLE CAN FOLLOW ALONG, BUT WE'LL DROP IN THE MANAGEMENT RESPONSE AS WELL.

PERRY: YEAH.

GORZELL: THE KEY PIECE IS SO THAT YOU ALL CAN SEE CONTEXT, WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT AND GET A LITTLE BIT MORE OF A FLAVOR OF WHAT WE'RE DOING.

PERRY: THAT WOULD BE PERFECT. GREAT. APPRECIATE IT. ALL RIGHT. I THINK THAT WAS IT FOR 18, BUT WE NEED A MOTION AND A SECOND TO ACCEPT THAT.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: SO MOVED.

PERRY: ALL RIGHT. GOT A MOVEMENT.

SECOND.

PERRY: AND A SECOND. IS THAT RIGHT? GOT A MOVEMENT OR A MOTION.

CLERK: A MOTION.

PERRY: OKAY. IT'S ALL THE SAME TO ME. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY AYE. (AYES).

PERRY: GREAT. WELL, LET'S MOVE ON TO THE NEXT ITEM. ITEM NUMBER 19 AND 20.
I GUESS THAT WOULD BE ME.

PERRY: IS THIS GOING TO BE TOGETHER OR SEPARATE? WE CAN DO THEM
TOGETHER, I GUESS. IT'S ME, SO...

PERRY: OKAY. ALL RIGHT.

THE NEXT ITEM IS JUST TO SHOW YOU THE SCHEDULE GOING FORWARD.

PERRY: SURE.

AND WHAT THIS IS IS OUR FISCAL YEAR 2022 SCHEDULE WITH OUR FISCAL YEAR
2021 CARRYOVER AUDIT, SO WE HAVE ABOUT 50 FISCAL YEAR 2022 AUDITS AND
ABOUT 20 CARRYOVER AUDITS FROM 2021, TOTAL ABOUT 70 AUDITS. ABOUT,
AGAIN, THIS DOESN'T SHOW THE ACTUAL TIMES, JUST THE SCHEDULED TIME FOR
THOSE AUDITS. THAT'S ALL WE WANTED TO SHOW ON THIS.

PERRY: GREAT. AND HAVE WE SENT THIS OUT TO ALL THE COUNCIL FOLKS FOR THEM
TO TAKE A LOOK AT THE SCHEDULE? AND IF THERE'S SOMETHING ELSE THAT THEY
SEE THAT THEY WOULD LIKE TO ADD IN TO THE AUDIT SCHEDULE?

LAST SUMMER WE DID SO DURING OUR -- THE PROCESS THAT WE GO THROUGH TO
GENERATE THE POPULATION OF POTENTIAL AUDITS, BUT THEN WE NARROWED
THAT DOWN TO ABOUT 50 AUDITS, AND THEN THAT WAS PRESENTED TO THE AUDIT
COMMITTEE. AND THEN TO THE FULL COUNCIL --

PERRY: OKAY.

-- AND AGREED UPON. SO ANY CHANGES TO THIS AUDIT SCHEDULE, WE WOULD

BRING TO YOU FOR YOUR APPROVAL, AND THEN GO FROM THERE.

PERRY: I GOT YOU. I'D LIKE TO SEND THIS OUT TO THE OTHER COUNCIL FOLKS TO LET THEM KNOW WHAT IS ON THE SCHEDULE, WHAT Y'ALL ARE WORKING ON AND WHEN -- WHEN YOU'LL BE WORKING ON THOSE AUDITS, SO IF YOU COULD JUST TAKE THIS CHART, FLOWCHART, AND SEND THAT OUT TO EVERYBODY, THAT WOULD BE GREAT. AND SPEAKING OF WHICH, WHAT'S YOUR FLOAT ON THIS? IN OTHER WORDS, CAN YOU -- DO YOU THINK -- HOW MANY COULD YOU TAKE ON EXTRA, EVEN WITH THE CARRYOVER? OR IS THAT SOMETHING THAT WOULD HAVE TO DROP SOMETHING --

OUR PLACE IS PRETTY FULL RIGHT NOW. WE'VE GOT 70 AUDITS TOTAL RIGHT NOW AT THIS POINT THAT NEED TO BE COMPLETED, AND TYPICALLY, WE WILL ALWAYS, FROM YEAR TO YEAR, HAVE X NUMBER OF CARRY-FORWARD AUDITS, BECAUSE YOU CAN'T START ON OCTOBER 1, YOU KNOW, 50 AUDITS AND THEN --

PERRY: RIGHT.

AND END AT SEPTEMBER 30TH, THE FOLLOWING YEAR. SO WE'LL ALWAYS HAVE THAT CARRYOVER. THE PANDEMIC DID RESULT IN US LENDING SOME OF OUR FOLKS OUT TO OTHER DEPARTMENTS, AND SO WE DID GET A LITTLE BIT BEHIND IN THIS PAST FISCAL YEAR. HOPEFULLY WE WILL MAKE THAT UP. AND, OF COURSE, WE HAVE A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF TURNOVER EVERY YEAR THAT TENDS TO MAKE THINGS A LITTLE BIT MORE DIFFICULT.

PERRY: YEP.

BUT IF THERE'S A NEED, IF WE CAN ACCOMMODATE MORE AUDITS, WE'LL TRY TO DO SO.

PERRY: YOU MAY WANT TO PUT SOME OF THOSE WORDS, WHEN YOU SEND THIS OUT TO THE COUNCIL FOLKS. THIS ISN'T A SOLICITATION FOR ADDITIONAL, BUT THIS IS ABOUT HOW MANY WE COMPLETE A YEAR, WE'RE WORKING ON CARRYOVER AND THIS IS OUR CURRENT SCHEDULE, JUST TO LET THEM BE AWARE OF WHAT WE'RE WORKING ON. AND I'M CERTAINLY NOT -- DON'T EVEN ASK THE QUESTION, DO YOU HAVE SOMETHING ELSE YOU WANT TO ADD IN THERE, IF YOU DON'T THINK

THAT WE CAN GET TO IT THIS YEAR, BUT I GUESS WE COULD IF WE DROPPED SOMETHING OUT LATER ON AND SUBSTITUTE SOMETHING ELSE IN THERE.

SURE.

PERRY: YEAH. JUST SOMETHING OUT TO NOTIFY THEM WHAT WE'RE DOING.

OKAY. NOTED.

PERRY: OKAY. GREAT. I THINK THAT WAS JUST A BRIEFING FOR THAT.

YES.

AND THEN THE FINAL ITEM ON THE AGENDA --

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: MAY I ASK A QUESTION REAL QUICK JUST ON THE --

OH, SORRY.

PERRY: I'M SORRY.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: THANK YOU. I'M JUST WONDERING HOW MUCH -- IS THERE WIGGLE ROOM TO MAYBE ADJUST THE TIMELINE FOR SOME OF THE -- SOME OF THE AUDITS?

YES. SOMETIMES -- I MEAN, THESE AUDITS, THE HOUR BUDGET IS A GUESSTIMATE, YOU KNOW, AT BEST. AND SOMETIMES WE'LL SAY, JUST BASED ON OUR EXPERIENCE AND SOME OF US HAVE BEEN AROUND A LOT LONGER THAN OTHERS, SOMETIMES WE'LL SAY, THIS SEEMS LIKE A 400-HOUR PROJECT, JUST FROM -- BASED ON WHAT WE KNOW. SOMETIMES WE'LL SAY, OH, IT'S A 600-HOUR OR 200-HOUR AUDIT. AND SOMETIMES IF WE SAY 400 HOURS, MAYBE IT'S NOT 400 HOURS. MAYBE IT COMES IN AT 250 HOURS, SO THEN WE HAVE THAT LITTLE BIT OF CUSHION. UNFORTUNATELY, THEN WE HAVE THOSE AUDITS THAT WE SAY ARE 500 HOURS AND THEY TURN OUT TO BE 1,000 HOURS. SO WE HAVE A LOT OF AUDITS, AND WE DON'T KNOW WHAT WE DON'T KNOW WHEN WE GO INTO THESE AUDITS A LOT OF TIMES. SO WE DO WHAT WE CAN. WE TRY TO KEEP THE SCOPE IN FOCUS AND NOT

TRY TO GO OUTSIDE OF THAT SCOPE, BECAUSE YOU CAN GET SCOPE CREEP A LOT, PARTICULARLY IF YOU FIND THINGS ALONG THE WAY AND GO, OOH, MAYBE WE OUGHT TO LOOK INTO THAT, BUT YET WE DON'T HAVE THE BUDGET TO LOOK INTO THAT, SO WHAT DO WE DO? SO IT'S A BALANCING GAME.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: UH-HUH.

SO TO YOUR POINT, WE TRY TO MAKE UP TIME WHEN WE CAN. OCCASIONALLY WE WILL CANCEL AN AUDIT BECAUSE IT DOESN'T MAKE SENSE TO DO THAT AUDIT FOR WHATEVER REASON, AND THAT ALLEVIATES THE HOURS ASSOCIATED WITH THAT AUDIT, BUT WE DO WHAT WE CAN.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: OKAY. I GUESS I'M MORE SPEAKING SO TO LIKE SAY THERE'S ONE THAT'S SUPPOSED TO START IN -- START THE PLANNING PROCESS IN DECEMBER, WOULD IT BE POSSIBLE TO MOVE ONE THAT WAS, SAY, MARCH OR APRIL OF NEXT YEAR, COULD THEY BE SWAPPED, OR IS THAT --

SURE. ABSOLUTELY. WE CAN DO THAT. AS IT MAKES SENSE TO DO. AND SOMETIMES THAT DOES HAPPEN. SOMETIMES WE DO HAVE TO SWAP AUDITS FOR WHATEVER REASON, AND SOMETIMES THE PEOPLE AREN'T AVAILABLE, THEY'RE ON LEAVE, WHATEVER, AND SO WE CAN'T PROGRESS WITH THAT PARTICULAR AUDIT, SO WE'LL SWAP IT FOR ANOTHER AUDIT.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: WONDERFUL. I WOULD LIKE TO MAYBE HAVE A CONVERSATION, IT MIGHT HAVE TO BE OFFLINE, BUT I'D LOVE TO SEE THE SA READY TO WORK AUDIT HAPPEN QUITE A BIT SOONER IF POSSIBLE.

WHICH ONE WAS THAT, I'M SORRY?

THE SA READY TO WORK PROGRAM. I KNOW THAT ONE WAS A PRETTY -- THAT ONE HAS 900 HOURS, SO I KNOW IT'S A PRETTY HEFTY ONE.

PERRY: AND THAT'S ONE OF THEM THAT I'M REALLY INTERESTED IN ALSO, AND I WOULD -- I WOULD ASK, LET'S LET THEM TAKE A LOOK AT IT TO SEE IF WE ACTUALLY HAVE ENOUGH DATA AT THIS POINT TO LOOK AT AND EVALUATE. I DON'T WANT TO GET TOO AHEAD IN THE PROCESS --

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: FOR SURE.

PERRY: -- THAT THEY GET STARTED ON SOMETHING AND, WELL, THERE'S NOT ENOUGH DATA FOR THAT.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: UH-HUH.

PERRY: SO IF YOU WOULDN'T MIND LETTING THEM TAKE A LOOK AT THAT AND --

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: ABSOLUTELY.

PERRY: -- AND LETTING THEM GET BACK WITH YOU.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: ABSOLUTELY. JUST WANTED TO EXPRESS MY INTEREST.

PERRY: NO, I'M -- TRUST ME, I'M INTERESTED IN THIS ONE ALSO. YEAH. GREAT. AND I APOLOGIZE, AGAIN, FOR SKIPPING OVER Y'ALL. DO Y'ALL HAVE ANY OTHER COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS? ALL RIGHT. THIS WAS A BRIEFING, AND, AGAIN, IF WE CAN GET THIS OUT TO THE REST OF THE COUNCIL, THAT WOULD BE GREAT.

YOU BET.

PERRY: WITH SOME PROVISOS IN THAT.

OKAY.

PERRY: OKAY. THAT'S ALL OF THE AGENDA ITEMS THAT I HAD LISTED ON HERE.

WE DO HAVE ONE LAST ITEM.

PERRY: WHICH ONE?

20.

IS THAT 20 OR 19.

AND THIS IS SOMETHING THAT YOU HAD REQUESTED BACK IN AUGUST, I BELIEVE. AND WHAT THIS IS IS A MOCKUP OF OUR AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THOSE RECOMMENDATIONS. I BELIEVE YOU ASKED KEVIN FOR THAT IN AUGUST.

PERRY: YES. YES.

AND SO THIS IS WHAT WE WOULD PROPOSE IN TERMS OF HOW TO REPORT THAT TO THE AUDIT COMMITTEE. SO I DON'T KNOW IF THIS IS IN YOUR PACKET. I ASSUME IT IS. CAN YOU SEE THIS IN YOUR PACKET.

PERRY: YEAH. I'VE LOOKED AT IT, BUT UNFORTUNATELY, MY COMPUTER DIED, SO I DON'T HAVE ANYTHING --

I DON'T KNOW, IF THE MAN BEHIND THE CURTAIN -- CAN YOU.

PERRY: OH, HERE'S A HARD COPY. THANK YOU, SIR. NO, I THINK THIS IS GREAT. IT'S GOT A LOT OF INFORMATION ON IT. TO ME, IT'S -- IF WE COULD TAKE A LOOK, DO WE REALLY NEED TO SHOW ALL OF THESE COLUMNS? IT'S STILL -- IT'S A LITTLE BUSY. AND THE INTENT, AGAIN, IS TO ACTUALLY PUT THIS UP ON THE FOR THE VIEWING PUBLIC SO THEY CAN TAKE A LOOK AT IT. A LOT OF GOOD DETAILED INFORMATION, BUT, CAN WE SIMPLIFY IT JUST A LITTLE BIT?

SURE. WE'LL GO AHEAD AND TAKE A CRACK AT THAT. WHAT I WANTED TO POINT OUT HERE WAS THAT THE CELLS THAT ARE NOT COLORED, THAT'S ACTUAL INFORMATION, THAT'S ACTUAL DATA FOR AUDITS THAT HAVE BEEN COMPLETED AFTER APRIL 1ST OF THIS YEAR.

PERRY: OKAY.

THE TWO -- THE LAST TWO COLUMNS ON THE RIGHT, THE COLOR-CODED CELLS, THOSE -- THAT'S NOT ACCURATE INFORMATION. THAT'S JUST DEPICTING HOW IT COULD BE.

PERRY: RIGHT.

AND SO THE SECOND TO THE LAST COLUMN IS MANAGEMENT'S ASSESSMENT AND MANAGEMENT MIGHT SAY, HEY, YEAH, WE COMPLETED THAT. AND THEN WE GO TO THE VERIFICATION AND WE SAY, YES, YOU DID, AND IT WILL BE COLOR-CODED APPROPRIATELY. OTHERWISE, IF WE SAY, NO, WE DON'T THINK YOU DID, AND SO WE'LL COLOR-CODE THAT APPROPRIATELY. SO THE BLUE AND THE GREEN ON THIS SCHEDULE SHOWS -- THE BLUE AND GREEN IS GOOD. IF YOU SEE BLUE AND GREEN, YOU DON'T EVEN HAVE TO LOOK AT IT ANYMORE. IF YOU SEE YELLOW AND RED, THAT MEANS IT'S NOT SO GOOD. YOU MIGHT WANT TO TAKE A CLOSER LOOK AT IT.

PERRY: OKAY. I LOVE IT. I LOVE THE COLORS ON THIS, BECAUSE IT DOES HIGHLIGHT, YOU KNOW, WHERE WE -- AND THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT THIS WAS SUPPOSED TO DO WAS HIGHLIGHT WHERE WE STILL HAVE SOME FOLLOW-UP TO DO. WHAT'S NOT BEEN COMPLETED WHEN THEY WERE SUPPOSED TO BE COMPLETED, THAT KIND OF THING. SO TO ME, THIS IS PERFECT.

AND WE'LL SEE WHAT WE CAN DO TO TAKE OUT SOME OF THESE COLUMNS, MAKE IT A LITTLE MORE PRESENTABLE.

PERRY: OKAY. GREAT. AND THAT'S -- THIS IS EXACTLY WHERE MY VISION WAS ON THIS IS TRYING TO GET INFORMATION TO SHOW WHERE WE'RE AT IN THE TOTAL PROGRAM OF THE AUDIT.

AND ALSO ONE THING I WANTED TO POINT OUT, WE ANTICIPATE DOING THIS QUARTERLY.

PERRY: YEAH.

PRESENTING THIS QUARTERLY.

PERRY: THAT WILL BE GREAT. ISN'T THAT WHAT WE TALKED ABOUT, BEN, QUARTERLY, SOMETHING LIKE THAT? YEAH.

AS THESE AUDITS ARE COMPLETE, WE WOULD SHOW THEM FOR ONE ITERATION, AND THEN TAKE THEM OFF THE LIST, SO -- AND ADD OTHERS SO THAT THIS WILL BE MANAGER.

PERRY: RIGHT.

INSTEAD OF BEING, YOU KNOW, 15 PAGES LONG.

PERRY: PERFECT.

AND SO THAT WAS OUR THOUGHT ON THE SUBJECT THERE.

PERRY: YEP. JUST A SNAPSHOT IN TIME, WHERE WE'RE AT IN THE PROGRAM.

YES. EXACTLY.

PERRY: YEAH. PERFECT. I LIKE THE COLORS BECAUSE IT ADDS SOME EXCITEMENT
HERE TO THIS ROOM.

THERE YOU GO. [LAUGHTER]

PERRY: OKAY. GREAT. ALL RIGHT. AWESOME. YES, SIR? RODRIGUEZ I JUST WANT TO
MAKE A RECOMMENDATION FOR MAYBE THE ORDER OF THE COLUMNS, EVEN IF
THEY DON'T -- I DON'T KNOW IF THEY NECESSARILY NEED TO BE REMOVED EXCEPT
FOR MAYBE REFERENCE NUMBER, WHAT IS THAT FOR? WHAT IS IT SUPPOSED TO --

THE PROJECT NUMBER THERE, THE FIRST COLUMN.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: SO THERE'S PROJECT NUMBER AND THEN REFERENCE NUMBER
NEXT TO THE SHORT RECOMMENDATION. WHAT DOES THE REFERENCE NUMBER
MEAN?

THAT, I BELIEVE, IS THE -- THE AUDIT RECOMMENDATION, THE FINDING. I BELIEVE
IT'S FINDING A AND B, FOR EXAMPLE, ON THAT FIRST ONE, YOU'LL HAVE A FINDING
A AND B ON AUDIT 20-0-22. AND THEN ON THE NEXT ONE, YOU HAVE THREE
RECOMMENDATIONS, IT WAS RECOMMENDATION B, C AND D IN THE AUDIT
REPORT.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: WHY DO THEY START -- WHY WOULD WE START WITH

RECOMMENDATION B INSTEAD OF RECOMMENDATION A FOR A DIFFERENT PROJECT.

I DON'T RECALL EXACTLY WITH THAT PARTICULAR AUDIT, BUT IT COULD BE THE RECOMMENDATION -- THERE MAY NOT HAVE BEEN A RECOMMENDATION TO SECTION A IN THE AUDIT REPORT.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: OKAY.

IT MAY HAVE BEEN MORE OF AN INFORMATIONAL PARAGRAPH IN THE AUDIT REPORT WHERE THERE WAS NO RECOMMENDATION. OCCASIONALLY WE DO THAT. AND PARTICULARLY, IF IT WAS A FOLLOW-UP AUDIT. SOMETIMES IF THEY IMPLEMENT THE ACTION, THEN THERE WOULDN'T BE A CORRESPONDING RECOMMENDATION.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: SO I DON'T KNOW IF -- I CAN SEE WHY IT'S USEFUL. SO WHAT I WAS ORIGINALLY GOING TO RECOMMEND WAS MAYBE START WITH PROJECT NUMBER AND THEN REFERENCE NUMBER -- I ASSUME THAT STANDS FOR REFERENCE. AND THEN DEPARTMENT, PROJECT NAME, REPORT DATE, TARGET DATE AND THEN THE MANAGEMENT AND AUDIT VERIFICATION, THOSE COLUMNS. BUT JUST MOVING THE COLUMNS AROUND, I THINK WOULD MAKE IT A LITTLE BIT MORE READABLE. THE PROBLEM NOW THAT EXISTS IS THE REFERENCE NUMBERS WOULDN'T MAKE SENSE FAR AWAY. SO THAT'S A THOUGHT. BUT... OKAY. JUST THROWING THAT OUT.

WE'LL CONSIDER THAT. THANK YOU.

PERRY: THIS IS JUST THE FIRST DRAFT. SO IF WE NEED TO MAKE ADJUSTMENTS, THAT WOULD BE GREAT.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: ALSO IF I'M --

PERRY: I LOOK AT IT, IF I'M OUT IN THE PUBLIC LOOKING AT THIS, WOULD I UNDERSTAND IT, WHAT THOSE COLUMNS MEAN. AND I WANT TO MAKE IT AS SIMPLE AS POSSIBLE.

MCKEE-RODRIGUEZ: ABSOLUTELY. AND SOMEONE THAT DOES THAT REALLY GREAT IN PRESENTING A WHOLE BUNCH OF INFORMATION IN TABLES IS THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT, SO EVEN IF YOU COULD REVIEW A FEW OF THEIR DOCUMENTS AND SAY, MAYBE, FORMATTING CAN BE SIMILAR, I THINK THEY DO A REALLY GREAT JOB. BUT THANK YOU.

PERRY: GREAT.

THANKS FOR THE COMMENTS.

PERRY: ANY OTHER COMMENTS? ALL RIGHT. THAT WAS A BRIEFING ITEM ALSO, SO I THINK THAT NOW BRINGS US TO THE END OF THIS MEETING. WE'RE RESCHEDULING -- JUST A COUPLE OF NOTES. THE NOVEMBER 24TH MEETING IS MOVING TO NOVEMBER 15TH AT 2:00. IS THAT HERE AGAIN IN THIS ROOM? OKAY. HERE IN THIS ROOM. AND JUST A NOTE ON THAT, AND I'LL ASK MY FELLOW COMMITTEE MEMBERS IF Y'ALL HAVE ANYTHING ELSE THAT Y'ALL WOULD LIKE TO SEE OR ADD TO OR ANYTHING FOR THIS -- ANY FUTURE MEETINGS HERE? NOTHING AT THIS POINT? ALL RIGHT. GREAT. WELL, WITH THAT, I WILL ENTERTAIN A MOTION AND A SECOND TO ADJOURN.

MOTION.

SECOND.

PERRY: ALL RIGHT. WE'VE GOT A MOTION AND A SECOND. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY AYE. (AYES.)

PERRY: ALL RIGHT. GREAT. WE WILL MOVE TO THE NEXT MEETING ON NOVEMBER 15TH AT 2:00. THANK Y'ALL VERY MUCH. APPRECIATE Y'ALL COMING IN TODAY.

Audit and Accountability

Mon, Nov 1 2:00 PM

Audit and Accountability - Agenda Comments

No comments to report for this meeting's agenda