

## DRAFT

September 16, 2014 EEAC Executive Committee Meeting Notes

### Attendees:

Christina Halfpenny (DOER) – phone, Matt Saunders (AG), Amy Boyd (ENE) - phone, Elliot Jacobson (LEAN) – phone, Emmett Lyne (PAs), Carol White (NGrid), Lisa Shea (NU), Eric Belliveau (Consultant) – phone, Ian Finlayson (DOER), Maggie McCarey (DOER). Steve Venezia (DOER)

### Agenda:

- 12:30-12:40: Overview of evaluation process and ExCom/consultant meeting schedule
- 12:40-12:45: Preliminary scoring results
- 12:45-1:35: Proposal discussion
  - discuss strengths/weaknesses of proposals
  - discuss what additional information would be helpful from bidders to include during interview Q&A
- 1:35-1:50: Finalize list of interview questions
- 1:50-2:00: Discuss interview process/roles

The meeting began at approximately 12:30.

### Overview of Evaluation Process

- (McCarey) reviewed the procurement evaluation process outlined in the attached memo. The team will discuss proposals today, conduct interviews tomorrow, and make a final decision following the interviews tomorrow. All scoring members (Tina Halfpenny, Amy Boyd, Matt Saunders, and Eliot Jacobson) will complete the evaluation scorecards using the approved evaluation criteria in the attached memo. Others present will provide input and guidance to scoring members.

### Preliminary Scoring Results

- (McCarey) received scores from Tina Halfpenny, Matt Saunders, and Amy Boyd. All scores had the Raab Associates proposal ranked highest, but the scale of point differential varied between scorers.

### Proposal Discussion

- (McCarey) suggested starting with Raab Associates proposal first and have each scoring member discuss his/her evaluation.
- (Saunders) provided overview of evaluation comments:
  - Proposal demonstrated knowledge of what the Council was looking for
  - Budget was confusing and should be resubmitted with hourly rates
  - Unclear about the overhead on CBI labor
  - Unclear which, if any, ExCom meetings the bidder is proposing to observe

- (Boyd) provided overview of evaluation comments:
  - Agree with Matt Saunders' comments on the budget
  - The substance of the response was aligned with the RFR
  - Bidder proposed using experience learned from the councilors, which is somewhat distinctive and a good approach
  - Also confused whether bidder is proposing to observe ExCom meetings
- (Jacobson) provided overview of evaluation comments:
  - Both bidders are competent and he thinks the team should use the interview process to determine which firm is best suited for this project
  - Suggested that a clear understanding of what is expected of bidder and details of what the bidder is required to submit needs to be addressed in the contract
  - Confident that both firms could handle the work
- (McCarey) requested any additional input from non-scoring members present.
- (Lyne)
  - Appreciates the opportunity to provide input
  - Thought that Raab Associates' proposal was well-organized
  - PAs have had good experience with Raab Associates and Consensus Building Institute
  - Proposal strength - Bidder proposed looking at the statute and the by-laws
- (Belliveau)
  - Proposal strength – Bidder is competent
  - Proposal weakness - Proposal did not provide hourly rates and proposes fewer hours than the Hamel Environmental Consulting proposal
- (Boyd) had two additional comments during the discussion:
  - The proposed amount of time allocated for document review seems short
  - The proposal does not finalize the Assessment Report prior to the Strategic Engagement Plan
- (White) encouraged ExCom to think about how important the schedule is as the compressed timeline might not be realistic.
- Discussion about the schedule ensued:
  - (Saunders) agrees with Carol White and thinks the timeline should be extended
  - (McCarey) suggested timeline is important so that the Council can have the Strategic Engagement Plan prior to starting the planning process for 2016-2018.
  - (Jacobson) agrees that schedule is important and delays could cause problems.
  - (Boyd) suggested that Council needs presentation during November meeting because December meeting may be canceled.
  - (White) suggested that the schedule be included as a question during interviews and all agreed.
- (McCarey) suggested moving onto Hamel Environmental Consulting Proposal and using the same process, starting with scoring members.
- (Saunders) provided overview of evaluation comments:
  - Proposal strengths - The proposers have a good recommendation and sufficient experience.
  - Proposal weaknesses - The Assessment report is proposed to be complete before observing an ExCom meeting. The total column in the budget table of hours needs to be corrected. The proposal presents a large team of consultants.
- (Boyd) provided overview of evaluation comments:
  - Agrees that the team of consultants is large and resulted in a lower score in that section.

- The personnel conducting interviews and research are not the same people developing the Strategic Engagement Plan.
- The Strategic Engagement Plan focused on public input and would be more beneficial to focus on the Council.
- (Jacobson) provided overview of evaluation comments:
  - Agrees with Amy's point on the public input focus of the Strategic Engagement Plan.
  - The research should focus around the interviews with the councilors.
  - Confident that both firms are competent.
- (Belliveau) raised the question of whether the Hamel Environmental Consulting and Meister Consultant Group worked together previously.
- (Lyne)
  - Echoed Matt Saunders' and Amy Boyd's comments regarding the large team and added that the Raab team proposed more senior level staff working throughout the project. Important to evaluate given the limited duration and scope of the project.
  - The proposal mentioned anonymity of interviews which will need to be discussed further.
  - Proposal strength and distinction of the Raab Associates Proposal – proposed reaching out to specific non-Council stakeholders.
  - The costs of both proposals are very similar and shouldn't be a driving factor in the decision.
- (Belliveau)
  - Agrees that there are junior staff proposed, but they are proposing more work hours on the project.
  - One issue might be duplication of effort to brief the senior staff that are developing the reports.
- (White) suggested that the kick-off meeting should include participation of senior staff with strongest understanding.

### **Interview Questions**

- The team agreed that both proposals deserve to move into the interview phase and finalized the list of questions for each (attached).
- (McCarey) explained the process for the interviews. Both interviews will consist of a 15 minute presentation from the bidder, followed by Q/A and discussion.
- The team agreed that a single person from DOER would take the lead in asking the questions.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 1:50.