MEMORANDUM

Harvey Ruvin
Clerk of the Circuit and County Courts
Clerk of the Board of County Commissioners
Miami-Dade County, Florida
(305) 375-5126
(305) 375-2484 FAX
www.miami-dadeclerk.com

EDSS

Agenda Item No. 6(B)

TO: Honorable Chairwoman Rebeca Sosa and Members of the Economic Development and Social Services Committee

DATE: January 12, 2011

FROM: Diane Collins, Acting Division Chief
Clerk of the Board Division

Diane Collins

SUBJECT: Approval of Commission Committee Minutes

The Clerk of the Board's office is submitting the following Clerk's Summary of Minutes for approval by the Economic Development and Social Services Committee:

December 02, 2010
HDCD Small Business Workshop

DC/jt
Attachment

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY
FINAL OFFICIAL
MEETING MINUTES
Housing and Community Development Committee (HCDC)
Small Business Workshop

Board of County Commissioners
Stephen P. Clark Government Center
Commission Chambers
111 N.W. First Street
Miami, Florida 33128

December 02, 2010
As Advertised

Harvey Ruvin, Clerk
Board of County Commissioners

Diane Collins, Acting Division Chief
Clerk of the Board Division

Jill Thornton, Commission Reporter
(305) 375-2505

Stephen P. Clark
Government Center
111 N.W. 1st Street
Miami, FL 33128

CLERK'S SUMMARY OF

Meeting Minutes

Housing & Community Development Committee

Audrey M. Edmonson (3) Chair; Barbara J. Jordan (1) Vice Chair; Commissioners Lynda Bell (8) Joe A. Martinez (11), Jean Monestime (2), and Javier D. Souto (10)

SMALL BUSINESS WORKSHOP

Thursday, December 2, 2010 | **9:30 AM** | **Commission Chambers**

Members Present: Audrey M. Edmonson.

Members Absent: Lynda Bell, Barbara J. Jordan, Joe A. Martinez, Jean Monestime, Javier D. Souto.

Members Late: None.

Members Excused: None.

Members Absent County Business: None.

1 MINUTES PREPARED BY:

Report: *Jill Thornton, Commission Reporter (305) 375-2505*

1A INVOCATION

1B PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

1C ROLL CALL

Report: *The following staff members were present: Special Assistant to the County Manager Howard Piper; Assistant County Attorney David Hope; Director Penelope Townsley, Department of Small Business Development (DSBD); and Deputy Clerk Jill Thornton.*

Chairwoman Edmonson convened the Housing and Community Development Committee workshop. She noted DSBD staff would make a presentation on Miami-Dade County's Small Business Programs and then entertain questions from the members of the public and the Committee. She expressed appreciation to everyone in attendance at this workshop, particularly to Ms. Townsley and her staff for providing this presentation.

1D OPENING REMARKS FROM CHAIRPERSON EDMONSON

2 SMALL BUSINESS WORKSHOP

2A

102768 **Special Presentation**

PRESENTATION BY THE DEPARTMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT RE: SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

Report: *Ms. Penelope Townsley, Director, Department of Small Business Development (DSBD), noted DSBD was charged with promoting small business growth and development by providing assistance supporting contracting opportunities for small business enterprises that lead to industry success and sustainability in both the private and public sectors. She noted DSBD carried out this charge by administering the following three industry-specific Small Business (SB) programs:*

• Community Small Business Enterprise (CSBE) program for Construction projects
• Small Business Enterprise (SBE) program for Goods and Services procurement
• Community Business Enterprise (CBE) program for Architectural & Engineering (A&E) services

Ms. Townsley noted DSBD staff members would outline the following (SB) Program components and operational processes used to administer these programs:

• Certification Process- established eligibility for SB participation in an SB program, and fundamentals for achieving the objectives and overall effectiveness of the program.
• Business Support Services- provided contracting opportunities and business-related assistance critical to a firm's development, long-term success and sustainability.
• Contract Monitoring- monitored the SB goals to ensure compliance with the program requirements.

Ms. Sherri McGriff, Division Director, Business Opportunity and Support Services, DSBD, provided an overview of the certification process and requirements. She noted a firm must become certified before availing itself of the benefits of the SB Programs. She also noted firms learned about the SB Program(s) through MDC outreach services, industry partners, the Chamber of Commerce, other certified firms, and through the DSBD's Website. Ms. McGriff said the Website contained relevant program information and downloadable documents including applications

and supporting forms. Ms. McGriff also noted that firms must meet certain criteria before becoming certified. She noted criteria similar for all three SB programs required that firms have an actual place of business in MDC and three-year average gross receipts not to exceed certain thresholds; be licensed and/or have the applicable local business tax receipts; and provide specific supporting documentation when submitting an application for an SB Program. Ms. McGriff presented specific certification criteria for each SB Program as follows:

1) CBE program (for A&E services):

• Three-year average gross receipts not exceeding $4.5 million for architectural services, or $6 million for engineering, surveying/mapping, and architectural landscaping services.
• Appropriate technical certification and applicable licenses.

2) SBE program (for goods/service providers-two levels):

Level 1 – Micro-firms (smaller firms):

• Three-year average gross receipts not exceeding $2 million; except for wholesalers and manufacturers whose threshold criterion was based on the number of employees. Micro-wholesaler firms cannot exceed 15 employees, and micro-manufacturers cannot exceed 50 employees.
• Local business tax receipt in the appropriate commodity or service provided.

Level 2 - SBE Firms (larger firms)

• Three-year average gross receipts not exceeding $5 million, except for wholesalers and manufacturers with threshold criterion based on the number of employees. SBE wholesalers cannot exceed 50 employees, and SBE manufacturers cannot exceed 100 employees.
• Local business tax receipt in the appropriate commodity or service provided.

3) CSBE program (for construction firms):

• Three-year average gross receipts not exceeding $10 million for General Building Contractors, $6 million for Heavy Construction Contractors, and $5 million for Specialty Trades Contractors.
• Each owner's personal net worth must not exceed $1.5 million.

• Applicable license(s) for the services provided.

Ms. McGriff noted once submitted, a firm's application and supporting documentation are entered into DSBD's database and reviewed by a DSBD Certification Specialist. The firm would be approved as a CSBE upon determination that the application was complete and contained the required information and supporting documentation, said Ms. McGriff. She provided an overview of the DSBD review process, which involved comprehensive research on the firm and the use of various resources to verify that the submitted application and supporting documents contained the required information. Ms. McGriff said that the review often included DSBD follow-up requests for additional information to complete the process. She noted the faster the applicant submitted the required information and maintained an open line of communication with DSBD, the less time it took to certify the firm. Ms. McGriff also noted that quarterly orientation workshops were held for certified firms to learn about SB Program policies, procedures, benefits, County contracting opportunities, as well as other resource assistance and services.

Ms. McGriff described the Business Support Services provided by DSBD, which included outreach services, assistance with contracting needs, promoting a firms competitiveness, sustainability and growth; assistance in developing business plans, financial resources, and prompt payment; holding industry-specific workshops and referring firms to lending entities. She noted DSBD staff attached survey forms to each application and used input from these forms to develop appropriate training seminars/workshops based on firms' specific needs. She also noted DSBD staff referred SB firms who were not interested in becoming certified or not qualified to be a CSBE to other resource partners when needing their assistance. Ms. McGriff introduced Ms. Laurie Johnson to explain the Project Review and Analysis Process.

Ms. Laurie Johnson, Manager, Business Support and Opportunity Services, DSBD, noted Project Review and Analysis was a component of the SB programs which allowed DSBD to review proposed County purchases of goods, services, construction and A&E services to determine if an SB participation goal or measure could be applied. If a goal could be applied, staff would present their recommendations to the Review

Committee for approval. She noted the Review Committee was comprised of representatives from capital departments who were assigned by the County Manager. Ms. Johnson outlined the Review and Analysis process.

Ms. Johnson noted certified SB firms must maintain their certification and respond to DSBD's notifications of opportunities to bid on upcoming proposed projects. She noted timely responses allow DSBD to identify adequate availability and SB participation goals. She also noted DSBD staff attended pre-bid and pre-proposal meetings to reinforce project information. She advised that once projects with SB goals were advertised and before they were awarded, DSBD conducted a pre-award compliance review to determine if the bidders could comply with the SB measures. Once bids were submitted, DSBD conducted a 48-hour review on construction projects to determine responsiveness for SB measures.

Ms. Johnson provided a hypothetical scenario in which a construction firm (XYZ) collaborated with a prime company, and committed to perform the project's scope of work; and as a result, was deemed responsive and compliant. In addition, because the firm (XYZ) availed itself of opportunities, it achieved contractual relationships with other prime contractors and possible prime contracts with the County. Ms. Johnson noted contract monitoring was required for all projects awarded with SB measures. She introduced Ms. Alice Hildago-Gato to explain that process.

Ms. Alice Hildago-Gato, Director, Contract Monitoring and Compliance Division, DSBD, provided an overview of the contract monitoring and compliance process that ensured approved SB goals were met. She noted DSBD sent contract award congratulatory letters to the prime contractors and certified copies to the SB firms to remind them of the SB requirements. Ms. Hildago-Gato also noted that DSBD may request the prime contractor to submit copies of the subcontract for review of the scope of work, the schedule of intent, and the agreed upon price. DSBD Compliance Officers may also visit the construction site to observe the subcontracted SB firm and not another firm was onsite performing the scope of work, and DSBD may interview the employees' onsite to confirm they worked for the subcontracting firm, she noted. Ms. Hildago-Gato said DSBD may also

review the certified payrolls and compare the workforce with the contract amount to ensure fair subcontracting workforce compensation.

Ms. Hildago-Gato noted a prime contractor must submit Monthly Utilization Reports (MUR) reflecting the requisitions submitted to them by a subcontracting firm and the payments made to the subcontractor for work performed. She also noted DSBD sent certified SB firms quarterly letters requesting confirmation of the amounts paid as reported by the prime contractor. DSBD may also audit the payments reported by the prime contractor by comparing cancelled checks with the requisitions, said Ms Hildago-Gato. She said that DSBD was available to mediate any disputes that may arise between the CSBE firms and the prime contractors throughout the life of the contract.

In addition, Ms. Hildago-Gato noted DSBD monitored the County's Responsible Wage and Benefits Ordinance, which applied to construction contracts, and the Living Wage Ordinance, which applied to service contracts and covered service providers at airport facilities. She noted wages must be considered by all firms when preparing their bids; that both wage ordinances required certified payrolls for all employees be submitted, and applied to all employees of prime and subcontractors, regardless of their tiers. Ms. Hildago-Gato said that DSBD provided all certified SB firms with training on compliance with the ordinances upon request.

Ms. Townsley noted DSBD partnered with and advocated for every SB firm from the time of certification to graduation. She also noted continual communication and feedback between DSBD and SB firms was critical for understanding the challenges and obstacles faced by SB firms. Ms. Townsley said DSBD worked with the CSB firms, advisory boards and industry partners over the past year to identify ways to streamline and strengthen SB Programs, to maximize SB opportunities, and to align DSBD's requirements with industry's standards. She noted DSBD developed amendments to the SB Programs and would be presenting them to the Commission for consideration. Ms. Townsley highlighted some of the major proposals, as follows:

1) Consolidated the pre-award and post-award Compliance Reviews and expanded the 48 hour cure period for all SB Programs.

2) Streamlined the Committee Review process by establishing an expedited review process similar to the Economic Stimulus program.

3) Required the $250 non-refundable filing fee and recovery of the appeals administrative costs, which was approved for the CSBE (construction) program in 2008, be implemented throughout all the SB programs.

4) Enhanced the Re-Certification process by extending the certification term from 1 to 3 years, with affidavits and supporting documents submitted annually for establishing continual eligibility.

5) Increased A&E set-aside opportunities for all CBE firms (Tiers 1 and 2).

6) Expanded construction contracting opportunities by establishing CSBE trade set-asides.

Ms. Townsley noted the current process in Proposal 1 gave bidders 48 hours to cure defects in the documents committing them to a measure prior to bid openings. She noted DSBD reviewed all bids for responsiveness; however, due to high bidding activity resulting in use of significant resources and time to review documents for compliancy, DSBD proposed the pre- and post-reviews performed by DSBD be consolidated into a single review that would be implemented at the end of the process. She explained that a user department, after receiving and opening the bids, would submit the bids it would like DSBD to review for responsiveness, which would increase staff's productivity and turnaround time in the bidding process.

Regarding Proposal 2, Ms. Townsley noted this proposal would reduce the review process by at least 1 to 1.5 weeks and would provide for greater public input. The review committee would only convene if the DSBD, the user department and the public could not reach consensus, said Ms. Townsley.

Ms. Townsley noted in relation to Proposal 5, only Tier 1 CBE firms may currently participate in projects with A&E set asides. She said that the recommendation was to establish A&E set asides for Tiers 1 and 2 CBE projects.

In relation to Proposal 6, Ms. Townsley noted,

currently, DSBD could only identify CSBE set asides for construction projects with a Construction Manager and a specific scope of work. The proposal was that this measure be applied to any contract where it was appropriate.

Ms. Townsley presented statistics reflecting the effectiveness and achievements of the SB program(s). She noted the County's objective was to ensure SB's received no less than ten-percent of the County's annual construction expenditures and A&E services, and no less than five-percent of its annual Goods and Services expenditures.

Ms. Townsley pointed out that in FY 2009-10, most A&E projects awarded by the County were of such size and scope that it was more efficient to award them through the County's Equitable Distribution Program (EDP). She explained that the EDP was a pooled contract opened to all qualified A&E firms, and since most certified firms participated in it, DSBD did not apply SB measures to those projects. As a result, CBE participation was significant and remained relatively constant. She also pointed out that because the contracts for goods and services purchases typically involved high volume/dollar amounts, the SBE participation level (percentage) appeared lower, even though the dollar amount for SBE (prime) participation was relatively consistent compared with other SB programs. Ms. Townsley concluded by noting that although DSBD had achieved its overall objectives, it was still actively pursing greater inclusion goals.

2B

102770 Workshop Item
QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Report: *In response to Chairwoman Edmonson question regarding whether the 1% SBE program participation level for goods and services in FYs 2008-09 and 2009-10 seemed low, Ms. Townsley clarified that based on the types of goods and services the County procured, many SBs lacked the capacity to perform these services. She noted participation was in the open market, and these types of purchases were included in the dollar value.*

Chairwoman Edmonson opened the floor for comments:

Ms. Ismalia Rashid appeared on behalf of Rashid Enterprises and the CSBE Association, Inc. She noted members of the CSBEs and the CSBE Association were concerned with the County imposing bonding requirements on some projects valued at less than $200,000, which violated State statutes that did not require bonding for projects in this category and caused concern since many CSBE firms could not obtain bonding. The CSBEs were also concerned with County projects being bundled into one project allowing one firm to bid on it, rather than several firms; and that they would like to see projects which included established CSBE General Contractor (GC) set aside goals. Ms. Rashid expressed concern with changes made to the MCC 70/40 Program, specifically regarding projects under $10,000 that were intended to be awarded on a rotational basis, but now being competitively bid. She also expressed concern that if an extension for time and money was not granted for the MIA MCC Program, particularly the existing MCC 7 project and the proposed MCC 8 project, then CSBEs would be without any small projects to bid on at the airport for awhile.

Ms. Townsley advised that DSBD was working closely with the CSBE Association to address their concerns. She also noted DSBD was authorized to request a waiver of the bonding requirements under the CSBE program for projects valued less than $200,000, and was working with the Office of Capital Improvement (OCI) to analyze projects with excessive requirements and qualifications. She noted in some cases, bonding was required for

projects within this category and necessary due to the scope of work and risk involved; however, user departments were asked to justify their need for requiring bonding on projects valued at this level, or waive it if they could not justify it. Ms. Townsley noted DSBD, the CSBE Association and the OCI were engaged in ongoing dialogue to educate departments on this issue.

Responding to Ms. Rashid's concern regarding bundled projects, Ms. Townsley noted DSBD had a Construction Manager that was responsible for working with the capital departments to provide input at the conceptual stage of a project so that projects were designed with SB inclusion in mind. She also noted that user departments provided DSBD with a forecast six months in advance of an upcoming project, and DSBD worked with them to identify SB participation opportunities. She advised that DSBD was actively working to address this issue, but the user departments' were responsible for providing greater inclusion, and doing so was not always possible.

In response to Chairwoman Edmonson's question regarding how the user departments determined the need to impose or waive the bonding requirement for projects less than $100,000, Ms. Townsley noted DSBD considered the feasibility of waiving the bond requirement or imposing it for projects with significant risk or liability.

Ms. Rashid acknowledged that she and members of the CSBE Association were aware of DSBD's active role in addressing their concerns and pleased with it; however, because DSBD was short-staffed, their response was limited and all concerns were unable to be addressed.

In response to Chairwoman Edmonson's question regarding whether CSBE set asides had been established, Ms. Townsley noted the County had projects with CSBE set asides, but she preferred to meet with Ms. Rashid to address her specific concerns.

Ms. Rashid noted it was imperative the County established a mechanism for tracking the success rates and participation levels of Black, Hispanic and Women Small Business Enterprises. She concurred that SB programs were race, ethnic and gender neutral, but noted that tracking the success rates of minority businesses was not illegal and was necessary under the CSBE program.

In response to Chairwoman Edmonson's question regarding whether DSBD had any mechanism in place for tracking minority businesses, Ms. Townsley noted she preferred the County Attorney address this issue and whether DSBD could legally track this information.

Assistant County Attorney David Hope noted that based on current case law, DSBD could not mandate firms to provide this information; and could only ask that firms provide it voluntarily.

Assistant to the County Manager Howard Piper added that due to the current case law, the County no longer mandated DSBD to collect information by race, ethnicity or gender, but firms could voluntarily disclose the information within the application for certification.

In response to Chairwoman Edmonson's question regarding whether SB firms were aware of this option or had they refused to disclose the information, Ms. Townsley noted the disclosure rate was about 95% in the certification process. She also noted that pursuant to legislation sponsored by the County Commission and the Commission's direction, DSBD collected ethnic and gender information when vendors registered. She said she believed the issue was not how the information was collected, but how DSBD considered that information when making its decisions.

Ms. Rashid noted the 70/40 contract under the MCC program consisted of three parts: projects valued less than $10,000, which were intended to be awarded on a rotational basis; projects valued between $10,000 and $200,000, which required a minimum of 3 participating bidders; and projects valued in excess of $200,000, which required inviting the entire available contractor communities to bid on these projects. Ms. Rashid expressed concern that the departments had requested more than one bidder (as many as seven) to bid on most projects less than $10,000, making it a competitive bid rather than a rotational contract. She also expressed concern that she had seen as many as 25 bidders on projects valued between $10,000 and $200,000, and would like to see the number of bidders capped at 3. In addition, she would like to see the entire available contractor community be invited to participate on projects at lower program levels, not just for projects in excess of $200,000.

Chairwoman Edmonson questioned whether a cap could be placed on the number of firms that bid on a project.

Ms. Rashid noted the MCC 70/40 program was a special program requiring that firms be pre-qualified for projects between certain amounts and did not involve bidding in the open market; therefore, she believed the number of bidders could be capped.

Ms. Townsley noted she was aware of the CSBE Association's issue concerning this program, but she did not know the details of the subject contract, except that it was administered by the OCI. She respectfully requested that she be allowed to meet with the OCI Director to discuss it further. Ms. Townsley also noted she offered to conduct a workshop with the CSBE Association and the OCI to address this issue and would continue working with Ms. Rashid and the CSBE Association.

Ms. Dorothy Brown-Alfaro, representing the CSBE Association, commended Ms. Townsley and DSBD staff for their efforts and assistance provided to the SB firms, despite being understaffed. She agreed with Ms. Rashid that DSBD needed more staffing to cover all the areas they were responsible for. She noted that CSBE firms utilized every division of the DSBD, and really needed this department; that DSBD's staff took the time to literally meet with and assist each firm in resolving disputes, bonding and compliance issues, and CSBE firms were very concerned with the County's proposal to eliminate this department.

Chairwoman Edmonson advised that the proposal to eliminate the DSBD came from the Mayor's office; however, the Commission was doing their best to ensure the County maintained this department.

Ms. Brown-Alfaro expressed appreciation to Chairwoman Edmonson for conducting today's (12/02) workshop and initiating this dialogue. She suggested Ms. Townsley schedule another workshop sponsored by the entire County Commission to discuss bonding issues and GC trades set asides with all County department heads.

Chairwoman Edmonson noted she liked that suggestion and would take it into consideration.

Mr. Sam Sami, General Contractor, Aarya Construction and Design, 7657 NW 50th Street, and board member of the CSBE Association, expressed appreciation to Chairwoman Edmonson for conducting today's (12/02) workshop, and to the DSBD staff for the services they provided. He was pleased that the certification process was remaining in DSBD. Mr. Sami noted construction contracting opportunities needed to be expanded to include GC goals or trade set asides for projects of other departments.

In response to Chairwoman Edmonson's question regarding whether general contractors fit into any of the SB program categories, Ms. McGriff noted the MCC 70/40 Contract Program administered through the OIC provided projects with GC set asides.

Mr. Sami clarified that the MCC 70/40 Contract administered through the OIC had very few projects with GC set asides, and other departments such as Parks and Recreation and Miami-International Airport generally had no projects with set asides for GCs. He noted CSBE GCs needed more share of the projects.

Ms. Townsley pointed out the MCC 70/40 Contract was a set aside pool specifically for SB prime contracts. She also noted DSBD analyzed projects of other departments to determine the feasibility of a set aside and pursued first opportunities for set asides; however, DSBD must ensure availability in order to establish a measure. She defined availability as a sufficient number of certified SB firms that could participate in each area of a project's scope of work, including the subcontracting trade areas. Ms. Townsley noted she had discussed with the SB firms and their advisory partners the proposal to streamline the review process. She noted that making the SB community more aware of opportunities in-house and in advance of a project would encourage communication among the SB firms, which in turn would help create the availability. Ms. Townsley explained the issue was the firms were not responding to DSBD's availability analysis, and at least three affirmative responses were needed in order to establish a measure. She noted it would be greatly beneficial to the SB community if they were aware of in-house information and had the knowledge in advance of the project.

In response to Chairwoman Edmonson's question regarding whether the criteria or policies used to determine project set asides were uniform for every department and processed through the DSBD, Ms. Townsley noted the criteria was uniform for all departments and reviewed by the DSBD.

Mr. Sami noted he had seen some Level 1 CSBE set asides for Public Works Department and Port of Miami projects, but had not seen any Level 2 and 3 CSBE set aside projects for a few years. He explained that Level 1 CSBEs could participate in projects valued up to $2 million; Level 2, could participate in projects between $2 million and $5 million; Level 3 could participate in projects between $5 and $10 million, and graduated with projects over $10 million. Mr. Sami noted he would like to see more CSBE GC set asides at Levels 2 and 3, and would appreciate it if DSBD provided assistance to the CSBE GCs that participated in the open market or in other CSBE programs. He noted CSBE GCs hesitate to seek assistance from DSBD when in trouble because set asides or goals were not established for those projects.

Chairwoman Edmonson noted DSBD provided outreach services, but could not force those firms to seek DSBD's assistance; however, DSBD would provide them with assistance upon request.

Ms. Townsley added that DSBD advocated for the SB Community and supported their doing business with the County, regardless if a set aside goal had been established in the project or not.

Ms. Priscilla Dames, Wingspan Seminars, expressed appreciation to the DSBD for proposing to extend the SB certification from 1 to 3 years. She noted many SB firms utilized the services and workshops offered by DSBD, and found DSBD technicians to be professional and helpful in the certification process; however, many needed additional assistance in the bidding and proposal process, specifically micro businesses with less than 15 employees. She noted she agreed with the proposal to streamline the review process and expand communication between the SB firms, but expressed concern that micro-firms, once certified and receiving proposals, were confused about the bidding process.

Chairwoman Edmonson advised that she would meet with Ms. Townsley later to discuss this matter

further.

Mr. Al Hardemon 655 NW 48 Street, Sky Community Development (an affiliation of American Workforce Corporation) expressed concern that general contractors and developers of larger firms were receiving more share of the projects; that SBs made up a larger portion of the population but received less share of the projects, which created a conflict and bidding war between the larger and smaller firms. He stated he believed more jobs needed to be created for the micro firms and Level 2 CSBEs. Mr. Hardemon also noted an oversight committee or an entity independent of the DSBD needed to be created that would monitor the procurement process and compliance of scope of work to ensure a fair portion of the schedule of values was distributed to the SB firms or subcontractors. He noted he believed a limit should be set on the amount of profit a GC could earn from a County project, and an entity should be established to ensure the sub contractors were paid.

In response to Chairwoman Edmonson's question regarding whether a monitoring process was currently in place to oversee this process and who was responsible for it, Ms. Townsley noted Ms. Alice Hildago-Gato, Contract Monitoring and Compliance Division Director was responsible for overseeing the compliance monitoring process, and she described this process earlier during her presentation. She noted it seemed that Mr. Hardemon was speaking about contractual requirements, and in some instances, about an oversight role by the user department to monitor the schedule of values; however, she was unsure of his specific concerns, and would like to meet with him to get further clarification.

Mr. Hardemon agreed to meet with Ms. Townsley after Chairwoman Edmonson asked if he could meet with the DSBD following today's (12/02) workshop to discuss each of his concerns.

Mr. Jose Andarcio-Gonzalez, APER Construction, LLC, 18340 SW 296 St, Homestead, Florida, appeared and expressed his appreciation to Chairwoman Edmonson for conducting this workshop and inviting the CSBE community to attend. He also expressed appreciation to the DSBD's staff, noting without their assistance, he could not have achieved the success he had in his business.

Mr. Reza Johan Shahi, family-owned CSBE, appeared and expressed his appreciation for DSBD's assistance, noting he believed it was critical to the survival of his business. He also noted with DSBDs support, he joined the CSBE Association and now shared his experience and knowledge with other SB firms he came in contact with.

Chairwoman Edmonson expressed her appreciation to Ms. Townsley and the DSBD staff for today's (12/02) presentation. She said she was very happy to hear the positive comments expressed by speakers about the DSBD, and based on those comments, she felt good about pushing the County to maintain this department, and she would continue those efforts. Chairwoman Edmonson advised that anyone with further questions to contact her office or the DSBD for assistance.

2C

102769 **Workshop Item**
QUESTIONS FROM COMMISSIONERS

3 ADJOURNMENT

Report: *There being no further business to come before them, the Small Business Workshop was adjourned at 11:13 a.m.*