

# Memo

**To:** City Council  
**From:** Sharon Eveland, City Manager  
**Date:** 7/11/2024  
**Re:** City Manager's Report

---

**MLK Jr Ave resurfacing** – I am recommending against moving forward with MLK at this time. During the process for reviewing the bidders, it came to my attention that the underground infrastructure needs serious work and it is a problem area for I&I. Given this, it seems an unwise long-term decision to repave the street given that there is a good chance that we will need to dig it all up within the next few years. An alternative option would be to crack-fill MLK, which is not going to be an ideal situation but will extend the life of the road, and then work with DOT on applying the \$95k of grant funds to another street. As of this writing, Robert and Alex are working to determine an appropriate alternative street that does not need underground infrastructure work and we will have that information by the meeting. The Council could also elect to delay the project while we work out funding for the underground infrastructure needs and I have asked Robert to talk to DOT to verify how long we have to spend those funds. And, of course, the Council could still elect to move forward as is with the knowledge it will get torn up long before the surface would need to be replaced again. One of the things I will be working with Alex and the future PW Director on is coordination of future street projects so that we avoid these issues moving forward. Ideally, we are doing both full reconstructions (with surface and underground infrastructure improvements) and resurfacings every year. We also need to start funding annual street maintenance efforts for crack-filling and sealcoating, which greatly increases the life of the street. However, even with maintenance, streets typically only last about 50-75 years, and so one of the other things I intend to work on with staff is a long-term replacement schedule so that we are planning our street and infrastructure work 5-10 years out.

For this meeting, if the Council wishes to move forward with the project as is, then we are recommending the bid be awarded to the second lowest bidder, which is ASA paving. After reviewing the details with Keenan, we feel there is sufficient justification to declare them a non-responsible bidder. An appropriate motion, if the Council does still want to do the project now, would be *“Motion to award a contract to ASA Paving in the amount of \$239,754.36 for the MLK JR resurfacing project.”*

**Ordinance 2024-02 – Finance Procedures** – This will be the 2<sup>nd</sup> reading of this ordinance. The following is copied from the last memo as the information is the same: As I have mentioned in the past, Brianna and I have been working on significant changes to the procurement policy

(draft copy is in the packet). Some of these changes will conflict with certain provisions of the Finance Ordinance. As such, I have prepared an ordinance to amend that section that essentially removes most of the ordinance and replaces it with a statement that simply incorporates the procurement policy. This will allow future changes to the procurement policy without having to go through an ordinance change and it mirrors the section of the Ordinance that deals with Personnel matters (it simply refers to the Personnel Manual). The procurement policy will provide greater flexibility to staff while still providing important guardrails for how we procure goods and services (and still complies with state statutes). The only non-procurement piece that would change in the ordinance is, as I mentioned at the last meeting, the City Manager would have the authority to declare items surplus when valued at less than \$500. Everything at or above \$500 would still come through the Council.

**Procurement Policy Update** – This goes hand-in-hand with the Finance Procedures Ordinance update. I provided a summary of the changes at the previous meeting but they include the following:

- Increasing city manager purchasing authority to \$50,000 (up from \$10,000)
- Increasing the bid requirement to a minimum of \$50,000 (certain things will have a higher threshold to require formal bid process but remain compliant with state statute on purchasing)
- Increases department head purchasing authority to \$6,000 (up from \$500)
- Defines emergency purchasing and provides limits
- Addresses internal controls, use of p-card v. vendor invoicing, sales tax, platforms for advertising
- Addresses procedures for informal and formal bidding
- Eliminates need to pull small dollar items on the council agenda
- Specifies items that are exempt from purchase orders

As I mentioned at the previous meeting, these changes will allow us to operate more efficiently and effectively with regards to purchasing while still ensuring appropriate safeguards are in place.

**Ordinance 2024-03 Regulatory Fee Amounts** - This ordinance will remove the fee amounts for certain licenses from the ordinance so that they are treated in the same way as all other fees charged by the City. Right now, to change a fee for the transient merchant license, which is the next agenda item, it would require an ordinance change. This is not the best way to handle fees. The vast majority of cities do all fees via resolution, which is what this ordinance change will do. Given the relatively benign nature of this change and that we are actually decreasing, not increasing, the fee, I am requesting that the Council suspend the rules to waive both readings and adopt the ordinance in a single meeting and then follow up with approving the resolution amending the fee schedule.

**Resolution 2024-16 Fee Schedule**- This resolution amends the fee schedule to add the occupational licenses that were previously listed in the ordinances. In addition to setting them via resolution now, I am also recommending we reduce the annual transient merchant license fee to \$250. I feel that \$500 is overly burdensome and more than is necessary to effectively administer the license.

**Strategic Plan Contract Award** – We received six proposals, including one from Carl Vinson Institute. I review and scored all six proposals using factors such as the project personnel, project experience, scope of work, cost effectiveness, quality of submittal, and structure/final product as scoring factors. The top three scoring firms (out of 100 points) are as follows:

- Allyson Brunette Consulting – 86 points – Cost \$24,410
- MGT(GovHR) – 84 points – Cost \$27,700
- CP2 Consulting – 84 points – Cost \$28,000

I am recommending awarding the contract to Allyson Brunette Consulting at a cost not to exceed \$25,500 (this additional cushion will act as a contingency fund for the project). I personally know Allyson though I have not been through a project with her before. However, I know those who have and they have all spoke very highly of her and her work. She is also the lowest cost option. Her process would include two on-site visits in addition to virtual meetings whereas MGT's proposal only includes virtual meetings/workshops. CP2 also primarily relies on in-person activities. Both CP2 and Allyson Brunette Consulting specialize in and only do strategic planning. MGT has a host of different services it offers has a very deep pool of consultants to pull from because it is a national firm, whereas Allyson Brunette Consulting and CP2 are small businesses. I do believe all three firms would provide a quality product, and I feel Allyson's process is best suited for Sandersville's needs. As a side note, the cost proposed by Carl Vinson Institute was \$54,293 (or about \$40,000 if you exclude the proposed in-person implementation follow-up meetings), making it significantly more costly than the top three scoring firms and the second highest cost proposal out of all six.

**Compensation Study Contract Award** – We received ten proposals for the compensation/classification project. I have reviewed and scored all ten of the proposals using a phased approach (due to the large number of proposals) whereby I separated the pricing and reference scoring from the rest of the scoring evaluation. Phase 1 scoring included the firm's history and resource capability, staff qualifications, proposed methods and procedures, overall quality of submittal, and structure/contents of final product for a total possible point score of 65. In doing so, I eliminated four of the firms just based on having less than 50 points. Phase two involved determining the score for their pricing (and pricing proposals were required to be separate documents so that I could evaluate the proposal without undue influence from pricing). I then eliminated three additional proposals based on the total scores for Phase 2 (which is the pricing score added to the Phase 1 score). Those three were eliminated simply because I wanted to narrow it down to no more than three proposals for reference checks and there was a comfortable gap of seven points between the lowest of the top three and the highest of the Phase 2 eliminations. At this point, I attempted to contact all references provided (each firm provided at least three). I was not able to get responses from all of them but enough that I felt comfortable scoring the references. After adding in the reference score, the top three firms were as follows:

- Evergreen Solutions - 89 - \$29,500 (all-in cost)
- MGT(GovHR) - 88 - \$19,890 (+\$250 per job description)
- Management Advisory Group - 85 - \$24,900 (provided as estimate rather than fixed fee or not-to-exceed)

Based on the scoring and my overall impression of the finalists, I am recommending the City award the contract to Evergreen Solutions at a cost not to exceed \$30,500. The additional \$1,000 will be for contingency if something comes up that is beyond the proposed scope.

**Funding for Airport Equipment** – I met with Jim Croome about their needs for additional equipment to maintain the grass at a reasonable height. I am working to determine the most appropriate source of those funds and will have that information for the Council at the meeting.

**M. Friedman Sidewalk** - This project was rebid last month due to issues with the bids of the two lowest bidders from the first attempt. Turnipseed has reviewed the bids and is recommending (see letter in packet) the City award the bid to HD Construction with Addition 1-A, which is for replacing the culvert north of Railroad Avenue, at a cost not to exceed \$414,425. We anticipate that the project will start in late August and the contract allows for up to 120 days to complete it.

**Changing grade of PW Director** - After reviewing the salary range for the PW Director and having attempted to recruit this position, I am significant concerns that the grade was lowered more than it should have been and it will be incredibly difficult to recruit someone with experience at the current range. In order to be more competitive, I am recommending the grade be increased at least one level. The current range is \$58,752-\$82,268. The proposed one level would adjust the range to \$65,823-\$92,168.

**Other matters not on the agenda:**

- This was in my report at the last meeting but just a reminder that we will be closing City Hall for 90 minutes on July 12<sup>th</sup> to hold a going away luncheon for Brianna. The closure notice was posted at the end of last week.
- Alex has informed me that we will need to perform extensive cleaning of the two water tanks. We have selected the vendor and will be finalizing timing in the next week or so. It is likely we will need to issue a water restriction when the work is performed because water pressure will likely be affected. However, the work is only expected to take three days so it will just be a short period. We will provide further communication to the public as soon as we know when the work will take place.
- I held a meeting with relevant staff and the attorney to work on the food truck ordinance. We've made good progress but there are still some logistical pieces we need to evaluate and make determinations on. Keenan will be working on making changes to the draft ordinance based on the conversations and decisions that came out of that staff meeting. Our goal is to have a draft ordinance to the Council in September but before we finalize the draft ordinance, we will be meeting with the vendors to get their thoughts and see if there are any major concerns or questions that we need to address.
- I will be attending the GMA Broadband Summit in Warner Robbins on the 16<sup>th</sup> and will likely be doing a tour of Plant Vogtle with GCCMA on the 19<sup>th</sup>.
- I have continued to work on overhauling the Personnel Manual. I will be meeting with the management staff later this month to review and get their input. My goal is to have a draft for the Council's consideration no later than the first meeting in September.

Respectfully,  
Sharon Eveland, City manager