

## September 17, 2014 EEAC Executive Committee Meeting Notes

**Attendees:** Christina Halfpenny (DOER), Matt Saunders (AG), Amy Boyd (ENE), Elliot Jacobson (LEAN), Emmett Lyne (PAs), Carol White (NGrid), Lisa Shea (NU), Maggie McCarey (DOER). Steve Venezia (DOER)

Interview #1: Sonia Hamel (Hamel Environmental Consulting), Wilson Rickerson (Meister Consultant Group), Andrew Belden (Meister Consultant Group)

Interview#2: Jonathan Raab (Raab Associates), Pat Field (Consensus Building Institute) - phone

### **Agenda:**

- 1:00-1:15: Review interview process and roles
- 1:15-2:00: Interview #1 with Hamel Environmental Consulting and Meister Consultant Group
- 2:00-2:15: Break/score first interview
- 2:15-3:00: Interview #2 with Raab Associates and Consensus Building Institute
- 3:00-3:30: Score interviews and finalize selection

The meeting began at approximately 1:05pm.

### **Hamel Environmental Consulting and Meister Consultant Group Interview**

- (Hamel, Rickerson, and Belden) presented the attached powerpoint
- (Halfpenny) followed up with the questions below:
  - a. What do you see as the key challenges or risks to meeting the goals and schedule of this assessment? What will you do to mitigate those risks?
  - b. How do you plan to structure interviews to ensure that you identify the key issues and priorities of stakeholders within the limited schedule for this project? Can you explain the proposed breakdown of personnel hours for interviews in the cost proposal?
  - c. Given the large team of consultants working on this project, can you discuss the project management structure? For example, it appears that those conducting research and interviews are not the same personnel working on the reports. How will you ensure that interview and research results are effectively translated into the assessment report and strategic engagement plan?
  - d. The proposed Strategic Engagement Plan puts a large focus on public input. The Executive Committee expects that the strategic engagement plan will focus on EEAC input into the three-year planning process rather than a public engagement process. Can you discuss why you proposed a public comment process and how you might approach it differently to focus on the EEAC?
  - e. Schedule – The schedule for EEAC Process Review is proposed to be completed prior to an EEAC meeting. Are you planning to observe any EEAC and Executive Committee meetings? How will those observations factor into the assessment given the proposed schedule?
  - f. Budget clarification – the total column needs to be corrected and re-submitted.
  - g. If we were able to extend the timeframe of this assessment by a month, would proposal change? How so?

### **Raab Associates and Consensus Building Institute Interview**

- (Raab and Field) presented the attached powerpoint
- (Halfpenny) followed up with the questions below:
  - a. What do you see as the key challenges or risks to meeting the goals and schedule of this assessment? What will you do to mitigate those risks?
  - b. Are you confident that the number of hours allocated to each task in the budget will be sufficient? Specifically, will 1.5 days allow enough time for thorough review of meeting materials/relevant documents and are 3.75 days enough hours allocated for each report?
  - c. The proposed schedule does not require a final assessment report prior to the strategic engagement plan. Can you discuss why this is the proposed approach and how you will ensure that Executive Committee feedback on the assessment report and priority of issues/challenges gets factored into the strategic engagement plan?
  - d. Can you clarify whether you plan to observe Executive Committee meeting(s) and, if so, which meeting(s) are you proposing to observe?
  - e. If we were able to extend the timeframe of this assessment by a month, would proposal change? How so?

### **Scoring and Decision**

- Scoring members submitted scorecards for interviews and Maggie McCarey compiled the final scores. The team had a positive review of both interviews, but both bidders went over the allotted time for presentation. The team determined that Raab Associates and Consensus Building Institute should be hired. While both bidders were impressive and experienced, the Raab/CBI interview demonstrated a very well-thought out understanding of the scope of work, an understanding of the existing challenges in the EEAC process, a detailed strategy for stakeholder engagement, and demonstrated ability and experience with facilitation.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:40pm.