

TCC RFP COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES 6/29/2010

In Attendance:

Becky Maruca
Diane Heming
Peggy Gillespie
George Safin
Jim Meyer
Dave Amatangelo
Joe Koluder
Dan Watson
Lawrence J. Maiello

Not In Attendance:

Margaret Graham
Jim Morrison

Review Responses to List of Questions

The committee shared comments regarding their review of the responses by Berkheimer, Centax and Keystone to the list of questions. Some of the points that were made are as follows:

- Originally the committee discussed requesting from the vendors that additional permanent sites be considered. It was decided at this meeting that additional permanent sites would not be mandated because it may be cost prohibitive and that the committee would seek input for each of the vendors during the interview process.
- Some of the vendors are requesting that the TCC pay additional costs, such as postage and court/delinquent proceeding costs. This is a concern to the committee because these additional costs are not clearly defined in the proposals. This will be added to our list of questions for the interview.
- One of the vendors is still not willing to bill at gross cost. We will ask them to elaborate on this at the interview.
- One of the vendors is not willing to consider our 3rd party backup request. We will ask them to elaborate on this at the interview.
- There is still a concern as to how these vendors will handle manual records during the transition period. We will ask them to elaborate on this at the interview.

Review Responses to TCA Agreement Objections

Lawrence shared his second review for Berkheimer and Centax, and his first review for Keystone of their response to our Tax Collector Agreement. While

there were several objections which were unanimous across each of the vendors, the following is an incomplete list of some of the objections that were specific to just one or two of the vendors:

- Keystone and Berkheimer objected to our liquidated damages amount/language if reports are not timely.
- Keystone and Centax objected to our language on being able to transfer delinquent tax collections to a 3rd party if the TCC believes it is necessary.

It was noted by members of the committee that it is very difficult to do a complete review/comparison of each proposal/response to list of questions because of the different manners that each responded in. Some of the vendors were more direct/clear in their responses, while others were much vaguer and less transparent. The committee agreed that it would be unfair to view negatively on those who responded more directly than those who had not because they both may have the same objections, just one of them stated it in writing.

Review Responses to Delinquent Taxpayer Sample Situation

The committee reviewed each of the responses to the sample charges to delinquent taxpayers question and estimated that Keystone would be the most costly to the delinquent taxpayer, followed by Centax and Berkheimer. (Note: Berkheimer proposal also includes a cost to the TCC)

Review Weighted Scoring Sheet

The committee once again reviewed the revised weighted scoring sheet. It was decided to revise it once again. We will now have two sheets. The first sheet will be distributed to all members prior to the interviews. Each category listed on this sheet will deal with technical aspects of the proposal only. Each member will be responsible for rating each vendor following their 1 hour interview, by each category, giving a rating of 1 to 3, with 3 being the highest rating and 1 the lowest. Following all three interviews, each member will share their rating sheet with the other members. The entire committee will come to a consensus on one rating sheet for each of the three vendors. These final three rating sheets will then be entered into the Weighted Scoring Sheet that was agreed to prior to the proposals being received. Scores will be calculated out and shared at the next meeting.

Review Next Meeting Date (7/14/2010) Topics

Notification – Lawrence will prepare written notification for review by the committee to be distributed to each of the vendors requesting their presence at the July 14th meeting.

Review Questions – It was agreed that we would provide the questions at the interview, not in advance. Lawrence will prepare the questions for review by the committee to be distributed at the interview.

- Personnel
- Locations
- Technology
- Transition Plan
 - 3rd Party Backup Option
 - Manual Records
- Additional Costs (Postage, Court/Delinquent Proceeding Costs)

Approach – There will be 1 hour interviews starting at 1 PM, with a ½ hour break for each member to rate independently. Following all three interviews, the members of the committee will share each of their ratings and the committee will come to a consensus on an overall group rating for each vendor.

Discussion on Requests for Revised Cost Proposal

It was agreed to by the committee that we would accept a last best final pricing proposal from each of the vendors. In advance of the July 14th interviews, Lawrence will draft a document notifying each of the vendors to bring their best and final costing submittal to the July 14th interviews. Their revised costing proposal should be delivered in a sealed envelope and will not be reviewed by the committee until after the interview and rating process has occurred.

Other

Dan informed the committee that he will not be at the TCC meeting in July because he will be at the beach that week. The District's Superintendent will attend the meeting in his place so she can cast her vote on behalf of the Greater Latrobe School District.

Next Meeting Date

The next meeting is scheduled for July 14th starting at 1 PM at the Greensburg Salem Middle School. This meeting will be lengthy, so please plan accordingly.