

**City of Coral Gables City Commission Meeting**  
**Agenda Item I-1**  
**Commission Chambers**  
**November 10, 2020**  
**405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, FL**

**City Commission**

**Mayor Raul Valdes-Fauli**  
**Vice Mayor Vince Lago**  
**Commissioner Jorge Fors, Jr.**  
**Commissioner Pat Keon**  
**Commissioner Michael Mena**

**City Staff**

**City Manager, Peter Iglesias**  
**City Attorney, Miriam Ramos**  
**City Clerk, Billy Urquia**  
**Deputy City Attorney, Cristina Suarez**  
**Chief Procurement Officer, Celeste Walker-Harmon**  
**Public Works Director for Sanitation, Al Zamora**  
**Assistant City Manager, Ed Santamaria**

**Public Speaker(s)**

**Miguel De Grandy, Partner, Holland and Knight**  
**Mitch Kessler, Consultant**

---

Agenda Item I-1 [12:00 p.m.]

A Resolution of the City Commission accepting the recommendation of the Chief Procurement Officer to award the Solid Waste and Recycling Services to Waste Management Inc. of Florida, the highest ranked responsive proposer, pursuant to Section 2-763 of the Procurement Code entitled “Contract Award” and Request for Proposal (RFP) 2020-015.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: The next item is I-1, time certain 9:30 a.m.

Chief Procurement Officer Walker-Harmon: Celeste Walker-Harmon.

Deputy City Attorney Suarez: Let me read it into the record.

*City Commission Meeting*  
*November 10, 2020*

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: I'm sorry, please start.

Deputy City Attorney Suarez: I-1 is a Resolution of the City Commission accepting the recommendation of the Chief Procurement Officer to award the Solid Waste and Recycling Services to Waste Management Inc. of Florida, the highest ranked responsive responsible proposer, pursuant to Section 2-763 of the Procurement Code entitled "Contract Award" and Request for Proposal (RFP) 2020-015.

Chief Procurement Officer Walker-Harmon: Again, good morning, Celeste Walker-Harmon, Chief Procurement Officer. For this particular item, we are asking for recommendation to move forward with Waste Management Inc. of Florida. But for this particular item, we do have a presentation from staff. So, first off, I would like for the Public Works Director of Sanitation, Al Zamora to come forward and he's going to start the presentation that we have for you this morning.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Good afternoon Al.

Director Zamora: Good afternoon Mayor and Commissioners, how are you? The current RF fee, like the prior competitive solicitations containing rates, as well as the proposed franchise, because in 2010 there was a waiver of the Procurement Code, additional payments were negotiated in about a total of about \$900,000. Without that for the current solicitation was a better and more transparent practice to simply include rates and a percentage franchise fees. At this time, I just want to give you a little overview presentation that we put together explaining the RFP, the process, and legal will finish it out. Obviously, we've discussed this before. I want to go over some of the services that were provided. Obviously, we have multi-family and commercial services. We have residential backdoor services for duplexes and townhouses. We have the shared alleys and we also have as a component; the proposers accept delivery of recyclable materials and yard waste collected by city crews. Again, approximately 2,500 tons of recyclable materials are collected by the city and dropped off to the proposer and 37,000 tons of clean yard waste that are delivered to the proposer. In the RFP we did ask for some in-kind services – roll-off containers to city facilities at no additional cost, and garbage and recycling service to all city facilities at no additional cost. What you are going to see here is, I'm going to go through this really quick and what I'm doing here is a comparison between our current rates and the bid rates that Waste Management, the number one ranked proposer came back with. I kind of just broke it down by service and as you can see at the end, we are looking at a ten percent increase of what we currently pay to what the bid price is, and the two big movements there was on the backdoor residential service for duplexes and townhouses. Next slide I'm seeing is, I compared the prices, the bid prices that were turned in by the number one and number two proposers; and as you can see, at the end of the day when you put everything together, the difference between one and two is less than one percent, its 0.6 percent, for all the services, the whole ball of wax.

Vice Mayor Lago: Do you want to take some questions after the presentation. I don't want to interrupt.

*City Commission Meeting  
November 10, 2020*

Director Zamora: Yes, we can do questions after the presentation, we can have Procurement and the Legal.

Vice Mayor Lago: Thank you Al.

Director Zamora: Again, I wanted to put this up there for your benefit. This is basically a chart that shows where we're at, as far as the different municipalities in Dade County. As you can see, we are right there in the middle. We are not the lowest, but we are not the highest. That's something to consider in the long run. At this time, I want to bring up Celeste. She can do her part of the presentation.

Chief Procurement Officer Walker-Harmon: I would like to briefly go over just the Procurement process and will address these topics; the project timeline and a couple of other key milestones that actually took place in the actual project. The first thing I will discuss is the actual timeline. This particular project was actually solicited for a total of four months. More specifically, I want to point out that the actual solicitation was out for ten weeks. So, we offered everybody more than ample time to be able to sufficiently reply to this particular project, with regard to it being out and available. Next. We did host a pre-proposal conference. This conference allowed anyone to be able to participate, to ask questions, and we had five of the major waste and recycling providers in South Florida. Those are Waste Management, Waste Pro, Great Waste, Postal Waste, and Waste Connections of Florida. For this project we issued a total of five addendums. I'll point out the highlights and more specifically that two of the addendums were issued to extend the time for the actual project. We extended it twice. And we also answered 208 questions. We fielded all the questions that were issued by all the proposers and provided the responses and answers prior to the closing of the solicitation. Next. The solicitation responses – We did receive three responses. One was an actual no bid and that was from Waste Connections of Florida. We will be addressing any legal questions that were proposed or that were addressed in a letter that they did send to Commission. Two proposers that we actually received that were evaluated were from Coastal Waste and Recycling of Florida, Inc. and Waste Management Inc. of Florida. We conducted our responsive review, which we normally do as a normal standard as part of our process. We initially evaluated the proposers to see if they are responsive to the minimum requirements of our RFP, and that's how they made it to the next phase of being evaluated by the actual evaluation committee. Next. I'll highlight the minimum requirements that were actually issued for this particular solicitation. Specifically, the most importantly is that we asked for them to have a minimum of five years of relevant business experience with providing waste and recycling services. They had to provide us three references that demonstrate that experience. They had to be registered with the Florida Department of State Division of \_\_\_\_\_ or District Manager and a Field Supervisor on staff to be able to provide the services to us. So those were the minimum requirements that we asked for. The evaluation process – The evaluation process took place with a group of professionals that actually evaluated all of the information that were submitted by the proposers. That included references, their resources, the personnel and equipment that they propose to be able to provide the services that were requested by the city. The evaluation committee – This was a group of professionals and subject matter experts that we pulled from our resources here in the city. Specifically, I'll point them out, it was Hermes Diaz, who is the Public Works Director for the

*City Commission Meeting  
November 10, 2020*

City of Coral Gables, Mike Fernandez, who is the Solid Waste Director for Miami-Dade County, Jay Fink, who is the Assistant Public Director for Miami Beach, Mario Nunez, Director of Solid Waste for the City of Miami, and Rudy Oma, who is Superintendent of Operations for Public Works for the City of Long Beach, California. Lastly, I will briefly go over the evaluation results. I don't know if that's big enough for you to see. In the end, Coastal received 395 points, and Waste Management 463. This was out of a total of 500 possible points. Specifically, Waste Management scored 95 percent of the available points that were related to experience, methodology and their references, and Coastal received 77 percent of those points. As far as the points for the pricing is concerned, Coastal received 90 percent of the possible points, which was 75, and Waste Management received 74 percent of those points. So, in total the overall proposer who was recommended by the committee was Waste Management Inc. of Florida. So that is the summary of the procurement process; and so, next I will have an outside consultant, which is attorney Miguel De Grandy from Holland and Knight and he will go over a couple of legal aspects of the project.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Welcome Miguel, nice to see you.

Mr. De Grandy: Thank you and good afternoon Mr. Mayor, Commissioners. Again, for the record, my name is Miguel De Grandy, my address, my office address is 701 Brickell Avenue. I am a Coral Gables resident. I'm also a Partner of the law firm of Holland and Knight, specializing in public procurement law. Now, I was retained by your City Attorney to provide legal advice during this procurement and today, I'll be addressing all the legal issues related to this solicitation. And I want to start chronologically. As was discussed, there were three proposers that responded to the RFP. One company, Waste Connections elected not to submit a proposal, and instead filed a no bid letter. In that letter, Waste Connections raises four points, two of which are related. First, they advise that performing the contract will require significant capital expenditures and that such investment is not feasible in light of a termination for convenience clause in the agreement. Our legal position is that the city has a right under the case law in your own Procurement Code to require a termination for convenience clause. Specifically, Section 2-762 of the City's Code authorizes your staff to include a clause for quote "Termination of the contract in whole or in part for the convenience of the city. And regardless of the level of capital investment, terminations for convenience clauses are frequently used in agreements with a nature of the service if improperly performed and cause health and safety hazards to city residents. This is a solicitation, obviously for waste collection services in which strict adherence to sanitary procedures are important and heavy equipment will be operating in our city on a daily basis. The nature of the service itself justifies a need for the city to be able to quickly respond to abate any threats to the public resulting from improper procedures that could result in public hazard, and thus the law allows for such provisions, because they are rationally related to the needs of our city. The fact that two proposers did tender responses to the RFP, evidence that either they currently have the assets needed to perform the contract or that they deemed the need to require those assets to be an acceptable risk. Moreover, the case law is clear that the city does not have to make special accommodations for a bidder that may not have the necessary resources to perform the contract at time of bid. Now, Waste Connection also claims that it is inappropriate for the city to reserve the right to drug test its drivers and they inform that they do their own drug testing several times a year. Now again, drivers will be operating heavy trucks and machinery on a daily basis in our city. Doing so while

*City Commission Meeting  
November 10, 2020*

under the influence can literally result in death or serious injury to members of the public and thus the city has a legitimate interest in protecting the health and safety of its residents and visitors and imposing requirements for drug testing are neither arbitrary or unreasonable, and therefore the case law would amply support the city's prudent and reasonable requirement in this regard. Now finally, Waste Connection complains that it is unacceptable for the city to reserve the right to unilaterally reduce prices paid by city businesses to the company. This is not the case. In fact, state statutes specifically authorize the city to set rates. Now keep in mind this becomes, of course, an exclusive franchise, and unlike other services, where city business can negotiate better prices due to market conditions, city businesses would otherwise be at the mercy of an exclusive provider in regards to rates. Thus, it is prudent for the city to reserve the right to adjust the rates in order to protect city businesses from potentially unreasonable charges. By analogy this is no different than the regulatory power exercised by the state in regard to electric franchises or other type of issues where normal competitive market forces do not operate. And so in summary, as to that issue, after careful review of their correspondence, I did not find that the issues that Waste Connections raised made this process anti-competitive or otherwise created a legal defect in the procurement process. Now let's talk a little bit about minimum qualifications, if I may, because that's always an issue as to whether the reasonable or not in the context of a procurement. The city required the proposers demonstrate at least five years of experience in this type of business and that such experience be proven by at least three contracts of similar size, scope, and complexity as described in the RFP. The Procurement Department determined that there were several companies in the market today that can meet this requirement. Now certainly in terms of minimum qualifications, the case law speaks to the availability of sufficient competitors but does not require their participation in order to deem that the procurement was in fact competitive. Minimum qualifications are a tool very often used by public agencies to ensure that proposers are knowledgeable and experienced in providing the solicited services; and even though minimum qualifications may have the effect of restricting competition, there are a legion or cases upholding the use of minimum requirements when such are rationally related to the needs of your city. In this case, five years of experience and proof of three similar contracts is not oppressive or anti-competitive and is rationally related to the needs of the city to have a reputable and experienced service provider perform these services. Likewise, the RFP included many performance requirements related to how the city expects or demands that the services be performed. The RFP has collection, commercial collection service requirements, how to handle white goods, overside waste, requirements related to schedules, routes, sanitary protocols, etc., and all of these are rationally related to the city's needs and requirement, none were unduly restrictive. Indeed, the vast majority could be said to be normal industry standards and practices. Now, let's go to the letter that you recently received from Coastal Waste and Recycling. You received that on October 27<sup>th</sup> and the letter argued basically that, they should have been selected because they had lower rates. Now the crux of their complaint is that qualitative criteria comprised 85 percent of the evaluation points and price and rates only 15 percent; and they assert in their complaint letter that they had better prices than the recommended proposer and that this should have been give greater emphasis. Now, I understand the city staff does not necessarily agree with their claim from a...perspective, but I will only be addressing the legal issues in this regard. The city's code section 2-910 sets forth the rules for protest of a recommendation of award. The provisions require the proposer to file a notice of intent to protest three calendar days, within three calendar days of the Manager's award recommendation, payment of a protest fee and the

*City Commission Meeting  
November 10, 2020*

subsequent filing of a protest document within five days thereafter. Coastal failed to follow these procedures and file a protest in compliance with the provisions of your code. Importantly, subsection K of section 2-910 of our city's code states that, quote, "The protesting party shall not be entitled to seek redress before the City Commission or see judicial relief without first having followed the procedures set forth in this section." Unquote. In effect, Coastal is asking you to consider the belated protest when your code explicitly states they cannot seek redress before you in this regard. Moreover, in the gravamen of their complaint is there should have been a different scoring methodology. In that regard it is important to note they did not request changes to the scoring methodology prior to submission, they did so after they were not successful. Second, subsection F of section 2-910 of your code states that, quote "The written protest may not challenge the relative weight of the evaluation criteria or the formula for assigning points and making an award determination." Unquote. So even if they would have followed the protest procedures, their protest would still fail to state a valid cause of action. Now the provision I read to you was not novel, in fact, many jurisdictions including Miami-Dade County have that exact provision in their codes and the rationale for it is simple. The city is deemed to be the best judge of its needs and thus to determine what criteria to use in a public solicitation based on its needs. If you are procuring office supplies or other goods that are fungible or well defined, an invitation to bid that is price driven is the appropriate model, but when you are looking for more complicated services requiring experience providers, a procurement driven like qualitative factors is always an appropriate procurement model. Now let me just summarize, if I can, the next slide. The procurement process, and I was able to view the whole process from beginning to end, was conducted in an open and transparent manner. Every proposer had a fair opportunity to present their qualifications and their proposals on how they would perform the solicited services. Your Procurement Department went out of its way to provide every opportunity for an experienced provider to participate and compete. As was discussed during the pre-submission phase, the city responded to over 200 questions from potential proposers. In response to industry input during that question and answer period, some changes were actually made to respond to industry input and the changes were made to the terms and conditions and issued via addenda. After submission, the city acted reasonably to make sure there was a proper competition. For example, in the original submission Coastal did not include copies of all the contracts that would have demonstrated their five years of experience. The Procurement Department gave them five separate opportunities to produce the contracts and extended compliance deadlines at least twice, to my knowledge, in order to make sure that they can demonstrate compliance with a minimum requirements and then they were able to proceed to the competitive evaluation. And so, in summary, Mr. Mayor, Commissioners, the process was conducted, in my opinion, in a fair, open, and lawful manner, and I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Thank you very much. Good to see you Mr. De Grandy.

Mr. De Grandy: Good to see you sir.

Vice Mayor Lago: I have a few questions; I just want to make sure.

Chief Procurement Officer Walker-Harmon: We're done. This presentation is complete.

*City Commission Meeting  
November 10, 2020*

Vice Mayor Lago: Should I address them to Mr. De Grandy or to the Director.

Chief Procurement Officer Walker-Harmon: We'll take turns or rotate for whoever you have questions for.

Vice Mayor Lago: First off, Mr. De Grandy, its great to have you here in the city. Like I mentioned to you before, its been too long, so its great to see you. This is a very contentious procurement process, especially when you're talking about a contract of this magnitude. And it's the entity that services Coral Gables gets a lot of publicity and they use that contract, in a good way, to obviously leverage that to hopefully get other contracts for other municipalities. One of my biggest sticklers that I always mention to Procurement is, what is your litigation history and the length of contracts. We for too long have provided these contracts that are way too long. I spoke to the Manager and he clarified, this is an eight-year contract, but it was a five-year term with three one-year extensions. I want to put it on the record and I want to be very clear, and I want to hear from staff and from yourself, that these one-year extensions are at our request, and do these have to come for ratification before the Commission? That's the only question I have on that issue.

Chief Procurement Officer Walker-Harmon: I'll answer that question. Initially, no. It is your will, but how the actual recommendation is written that it is five years with the initial, with three one-year renewals, that is what we are asking for permission now. Renewals are at the city's discretion and so, there are some information and steps that we go through prior to us exercising those renewals. So, it is not an automatic renewal. We go through the steps of making sure that we are happy with the services, that there are no issues with performance, and so, all that's taken into consideration during the evaluation prior to us exercising that renewal period.

Vice Mayor Lago: And I'll tell you why I say that, because I have the utmost faith in the Manager and his team, but for example, in my neck of the woods, where I live next to University of Miami, you have City Waste Disposal, the employees do a wonderful job, and then you have Waste Management coming and picking up the townhomes and the other areas adjacent to Doctor's Hospital. So, what I've been saying for a long time is that we really need to focus on coordination, because you'll have the garbage be out for two or three days and Waste Management has their routes and sometimes they don't pick up on the same day. So you'll have a home that's picked up by City Waste Disposal, our City, our team, and then literally the neighboring property has their garbage out for two days because one reason or another, our outside agency does not pick it up or its not scheduled for pick up. So, I think that's something that we really need to work on and bridge that gap.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: The neighboring property is not single-family residents.

Vice Mayor Lago: It is. It's very interesting.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: It couldn't be.

*City Commission Meeting  
November 10, 2020*

Vice Mayor Lago: It is because you'll see – when you go down Campo Sano, it literally stops from a beautiful development that's facing the Granada Golf Course and then the next home will be single-family. It will happen that way. So, I'm just saying. I'm just giving examples of things that I think that we need to – you want to say something. I see it because I drive by everyday in my neighborhood, so its something that I'm bringing up. So, I want to make sure that we have all the power, that we have all the power on our side to, after five years to say, listen, if we are going to renew this contract, we need the trucks to be serviced, I'm just making up reasons, trucks to be serviced, we need better service or continued service in certain areas that may be are not being offered, the alleys to be maintained, the garbage bins in the downtown to be cleaned. I'm not the only one. I know that everyone on this Commission has also brought that up, especially on Aragon. There are some concerns; there are some concerns about the stench and there are also concerns that Waste Management is not responsible for. It's the business community is responsible for over-stacking, not conducting themselves in a certain way, which is again, in line with what we expect here in the City Beautiful. You have a lot of illegal dumping and I've had this conversation with Waste Management. They have an actual crew that addresses this illegal dumping, and we are seeing that more and more in the alleys. So, I just want to make sure that we have on our side the ability to reign in or to change whatever we need before we renew a contract. I just don't want to renew contracts automatically like we've done in the past.

City Manager Iglesias: Vice Mayor, I can assure you that we will review this contract completely at the five-year level and before. Remember that we have termination for convenience.

Vice Mayor Lago: That's key. That's the key. And I want to put that on the record. You mentioned that to me, but I want to put it on the record and make sure that we are doing things completely different now. We have certain contracts that have been going on for years and years and years, those extensions are automatic, and they are not in our favor.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Very good points Vice Mayor.

Director Zamora: The extension is not automatic. And just to give you a little bit of insight why you would go eight years in this industry, that's the lifespan of a truck. So, you want to make sure that your combinations of original term and any extensions are eight years, because if not, you're buying a truck for somebody else. So that's why most of these contracts that I've done, that's the thinking behind it.

Vice Mayor Lago: And when I brought that question up to you during a meeting, the Manager and yourself, so eloquently stated, obviously this is the reasoning behind these years of contract life. My other point or my other question deals with, I reviewed the Coastal Waste and Recycling letter in detail, and one of the points that again, sticks out to me, which again I need real clarity on and I want to put it on the record is, the \$6 million that they say is the difference between their contract and Waste Management's contract. And I want to make sure that we put it on the record and that we explain it in detail so that, again because I've had people call me and say, don't sign that contract because you are going to overpay; and right now, this is my last point, and right now as we are, hopefully, God willing, we are seeing the other side of Covid, the business community is

*City Commission Meeting  
November 10, 2020*



having their tough moment right now and we need to do everything we possibly can to ensure that we lower their overhead as much as possible, or at least so its less painful. So, explain to me what is the issue and how are they claiming that their contract is close to \$1 million dollars less than that of Waste Management.

Director Zamora: According to my numbers, it wasn't a million dollars. One of the things that letter did not address was the roll-offs, okay. Once you throw the roll-offs in there, the amount of poles at the prices that they bid and the prices that Waste Management bid, brings that number to less than one percent difference.

Vice Mayor Lago: Can you explain to everybody what a roll-off is. I understand it, because I deal with it in my industry every day.

Director Zamora: We have 48 accounts within the city that have roll-off service which could be either an open top or a compactor. These roll-offs, UM uses a lot of them, big box stores use them.

Vice Mayor Lago: 20-yarders, 30-yarders.

Director Zamora: 35, 40-yard compactors.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: What are they?

Vice Mayor Lago: The Mayor wants to know what is a roll-off?

Director Zamora: The roll-off with a machine on it or it could be an open top, okay, and these things are either most of them are on call, so when you take the number of proposed poles per year and you times them by both bid prices, that's where that number becomes less than one percent, if you throw everything at it.

Vice Mayor Lago: So, what Coastal was saying that they were going to charge us, outside of our contract for the roll-offs.

Director Zamora: What they didn't include in it, the price that they didn't include in their letter was the roll-offs.

Vice Mayor Lago: And did we ask them, did we formally ask them?

Director Zamora: Yes.

Vice Mayor Lago: And what was their response when we formally asked Coastal about the roll-offs?

Director Zamora: What was their response what?

*City Commission Meeting  
November 10, 2020*

Vice Mayor Lago: Why didn't they include the roll-offs?

Director Zamora: They included a price in the roll-off.

Vice Mayor Lago: So, they included a price in the roll-off...

City Manager Iglesias: The included it as a unit price.

Vice Mayor Lago: As a unit price.

Director Zamora: As a unit price. I don't have a frequency. I have a number of accounts.

Vice Mayor Lago: So, they gave us \$550, just for example.

Director Zamora: It was \$800.

Vice Mayor Lago: \$800 which is high.

Director Zamora: Per pole.

Vice Mayor Lago: So they gave us \$800 and then they said, we are not going to tell you how many; Waste Management on the other hand gave a unit price and said, in our contract we are going to cover you for how many roll-offs?

City Manager Iglesias: It was a lower unit price, Vice Mayor, so whatever we use we pay at a lower unit price.

Vice Mayor Lago: And you basically multiplied that unit price number by how many roll-offs we had last year and we basically...

City Manager Iglesias: We actually took a three-year average.

Vice Mayor Lago: You took a three-year average.

Director Zamora: Yup. Which came to 2,109.

Vice Mayor Lago: I just want to make sure people understand. We do this everyday and this is a little bit complicated to understand. Okay. My last point was, we all love competition, and we want to make sure we get the best value for the residents and the business community, especially the business community now. Give me reasons why you oppose having two companies and bringing somebody new in after 30 years of one company having the contract, to having two companies basically servicing our downtown?

*City Commission Meeting  
November 10, 2020*

Director Zamora: Well, one of the issues, obviously is, you are going to need more trucks, you are going to create more traffic. The second thing is accountability of who, if there is any damage or anything, who did it? It complicates things. There are other cities that have multiple haulers in their city and what they do, it's a free market. They give out five franchise licenses and they let them compete. A city of this size, I don't recommend it. They have that in Miami, they have that in Dade County.

Vice Mayor Lago: Even if you divvy up the downtown, let's say, east-west. I agree with your statement, by the way, about accountability, I think that's key.

Director Zamora: And carbon footprint.

Vice Mayor Lago: Unless you say, this section goes with one hauler versus the other and you have it divvied up that way. Mr. ACM.

ACM Santamaria: Yes, Mr. Vice Mayor. We also have on the call participating in this presentation, Mitch Kessler, our consultant, and I think Mitch can contribute some answers to some of the questions that you have. Mitch, if you'd care to jump on what your experience is in terms of having our size city and multiple service providers.

Vice Mayor Lago: But I will tell you, Al did a very good job, giving us a good explanation.

Mr. Kessler: Thank you. Commissioner, I think you raise a good point and Al gave you a good answer. We do a lot of work in this field throughout the state, we work on procurements constantly, and this is one of the issues. As Al was saying, you have a franchise situation, and a city of your size is A-typical type of franchise that would be divided amongst multiple firms. It just creates some of the problems that we discussed. I don't think you want to go to an open market system, that's not what this bid was for. In an open market system, again as Al said, there is much more competition and then the businesses are much more directly involved who they are picking, which often leads to more trucks on the road. So, I would compare that, in this situation you would not want to divide the City of Coral Gables into multiple zones and have multiple haulers.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Thank you very much sir.

Vice Mayor Lago: Thank you.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Alright. Do I hear a motion? Any other comments?

Commissioner Keon: I'll move the item as written.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Is there a second?

Commissioner Fors: I'll second.

*City Commission Meeting  
November 10, 2020*

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Will you call the roll please.

Commissioner Mena: Yes

Commissioner Fors: Yes

Commissioner Keon: Yes

Vice Mayor Lago: Yes

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Yes

(Vote: 5-0)

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Thank you very much everybody. Very good job.