

MINUTES OF MEETING
INDIGO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

An audit RFP committee meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Indigo Community Development District was held on Wednesday, May 22, 2013 at 1:00 p.m. at the Holiday Inn Daytona Beach LPGA Blvd., Boardroom B, 137 Automall Circle, Daytona Beach, Florida 32124.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Robert Welsh	Chairman
Ed Bertsch	Vice Chairman
Don Parks	Supervisor
John McCarthy	Supervisor
Tom Leek	Supervisor

Also present were:

Jim Perry	District Manager
Katie Buchanan	District Counsel (by phone)

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Introduction

Mr. Perry called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Review and Ranking of Proposals for Auditing Services

Mr. Perry stated the committee members have received copies of the proposals, along with the auditor evaluation criteria and ranking sheet. The first proposer is Carr Riggs & Ingram. I am very familiar with this firm. They do about 200 CDD audits throughout the State of Florida. Several of them are with Districts that we manage. Their fees for year number one were \$5,800, for year two \$5,900 and year number three \$6,000. Our current budget is \$5,100. For ability of personnel I gave them an 18. For proposers experience I gave them a 20. For understanding the scope of work I gave them an eight. For ability to furnish the required services I gave them a 20. For points I gave them a 14. The reason the points are lower for price is because the lowest priced proposer was McDermitt Davis, which would get 20 points. They will receive 90 total points. The second proposer was Masters & Smith, P.A. I am not familiar

with them. They are out of Jacksonville. Their bid was \$12,725 for the audit. For ability of personnel I gave them a 15 because they have very little, if any, CDD experience. They have some governmental experience but very little CDD experience. I gave them a five for proposers experience. They are not nearly as strong as the rest of the proposers. For understanding the scope of work I gave them a 10. I don't think they really understand the scope of this work. For ability to furnish the required services I gave them a 15. For price I gave them a five. They received a total of 50 points. The third proposer is Elam Gaines & Frank. They do about 35 Districts in the State. Their initial bid is \$4,125; however, for years two and three it says to be negotiated. As a result of that, I ranked them a little bit lower on certain things. For ability of personnel I gave them an 18. For proposers experience I gave them a 20. For understanding the scope of work an 18. For ability to furnish the required services I gave them a 20 and price an 18. They had a total of 94 points. Grau & Associates is the fourth proposer. They do more CDD audits in the State than any of these other firms. They do about 350 audits. They are our current auditors. Their cost for this past year was \$5,100, which is what we budgeted. Their proposal for year one is \$4,800, year two is \$5,000 and year three is \$5,200. For ability of personnel I gave them a 20. I know they can do the work without any issues. Their experience is at a 20. For understanding the scope of work I gave them a 20. I gave them a 20 to furnish the required services and a 19 in regards to price. Their total was 99. The next proposer was McDermitt Davis & Company. They do about 45 Districts in the State. They proposed \$4,300 for the first year, \$4,400 for the second year and \$4,500 for the third year. In regards to ability of personnel I gave them an 18. For proposers experience I gave them a 20. For understanding the scope of work I gave them an 18. For ability to furnish the required services I gave them a 20 and 20 for price because they were the lowest overall price. They had a total of 96 points. The last firm that proposed was Stewart Angelo & Company. They do about 63 Districts predominantly on the west coast of Florida. Their initial fee for the first year was \$5,000. They proposed \$5,250 for year two and \$5,500 year three. They did have a qualification in there that those out years may change if there is any change in scope. I kind of look at them the same Berger Toombs, in that years two and three are really not that solid. I gave them an 18 on ability of personnel. I gave them a 20 on proposers experience. I gave them an 18 on understanding the scope of work. For ability to furnish the required services I gave them a 20 and price is 17. Their total is 93 points. I ranked Grau & Associates as number one with 99 points, McDermitt

Davis as number second with 96 points, Berger Toombs was third with 94 points, Stewart Angelo & Company was fourth with 93 points, Carr Riggs & Ingram was fifth with 90 points and Master & Smith was sixth with 50 points. You can take my input or you can say that you agree with it or that you don't agree and rank it as you see fit.

Mr. Leek stated the significant thing to me is the firm that we have been using ranked the highest. We haven't had any problems with them. They have done a very good job for us.

Mr. Perry stated the board has agreed to accept my rankings.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS **Other Business**
There being none, the next item followed.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Adjournment**

On MOTION by Mr. Welsh seconded by Mr. Bertsch with all in favor the Meeting was adjourned.
