

BUICK CLUB OF AMERICA

**November 19, 2018
5:52 pm CT**

Conference ID is - PMD1075.

Recording: This conference is being recorded.

All are present except Bill Stoneberg

Alan: We have a board that has widely divergent points of view sometimes even to the point where it seems like our board is divided. And I'm going to take the floor here for a minutes - the rules for the rest of the evening - rules, I hate rules. The guidelines are the same as before, as for the floor and when you get to the floor please identify yourself but I will start.

Since this board took office, I have deliberately tried twice to try to bridge the divide by asking members from each faction to work together on a project. Twice I feel that effort has been thwarted and turned into something different and not what the board agreed to.

The first example I would sight was the Request for Proposal -- Roberta, Larry Schramm, Bob assigned to work on a committee for an RFP for an audit and the board agreed the RFP was to include an opinion audit and a forensic audit. But what we came back with - what we got back had no input from Bob

and was only for a forensic audit after we had specifically discussed both of those options.

The latest assignment was for John and Larry DiBarry to work on a job description for the Book's replacement. The charge was, the committee to do a job description based on the input from our call all of us were on several weeks ago. There was no collaboration on that and so we ended up with two distinct and very different documents -- one job description one RFP.

I compliment both gentlemen on their work because there was a lot of work and a lot of investment of time put into those documents. But I do not understand how our request for a job description became an RFP that included CFO duties, CPA duties and Web services.

Hence I suggested sending out both documents as a compromise to the divisions on the board so we could move ahead. I do think we are better than that. I don't think we should be having additional board of directors' calls that we all had to jump on to revisit a decision on what we need. We had a clear agreement I believe on what the charge was for that.

Now, if the board wanted to find a new Web Master, we can do that -- if the board wanted to find a new CPA, we can do that. I do not believe that we have the time now to make wholesale changes in three critical positions.

I think we have to focus on office manager replacement, get it done then we can work as a board together thoughtfully on the new Web Master and the new CPA if we want. Roberta and I spoke this afternoon, she told me at that time that she supports sending out both of the documents that John and Larry produced as a way to move this forward. So I'm here tonight to ask you to either send out the job description that John did or we send them both out.

Before I turn over the floor, there is one more thing I want to ask before we are all done here and that's what's happening with the RFP for the audit but I want to leave that to the end. So what I would like to do, I have laid out -- I will cede the floor.

Ed DePouli: Alan, I don't have a vested interest in which way we do it -- whatever gets the job done.

Jack: This is Jack. I greed with Ed but I do believe that if we are not going to look at committing to a single responsibility for the office for CPA or for - I mean, accounting or whatever you want to call it and for Web Master that it's a waste if everyone's time including the people who respond to what we send them to do that. And so therefore, I would say that what we are really going to end up voting on is John's RFQ and why don't we just take the track?

Larry Schramm: Okay, this is Larry Schramm. My position is this, it's that I read both of them very carefully and they had probably done enough buying and purchasing - you know, setting specifications for vendors whenever I work for GM.

One of the most important things we needed to send out is you need to make sure you have some sort of specific standards of performance when you send it out so that you don't say write reports. It's something - as an example, write reports so you don't do it monthly.

But the one with John - John's was very I'm going to say it's a 50,000 feet look of what the office does but it has the opportunity to put us back in the same conditioning we are in right now where some of the reports and things are not on a timely basis if we even get them.

That's why if I was to look at the two of them, I'm not sure if you award any sort of a contract based on the description that you are not going to be able to discern a lack of performance. There is nothing to say this is what the contract says you are supposed to be doing, this is what you are quoted on, this is what you are supposed to do.

John Steed: This is John Steed. I guess Larry, that was never written as a contract -- at least I didn't see it. I didn't see that we were sending out something like a contract, I thought we were sending out something to describe what the Books had been doing.

And one of the things that I realized the Books had done is some of the stuff they do at National Meets with the trophies and stuff like that which was not included at all on the other. And when I asked Larry DiBarry about that he says, "That's something Roy Faries could do."

It couldn't be something Roy Faries can do unless we are going to tell Roy Faries he can't be a ridge star -- because Roy Faries us busy getting the awards ready as far as who wins what awards at the same time as Mike Book has been preparing the trophies so we can pass them out them. But it's on Saturday afternoon, there is a real crunch time there, we have got to have at least those two jobs being done at the same time.

Larry Schramm: Well, and as for having the one which is just a description of what, you know, a global description of what the Books are supposed to be doing or what we say they have been doing versus the other one which says, this is what you are going to do. And when you bid something out, how does the bidder know where our expectations are?

And I'm not going down on the one that's your role, I'm just saying, how do you bid on something at 50,000? You need to have some sort of a description where they can say, well, this is the work that needs to be done -- that's important.

Plus and as for not putting it all into one, you know, what Larry put together is roughly what I thought, you know, we talked about even looking to have the AACA do everything for us. That's the only thing I'm sure got put together because that's what we were looking at to see if we could get them to do it and they would do everything.

And so, why don't we take a look at bundled package or what I call a bundled package and that's how we did stuff when I worked for GM -- we tried to figure out how to get the most amount of work done and that will also limit some of the finger pointing that I have continued to hear about.

You know, databases and who is still on the rolls and people who have been dead for six or seven years and they still show up on there. I have no idea how good our database is and this would put responsibility at one single point -- no finger pointing.

John Steed: Well, I guess the question is Larry, when you talk about that, you are talking about a database that isn't a BCA database -- that was a Pre-War database.

Larry Schramm: No, that's not true. That is not true -- that is not true. I forgot about the Pre-War stuff but, you know, thanks for bringing the Pre-War stuff up. That Pre-War stuff all comes directly from Columbus -- that's where all that information came from -- it comes from Columbus. It doesn't come from anybody else. How would (Dei Veebert) know who the members of the Buick Club own Pre-War cars?

Jack: This is Jack again. The database that the Books have has to be correct because it's based on who is paying dues. So dead people don't pay dues and so if there is some other database out there it's not the BCA database. We are very clear what our database is, it's listed in the roster, If you are not going to pay you, are not a member of the club, period.

Larry Schramm: This is Larry Schramm. Roberta just told me, she had somebody that could not get into the Web site even though they are a paid member.

Larry Schramm: I don't know. Anyway, she was telling me, the other day she had got a call from somebody that they couldn't get into the Web site even though they are a paid member. So that tells me something between what the Books have and what (company) has there must be some difference between the two of them and I have had a number of those. I don't remember them all but I have had a number of those cases.

And that's one of the things about getting a bundled contract, we put everything together and say, what can you do? And find out what the possibilities are between, you know, you have got what, eight or nine people now that say they want to do it, right?

Roberta Vasilow: Yes. Past President Al Eichelberger could not get a hand to the E-Bugle to look at the E-Bugle and he had to send a message to Peter Gariepy and Peter had to send that message to Mike and Nancy to get his membership number which is like 9106 or something - he was a kid when he joined in order for Al to get into the E-Bugle which is totally unacceptable.

And I don't understand why there appears to be two databases one of the E-Bugle and one for the membership roster. Speaking of which, the membership roster when we went through and looked at the 100 year anniversary things that Larry worked down with Terry -- there is people on that list that are dead.

And I don't know if their wives are still paying their dues or why they might even still be in the list? That is just something that bugs me a little bit. I'm not going to call them up and say, surely, are you still paying for Glen's dues and why are you still in the BCA database? But, that's another thing that bugs me.

Alan: Well, this is Alan. I recently couldn't get into the E-Bugle either and it was because I was entering information wrong so I know that can happen. And people can die during the time that they pay their dues - in the 12 months from the time you pay your dues until you get a notice for renewal.

I don't mean to discount what you are telling me, I'm just saying that people can enter stuff wrong and people can die -- so that doesn't mean that there is a flaw in the database. It may but it doesn't necessarily mean that.

John Steed: This is John Steed, Alan. And I have got my roster in front of me and Al Eichelberger his membership number is in the roster -- why would Peter be calling Mike Book instead of pulling out his roster and pulling up the membership number?

Larry Schramm: Good question John -- this is Larry Schramm.

Larry DiBarry: Okay, this is Larry DiBarry here. One of the reasons why I wanted to out that in there speaking with the people at the AACA which I know I'm local and we have people on the board directors there who are involved in our chapter.

One of our members (Richard Sills) he is also with the Buick Heritage Alliance -- and asking him some things about how they handle things and because there is going to be one of our possibilities before we found out it's going to take too long for that to happen.

So that was one of the big things they were mentioning too and us as a chapter we have had - since we have put up our own Web site - so we had our own Web site contractor and all to do our particular page and how any of our people could not access that from the Buick Club Web site. And we went round and round with Peter Gariepy for like three weeks until that was resolved.

And every time there is the information for the E-Bugle for me to access as a director of the chapter I have not been able to do it. Sand I have gone to Peter Gariepy and I gave him my stuff and I still can't get in -- so I stopped even trying anymore. So I think this would be a great opportunity to get that taken care of too. Next. Wow, it got quiet.

Larry Schramm: I will start commenting then just generically, okay? This is Larry Schramm again. Generically is that, on one of - Ed, make sure I get this right. One of the concerns you had on the one RFP that I don't think is totally addressed at all in John's RFP or ORQ but on Larry's about demanding the offices that are in that.

Yet neither one of them says what holidays are or days they are not going to be in the office, okay? And my comment is that, one of the things I guess I would ask is that if we send out to one of them or both of them, what I will do is to say, you know, put a note in the letter is we would probably - what we would expect to have is, you know, US national holidays observed and the office will not be manned in those days or something in that effect.

And or ask, whoever bids on the work to say, what do you suggest for days that the office wouldn't be manned or a combination of both? That would be one way to address that Ed DePouli's concern.

Alan: Larry, this is Alan. I think those are valid concerns but I don't know that we have to nail down each and every one at this point and here is my point. I think we will probably at some point in the next few couple of weeks figure out that there are a couple of our applicants who are qualified and maybe some who are not and have an interview with them.

I mean, I talked to Cornerstone today and I said, would you be available to do an interview or a Q&A with the board of directors? Because I don't think we can cover everything that might come up in an RFP or a job description.

And I think we need a discussion with whomever we are going to work with about some of these finer details. We might have an idea holidays and they might have a different idea and either one might be workable.

So it doesn't seem to me that we have to have this down to every, single, minute detail at this point. We need to get information that the applicant can use to assess whether they are capable and what they might need or want to ask questions for us about -- get that into their hands. And then there needs to be a face to face or phone to phone conversation and perhaps negotiation before we nail down a contract. The other thing that we talked about earlier this year was forming a committee of two or three board members who would be giving annual feedback to our contractors.

And that is also a way for us to make sure if we are not getting what we need from the office managers, from Peter Gariepy that we can do a tune up there.

We can tell him, you know, we need more of this or less of this or, “Peter, you are not proactive enough, you are doing stuff only when you are told.”

So I think there is the opportunity to fine-tune the relationship.

Larry Schramm: All right, what I was going to say is, I agree with you all that that wasn't put in there -- I don't think that's a big issue. I think this is the request for quote and that cover letter goes out kind of like what we sent out on the RFQ for the audit and it's a simple thing that will take up 15 seconds.

We have not heard back if there is anything other than December 1 is when everything is due so I would expect to hear something right after the weekend. But anyway, I agree with you and I think a lot of that would be able to be resolved in some sort of a - when we set our final contract what days is it going to be open? Tell me what you are capable of doing? Tell me what's reasonable for your resources and let's look at that? I agree with you on that.

I don't know, like I said, send out a letter and say, this is what we are looking for, what are you capable of and how much is it going to cost us, period?

Alan: Well, this is Alan again. That raises a question that we haven't specifically addressed which is cost. I'm assuming that we were just looking for someone who would duplicate what the books were doing and I'm assuming that the board did not want to increase our costs there. Obviously, that changes if we hire someone who does Web services, who does other kinds of duties.

Larry Schramm: So we would be just changing what's on the account.

Alan: This is Alan. I don't have a problem with sending out something that includes the minimum standards of what we need done and levels of other services --

and I told Larry this when Larry and John and I talked. I think the RFP that Larry wrote was very well-written overreaches and I think it gets into Web services and CFO positions and CPA duties.

And I just don't have the believe as I said here tonight that we are advertising for someone to replace three or four positions at this point -- I just don't think we have the time to vet that.

Larry DiBarry: This is Larry DiBarry here again. This is what we discussed Alan was that, yes, we thought that we had a maximum or what you mentioned about it - one tier, two tier level of an RFQ and that was why I said, well, then we have our maximum that we are looking for then there is the minimum we are looking for and what can you do in either of those. So is there a middle ground that you can provide for us whoever is going out for the bid?

Larry Schramm: This is Larry Schramm. If you take what's available and what can you do doesn't mean we have to - we are not wired-in or had into having to do everything that's said in the contract but what do we say in the RFP as part of the RFP?

But at the very least it would give us some sort of a, what I'm going to call a reality check of what the marketplace is currently charging with some of that work to make sure that we are getting the best value for what we are doing.

And some of the best value I'm not 100% sure that's accurate because of some of the complaints we have all gotten about - you don't get complaints because God knows, I have talked to - working for GM customer service, I talked to tens of thousands of people about it.

But you kind of get a feel of what is reasonable complaints and what weren't and some of these I question -- it just raises questions in my mind. So I would send it out and at the very least it will give us a check on cost. And I think the way that Larry wrote it down it's broken into sections -- it doesn't say one overreaching everything.

Terry Wiegand: This is Terry and I would like to stick my two cents worth in here. I think the way that Larry DiBarry had this written up is the way we need to go. He is very, very through on that, I liked his wording and I don't know even know why we are discussing something else. He has got it -- he nailed it right there. That's my opinion. And when you are going to send something out for quotes, you are asking for question, you are asking for their price -- what else do you need?

Roberta Vasilow: We could learn to understand you much better if I can get familiar with the way you talk.

Larry Schramm: So Alan, this is Larry Schramm again. Where do we want to go with this discussion?

Alan: Well that was the question we began with.

Larry Schramm: I know.

Alan: So I want to pull everybody on the board on this question. Like, I'm looking at Larry's proposal here and he has a session about information technology, Internet and phone -- are we ready, willing to say we want to hire someone new to manage the BCA Web site? We want to hire somebody new to do database management for the Web site.

Are we ready to do that because that is a complete turnaround from what we talked about on the last board call. We all got together and said, these are the things we want in a job description so this goes far beyond that. I think it overreaches, I don't get a vote, you all do so that's the question -- are we ready to adopt a wide ranging proposal that asks for replacement of some CPA duties and replacement of Web service duties at this point and we all ready to vet that?

Ed DePouli: This is DePouli. I would prefer to keep it strictly related to the Books -- that's the deadline we are facing.

Alan: Ed, this is Alan. That's my opinion as well. I'm sorry Larry, go ahead.

Larry Schramm: That's good.

Jack: This is Jack. I'm thinking we keep it as absolutely simple as we can do. If we decide we want to expand this going down the road at some point, if we decide there is a real problem with the people in place. But it seems like we are thinking about replacing people who don't need to be replaced and it's really difficult to get one person or one couple that is really fluent in all of the things that we are asking for here.

People who are in finance people and not necessarily always computer people, they are not always people skills, people that we need in the office so we are looking for different kinds of people. I would say, keep it simple and go for just a replacement of the Books.

Larry Schramm: Okay, this is Larry Schramm. I'm going to say that, when we talk about doing a Q&A, going out and have them do those duties and activities for us that is -

we were looking to maybe move them further out than having just one or two individuals doing this in their house or wherever they are going to do it.

And then Alan you said you have talked to Cornerstone and I know we talked about Cornerstone some time ago and so I happened to look out, it's the same type of activity that's kind of a bundled contract of services that they can do.

And I have talked to - I have a friend of mine that's in the Packard Club so I guess they do their work there also. So I don't see that as an overreach and I think that even if we decide that it's something we don't want everything -- I think it's the right thing to do to send everything out as written by Larry and just see what comes back. Throw some spaghetti on the wall and see what sticks so to speak.

That's where I would look at it. I think that's the responsible thing for this board to do -- and we may find out that there may be, you know, Cornerstone we put out the bid with them also and say, look, what can you do? How much of this can you do? And see what they say. And we maybe you know, disappointed, we may be surprised - I don't know.

But I think it's the responsible thing to do to put it out - ask for the moon. And I can tell you that, when I was doing this stuff I asked for the moon on some stuff and people said it couldn't be done and guess what, some of the people came through -- the vendors that I worked with came through and surprised a lot of people when you ask for their best.

Alan: This is Alan. Just as a note, I talked to the Cornerstone again this afternoon, I have asked them to give us basically a cost estimate for what it would cost us for them to provide a list of services based on what they are doing for a number of other clubs -- so that should be coming to us next week sometime.

One other thing that came up with my discussions with them, I used an example of what happened today. So I asked Mike and Nancy about it 9 o'clock this morning their time if they could put together this conference call and they had it turned around and set up within a matter of minutes and I told - I spoke to (Mike Willard) at Cornerstone -- I said, can you do something like that? And the short answer was, not really.

They are set up to manage the membership and not as he described the secretarial services and that's fine -- that's what they do. But there is a portion of what we ask from the office management which is stuff that you don't put into a contract that's going to come up and can you handle that?

So, you know, that maybe something to consider if we get down the road with Cornerstone. I'm not arguing for them, I just want to make sure that if we look at them that they can do what we need done. So I don't have a dog in this fight -- if we want to put together a very comprehensive proposal, making it clear to the applicants that they can pick and choose, we can do that. I'm skeptical but, this is a board decision.

I think the cover letter is going to have to be very clear about how they should respond because the proposal as I read it is - I think if I got that in my inbox and I looked at this - if I'm four or five of the people who have applied so far I would go, holly crap -- you are talking about a big firm Web services, financial services, database management, office management, pick up the phone, arrange phone calls.

That's my concern is that we are asking way, way too much and we are going to end up with nobody who can do all of this and scare them away. I will see if...

Terry Wiegand: Mr. Oldfield, this is Terry Wiegand, I have a question of you.

Alan: Go ahead.

Terry Wiegand: Are you afraid to send Larry's proposal out for quotes?

Allan: No, not at all. No, my position Terry is that...

Terry Wiegand: Then what's the problem? What's the problem with that? I think he has nailed it really well.

Alan: hey, may I have the floor?

Terry Wiegand: Sure. I'm done.

Alan: Okay. As I stated at the beginning this proposal, the RFP that Larry prepared is dramatically, substantially, gargantuanly different than what the board agreed to on our last call.

On our last call, we all said, here is what we want in the job description -- so what the RFP does is, take that and change is completely. So I'm not going to send out something that is completely different from what the board agreed to on our call last time. That's what throws me.

Thing one is, it's not what the board agreed to and we can go back and listen to that or look at the minutes if you want to. Thing two is, I personally believe that it's overreaching. So that's my bought on the RFP. I don't have a problem with it, it's just not what we agreed to -- the game has been changed in midcourse.

Larry Schramm: This is Larry Schramm. I think when we went from talking about an individual doing it and have the AACA doing it and that was in agreement that we said that would be a good investigation, I think that upped the scope of work for the RFQ or RFP that was put together.

That significantly changed because it went from an individual to an entity that has those resources already. And they said, they would be interested to do it if it wasn't for the fact we are in the middle of a move.

Jack: This is Jack. But we never asked them for service beyond office manager services -- all our discussion with AACA was aimed at situations that we are looking at right now with replacing the Books. Because I don't feel that we as an organization are even considering bringing in a brand new Web Master, a brand new office manager, a brand new CFO or whatever you want to call it all at the same time. That makes no sense to me at all. It's a bad business decision to do that.

Larry Schramm: This is Larry Schramm. If you get where nobody is able to bid on everything, no problem then we will leave whatever you don't get bids on. If you get somebody that can do everything or close to everything or some reasonable percentage, I think we have responsibility to look at it.

You know, what is the best objective of us running the club? And that's to get the best quality service as we can at the best price. And I know bundling services together where you have no overlapping work helps everybody and that's just the way it is.

As I said last time, what we need to be able to understand today's marketplace is Amazon's delivery of products and services -- you know, they call right

now and then you get the answer right now. And it would be up to us to consider putting everything under one roof or close to it if we can at a reasonable cost.

Another reason that this would be a good time to do something like that is we are going to be hopefully, we will get this audit stuff behind us, we won't have to worry about that anymore and it will be a clean beginning for everything and then we can move on to growing the club.

Jack: Well, this is Jack again. You are talking about consolidating three different jobs into one job all at one shot -- I feel no matter what we get for the response that we shouldn't do it anyway. It would be a bad situation to all of a sudden make three changes without need when we only need to have one change right now.

Terry Wiegand: This is Terry, could I ask Jack a question?

Jack: Sure.

Terry Wiegand: Why do you feel that it's a bad thing to change three things? What we have got now it's not working.

Jack: I sort of disagree with you. Just because there are a few glitches in the system does not mean that it's not working. And I believe we will have far more glitches if we try and change three jobs at the same time, you know - I mean, all of us have been in business, all of us have had big job at one point in time and we know what works and what doesn't work. And to make three big changes at once in my opinion does not work.

Larry Schramm: This is Larry Schramm. Well, I worked at a project that we went from internal combustion cars to Chevrolet Volt and multiple, multiple, huge numbers of changes and that got launched flawlessly. It depends upon commitment of the organization and getting the right people and the right places to do it.

And that's why I'm going to argue to say that, that should be left as it is and see what comes back. And then the board at that point in time can look at proposals and say, what do we want to do and how much is it going to cost and what's in the best interest of the members?

Alan: Larry, this is Alan. With all due respect to your reference, that was General Motors.

Larry Schramm: I understand that but its multi-billion dollar company versus a \$350,000 company -- it's the same thing.

Terry Wiegand: That's a good point.

Ed DePouli: Alan, this is DePouli. Could we take a straw vote on the two concepts and see how we are winding up?

Alan: Yes, I think that's a good idea. If I'm correct in my note taking Ed and Jack have weighed in with staying with a simple job description, am I correct?

Ed DePouli: Correct.

Jack: This is Jack, yes.

Alan: All right. Larry Schramm?

Larry Schramm: For the fall one - the Larry DiBarry's job.

Alan: Understood. John Steed?

John Steed: I think the job description. We need to solve the problem that we are trying to solve now instead of trying to solve a bunch of other problems.

Alan: Bob Safrit?

Bon Safrit: I feel the same.

Alan: Terry Wiegand?

Terry Wiegand: I'm going with Larry DiBarry's proposal.

Alan: Larry DiBarry?

Larry DiBarry: Okay. You know, I want my proposal but also I'm looking at what you had sent out to us as far as the cover letter and the office description that I put at the RFQ and we only changed a few words in it. So I thought you pretty much liked it to send it out as the tier one, tier two proposal so that was - I thought things were pretty much set as sending them both out -- so that's where I was at. But of course, I would like to see my proposal sent out. Like I said, I have a vested interest in this.

Alan: So I'm going to write you down as the RFP...

Larry DiBarry: Well, I have RFQ.

Alan: Oh, I'm sorry. RFQ or compromised proposal.

Larry DiBarry: Or tier one, tier two both.

Roberta Vasilow: I really think you guys need to look at the big picture. I told Alan this afternoon we have got to look at the bug picture. Where do we want to go? Do we want to do a status quo and keep some of these bed rooms running our club or do we want to see what else is out there and put the bid out to the tier two and let's see if there is someone out there that can do it all. Also considering the Sloan Museum is interested in case you hadn't seen that email.

Alan: So Roberta, how do I write you down?

Roberta Vasilow: Yes,

Alan: Yes. We have choice one is to use the job description - I'm going to call it the simple job description with no - not meaning it's simple but it's the less complicated job description, that's one option. Larry DiBarry's RFP is the second option or tier one or tier two which is the compromise I sent out to everybody. You have your choice.

Roberta Vasilow: I would prefer not do both but I would rather go with the Larry's.

Alan: Well, here is how I have it then, for the simple - Ed, Jack, John, Bob - that makes it four. Larry DiBarry's RFP - Larry Schramm, Terry, Larry DiBarry and Roberta - that's four -- that makes it a tie.

Terry Wiegand: Okay, I understand.

Alan: So its four to four so does that mean I break the tie?

(Group): Yes.

Ed DePouli: Yes please, Alan, break the tie.

Alan: Well, I would go with sending out tier one and tier two because that's what I thought was the best compromise in the beginning.

Larry Schramm: This is Larry Schramm. If you are going to send both of them out, I will vote to send both of them out. I didn't know you had that as a vote, I thought you only had the simple one of Larry DiBarry's -- and if you are talking about sending them both out, I would send them both out. I vote for that.

Larry DiBarry: This is Larry DiBarry. I mentioned that I will go with both of them too.

Ed DePouli: This is DePouli. I agree with both. Let's get this done.

Jack: Yes, ...

Terry Wiegand: Yes, I will change my vote - this is Terry and I will go with what Larry and Larry and Ed is probably proposing.

Alan: John and Bob?

Roberta Vasilow: I will vote for sending both but I think it's going to confuse the hell out of the people that are asking for quotes.

Larry Schramm: Alan, this is Larry Schramm. I guess - tell me if you and I edited it up, do we have five or six people now that said send them both out?

Alan: Let me look here. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 - five or six, yes.

Larry Schramm: Okay. Then that means we are going to send both of them out. Then I'm going to like to make a suggestion, if we would please put together a cover letter that you think you would like to have, could you please send it out to the board and let us look at it and maybe put a little bit of our perspective in it to make sure that we all kind of agree on it -- send it back to you and then you can consolidate it into one letter and send it out.

Alan: All right, I think that would be great. Absolutely.

Ed DePouli: Great.

Larry Schramm: You know, we all can take and least give it a proverbial kick if we can and maybe reword or rework it and send it back -- its just the way I would reword it if I was sending out, you know - and I can see on the base on the way I have sent a bunch of stuff and I know the rest of us all have at one point in time.

That way then we can get this thing going because we are really, really time wise, we are in a time crunch. And that's why I got the motion - and I guess that means I probably should withdraw my motion about sending what Larry DiBarry wrote -- I will withdraw that by the way in order to clean everything up. But our change of the fact that we are going to send both of them, how would we want to word it.

And then because we need to get this out by the 1st and then get it back by the 15th so we have between the 15th of December and Chris or at the first of the

year to figure out what we are going to do -- because the Books are gone on the 30th. We really have basically 40 days to get any answer.

Alan: I concur with your sense of urgency and I want this to be as best we can I want it to be a board proposal so yes, I will do that.

John Steed: Alan, I think - this is John. I have been trying to get in and getting walked over. I think it's important that while what we talked about originally on the tier one and two was that, basically these people were going to be able to kind of pick and choose what - tier one was kind of what they had to do, tier two was, if they can do that to pick that up. At least I thought that was the discussion we had.

Alan: Yes, sir. You are correct John.

John Steed: And I guess I would like to see that quote in your letter that, hey, here is what we are expecting as a minimum and if you can do these other things, tell us how you would do it.

Alan: Yes. And I did attach a draft to a paragraph I think when I sent out the compromised proposal to everybody, but I will work on that, turn it into a letter and I will shoot it out to everybody and welcome your input. It should be a board proposal.

Jack: This is Jack just before we leave. Are we going to put a term on what we expect the contract term is going to be? That may affect people's placing based on how long they think they are going to have this position.

Alan: Yes, I think that's a good idea Jack. I would suggest that we say this is for a one year term and potentially renewal on an annual basis.

Jack: Okay, I agree with that.

Alan: Is everyone else happy with that?

Larry Schramm: Well, one comment about that is I think, we have to be careful about just saying its out on a renewal basis on an annual I think as part of it. You may go ahead and do that but I think it should automatically be included in there that it will go for bid at minimum every five years or maybe less.

Terry Wiegand: I'm for that. I think that's great Larry.

Ed DePouli: Larry, could you repeat what you said? Larry, could you repeat what you just said? I'm getting a lot of squeaking on my phone.

Alan: Larry Schramm, are you still with us? This is Alan, we may have lost Larry for the moment. What he said was, he wants in the cover letter that though the contract would be for a year and potentially renewable annually that it would be going out for bid at least every five years. So whoever applies know that they don't get it for a lifetime, they get...

Alan: Okay. Ed had asked you to repeat what you said about the minimum - putting out for bid every so many years Larry.

Larry Schramm: Yes. The question I think he has I'm not aware maybe tell me, was the Books contract ever put out for bid or did they just pretty much follow it on automatic renewal?

Alan: This is Alan. They did not automatically renew. Every time the contract ended it was either two years or three years the board decided whether or not they

would renew. I do not remember during my period on the board that we put it out for bid -- but I have only been on the board a few years so I don't know if it was every put out for bid.

Larry Schramm: My comment on this is, we can put in subject to satisfactory performance we will renew it on an annual basis up to a maximum of five years and then at point in time it must be put out for bid -- because we need to make sure we understand among other things the technology changing in the marketplace and things that are maybe - I will just give a simple example and I'm not going to pivot the Books a bunch.

But they sent me a spreadsheet of the 11 Centennial people and it was totally unusable -- you couldn't sort it, you couldn't do anything with it because the way they set it off. And I think probably they are not as proficient as other places and that's where we need to go look and just force ourselves to do at least a minimum of five year out for bid for all of our services.

Bob Safrit: This is Bob. When did they send you that list?

Larry Schramm: Shortly after I got the approval or heard of the approval for the Centennial Award three years ago, four years ago.

Bob Safrit: It was last year and it was very plain.

Larry Schramm: No, it wasn't last year.

Bob Safrit: We used it very successfully.

Larry Schramm: No it wasn't. It was in Allentown the first year so when was that, two or three years ago?

Terry Wiegand: 2016, two years.

Larry Schramm: Two years.

Bob Safrit: No. The last year was the first year we recognized these people.

Larry DiBarry: No. Bo you are talking about the 50-year membership. This is Larry DiBarry.
Larry is talking about the 100 Year Awards for brining your 100-year-old
Buick to the Meet.

Terry Wiegand: And that's (forwarded) in Ellen Town.

Larry DiBarry: Yes, Terry.

Terry Wiegand: Yes, it did.

Larry DiBarry: Yes. Bob and I worked on the 50-year Membership Award for people -- that's
what Bob is talking about, yes.

Larry Schramm: Okay, so two different things. I'm talking about that list.

Larry DiBarry: Yes.

Roberta Vasilow: Hey, guys, can we kind of get rid of the bullshit and get out of here.

Alan: Okay. This is Alan, I have my matching orders. I will rewrite a cover letter
and send it out to everybody.

Terry Wiegand: Bless you.

Roberta Vasilow: And you also have another question for us before we are done.

Alan: I think Larry Schramm has already answered it and Larry, when do we expected any responses to the RFP for an audit?

Larry Schramm: All the bids and proposals are due December 1 and I think we got one back but I'm not sure they are going to want to bid on it. I don't know what the other two are because I have not talked to them and I never heard from them.

All I know is, we sent it out, everything was due December 1 -- and hopefully we will be able to award that contract by either somewhat the 15th of December or the end of the year so we can start getting it done.

I think doing a whole big, look-see at all of our activities is a great thing going on because it will have what I'm going to call relatively speaking, a fresh start. We will know where we stand, financially we will know where we stand with new office activities and everything else around and we can help direct the club to grow.

Alan: Sorry, just so I'm clear, we expect the responses - we will know by on or about shortly after December 1 what the responses are?

Larry Schramm: Yes, that's correct. That's what's in the letter and we sent the letter out saying everything is expected to be back to us I think by December 1. It gave them about 30 days in order to look at everything and determine what it is that they are capable of doing and how much they want to charge.

Ed DePouli: Thank you. I really hope that Cornerstone gets a chance to bid. I don't know them, I have never heard of them before yesterday. If there are any other organizations like Cornerstone that somebody knows of I think they should get an opportunity to bid. I'm very concerned that we are going to get another ma and pa situation (unintelligible) and I think will not work for the future.

Alan: Well, Ed, this is Alan. I'm going to get some additional information from Cornerstone next week and I will make sure that gets to the board.

Ed DePouli: Thanks you Alan, I appreciate it.

Larry Schramm: This is Larry. And are you going to send them the RFQ or RFP both of them?

Alan: Yes. As soon as it's board-approved, you bet.

Larry Schramm: Okay, are we going to set a date to have that done, can it be done by the end of next week?

Alan: For what to be done Larry?

Larry Schramm: For the letter to be done and send everything out by the 1st of December because we are running on this time crust.

Alan: Oh, yes. Absolutely.

Alan: I know. It's Monday the 3rd of December.

Ed DePouli: Absolutely. Let's schedule another meeting for that day then and take a vote for what we are doing.

Larry DiBarry: This is Larry DiBarry. We can do an email vote, that's still not an issue -- unless there is other problems with comment about the cover letter which I don't see from what Alan already sent out. To me, I think that would be fine.

Ed DePouli: Actually what I'm thinking is that we are going - let's assume that the six people that we have already talked about are going (unintelligible) response -- maybe what we do is, we pick out one or two leading congregation and to see those candidates to completion.

Larry Schramm: Ed, this is Larry Schramm. If we have sent it out for everybody that has interest to do it, we are responsible to send it out to everybody and see what they say.

Ed DePouli: Yes, I see that. And let's say we get seven responses, my experience I, when you get a multiple response is you pick the top one, two and those are the two you would negotiations with prior to the vote.

Alan: Yes, absolutely. Yes, we are going to have to look at them because nobody will necessarily - I don't think is going to have every single thing in that we put in the RFQ especially the second one - the larger one.

So we are going to have to see, like, one of the columns that you asked was having specific dates that they would not be working on Holidays like Christmas and New Years and whatever other days -- that will be part of the final contract that we would write with them.

Ed DePouli: Right. Okay. And then I would recommend we try and do that on December 3.

Larry Schramm: Okay. I got you.

Ed DePouli: That way we will still have three weeks to get them done.

Larry Schramm: Yes, but we are going to send them all out if I understand, Alan, is this correct? Are we going to send it out when everything is due back from the vendors on December 15?

Alan: That is the deadline - yes, that is the deadline we stated in the advertising we placed.

Larry Schramm: Okay. So everything has to be back from the vendor by December 15.

Ed DePouli: Okay. I misunderstood -- sorry.

Larry Schramm: No. We want all this out by no later than the 1st and hopefully earlier than that. If that one gets locked and done in the next couple of days and we can send it out this weekend or the 1st of next week, we will send it out.

And then by the drop dead dates for getting anything back will be the 15th and then we will be done. And then we just have to evaluate the proposals and make a selection. Correct? Is that kind of what we are agreeing to Alan?

Alan: I believe so.

Larry Schramm: That's my understanding -- tell me if I'm wrong but I think that's what we are agreeing to.

Alan: I believe you are correct. Anyone else?

Larry DiBarry: I think he is correct too -- this is Larry DiBarry.

END