

**Policies & Procurement Committee  
September 17, 2002 Meeting**

**Draft Minutes**

Members Present: Theodore Martland, Committee Vice Chairman  
Michael Pace, Board Chairman  
Raymond O'Brien  
James Francis (arrived at 9:55)  
John Mengacci

CRRA Staff Present: George Carlson, Facilities Manager (part of meeting)  
John Clark, Operations Division Head  
Paul Doyle, Part-Time Counsel (part of meeting)  
Peter Egan, Director of Environmental Services  
Brian Flaherty, Communications Coordinator (part of meeting)  
Gary Gendron, Director of Administration  
Lynn Martin, Insurance & Claims Manager  
Angelica Mattschei, Corporate Secretary

Vice Chairman Martland called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

**1. Approval of Minutes – August 8, 2002**

Vice Chairman Martland requested a motion on the referenced topic. Director O'Brien made the motion to approve the minutes of the August 8, 2002 Committee meeting which was seconded by Director Mengacci.

Director Mengacci said that on page 2, the motion seconded was made by Director Francis, not Director Sullivan. Director Sullivan was not part of the Committee and did not attend the meeting, he said. Director Mengacci said that on page 5, last paragraph, the word "expounded" should be "expanded."

The motion previously made and seconded was approved unanimously.

## **2. Review draft of Vehicle and Cell Phone Policies**

Mr. Gendron circulated a draft of the Cell Phone and Pager Usage Policy to the Committee and noted that suggestions from Division Heads were included in the document. Mr. Gendron said that there was nothing fundamentally different from the policy that the committee voted on in August.

Director O'Brien made a motion to recommend the Cell Phone & Pager Usage Policy that was distributed to the Committee to the full board, as amended. Director Mengacci seconded the motion.

Director Mengacci said that on the 2<sup>nd</sup> to last paragraph, the word "Brief" should be added before "Incidental personal usage" for consistency. Vice Chairman Martland said that the last sentence should read "Exceptions to this policy shall be reviewed by" instead of "made only upon the approval of". Mr. Gendron suggested that an effective date should be added. The sentence "Effective upon passage by the Board on September 19, 2002" was added to the document.

The motion made and seconded was approved unanimously.

There was a discussion on the choice of carriers as documented in TAB B of the Committee materials. A comparison was made between the two existing phone providers, Verizon Wireless and Nextel, on Page 2 of TAB B. Mr. Gendron said that he would like to have only one cell phone provider. Vice Chairman Martland asked why it would be desirable to have one carrier. Mr. Gendron responded that it made sense to have one carrier because it would be easier to administer one set of the same equipment. It also would be easier for accounting purposes, he added. Two different carriers meant two different bills and two different checks written out, Mr. Gendron said.

Vice Chairman Martland asked what date the early termination would take place. Mr. Carlson said that it would depend on when a particular contract was started. It would be conceivable to have 14 different dates.

Director Mengacci stated that a lot of things incorporated into the procedures were based on existing contracts. He asked to what degree CRRA could use the State plan. Director Mengacci said that other options needed to be explored before they decided on Verizon, Nextel or any other plan.

Vice Chairman Martland suggested that the item be tabled until other options, including the State plan, were examined. Director Mengacci agreed and added that more information on CRRA's business needs should also be examined. The business needs of an organization should be determined first, he said, and then look at options that would fit those needs.

### 3. Vehicle Usage Policy

Vice Chairman Martland requested a motion on the referenced topic. Director O'Brien made the motion to accept the Vehicle Usage Policy as distributed to the committee. Director Mengacci seconded the motion.

Assignment of Vehicles. Vice Chairman Martland said that the last sentence of the first paragraph should state "may" instead of "shall." In the second paragraph, the word "rare" should be replaced with "appropriate."

Acceptable Uses of Pool Vehicles (in order of priority). There was a discussion regarding the acceptable use of pool vehicles. There was a question whether a list of priorities for the use of those vehicles was needed or appropriate. Mr. Gendron explained that a policy needed to be in place in order to give the Facilities Manager some administrative guidelines in circumstances where there may be multiple requests for one vehicle. Chairman Pace said that number 2 under the referenced item was sufficient. Chairman Pace said that a definition of every possible event was not needed. It was decided that numbers 2 and 5 be combined into one bullet and numbers 1, 3 and 4 be eliminated.

Acceptable Use of "On-Call" Assigned Vehicles. Vice Chairman Martland said that in number 1, the words "they have" should be replaced with "one has". Director O'Brien stated that number 7 should be eliminated.

A discussion ensued regarding the difference between daily commuting and on-call use of a vehicle. Chairman Pace said that it should be acceptable for an employee to take a vehicle home if a decision was made that that person could be called back at any given moment. That person would be on-call to handle CRRA business, he said. Chairman Pace noted that these were case specific events and would not happen on a consistent basis.

The committee discussed the reimbursement scheme for personal mileage. Mr. Gendron explained that there was a very rigorous reimbursement scheme already in place where an employee would pay 36.5 cents per mile for personal mileage placed on a vehicle.

Director Francis said that the daily commuting issue could be dealt with in accordance with IRS regulations. Director Francis continued that there was a formula for devising a taxable benefit added to an individual's W-2's instead of reimbursing the Authority on a mileage basis.

Director Francis suggested that the “use for commuting shall be accounted for in accordance with IRS Policy and Regulations” should be incorporated. Chairman Pace reiterated that this was for case-specific events, not a vehicle assigned to an individual 365 days a year.

Director Mengacci asked which IRS option should be given to employees. Director Francis replied that both options should be given.

The Committee reached a consensus that number 7 under the referenced item be replaced with Director Francis’s suggestion.

Scheduling. Mr. Egan stated that it was more appropriate to have vehicles assigned to Division Heads and an employee who intended to use a vehicle should advise their Division Head instead of the Facilities Manager. Mr. Egan explained that it would reduce bureaucracy and having to locate Mr. Carlson for a vehicle. Mr. Egan said that Division Heads had oversight of their staff and should govern vehicles with staff duties. Chairman Pace agreed that Division Heads should be held accountable for their staff.

Mr. Gendron suggested that on the 1<sup>st</sup> page of the document, under Assignment of Vehicles, the first sentence of the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph should read, “In appropriate instances, vehicles may be assigned to Divisions as warranted...” “To Divisions as warranted” was added to the sentence. Mr. Gendron continued that a new paragraph should be added under Scheduling that stated, “Use of any Division vehicle shall be scheduled through the Division Head and use of any pool vehicle shall be scheduled through the Facilities Manager.”

General Guidelines. The Committee agreed that in the 1<sup>st</sup> sentence, “drivers license” should replace “State of Connecticut” in order to accommodate employees who lived outside of Connecticut and did not have a Connecticut license.

Vice Chairman Martland said that the second paragraph was redundant and should be deleted. The Committee agreed to strike the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph.

Director O’Brien moved to strike the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence of the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph. It was not grammatically uniform with the document and was not needed.

In the 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph, it was the Committee’s consensus that the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence should read “such a card shall be” instead of “this card is for” for grammatical uniformity.

Director O’Brien suggested that in the 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph, the word “any” should be deleted from the 1<sup>st</sup> sentence. The second sentence should also be deleted, he said. Chairman Pace agreed and said that it was a common sense issue. Director O’Brien explained that if an employee needed to stop for a meal while he or she was on a field assignment, that individual did not need to return to his or her personal vehicle in order to

do so. Chairman Pace said that the appropriate use of a business vehicle was common sense. The Committee agreed to the suggested changes.

In the 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph, Ms. Martin said that only CRRA and MDC employees were allowed to drive Authority vehicles. It was agreed that the sentence should read, "Only CRRA employees and MDC shall be allowed to drive an Authority vehicle."

Purchase and Disposal of Vehicles. The Committee agreed that the 2<sup>nd</sup> & 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence in the referenced paragraph be removed.

Other. Ms. Martin said that "vendors" should be replaced with "MDC". She explained that no other sub-contractors or vendors should be allowed to drive Authority vehicles besides the MDC.

Director O'Brien made a motion to include under Others that all Authority vehicles shall be identified with appropriate decals. The Committee agreed to include the motion as stated.

Vice Chairman Martland suggested that the last sentence under Others concerning any employee found in violation of the policy be stricken. It was not needed, he said.

Vice Chairman made a motion to accept the Vehicle Usage Policy as amended. The motion made and seconded by Director Francis was approved unanimously.

Surplus Vehicles. A lengthy discussion was held regarding surplus vehicles. Mr. Gendron distributed a list of surplus vehicles divided into List A and List B. Mr. Gendron said that List A, which would retain a few of the newer vehicles and do away with the rest, had a Kelley Blue Book value of \$60,630.00 and proposed offers from wholesalers at \$37,600.00 and \$46,1000.00. List B, he said, would do away with all of the newer vehicles and retain the older but very serviceable Jeeps and had a Kelley Blue Book value of \$79,685 and proposed offers from wholesalers at \$55,600.00 and \$86,700.00. Mr. Gendron added that the State auction was also an option in October. Mr. Gendron said that the risks associated with the State auction was the Authority may not receive Blue Book or wholesale values for the vehicles and that the Authority could still retain the vehicles if the minimum bid was not met.

Vice Chairman Martland said that the Authority should keep the newer and better vehicles. He explained that the Authority had already taken the financial hit. Chairman Pace agreed. Mr. Gendron said that it was the Committee's initial charge to change public perceptions and to collect as much cash as possible considering the budget situation in the Mid-Connecticut project. These items had to be taken into account when selecting vehicles, he said. Mr. Gendron said that keeping the older vehicles would also lessen the perception of favoritism among staff and would be more appropriate to use in the landfills. Mr. Mengacci agreed with Mr. Gendron's recommendation.

After a lengthy debate, Chairman Pace suggested that the item be handled through management. Their recommendations could then be referred to the Steering Committee, he said. Vice Chairman Martland agreed that the item be referred to management and the Steering Committee.

**4. Review Draft of Procurement Policy for distribution to the Board**

The Committee reviewed the draft of the Procurement Policies and Procedures.

**ARTICLE I**  
**Preamble**

Section 2. Benefit. Director O'Brien said that the sentence should read, "The provisions of these Policies and Procedures are solely for the benefit of C RRA and its member municipalities..."

**ARTICLE II**  
Authority Effectiveness and Definition

Section 2. Definitions. Director O'Brien said that (v) should include "or these procedures" at the end of the last sentence.

**ARTICLE III**  
**General Guidelines for Contracts**

Section 1. Presumption of Competitive Process. Director O'Brien said that (a) should also include "or these procedures" at the end of the last sentence.

**ARTICLE IV**  
Competitive Process

Section 4. Request for Bids "RFB". Mr. Doyle asked whether the RFB should be negotiable. It was decided that the second to the last sentence, the word "low" should be added before the word "bidder."

**ARTICLE V**  
Guidelines for Particular Contracts

Section 1. Real Property Acquisition. Director O'Brien suggested that (b)(1) should read "No real property shall be purchased by CRRA with at least two (2) written appraisals." The word "without" was replaced with "at least."

Section 7. Construction Contracts. Vice Chairman Martland commented that a 2% holdback of payments after one year of service should be included in the policy to insure quick repairs and solutions associated with any particular project. Vice Chairman Martland said that this would only pertain to large jobs that involved a large sum of monies. He explained that the 2% retention would be held for one year during the warranty period. Chairman Pace explained that this was part of the 5% retainer after the punch list had been completed. After the punch list had been completed, 3% would be returned and 2% would be held for one year.

Section 8. Waste Hauling/Disposal and Daily Cover Contracts. It was decided that the “RFB contract” should be changed to “competitive bid process.”

Section 11. Market Driven Purchase and Sales. Director O’Brien said that property acquired by CRRA should be disposed of in the same way that it was acquired through a competitive process.

Vice Chairman Martland made a motion to refer the item to the Board for its review and comments. Mr. Doyle said that he would prepare the ad for the Board to vote on the item in November.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Vice Chairman Martland requested a motion to recess the meeting until after the Board meeting on September 19, 2002. The motion made and seconded by Director O’Brien was passed unanimously.

The meeting was recessed at 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Angelica Mattschei  
Corporate Secretary