

**MINUTES OF COMMITTEE MEETING  
CELEBRATION COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

A meeting of the Audit Selection Committee appointed by the Board of Supervisors of the Celebration Community Development District was held Thursday, January 9, 2006, at 9:00 a.m. in Town Hall, 690 Celebration Avenue, Celebration, FL.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Richard Quinn	Chairman
Linda James	Supervisor
Rick Woodville	District Manager's Office

Also Attending:

Cheryl Stuart (by phone)	Hopping, Green & Sams
Brenda Wright	District Manager's Office

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Call to Order**

Mr. Quinn called the meeting to order.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Roll Call**

Ms. Wright stated for the record, this meeting has been noticed as a committee meeting of the Celebration CDD Board. The Board appointed Ms. James, Mr. Quinn and Mr. Woodville as that committee and all three committee members are present.

**FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Discussion of Audit Ranking Criteria  
and Direction to Staff on RFP  
Publication**

Mr. Quinn stated the sole purpose of this meeting is to review the ranking criteria and provide direction to staff on the RFP for an auditor. Everyone received a copy of the evaluation criteria in advance of this meeting.

Ms. Wright stated I re-distributed copies and for Ms. Stuart's information, we used the information from Urban Orlando for their criteria and their RFP information. Ms. Stuart we are asking you to set your evaluation criteria for this District and we will make the appropriate changes and notices. I have schedule of when that will happen, but first I would like for all of you to discuss and give us your criteria.

Ms. Stuart stated the big change in the law was whether or not you can consider price and if you do, it cannot be the sole criteria that you evaluate by, but it can be clearly weighted. With most of the Districts the question is price or no price and why do we not alter the profit after award. Most Districts are including price in that factor. You have the criteria from Urban Orlando and I think they did 20-20-20-20-20.

Ms. Wright stated that is correct; a total of 100 points.

Ms. Stuart stated you can do anything you want on that, but they chose to include price and weight it as the other ones are identified with respect to the other criteria. Some want to weight price more and some a little less.

Mr. Quinn stated the way this is laid out the price is no more or less weighted than the other characteristics of the evaluation.

Ms. James stated I think we should include price as a component of that to be fiscally responsible.

Ms. Stuart stated if you did not, it almost becomes like the Consultants Competitive Negotiations Act. You have your criteria and proposals, but no price, so you come up with a rating and then try to negotiate a deal with the first one, which is what you will end up doing. This way, you will have your pricing, you will review the proposals, give them the points they are due in the category and the number one ranked proposer. Unless there are terms of the contract you cannot agree on, you will know what the price is going in.

Mr. Quinn stated I like it better this way. I cannot conceive doing an RFP where price is not one of the questions that you ask. One question I do have, even though the rankings are 20-20-20-20-20, there is nothing in here that says what gets 20, 20 or 5 points.

Ms. Wright stated you can change those numbers if choose to.

Ms. Stuart stated that has been left to the discretion of the committee, as to how much detail they want to give or can come up with in terms of saying to get the full 20 points, such as, you must have ten years experience or whatever. Most Boards have chosen to leave themselves the discretion to review the proposal as they come and then discuss the points.

Mr. Quinn stated that is fine.

Ms. Stuart stated normally what we do on price is take the lowest price, give the full 20 points and give everybody fewer points, depending on what their increased price was. The

lower bidder could get 20 and if somebody is \$1,000 more then you take whatever percentage that is and give them that percentage of 20 points. Most of the pricing is relatively consistent.

Mr. Quinn asked what else do we have to do?

Ms. Stuart stated move to adopt the criteria and the weighting as presented and then authorize staff to look at the proposals and bring them back to the Board at your next meeting.

Mr. Woodville stated we also want to figure out how long it is going to take us to do the advertisement and then set a due date for the proposals.

Ms. Stuart stated you need to approve the criteria and Ms. Wright has a schedule of when the ads go into the newspaper.

Ms. Wright stated in order for you to do this by your next meeting, if I get a notice in the newspaper today by 2:00 p.m., it will go in Wednesday's newspaper. Because of something that happened previously, we have already received RFPs and these firms are ready to respond. Staff had talked outside the meeting that a week was long enough to give them because they are all ready. If the notice goes in Wednesday, January 11, 2005, we are asking for them to be back by 10:00 a.m. on January 18, 2006. We talked about you have a Review Committee meeting at 5:30 p.m. on January 18, 2006 because your regular meeting is at 6:00 p.m. that same day.

Ms. James stated I will be California next week.

Ms. Wright stated if Mr. Quinn and Mr. Woodville are here that is quorum for a committee meeting.

Ms. Stuart stated Ms. James stated you could be on by phone if you choose to.

Ms. James stated unfortunately I am in an all day workshop out at DCA.

Ms. Wright stated that was our timeframe, to get the notice in by Wednesday and next Wednesday by 10:00 a.m. we will receive those proposals and hand deliver them to the committee to give them as much time as possible before 5:30 p.m. to meet as a committee and come up with a recommendation to the Board. The Board will meet at 6:00 p.m., consider the committee's recommendation and then authorize it; otherwise, if we wait until the February meeting I think it will just cause problems.

Ms. Stuart stated it works for me if it does for everyone else. If you think the Board members will be available on that date they will be able to review those proposals before 5:30 p.m.

Mr. Quinn stated I am going to be here.

Ms. Stuart stated you will get at least three or four proposals.

Ms. Wright stated I would say we will get at least three or four all the way up to six or seven. That is staff's timing recommendation to move the process.

Ms. Stuart stated at the same time you will notice the committee meeting on January 18, 2005 at 5:30 p.m. Do you think 30 minutes is enough time?

Ms. Wright stated I think so.

Mr. Quinn stated if staff does what they need to do ahead of time it should not take long.

Ms. Wright stated it should be some of the same auditing firms that are already out there doing CDD business.

Ms. Stuart stated right before a meeting people come in and they get a little disrupted, so I just wanted to make sure it was enough time.

Ms. Wright stated we can meet at 5:00 p.m. if you want.

Ms. Stuart stated I am not going to be there.

Mr. Quinn stated 5:00 p.m. is fine with me.

Ms. Wright stated we will notice the meeting for 5:00 p.m. and the regular meeting for 6:00 p.m.

Ms. Quinn asked is there a motion approve the auditor selection evaluation criteria?

On MOTION by Ms. James, seconded by Mr. Woodville, with all in favor, approval was given to the auditor selection evaluation criteria as presented.

**FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 9:10 a.m.