

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

November 27th, 2018

Chairman Larry Sorapuru

Vice-Chairman Tom Malik

Members: Larry Sorapuru, Jr., Kurt Becnel, Julia Remondet, Lennix Madere, Marvin Perrilloux, Larry Snyder, Michael Wright, Thomas Malik, Jaclyn Hotard

PRESENT: Kurt Becnel, Larry Snyder, Thomas Malik, Larry Sorapuru, Julia Remondet, Lennix Madere, Jaclyn Hotard, Marvin Perrilloux, Michael Wright

ABSENT: None

PUBLIC COMMENT - AGENDA ITEMS ONLY (2 minutes per citizen)

Shondrell Perrilloux commented that she would like things answered that were said at the last meeting. She asked that you all would hold them accountable and provide this council with materials facts proving that they requested financials from the contractors and the second thing for them to prove to the council, to identify to the council, which is no more than fair, to identify those contractors for the record who they researched and found that they provided falsified information and that they would give you all that proof. Thank you for your time.

Walter Wales, All the Time Janitorial, commented, he is currently working on the project and has the history to do this job. He has been doing this for 20 years and on his own for the last 8 years. I am just saying that I am not coming in low so that I can come back to the parish and ask for money. I know I can do the job for the amount.

BID OPENING REPORT/AWARDS

Jean Stewart - Bid Opening - Shell Potable Water Line Project

LaVerne Toombs stated, "Today we opened bids for the Shell Potable Water Line Project. There were five bids in total. Cycle Construction Company, LLC from Kenner, LA in the amount of \$627,750.00, Subterranean Construction, LLC from Mandeville, LA in the amount of \$282,217.00, LA Contracting Enterprise, LLC from Thibodaux, LA in the amount of \$239,670.00, NCMC, LLC from Baton Rouge, LA in the amount of \$338,991.60 and Wallace C. Drennan, Inc. from New Orleans, LA in the amount of \$276,655.00. The administration requests that we take these under advisement."

MOTION: Councilman Snyder moved and Councilman Perrilloux seconded the motion to take the five bids for the Shell Potable Water Line Project under advisement. The motion passed unanimously.

Jean Stewart - Bid Opening - 2019 Annual Fuel Requirements

LaVerne Toombs stated, "Today we opened bids for the 2019 Annual Fuel Requirements. There were five bids in total:

<u>VENDOR</u>	<u>REG. UNLEAD</u>	<u>LOW SULFUR DIES</u>	<u>HIGH SULFUR DIES</u>
Siarc, Inc.	.095	.0965	.0965

Lavigne Oil Co.	.0949	.0949	.0949
Roland J. Robert	.1149	.1149	.1149
Waguespack Oil Co	.0975	.1195	.1195
Gaubert Oil	.145	.194	.194

The administration requests that we take these under advisement."

MOTION: Councilman Snyder moved and Councilwoman Remondet seconded the motion to take the five bids for the 2019 Annual Fuel Requirements under advisement. The motion passed unanimously.

Jean Stewart - Bid Opening - 2019 Firefighters Bunker Gear

LaVerne Toombs stated, "Today we opened bids for the 2019 Firefighters Bunker Gear. There was one bidder. The one bidder was from BGS Bunker Gear Specialist in the amount of \$3,310.00. The administration request that we take this bid under advisement."

MOTION: Councilwoman Hotard moved and Councilman Perrilloux seconded the motion to take the one bid from BGS Bunker Gear Specialist for the 2019 Firefighters Bunker Gear under advisement. The motion passed unanimously.

Jean Stewart - Bid Opening - 2019 Granular Chlorine Requirements

LaVerne Toombs stated, "There were no bids received. The administration requests authorization to re-bid the 2019 Granular Chlorine Requirements."

MOTION: Councilman Becnel moved and Councilwoman Hotard seconded the motion to grant administration authorization to re-bid the 2019 Granular Chlorine Requirements. The motion passed unanimously.

Jean Stewart - Bid Opening - 2019 Liquid Chlorine & Sulfur Dioxide Requirements

LaVerne Toombs stated, "Today we opened bids for the 2019 Liquid Chlorine & Sulfur Dioxide Requirements. There was one bid from DPC Enterprise in the amount of \$117.00 for a Chlorine 150 lb. cylinder, \$709.00 for a Chlorine 2,000 lb. cylinder and \$10,234.00 for a Sulfur Dioxide 2,000 lb. The administration request that we take this one bid under advisement."

MOTION: Councilwoman Remondet moved and Councilman Madere seconded the motion to take the one bid for the 2019 Liquid Chlorine & Sulfur Dioxide Project from DPC Enterprise under advisement. The motion passed unanimously.

Jean Stewart - Bid Opening - 2019 Annual Culvert Requirement

LaVerne Toombs stated, "Today we opened bids for the 2019 Annual Culvert Requirement. There were four bids in total:

VENDOR	SEC 1	SEC 2	SEC 3	SEC 4	SEC 5
Coastal Culvert	\$477.00	3,318.90	8,704.23	1,745.00	98.21
Kedco, LLC	\$401.26	3,322.82	2,064.11	1,815.00	82.22
Coburns Supply	\$435.75	3,347.22	2,122.86	1,910.15	80.95
Quality Sitework	\$527.00	3,801.18	2,434.98	2,022.00	100.12

The administration requests that we take these under advisement."

MOTION: Councilman Perrilloux moved and Councilwoman Remonet seconded the motion to take the four bids for the 2019 Annual Culvert Requirement under advisement. The motion passed unanimously.

Jean Stewart - (Tabled 11-13-18) Authorization to award the Janitorial Services contract to All the Time Janitorial Service, LLC

MOTION: Councilman Madere moved and Councilman Becnel seconded the motion to take the Authorization to award the Janitorial Services Contract to All the Time Janitorial Service, LLC from the TABLE. The motion passed unanimously.

Robert Figuero stated, "All the Time Janitorial Service, LLC is the company recommended to clean the new Government Complex Building at a cost of \$10,151 per month. This amount is significantly lower than the other proposals and is based on experience cleaning the building utilizing local employees. The company stands behind their proposal which is based on experience with similarly sized buildings. The company's employment history and references are good and include a reference from the Contractor who built the building. The company was selected based on the criteria set forth in the RFP which did not include a local preference. Therefore, companies should not be penalized for not being local. A spreadsheet is attached detailing and comparing all proposals. The janitorial proposal includes (2) full time staff during the day, night time cleaning, monthly, and quarterly services. The standard contract document was reviewed by Legal Counsel and is being finalized with their recommendations. Administration recommends approval pending their final review."

MOTION: Councilman Snyder moved and Councilman Malik seconded the motion to have discussion on the authorization to award the Janitorial Services contract to All the Time Janitorial Service, LLC. The motion passed unanimously.

Councilman Snyder stated, "At our last meeting I had some dialogue about my feelings on this contract and the one thing that a few months ago, a few meetings ago, that I made a motion to award this contract for the next few months and then from there we were going to look at all of our contracts and I made that clear at our last meeting. Is that in the contract?"

Robert Figuero stated, "It is not."

Councilman Snyder stated, "That was one of the reasons that I made the motion to table it until that could get done. If we have to vote on that part of it that is fine."

Robert Figuero stated, "I am sorry Councilman I am not quite understanding."

Councilman Snyder stated, "If you remember a few months ago when this contract was being talked about and I made a motion that when we award the contract to only award it until all the contracts expire for our janitorial service and we voted on that that way. Am I right Ms. Hotard?"

Councilwoman Hotard in audible

Councilman Snyder stated, "Well you were the one who asked me the question and I told you yes that is what I meant and that is exactly what I meant. You asked me that you said do you mean when this comes up again and all the contracts come up again, is that what you meant and I said yes."

Councilwoman Hotard asked, "You mean at the time that we did that?"

Councilman Snyder stated, "So at the last meeting I brought the same thing up again but that hasn't been considered. In other words, you just brought it back to us the way it was. Am I right?"

LaVerne Toombs stated, "Councilman if I may I did listen to the tape today in regards to that particular meeting and it is my understanding from what I heard is that Mrs. Stewart presented to the council the site that was originally we were going to have this contract for 60 days and then it was recommended by the DA's office that we should have this contract for one year which was with JaniKing. In that recording, there was no conversation that I saw and I had also the PP executive assistant there with me to verify there was no conversation at that particular council meeting where you requested what you are stating basically there was a question that I think that Councilman Sorapuru thought that Councilwoman Hotard had asked a question but actually it was Councilman Malik who asked the question but again in that particular council meeting it was stated the fact that the contract be extended for one year under the advisement of the DA's office and so the council did approve that."

Councilman Snyder asked, "What meeting are you talking about?"

LaVerne Toombs stated, "This was I believe in the May meeting and I think I have the actual notes."

Natalie Robottom stated, "Without getting too deep into the weeds we are kind of on two different subjects. What we were asking was to extend the JaniKing Contract because there was a delay in us moving in the building from when we initially thought we would move in and we wanted to extend it by 6 months and the recommendation was to go ahead and extend it a year but that was for existing and again I didn't review the tape but I am going from memory there were concerns that well all of them are going to come due in March and we would be putting them all out at that time which we do need to however the pricing you would get for a building that requires 2 staff members for a 6 month period or a short period of time might be more expensive than if it was for a longer period of time like companies may not go out and get 2 people to work your building for 6 months and in the discussion and again I didn't hear what Mrs. LaVerne heard, I think at the time we thought let's do this building separately and then we have to go out, all of them are going to expire and at that point I think we are going to consider grouping them differently based on our history but because this one was by itself it didn't really fit with what was previously in place and wasn't included in that initial RFP but part of that discussion was how do we continue our services now through this building and yet this is a new building that we are adding and I think we actually amended the contract to maybe add the Senior Citizen building to the existing contract and then we did this one separately. Again I did not review the tape but that is my understanding of what took place when you are doing a building again of this size the pricing you are going to get for a short term contract might be significantly higher than if you had a longer contract because there is some sense of guarantee that I am hiring these people and investing in this equipment and I am going to have this job for longer than 6 months."

Councilman Snyder stated, "That is exactly what happened. There is one thing about telling the truth you don't have to have a good memory and that is exactly what happened at that meeting and those were our thoughts at the time

well they were my thoughts for sure. I told the truth. So, what you said is exactly what I meant. Now this contract that we are talking about here is for 6 years, 4 years up front and 2 years optional so that is 6 years if we go with this tonight okay and then I think since we have had this discussion some of us have come to realize that maybe it might be best to hold off and when we do our contracts again let's break them down to smaller groups and then we can get more people working or more little businesses working and we can still get the quality cleaning and I think at our last meeting that was my suggestion and that is why I asked to table it so that we could look at that part of it but I see you brought it back to us just the way we left it and nothing was changed. Now I know we can get it done because we have people cleaning the building right now and we can do this under a PO like is being done right now. Now if these people want to continue to do that let them continue I don't have a problem with that but I think we should wait until all of these contracts expire because we have what 23 buildings that is going to be 25 buildings that we have going out for bids so my suggestion is that we continue to clean this building the way we are cleaning it and we don't get the right price then we get someone to clean it right now until the contract expires. It is a new building right now it should be easy to clean."

MOTION: Councilman Perrilloux moved and Councilman Wright seconded the motion to recess to go into the Regular Council Meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Councilman Madere moved and Councilman Perrilloux seconded the motion to go back into the Finance Meeting. The motion passed with Councilman Snyder absent.

Councilman Perrilloux stated, "I don't know what Mr. Snyder is going to come back and say but I am agreeing with something that we did and the decision at the last meeting that we will not with the 4 year and the 2 year that we would break that down into every year or every 2 years now if that is what his motion is coming back I don't know but and we are looking to have all of these contracts come up at one time instead of all these different times of the year that is what we talked about. Now I was not at the last meeting I am just getting bits and pieces of what is going on and the comments before the meeting and some of them I didn't agree with but anyways I will yield to him when he gets back and see what his plans are and I will go from there."

Natalie Robottom stated, "Just for those who weren't here, we did discuss that all the contracts expire in March and we do think it is a better idea to break them up now I don't recall the discussion being let's do something temporarily because you all did authorize us to go out for RFP's for this building but if you all are asking now to do it under PO and do all of them, well that is the question is that what you are asking even though it was granted, we went out and everybody's prices are out there based on an authorization are we requesting now that in the interim just clean the building with a PO and then put all of them out at the same time which would probably be shortly because the contracts expire in March so we will be doing this again. Is that what you are asking?"

Councilman Snyder stated, "That is what I am asking."

Natalie Robottom stated, "Okay and that is fine with us too but keep in mind that we are probably going to end up with the same thing because we think this building, in terms of the grouping, we probably don't think this building needs to be grouped with anything because it is totally different we will have

full staff there, there are some different requirements, the size is different so it will probably end up by itself anyway but we do think some of the other buildings would be better served by grouping them together and in this specific RFP, it was very specific to this building because we knew we needed people there and there was some different equipment in this building that we had to address so even if we RFP them this one is slightly different because we are RFP cleaning a building that requires staffing. Our other buildings don't require that so that is why this one was a little different because we are dealing with a different building but if you would like for us to just do it PO we are probably going to have two different RFP's because this building is different from what we are asking for our other buildings."

Councilman Snyder stated, "Exactly, we have to get it cleaned. It needs to be cleaned because we are starting to use it now and that is exactly what I am asking for now I don't know what agreement or contract that you have with the people cleaning it now maybe we can talk to them, I have ideas on what I would like to see but I know it is far-fetched but I like to think out of the box that building is 44,000 square feet why can't we break it into 2 jobs? Why can't we have a top floor and bottom floor and have someone to clean them both? Break them up I know it isn't something that happens every day but how many buildings do we have around here that are 44,000 square feet that we have ever had to deal with before that is what I am talking about so that is just a thought. So, my suggestion is we do it on a RFP. We can get someone to clean this building. We just need to say come clean this building and we will pay you."

Natalie Robottom stated, "Or a PO you meant?"

Councilman Snyder stated, "Yes exactly until we can go out for RFP's for all of them because there may be some other ideas, now again I don't know if this is going to put us in a legal predicament since we already went out for RFP's."

Natalie Robottom stated, "No the RFP says that we have the right to award or not award. So, I don't think legally that would get us in trouble by not moving forward at all. Now if we violated what is in it maybe but that was part of the wording in it that as a parish we have the right to award it or not award it or award a part of it and that is specific to the language. I would like to further this discussion with you all. I personally would not be in agreement to have two contractors in the building. We have had a few issues with that kind of stuff like who is responsible for this and who did this versus this and whose fault it is and just management of something like that can be problematic and that is just my opinion based on what we have dealt with in the past and we have had more than one janitorial contractor before and had different issues not in the same building but in different buildings. So that is just my opinion on that. I don't think the RFP for the other buildings are going to be that much different from what we have done in the past. This one will be different and we wrote a scope of work that was specific to this building and what we thought our needs would be because we have experienced some problems here with this one with people being here all day and it not be clean so we wanted staffing there and not just cleaning it at night."

Councilman Snyder stated, "And I agree with you and I think we need to look at the RFP for all of the buildings. I don't think it is something that should just sit in a drawer, in a file then you get it out there as a RFP. I don't

think it should work that way because a lot of things have changed and a lot of things have happened. We even are a little bit more focused now on what we really want in the parish. Now maybe somebody else might have an opinion on this."

Councilman Madere stated, "Yes I think, well if I am wrong Mr. Snyder will stop me, I think what he is looking for and what he was trying to make sure of is that all of the contracts end and start at the same time and if I am wrong he can correct me but the RFP's for these buildings will be different because this building is completely different from what you are asking for from the other buildings so it will be two separate things. I think the thing he is trying to get at is the contract coming up and ending at the same time instead of dealing with them separately without making them the same. I think that is what he is trying to say."

Natalie Robottom interrupted, "And I think we can still do that Mr. Madere. We ended up doing it for example and again if the years are problematic that is part of the negotiation if you don't want three years but keep in mind all of our contracts have a 30 day out clause, so there is no guarantee on any of it because of the 30 day out clause. So we could time them to end at the same time for instance this one will be starting in December and the others will be starting in March so it may not be a 2 year or 24 month contract it might be a 28 month contract to end up timing them to end at the same time if you decide 2 years with options there is a way to get it on track and I am not saying that we are ready to do that tonight because I do hear what you are saying but if that is what you are trying to address there is still a mechanism to do that we just have them all end at the same time regardless of when this one started because the other ones are still under contract so they are still being cleaned, this one is not."

Councilman Madere stated, "I definitely understand what you are saying that you can word this contract to end at the same time that the other ones will end and that would put everything back on track like Mr. Snyder is talking about and still award the contract to someone tonight to clean that building. If we award the contract to someone tonight we can still time it so it would end with the other contracts and then they all would go out again at the same time. I don't have a problem with that but I do think that we have to award a contract tonight and I would be in support of having it end or worded to where it would end with the other contracts so that we could get on track so that the contracts come up at the same time and not one this year and another six months later where everything would end at the same time. Now this one can't start at the same time but it can end at the same time and I think the existing contract has how long on theirs before they expire?"

Natalie Robottom stated, "March, so we probably will be going out soon and again we tried to do some long term contracting because these people are making investments in people and equipment for these jobs so if we award a job for one or two years in janitorial and they have gone out and hired people or bought equipment specific to the same thing with grass cutting, I think we moved away from the one year grass cutting because you are likely to get better pricing and commitment if they know they have a long term contract and can get their money back and I think that is what we were hoping to do with all of these not just this one give the folks some time to earn their money back from investment and if you secure people you are likely to be able to keep them if you know they have a long term job now keep in mind with all of our contracts there is a 30 day out clause but there is some stability for our

company in knowing that if they have to get insurance or equipment that hey I am going to have this job for at least 2-3 years and again it is on you to keep it. We can award it but it is on you to keep it and perform and whether or not we would recommend an option or extension is based on your performance it is not a given, it is an option to consider. So I don't know the time frame that you are thinking about I am just telling you what went into our thinking and why we thought it would be best to have a set number of years to allow people to get their money and have some stability in their company instead of just hoping around every year or so changing companies. So those of you that might want to add to that I am asking. That is what goes into our thinking when we are trying to secure services for the parish."

Councilman Madere stated, "I agree with everything you just said. I think 4 years is a good investment because I don't think a building of that size people would like to invest equipment in knowing if they only had a year so I think 4 years are good and the 2-year option is similar to what I said about term limits. If you are not doing a good job they get rid of you anyways. So, the 2 years option in that contract really doesn't mean anything. It is really a 4-year contract and it will be up to the new council and administration to recommend for the other 2 years to take affect and it doesn't necessarily guarantee that it will. So, it basically is a 4-year contract and that is 4 years based on your performance and anytime that you are not performing, like we were made aware of at the last meeting, okay and you get a certain amount of write-ups you can terminate with the 30 day out clause. So, I don't see a problem with awarding the contract for 4 years with an option for 2 because we have the consideration to get rid of them if they are not performing or if at the end of 4 years that their evaluation comes back bad. So, I don't have a problem with that the way it is set up. I will make a motion if no one else has comments."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "I agree with you with the longer term it helps us also secure a better price because the vendors don't have to build everything into the first year. Let me ask this and I am kind of hearing what Councilman Snyder is saying about having them all at the same time. If we know that this RFP process is about 60 days that is pretty much January that we would be putting out the RFP and we still have this RFP so we can continue to get the building cleaned. We have already gotten this RFP and then put all of the other buildings out on a separate RFP because they would be 2 separate RFP's anyways because they require permanent staffing instead of reinventing what we already have secured here with this RFP and that might carry us until March because we know that the RFP process for all of our buildings, even on our end to prepare the documents will be at least 60 days, so that is 30 days from now we will be putting them out and we could use the one that we have here tonight. I would be open to that then we could have them all right at the same time."

Councilman Snyder stated, "I don't know how many contracts that you guys have read that we have on our list, we have a lot of contracts and how many have we 30 day out on them. I think it is one and we have hundreds of contracts on our website."

Natalie Robottom stated, "There has been more than one but not a lot based on the number that we have and again some of them are for services, design and construction management but we have had to cancel a few."

Councilman Snyder stated, "Well maybe we have but I tell you one thing I don't

know of any and maybe I am not reading like I am supposed to read or not getting the information but I have had problems in my district with grass cutters and for a long time I had the problem but I couldn't get rid of them because they had a contract and everybody knows the problem that I had but nobody got rid of them. Nobody said you don't cut here anymore and we are going to put you in another place to cut and put someone else here to do it. That is why I don't believe in long term contracts. Why do you think the insurance companies do that does anybody have insurance on their house for more than a year? Nope. I know mine is only a year and I have been paying insurance forever but mine is just a year and every year if they want to go up they go up and if they want to go down they go down. Now that is what I am talking about. A four-year contract with a two-year extension. We are going to be having a new council coming in in about a year. So, they will be stuck with this contract for another 3-4 years."

Natalie Robottom interrupted saying, "They are going to inherit all of the contracts."

Councilman Snyder stated, "I understand that but with the contracts that they are inheriting they shouldn't be worried about this one because when we came in here this is what happened to us. Let me tell you something, I think that some of these jobs are too big for some of these people that are putting these contracts in I am going to be honest with you. I mean we have had problems since we have been in here with cleaners that is why I would like to see them broken down a little bit more and give them the opportunity to get some smaller jobs."

Natalie Robottom stated, "We agree."

Councilman Snyder stated, "I am serious. You know what I am talking about."

Natalie Robottom stated, "We all agree on that they need to be broken up. We have other buildings and we agree that they need to be broken up."

Councilman Snyder stated, "The last time I looked there were 23 and then you are adding 2 more, this one and the one across the river."

Natalie Robottom stated, "Okay well that's a lot, we are agreeing that we probably would do better breaking them up."

Councilman Snyder stated, "I agree okay. I don't like long term contracts I am sorry but 2 years would be the max for me."

Councilman Becnel stated, "I would like to pass my opinion on this based on working in business 36 years and working with bids and stuff, I think what and I am trying to follow the process, when administration put out the RFP it was specifically for this building. So that building is by itself right now and if we and you all know my phrase 'stall and delay' that is not fair to the people who bid on this to just say we are going to throw it to the side. We put it out for bid to take action on it. We tabled it last month. I just feel that we need to move forward and vote no matter who is chosen but I just think we need to move forward tonight because to me personally it was in plain black and white, we were putting out an RFP for that particular building. I am not worried about the other buildings. When those contracts expire they are going to expire on their own but this building has been identified by itself and to me it is very unfair to everybody who bid on this if we don't take action

tonight. That is just my opinion."

Councilman Madere stated, "I just want to say one other thing before I make this motion and I hope I get a second or whatever. You know we always talk about shop local and help the small business. We have an Economic Development Department and that is their job to help promote businesses in St. John the Baptist Parish. Now I see that we had three companies from LaPlace that applied for this building and we get these things on our emails sent to us by St. John that say, 'shop local' or 'Shop St. John' and help small businesses all that is printed out and is promotion by us the council and the administration. So, my motion is to support a local contractor from LaPlace and my motion is that we award this contract to Star Maintenance Janitorial Service from LaPlace. That is the motion I make."

Councilwoman Remondet seconded the motion.

Councilwoman Hotard asked, "Just for the record and I don't have the information in front of me. What is, I know the price for the company that administration is recommending I believe is around \$10,000.00 a month I wrote down. This motion here what is the price on that company and I just don't have it in front of me. I don't have any of the companies in front of me."

Councilman Madere stated, "They didn't give us the total pricing here."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "I had them at the last meeting. It was in the spreadsheet at the last meeting. It was in the last booklet."

Robert Figuero stated, "I have it. Do you want me to read it out loud? All the Time Janitorial, LLC was \$10,151.00 a month, Enmon Enterprises, DBA was \$13,252.00 a month, DJS Janitorial Service was \$13,950.00 a month, First Class Enterprise was \$15,423.00 a month, Eagle Eye Resources, LLC was \$16,414.00 a month, A Quality Touch Commercial Builders was \$16,500.00 a month and Star Maintenance and Janitorial Services was \$21,864.00 a month."

Councilwoman Hotard asked, "So the one that the motion on the table for right now is the \$21,864.00 a month?"

Robert Figuero stated, "That is correct. That would be an additional \$120,000.00 a year for the same service."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "Okay thank you."

Councilman Perrilloux stated, "As it stands right now I can't support it if it is going to be the 6 years. I am in terms with Mr. Snyder. We can break this up and give more people some janitorial or business in the parish and local but I am not for the 4 or 6 years. So, I can't support the motion on that one."

Councilman Snyder stated, "I just want Mr. Madere to know my feelings. I just don't like 6-year contracts to be honest with you. I think that is too long and the way your motion was and the way it is written on the paper is for 6 years, 4 years with 2 optional."

Councilman Madere stated, "Like I said before it is really a 4-year contract. The 2 years are optional, that would be up to the new council and a new administration that will be in place to state the case to keep that company or

to get rid of them, those 2 years are optional they are not guaranteed. So, you are really talking about a 4 year. So, you are either going to do a 4 year or a 2-year contract. You can't expect anyone to do a building of that size for anything less than that. The 2 years are not guaranteed. So, it is really a 4-year contract."

Councilwoman Hotard asked, "Let me ask this and some of the concern that I have is with the cost, we are talking about \$11,000.00 more a month. I know in the past what we have done when we have had proposals come in and there is a company that wants to be selected that they negotiate with those other companies but I don't know if in good conscience that I could just pay over \$100,000.00 more dollars a year. I would like to shop local but like I said I know in the past we have negotiated with contractors because it is a RFP not a bid. So, we do have that flexibility. There are other local companies here too on the list in the price range. I am not sure what the direction of the council would like to be but I would like to, because we have the ability with a RFP, to try and negotiate with some of those local contractors to get closer to where we are so we are not making that big of a leap to just have a local presence and not spending double. Those are just my thoughts."

Councilman Malik stated, "First of all Mr. Becnel I agree with you, we offer them a bite at the apple and they take it I think it is only fair that we keep the 4-year contract however until legal really stipulates that it is legal and they finalize their opinion. I don't see why we are going to vote on something that may or may not be legal."

Councilman Madere stated, "Mr. Malik I am gathering what you are saying is that until legal says that the contract is sufficient we shouldn't even vote on it?"

Councilman Malik stated, "That is exactly what I am saying."

Councilman Madere stated, "Some of the information that was sent to us on email, something that they saw in the contract and you are not necessarily talking about the length of the contract you are talking about what is in the contract."

Councilman Malik stated, "I think we offered a 4-year contract and they accepted and I am in agreement with Mr. Becnel. I don't think we should be giving a second or a third bite at the apple to anyone."

Councilman Madere stated, "I think it should be 4 years with an option."

Councilman Malik stated, "It should be 4 years with an option and if we don't like them in 4 years then we can move on to company A, B or C."

Councilman Madere asked, "Let me ask Ms. Hotard a question, when you mentioned I know what we have done in the past when contracts have been awarded and they come back for more money and I do believe sometimes it has been decreased. So, the administration still has the option to negotiate with whoever is awarded this contract."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "We actually did that with the garbage that is the one that I can remember last where they ranked them.."

Natalie Robottom interrupting, "That language is in the RFP."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "Where they can negotiate because it is a RFP, if it was a bid we wouldn't be having this discussion right now."

Councilman Madere stated, "So that price can be adjusted through negotiations."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "It is a factor, but it isn't the only determining factor."

Councilman Madere stated, "I just wanted to make that clear so that is not a definite \$100,000.00 over."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "Right it would be up to that company or other local companies who submitted to say we want the opportunity to you know if those firms, you would do that in a sense where you believe that someone is going to offer you that much better of a service where the price may be a little bit more it might be a niche service just like we have permanent employees or something that someone can provide then you might go to someone who is number two and get a closer price to what maybe your lower price was you would do something in that instance. Here I am just looking at the list and I see a couple of locals on the list and you do have that ability when it is a proposal."

Councilman Madere stated, "So we do have the ability to get that price downward a little bit."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "Right."

Councilman Madere stated, "Just like if it was awarded to someone with a much lower bid they would come back and adjust it higher basically."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "Well it would be up to us to accept."

Councilman Madere stated, "But they could request that it go up in a year or two."

Natalie Robottom stated, "For example, you are right not just I am going up on my price. For example, when we get down to it and we get into the building and it is like you know what we didn't include this in the RFP but we need you to do this while you are in here. Well we aren't going to expect you to do additional work that wasn't specified without being compensated so in that case we can amend the rates to include that as well and we have done that before as well but in essence we put out what we wanted, everybody had a fair option based on information from prior legal counsel RFP you do not consider pricing souly but as a governmental entity we were instructed that we had to consider pricing as a government and we had to weigh it more than some of your other items because these are tax payer dollars. So that is why there is a formula in the RFP for pricing fairly and compared to itself that is how we got the ranking. So, you get a score for pricing that is consistent but because this is not our money we were instructed it should weigh more than some of your other criteria but it was not the sole determining factor. In our cases we had like 5 different criteria, pricing was one of them but experience and staffing and all of those were other components that were scored as well."

Councilman Sorapuru stated, "There is a motion on the floor to award the

contract to Star Maintenance Janitorial Service of LaPlace. Use your lights please."

MOTION: Councilman Madere moved and Councilwoman Remondet seconded the motion to enter into a contract with Star Maintenance Janitorial Service from LaPlace. The motion passed with 4 yeas (Madere, Remondet, Becnel, Sorapuru), 3 against (Malik, Perrilloux, Synder) and 2 abstaining (Hotard & Wright).

Councilman Sorapuru asked, *"That carries with 4 in favor."*

Jackie Landeche stated, *"I think it fails."*

Councilwoman Hotard stated, *"I just wanted to make a comment and this is a guess why it is a good thing that we do vote blindly and the reason why I am abstaining is my motion is not against this motion that you have here on the table but what I can't do in good conscience is just say I am going to spend \$21,000.00 a month over \$10,000.00 and not have entered into any negotiations with the company. If the motion would be to enter into a negotiation with the company, I could support that but to just spend \$10,000.00 more a month I just can't do that. So, my vote is not that I am against the company that we are selecting that is why I chose to abstain but I cannot support just spending that much double and I want the public to understand that is where the abstention*

Councilman Madere interrupted without his microphone and it is inaudible.

Councilwoman Hotard stated, *"We would have to have a recommendation and get administration to come back but maybe instruct them to enter into a negotiation with one of those companies but again this is my one vote right here and I owe that to the public to state."*

Councilman Madere stated, *"Like I said before, I want this to go to a local company and this is the company that I made the motion for but I definitely understand what you are saying right now that I could make a motion where I would get the administration to negotiate with Star Maintenance Janitorial Service to negotiate the price alright that is the motion I am making."*

Councilman Sorapuru stated, *"Okay Mr. Madere has a motion to negotiate with Star Maintenance and administration the price and the term of the contract."*

Councilman Madere stated, *"Not the term, just the price."*

Councilwoman Hotard stated, *"You need to withdraw all of your motions you have on the floor."*

Councilman Malik stated, *"This is still pending legal approval."*

Councilman Madere stated, *"Well we are waiting on legal approval because he still has to let us know. The first motion failed. This is a second motion."*

Councilman Sorapuru asked, *"Legal can we get an opinion on the situation right here?"*

Keith Green, Jr. stated, *"Our opinion is that we can take this under advisement but you all however the chairman and the council members you all are supposed to be aware and knowledgeable of your Robert's Rules of Order*

which includes the voting. Now we can have an answer for you but it will not be within the next 10-15 minutes. Thank you."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "But you are willing to amend your motion, I think that would be a recommendation because either way we won't have something back from legal about this vote."

Councilman Madere stated, "Well that is the motion I made I was amending the first motion, but the first motion didn't pass."

Councilman Sorapuru stated, "The first motion failed. Well we don't know."

Councilman Madere stated, "Well we are not sure."

Councilman Sorapuru stated, "Okay we are going to move on to the next item pending legal review."

Councilman Wright stated, "Or we can amend right now."

Councilman Madere stated, "Okay the motion I want to make is that we enter into an agreement with Star Maintenance and ask administration to enter into a negotiation on the price."

Councilman Perrilloux asked, "I have a comment. I thought once we voted and it failed you can't call a motion back."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "That is only when you are re-zoning property. He offered a new motion."

Councilman Wright asked, "Can we clarify the motion on the floor please?"

Councilman Sorapuru stated, "Yes, the motion on the floor is to go back and negotiate with Star Maintenance on the price that they are giving."

Councilman Madere stated, "To authorize the administration."

Councilman Sorapuru stated, "To negotiate the cost and then to bring it back to the council. Please use your lights."

Councilman Snyder asked, "Is it still for 4 years?"

Councilman Madere stated, "It is still 4 years. The motion was to go with the years that was already established."

Councilman Wright stated, "Whatever was outlined by the RFP."

MOTION: Councilman Madere moved and Councilwoman Remondet seconded the motion to authorize administration enter negotiations with Star Maintenance Janitorial Service the contract pricing. The motion passed with 5 yeas (Wright, Sorapuru, Becnel, Remondet, Madere), 1 against (Snyder) and 3 abstaining (Hotard, Malik, Perrilloux).

Jean Stewart/Blake Fogleman - Authorization to solicit bids for 2019 Self-Priming Pumps

Blake Fogleman stated, "This is an annual bid and administration recommends

approval.”

MOTION: Councilman Becnel moved and Councilwoman Remondet seconded the motion to grant administration authorization to solicit bids for 2019 Self-Priming Pumps. The motion passed with Councilman Perrilloux absent.

Jean Stewart/Blake Fogleman - Authorization to solicit bids for 2019 Submersible Pumps

Blake Fogleman stated, “*This bid is also annual and administration recommends approval.*”

MOTION: Councilman Snyder moved and Councilman Wright seconded the motion to grant administration authorization to solicit bids for 2019 Submersible Pumps. The motion passed with 6 yeas and 3 absent (Becnel, Madere, Perrilloux).

Rene Pastorek/Julie Bordelon - Authorization to advertise a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for Professional Engineering Services for the LASAFE Airline and Main Complete Streets Project

Rene Pastorek stated, “*Procurement of a design firm is required by the funding entity for the LASAFE program. The scope of work includes design, permitting, and construction management of the Complete Streets project. Administration recommends approval.*”

MOTION: Councilman Wright moved and Councilman Malik seconded the motion to grant administration authorization to advertise a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for Professional Engineering Services for the LASAFE Airline and Main Complete Streets Project. The motion passed unanimously.

Robert Figuero/Philip Rebowe - Authorization to engage Carr, Riggs & Ingram, L.L.C. for audit services

Robert Figuero stated, “*State law requires an annual audit by an independent audit firm and submission to the Legislative Auditor by the end of June. The audit must also address the New Statewide Agreed Upon Procedures. CRI has successfully completed this work for the past several years and based on their knowledge of the Parish’s financial history and policies and procedures, they are recommended to continue for fiscal years 2018, 2019, and 2020. The contract amount is for a not to exceed amount of \$92,500 for basic audit services and \$10,000 for the new procedures. These amounts represent an overall decrease of 8% from last year. Administration recommends approval.*”

MOTION: Councilman Wright moved and Councilman Snyder seconded the motion to grant administration authorization to engage Carr, Riggs & Ingram, L.L.C. for audit services. The motion passed with Councilwoman Hotard absent.

Jean Stewart - Authorization to award the Grass Cutting and Landscaping Maintenance Services to the following: Mighty Mowers, St. John Grass Cutting & Maintenance Services, RRJ Construction, LLC, BLBC Enterprise, LLC, Incredible Mowers & Cleanup Service, B&D Tractor Services Inc., Hymel’s Turf & Landscape, LLC, BHold Enterprise, LLC, and Pelican State Property Services, LLC

LaVerne Toombs stated, “*The companies listed above are recommended for grass cutting contracts by the Source Selection Committee. The contract terms are for three (3) years with an option to renew for two (2) years in one (1) year increments. Each contract will be funded through the appropriate department. A*

memo detailing company assignments and pricing was emailed to Council members and Administration recommends approval."

MOTION: Councilman Becnel moved and Councilwoman Remondet seconded the motion to grant administration authorization to award the Grass Cutting and Landscaping Maintenance Services to the following: Mighty Mowers, St. John Grass Cutting & Maintenance Services, RRJ Construction, LLC, BLBC Enterprise, LLC, Incredible Mowers & Cleanup Service, B&D Tractor Services Inc., Hymel's Turf & Landscape, LLC, BHold Enterprise, LLC, and Pelican State Property Services, LLC. The motion passed with Councilwoman Hotard absent.

Blake Fogleman/Oscar Boudreaux - Authorization to execute Change Order No. 4 with the Lemoine Company, LLC for the Reserve Wastewater Treatment Plant

Blake Fogleman stated, "This Change Order adds 20 days and \$54,920 to the contract, but the overall project remains underbudget. The increase is to install additional wiring and equipment for a Manual Transfer Switch (MTS) for auxiliary power during outages. The project is funded through an EPA grant and the 2010 Bond Issue. The items addressed in the Change Order were reviewed by the Parish Engineer, Project Engineer and Utilities Director, and are pending approval by EPA and the Council. Administration recommends approval."

MOTION: Councilman Snyder moved and Councilman Perrilloux seconded the motion to grant administration authorization to execute Change Order No. 4 with the Lemoine Company, LLC for the Reserve Wastewater Treatment Plant. The motion passed unanimously.

Blake Fogleman/Oscar Boudreaux - Authorization to execute the Certificate of Substantial Completion with Volute, Inc. for the Pleasure Bend Water System Project

The administration request that this item be tabled.

MOTION: Councilman Perrilloux moved and Councilman Wright seconded the motion to TABLE the authorization to execute the Certificate of Substantial Completion with Volute, Inc. for the Pleasure Bend Water System Project. The motion passed unanimously.

Stacey Cador - Authorization to settle and pay the June 20, 2016 Property Damage Claim with Reuben Keating of 206 Cypress Street, LaPlace, LA

Stacey Cador stated, "As presented by Riverlands Insurance Services, Inc. and approved by Legal Counsel, settlement of this case in the amount of \$3,010 is recommended with funds from the General Insurance line item in the Public Works Fund."

MOTION: Councilman Snyder moved and Councilman Becnel seconded the motion to grant administration authorization to settle and pay the June 20, 2016 Property Damage Claim with Reuben Keating of 206 Cypress Street, LaPlace, LA in the amount of \$3,010.00. The motion passed unanimously.

Adjournment

MOTION: Councilman Malik moved and Councilman Perrilloux seconded the motion to adjourn the finance meeting. The motion passed unanimously.