



ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING (“A/E”) SELECTION COMMITTEE

MEETING
Thursday, June 13, 2019
9:00 a.m.

Government Plaza
2nd Floor - Mayor’s Large Conference Room
505 Travis Street
Shreveport, Louisiana

AGENDA

- 1.0 Meeting Called to Order – Christopher Coe, Committee Chairman
 - 1.1. Roll Call – Wendy Wagnon, Purchasing Agent
- 2.0 Public Comments
- 3.0 Automated A/E Report Discussion
- 4.0 Old Business
 - 4.1. Approval of the meeting minutes from April 04, 2019.
- 5.0 New Business
- 6.0 Submittal Discussion and Selection:
 - 6.1. **RFS 19-705 SporTran Transit Resource Center**
Estimated Design Expenditure: \$170,000.
- 7.0 Adjournment

NOTE: RFS documents are located at www.shreveportla.gov, Enter the project number in the search box at the top right of the screen.

*******CERTIFICATION*******

PUBLIC NOTICE is hereby given that a meeting of the City of Shreveport Architectural and Engineering (“A/E”) Committee is called in accordance with Shreveport City Code, Chapter 26, Art. VI, [Division 3, Sec. 26-243](#). Public notice including the agenda with date, time, and place of the meeting was published on the City’s web-site and posted in the building, in accordance with [La. R.S. 42:19](#), on **Wednesday, June 5, 2019, at 9:00 AM.**

MINUTES

ARCHITECT & ENGINEERING SELECTION COMMITTEE MEETING

April 2, 2019



MINUTES
ARCHITECT & ENGINEERING SELECTION COMMITTEE MEETING

April 10, 2019

The Architect & Engineering Selection Committee meeting was held on the 2nd Floor in the Mayor's Large Conference Room at 8:00 a.m. on April 2, 2019.

Members Present

Jerry Bowman
Christopher Coe
Barbara Featherston
Patrick Furlong
Charles Henderson
Stacy Kuba for Tom Jones, Interim
Rachel Lawler
John Nickelson
Gary Norman

Members Absent

None

Staff Present

Quinn Eubanks

David Smith

Wendy Wagnon

Jeanette Watson

Others Present

Darius Bonton

Kodi Guillory

Todd Henry

Amy Neathery

Patrick Clifford

James A. Hagan, Jr.

Rod L. Hill

Mark Owen

Ron Coker

Jerrick Hall

Trotter Hunt

Dennis Prevo

Derrick Cannon

Rickey R. Hall

David E. Kunz

John Pruss

Sam Costanza

Terrell Hall

Sara MacNeil

Bob Wolfe

Drayden Dunn

Larry Harper

The meeting was opened by Committee Chairman Christopher Coe at 8:15 a.m.

- 1.0 Roll call by Wendy Wagnon. All members were present.
- 2.0 Floor opened for public comments.
 - 2.1. No comments.
 - 2.2. All proposing firms were asked to leave the conference room unless the primary firm they were representing was making their presentation.
- 3.0 Presentations and Question/Answer session for:
 - 3.1. **RFS 19-704 Program Manager – Capital Improvement Program & Consent Decree**
Estimated Annual Fee: \$10,000,000.

3.2. Each firm was allotted 20 minutes for presentations and 25 minutes for committee questions. The time slots for each team were as follows:

- 3.2.1. 8:15 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. BALAR
- 3.2.2. 9:15 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. Burns and McDonnell
- 3.2.3. 10:15 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. Hunt, Guillot & Associates

3.3. The following information was requested to be included in each presentation:

- Introduction of key team members and their roles. This should include identification of core Program Management staff, including the Program Manager that will be in the Shreveport office full time. Include an organizational chart with team members, roles, responsibilities and locations. The preference by the Committee would include attendance by the proposed Program Manager and core staff that will be on-site in Shreveport.
- Brief summary of understanding of Consent Decree and the City’s obligations under it.
- Brief summary of understanding of scope of services (including transition phase). Please provide details of proposed transition assuming a June 1, 2019 NTP with some level of existing Program Management staff in place during this phase.
- Description of similar past projects by the Prime and team.
- Discuss any substantial changes to the management or structure of the Program.
- Discuss any cost saving measures that you suggest to implement.
- Sub-Consultant Breakdown including percentage of Fair Share participation and any MBE/DBE/WBE participation. Please provide breakout by firm, location of firm, number of employees at office/branch, and type of services that will be provided. See basic format example below:

Firm Name	Participating Office Location(s)	Number of Employees	Fair Share Certified	MBE	DBE	WBE	Estimated Percentage	Type of Service
Firm A	Shreveport	4	X		X		15%	Construction
	New Orleans	40						Inspection
Firm B	Baton Rouge	8				X	10%	Project Management
Firm C	Mansfield	6					5%	Scheduling

4.0 Adjournment

4.1. Meeting adjourned at 10:58 a.m. by Christopher Coe.

MINUTES

ARCHITECT & ENGINEERING SELECTION COMMITTEE MEETING

April 4, 2019



MINUTES

ARCHITECT & ENGINEERING SELECTION COMMITTEE MEETING

April 05, 2019

The Architect & Engineering Selection Committee meeting was held on the 2nd Floor in the Mayor's Large Conference Room at 9:00 a.m. on April 4, 2019.

Members Present

Members Absent

Councilman Jerry Bowman

None

Christopher Coe

Barbara Featherston

Patrick Furlong

Charles Henderson

Stacy Kuba for Tom Jones, Interim

Rachel Lawler

Councilman John Nickelson

Gary Norman

Staff Present

Mekisha Creal
Watson

David Smith

Wendy Wagnon

Jeanette

Quinn Eubanks

Steve Olson

Others Present

Darius Bonton

Sondrea Gallman

James A. Hagan, Jr.

Todd Henry

Ron Coker

Karen Gray

Rickey R. Hall

David E. Kunz

Sam Costanza

Jay Guillot

Terrell Hall

Jordan Pearson

LaKeisha Ford

The meeting was opened by Committee Chairman Christopher Coe at 9:01 a.m.

- 1.0 Roll call by Wendy Wagnon. All members were present.
- 2.0 Floor opened for public comments.
 - 2.1. No comments.
- 3.0 Automated A/E Report Discussion
 - 3.1. Wagnon: We met with IT; Steve Olson is here to provide details on the quick fix.

Steve Olson: On the quick fix, we are going to have Purchasing to start recording the sub-contracts awards by date so we can pull them in and merge them with the report. So we can better report the timeframe of when the awards we given to those subcontracts. Going forward we plan to build a web-based application to start housing that data so we can move forward with a user friendly application and that will be merged into the report.

Coe: Would you be building a new website just for that criteria?

Olson: Most likely the application will most likely be on the intranet for now and if we need to make it available to the public facing we can get to that point.

Coe: Isn't the City in the process of redoing the city's website in general?

Olson: Yes.

Coe: We will eventually have to interface with that.

Olson: Yes probably 6 months to a year out before you can get that permanent application.

Coe: What is the time of at least getting an excel spreadsheet to update us with our current contracts?

Olson: We are going to run a test with the current CDM primary contract with their subcontractor data once we run that pilot and gather all the data from purchasing. The pilot, we should have within a week or two to test and allow purchasing to review so we can present that. From there it's a matter of entering all the data into the excel spreadsheet to flush out the current contracts we have being reported.

Coe: I assume we are not in violation of any public issue ordinance with regard to this information not being posted yet because we are still working out the bugs?

Wagnon: We are still reporting; it's just not showing the actual date of when changes are made but the bulk of the information is there and is available.

Coe: Ok, just keep us updated. Thank you for coming.

Olson: You're welcome.

4.0 Old Business

4.1. Coe: Do we have copies of the previous minutes?

Jeanette Watson: I didn't print out copies but I did email them out to everyone yesterday.

Coe: Ok, do we have a motion to approve the meeting minutes from March 27th?

Gary Norman: So moved.

Rachel Lawler: I second.

Coe: All in favor? Opposed? Sustained? Motion carries.

Motion passed by unanimous vote: Yes 9 No 0

5.0 New Business

5.1. Coe: I have a few new business issues but I want to give the committee an opportunity to bring up any other new business they may have.

Lawler: Would this be the appropriate time to bring up what you and I discussed yesterday?

Coe: Yes. You're talking about the press outreach issue?

Lawler: Yes.

Coe: I had a conversation with Ben Riggs, the communications director for the City; it was his recommendation as a committee that we refer all press inquiries to him first. My recommendation as a committee member is that we don't speak to the press because it could refer that we are speaking for the committee as a whole. However there are circumstances when directors, such as Mr. Furlong and others in the room, have the authority from the Mayor to do so. And that is a separate circumstance from what happens in this committee. I would make the recommendation that if you are contacted by the press that you speak with Mr. Riggs office.

Barbara Featherston: We already do.

Patrick Furlong: Even though we typically talk with the media, we always coordinate with Mr. Riggs.

Coe: Do we need to make a motion to make this formal?

Furlong: I don't believe we do but I do agree with your recommendation to coordinate.

Coe: Thank you.

5.2. Coe: My new business is related to what's on the agenda today but I have two particular motions. One of them refers to what I talked about last time [referring to March 27, 2019 meeting] I have a concern that we only received 3 submittals for an enormous project and frankly the biggest project the City is going to undertake. I have concerns that we did not perhaps do enough outreach to get more responses; I'm not casting any aspersion on the three that we got, with a project of this scale I just expected more and I was hoping we had a procedure for resoliciting when we get such a low turnout.

So I am going to make a motion right now that we suspend this approval process right now and we reissue the RFS and that we start the process over again and do some more proactive outreach.

Councilman John Nickelson: I share Mr. Coe's concerns that we received only three submittals for this project. This will pay to the entity selected tens of millions of dollars over the course of the contract to the entity responsible for managing hundreds of millions of dollars of work. Like Mr. Coe I would have expected more responses than received and if staff believes that resubmitting would result in additional submittals for consideration I would support that.

Norman: What kind of an affect would a delay; Wendy how long, if we put this back out again, would we be back at this point again?

Wagnon: Unless we change anything in the RFS we would probably have it back out in about 40 days, if we acted fast.

Lawler: Have we consulted a city attorney on this?

Nickelson: I don't think there is any question that as a committee we can do this.

Lawler: ok

Wagnon: We may have to go through council for an ordinance; Barbara would we have to do a resolution to throw these proposals out? Or do we need to get Mekisha to weigh in?

Featherston: You'd have to get someone to weigh in, I know that we do that with bids but I don't know about an RFS or RFP type process.

Wagnon: I have not seen it written anywhere.

Furlong: Wendy can you discuss the outreach that purchasing does?

Charles Henderson: Have you always put it out there so everyone can look at it?

Wagnon: Our official source of solicitation is BidSync. BidSync is a national firm, their outreach is extremely large and it's submitted. BidSync reaches out to all the firms who are set up in the commodity code for the goods or services that we are soliciting. We can provide the committee the list of the firms that were invited by BidSync, it's very large.

Featherston: Another thing with BidSync is there is a way for us to go into BidSync to see who has viewed the request. And I would hazard to guess that there were 20 to 30 firms that probably reviewed this and decided not to take action. From my personal perspective, this is different if you're starting from scratch for program management but when you're transitioning from another firm there are certain risks and there are certain things that a firm is going to take into account such as do I really want to go down that road or not. And I suspect that a lot of firms decided not to do that. I would guess that if they pulled the webpage up in BidSync that you would see lots of firms that actually viewed it but declined to submit. I don't feel that it's about outreach or that firms didn't know about it there's also the decision to not to propose.

Furlong: I agree, the selection of job is one of the most important jobs of a consultant and they're highly aware. I am fairly confident that any consultant will tell you that. I am confident that other firms were aware of this and also feel that the submittals that we do have are very good submittals. And I feel that several of these would make the short list even if we had 15 submittals. So I do not feel that we need to postpone this.

Norman: Patrick, what affect would this have if we did postpone this?

Furlong: So, CDM Smith is in place but it is very challenging for them to manage a staff of over 40 people when that staff knows that their contract will be ending very soon. So even though they are in place and are performing, they have people looking for other opportunities because they have to put food on their table and take care of their family. So right now we are not in a transition but it is a different situation because there are people leaving the team and it's very difficult for CDM Smith to replace them with someone who will only be here for a couple of months. That is part of the urgency of needing to get a new program manager in place.

Lawler: Do we as a committee feel the companies who did turn in submittals are qualified; do you feel confident that any one of these picks would be a high choice?

Furlong: Yes, I am very confident. I have an explanation I was going to give with my recommendation but I'm extremely confident.

Lawler: The second part of that question, do we feel we would lose any of the current submittals if we did that again.

Furlong: I doubt it, but this reminds of running advertisements to hire just engineers. We do it over and over again and we just seem to get the same one or two.

Lawler: But you feel confident?

Furlong: We've done everything we can, we've done all the outreach, the situation is the same. I am very confident in the submittals that we have.

Norman: Councilman Nickelson Mr. Coe, is the concern over the number or of the qualifications of the ones that we did receive?

Coe: When is the end date of the CDM contract up? Do we have an exact date?

Furlong: Their contract will be up at the end of April but we are working to have a supplement to extend for standard performance and then a transition period. And that's how their contract has been handled, with supplements.

Coe: Thank you. Director Norman, this is a project that will directly impact every citizen in Shreveport. Which is unusual when you think about it, certainly you can say that about most decisions but this one is in particular going to physically and financially going to impact every citizen. Knowing that and then seeing the dollar value of the construction involved, the dollar value of the fees that they will be earning per year and the normal number of submittals to me is highly out of proportion. That sends off alarm bells to me. I've been in a lot of selection processes and I have never seen a project with such a huge dollar impact and human impact with such a small pool to choose from. so that is my immediate concern. So, sure these firms could be very well qualified it just this seems highly, highly unusual in my experience.

Lawler: Do you feel further vetting would potentially accomplish

Coe: I do and that was a second motion I was going to make actually.

Nickelson: Perhaps we should have a full discussion on a related issue before we act on possibly having a new RFS which I have discussed with Mr. Coe and purchasing that this RFS did not include a non-solicitation affidavit. That ought to be part of every RFS RFP that the city puts out, I don't know why that was not part of it but I do believe that was an oversight but do think it is important before we make a decision of whether there is a slight delay or of reissuing the RFS I think that it's important that every submittal include that non-solicitation affidavit.

Wagon: That affidavit is not in that boiler plate but that is something that we will definitely look at and talk to legal about. It's not in the boiler plate for an RFS and has not been in, we will check on it.

Coe: Are you speaking about this as going forward or retroactively?

Nickelson: I am saying regardless of if we reissue the RFS or we delay slightly to we allow the firms to execute that affidavit that this committee should not make recommendations until that

affidavit has been executed and I fully expect that these submitters will be able to complete that affidavit without any trouble, but we need to add it.

Furlong: I am not familiar with that affidavit.

Nickelson: It's an affidavit that confirms that a submitting firm has not employed someone to go around this process and lobby through back channels for award.

Coe: Employed or requested.

Nickelson: That's right.

Coe: And the second issue to give us cause to delay for a little bit is that every submitter was required in their 10 project experience to provide a point of contact and from what I understand from City staff is that we have not contacted any of those references. I feel that it is incredibly important that we do that.

Featherston: Has anyone else in the committee reached out and done that?

Coe: No, I didn't know what the protocol was.

Featherston: As a committee member, everyone is entitled to reach out and touch someone.

Nickelson: I don't believe Mr. Coe is criticizing anyone but regardless as to why it wasn't done, I do think this needs to be done before we as a committee make a decision.

Coe: And to have some sort of a procedure for it. Is it more than one committee member on the phone at the same time? Is it just one person reporting back? We need to establish a protocol for that but again the order of magnitude of this project and the fees involved it just seems to me it would be who of us to do a little bit more of investigation.

Furlong: I understand that concern, but that concern I categorize that with your other concerns of improvements that we can and should make to this committee. And I look forward to doing that but right now the committee is operating and its functioning well so I don't see that as a reason to delay. But I do look forward to making those improvements in the future but to delaying this I do think it's necessary.

Nickelson: What about a slight delay to make someone call, that's not unreasonable.

Furlong: You know that's not a bad idea, but I know each of these firms. I didn't feel the need to call these firms, I have worked with them for years.

Nickelson: My concerns have nothing to do with the submittals or the confidence of your judgement, but I'm concerned about the process that we are following. And a selection of this magnitude should include contacting the references in the RFS and that has nothing to do with the firm, nothing to do with the firm, but I think if we are discharged, this is the most serious decision this committee will likely make on my time on the council. The dollar amount is so big that we need to be able to look back in retrospect that we did what we were supposed to do by following the appropriate process. I don't want to skip any steps because even if we know where we are going to end up we still need to do these things.

Lawler: In addition to calling these references, are there any other recommendations we should follow up on? I can support further vetting but am concerned about putting this back out. I

know that during the interview process we seemed concerned about how quickly these people could help transition over and reissuing this might change that answer from these companies. From what I understand the City doesn't have a whole lot of time that we can put these off that would be my concerns. I get the more vetting but would be more concerned about the issue. If Patrick, in fact does say that these companies are qualified and trusted we could certainly come to better conclusions ourselves.

Nickelson: I do feel that we have to rely on professional staff and that this was appropriately put out and we don't feel like any other firm was interested in submitting wasn't notified. But I do feel a brief delay of our decision that we at least contact references and obtain the non-solicitation affidavit that would not require a reissue of the RFS. And if we want to have further discussion of that possibility then we can.

Wagon: Mr. Chairman, I did pull up BidSync. 12,948 firms were invited and was viewed by 63 firms.

Coe: Thank you. If we did vote to slightly postpone the decision, what would you recommend for time? Are we talking a week, week and a half?

Furlong: Depends on the critical issues you want to delay.

Coe: Well its two, as explained by Councilman Nickelson.

Featherston: I would assume they could get us the affidavit back today. And references, we would have to take the time. I personally have two other meetings scheduled after this and a state phone call but we all work weekends anyway. I'm happy to make those reference calls.

Furlong: But if we're not making the reference calls as a complete committee then you're subject to that committee member's opinion as to how that reference call went.

Coe: Well that's why I said we need to make a process that more than one committee member make the call.

Featherston: It's just timing and coordination. I understand Councilman Nickelson concern about the non-solicitation affidavit. References if we're talking a week or two weeks then we need to schedule those, I've done reference checks before where I am not familiar with companies and it can be time consuming because you need to speak with the individual who is on the reference sheet; and honestly the companies are not going to provide anyone who is not a good reference.

Furlong: Please note that every reference on there is going to love these firms.

Featherston: So there are some challenges there. I would not want to delay this any more than the middle of next week and it's just a matter of determining which references are you going to check. Are you going to check the references of subs or of just the primes? And what do you want to ask. For example, Mr. Norman sent us an email yesterday about one the concerns he wanted to make sure we discussed included is the firms and/or the subs in consent decree negotiations. Obviously that is extremely critical and potentially cost savings later down the road for the City. So some of the primes may not have that experience but it may lie with one of their subs then your getting into a lot of reference calls. And your wanting to check that in

particular if that's a critical aspect. This is the only consent decree negotiation I've ever been through and it's been challenging and interesting. And it's not a skillset which is available within the City of Shreveport. That's outside with your outside council because legal was not geared up to handle that, so typically you have outside council and an outside consultant so that aspect of these teams is one of those important little markers, for me, in knowing how those relationships work and having someone who has experience with the EPA. So how many references do you want to check and how far do you want to drill them down. Patrick and I are familiar with the prime firms, there are some subs that we have not worked with before.

Coe: Don't take this as a criticism. My point is, just because we have done this a certain way doesn't mean it is the right way there is always a better way to do it. And the magnitude of this project requires us to do it better and to be frank, this committee, I wasn't on it, selected the firm who is currently on the project isn't performing and you went through the same process and that is exactly my point.

Councilman Jerry Bowman: They didn't have the same process. They had selected someone else first as the prime and the mayor chose someone else.

Nickelson: This committee did not select CDM Smith.

Coe: No, a different composition.

Bowman: I would have to agree with Ms. Lawler in that I would not want to prolong anything that may interfere with the City and the Consent Decree work. I do believe and I trust in Patrick and Barbara as far as them knowing these firms as well as we do, I trust their judgement and I wouldn't want to postpone something for something we could have done in the last few days. Either one of us from this table could have called and got references. We could have done this yesterday or Monday as far as checking references or anything else.

Nickelson: Certainly I am not in favor of an undo delay but I do think Barbara's reasoning is the reason references were not called. I just can't imagine this committee approving recommendations to the Mayor there being problems with the prime and then someone looking back at our process and saying we didn't even check for references. That sounds suboptimal and I think we need to have the process as close to optimal as we can make it within the practical constraints we are working with.

Featherston: And what I was merely asking for is... Patrick and I have a slightly different perspective because we are closer to the subject matter than the engineers and I get that. But if we are going to stop and delay to do the affidavit and references then we have to deal with everyone's schedules again which is difficult. I don't have a problem doing some reference checks I just need to know because it can be very time consuming and if you are going to juggle multiple people on this committee I just need to know the constraints such as are you looking at the primes, are you looking at the subs? If you are going to be consistent then you are going to look at primes and subs, do you do 1, 2, 3; it gets a little exponential with phone calls if you're not doing them individually.

Nickelson: Assuming the committee approves a delay of a week or two to accomplish this, what reference checking do you recommend and would be practical in that timeframe?

Featherston: Three firms, two appease, what I have found for most reference checks I have never gotten a negative response.

Lawler: We have 4 hours slotted for this meeting, can we at least step into another room and begin this process?

Nickelson: I don't think it would be likely to get people on the phone.

Featherston: Yes.

Lawler: Sure maybe, we can at least try.

Coe: I think we can quickly put together a process that we can abide by to do this. I just also want to say that I have been on both sides of this question and it is also important to not only ask the question of what did they do great but what did they do wrong and how did they fix it? You're not always going to get a glowing response, I don't think that's entirely correct.

Bowman: Assuming we do vote today to move forward, I don't think there is anyone at the table who would disagree of doing this process in the future.

Nickelson: Surely all members agree that we request the non-solicitation affidavit before we make a decision, that is basic due diligence.

Furlong: Can we make it contingent?

Nickelson: I prefer to have them in hand, given the scale of this project I see no problem in allowing staff to make whatever reference they feel are practical in that time period. This is a contract that confirms the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars of the public's money.

Furlong: For the record I did play phone tag with one reference.

Coe: Thank you.

Mr. Charles Henderson: Was the form an original part of the solicitation is there a reason these were not submitted?

Nickelson: It was not and I think that was an error and one that needs to be corrected.

Henderson: I agree but they did all that they were supposed to do.

Nickelson: Correct, it is no submitters fault that we did not request an affidavit. But it is something that needs to be corrected.

Henderson: I agree with you. But I don't think this is the time to do it because they made every qualification that was provided to them for the submittal but in the future we should require it. The fire is now, we don't need to make a fire prevention plan now. We need to put out the fire then come back and develop a plan.

Furlong: With the schedule, this has been very difficult to coordinate which is why we need to do this sooner than later. We are currently negotiating the CDM Smith supplement and we are trying to figure out when the transition period will be. And the more ideal to have one final supplement to identify their performance and the transition. We have it lined up to the day, I was going to have a very in depth discussion with who was selected to plan the supplement for

CDM Smith and their transition. So we will work with whatever we have and whatever information we have but that is just another piece of the issue at hand.

Coe: I am open to combining the two of checking references and requiring the affidavit if someone wants to make a motion.

Featherston: What is everybody's schedule? As far as meeting back up a day, a week, or so. I've been on the committee a long time and coordinating with everyone to get everyone to the meeting can be a process.

Lawler: Would it be worth just starting conversations as to what our recommendations would be? And perhaps picking this issue back up at the end of the conversation?

Norman: Also, would it be appropriate to ask, since we have all the submitters here, to see if there is any objection to that.

City Attorney Mekisha Creal: I'd have to look into that.

Featherston: Is that required by ordinance? And it's possible that we didn't do it and we just need to do it.

Creal: It's not in the ordinance, and if it wasn't part of the RFS I don't think it's something we can require them to do it but we can certainly ask and ask them to complete it by a certain time frame but we can't penalize any one if it's not done by a certain time frame.

Nickelson: Based on the magnitude of this award I feel it is essential that each submitter provide that affidavit regardless of what process we have. There is just too much money and too important to overlook and skip that step.

Creal: I think that is a decision the body needs to make but there is no requirement by ordinance or the RFS so again, you need to be very careful not to penalize anyone who opts out of completing that.

Nickelson: I would be compelled to question why any submitter would not complete the affidavit and I hear what you are saying but if we would require this and someone didn't turn it in then that would ring all kinds of bells.

Creal: And I understand that but ultimately it's a decision the body needs to make and in terms of formality that cannot be the only reason that someone is not chosen or selected because they opted not to complete that affidavit. Again, it would require additional research.

Nickelson: My motion is that we adjourn and meet in one week subject to the committee members availability. And in that time we address the non-solicitation act affidavit issue and we have staff call as many prime references as they can in that one week period. I think that is the responsible modest delay that will address these very substantial concerns.

Coe: Do we have a second?

Coe: I second.

Bowman: I have a sub-motion.

Lawler: Let's hear it.

Bowman: That's to not delay and to move forward with the process. In the future with any other future submittals to create procedures as mentioned to be in place.

Nickelson: Reiterate that making this decision without a non-solicitation affidavit would be greatly irresponsible of this committee. The prime selected for this project will be responsible for hundreds of millions of dollars in construction projects and we need to take the very modest step of requesting this affidavit which from what I understand is a very modest step in selecting contractors in this capacity for municipalities. What is the downside of requiring this formality for the city?

Bowman: When this become important enough to delay this now when it wasn't mentioned yesterday, the day before, or the day before that? My concern is that this makes us look more not together as a body to come up with this today.

Coe: I received a third party call.

Lawler/Bowman: Meaning?

Coe: Meaning someone approached me in favor of one of the firms.

Creal: Point of Order. We have a motion on the floor with a second and a sub-motion, is there a second to the sub-motion?

Henderson: Second.

Norman: Having the non-solicitation agreement is a good thing but what I am hearing from our City Attorney is that we cannot make that a requirement as part of the criteria for a decision. So if we do not request it today, that goes back to my previous question, since all of the applicants are here, is it out of order to ask the applicants if there are any objections?

Creal: No, it wouldn't be any different from asking anyone questions. But again I need to stress that you cannot exclude anyone if they choose not to participate in this extra step.

Wagon: The committee is not permitted to interview any of the firms at this meeting.

Featherston: I see both sides of this, I would assume that none of the firms have an issue submitting that piece of paper. I would also have some reservations of selecting a firm who didn't turn on in.

Nickelson: Does anyone at the table know why that was not included in the RFS?

Wagon: It's not that it was excluded from this RFS, it has never been in the boiler plate for any RFS.

Nickelson: But it was included in the RFS for the CDM Smith selection, is that right?

Wagon: No. It has never been in the boilerplate. It was in the contract but was not in the solicitation.

Furlong: So is it required for them to sign one in the contract.

Wagon: Yes. And it was part of this solicitation by Amendment 1 because someone requested the original project contract.

Furlong: So we do have it in place.

Featherston: Is it in the IFBs .

Wagnon: Yes, in the construction IFBs.

Norman: Does it have the same effect if it is signed after the fact as it does before?

Furlong: The week delay for this affidavit will not work; we will take this into consideration with negotiations with CDM Smith but that does create issues. So really, the only way to properly do this is to delay this over a month and to properly reissue the RFS. I am not in favor of this, but a week delay would be okay but a month and a half that would affect everything. Can we find a compromise to proceed and still obtain the affidavit?

Lawler: Is it not appropriate that we proceed with item 6 to discuss the submittals and by the end of this if we can't actually make selections then we need to make a motion so that we can further vet.

Nickelson: I have state my concerns, Mr. Coe has stated his, Councilman Bowman has a motion on the floor to not require the affidavit prior to recommendation and to not to delay a week for reference calls. I recommend a vote on that so we can proceed.

This vote is to Councilman Bowman's sub-motion which is no delay.

Coe: Do we have a second? Multiple yes, identifies Mr. Henderson as the official second.

All in favor? Yes 6 No 2 Abstaining 1

Motion carries.

- 5.3 Furlong: I would like to make my recommendation to the committee, but in my recommendation I want to come to an agreement as to how we will incorporate the affidavit without further delay.
- 5.4 Featherston: There have been a number of things brought up, is it appropriate for Purchasing to contact us about a subsequent committee meeting that does not include selections to discuss and to try to start working towards process, procedures, forms? I would like to have Wendy set something up in a couple of weeks. We select on is based on the RFS procedure, my suggestion would be for everyone to look at a boiler plate, for Wendy to send one out, if there are things in that boiler plate that we want to change.
- Coe: I agree. Ms. Creal, are we allowed to have a working session? If we do can it be the whole committee or does it have to a sub-committee.
- Creal: Yes, you can have what is called an Executive Session. There has to be an agreement on the majority of the committee to have that session. And in that session you can discuss things such as, character, professional confidence, things of your concern. It can be a private meeting to allow productivity to allow discussions to be free and productive. You cannot make any binding or final decisions at the meeting. {0:59:10}
- Featherston: This wouldn't be an executive session, this would just be a session we would have where we are not selecting something, talk about procedures and things.

Coe: I think we need to do this not as a public meeting, that involves the entire committee so that we can go through criteria weights and all the things we have been discussing the last couple of weeks.

Creal: The law allows for that. The law also allows for strategy sessions.

Henderson: Can we make a motion that we have this meeting?

Coe: Please, I would be repeating myself.

Henderson: I so move.

Coe: Is there a second?

Lawler: I second.

Coe: All in favor? Yes 9 No 0 Abstain 0

Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Coe: Motion carries, we will an executive session meeting to discuss future criteria and evaluation procedures.

Wagnon: We should have the City Attorney as well.

Creal: Number one is customer service.

Coe: And Ms. Wagnon you'll reach out to all of us to schedule the meeting?

Wagnon: Will do.

Coe: Any further new business? Okay onto Item 6 the submittal discussion for the program manager for the capital improvement program and consent decree. {1:00:09}

6.0 Submittal Discussion and Selection:

6.1. **RFS 19-704 Program Manager – Capital Improvement Program & Consent Decree**

Estimated Annual Fee: \$10,000,000.

6.1.1. Discussion

Coe: Can I indulge you for just a second?

Furlong: Please.

Coe: I know that we normally rely on the relevant staff whose directly involved with the project to make that first recommendation but would anyone else entertain to put in their thought first?

Furlong: We don't have to do it like that.

Featherston: That way no ones is bias.

Coe: I didn't say that. [laughter] We value your experience and your knowledge.

Featherston: That way no one's cheating.

Norman: I'd like to go back to the point that I brought up about asking the firms today, I'd like to hear the guys who have dealt with this and their confidence in whoever we select if they are going to be able and capable to help to renegotiate with the consent decree in the overall scope of things to save money. I know there has been some talk about differences in fees that firms are going to charge us and to me that may be a real saving to the City of Shreveport on the back end. I know a couple of firms brought it up and that maybe a subcontractor can do the subdealing with that, can you give me your opinion of how you

Furlong: Yeah.

Coe: I'm sorry Gary, are you speaking of dealing straight with DOJ/EPA? Is that what you are referring to?

Norman: Yes.

Furlong: So the program manager will communicate with EPA and coordinate however this RFS does not solicit services to renegotiate the consent decree. A renegotiation is a separate process which the City has not decided how to acquire a firm to that. It may be incorporated into the program managers duties or it may be a second solicitation.

Norman: Does it make sense for it to be a part of the firm that we select or for a firm on the outside selection?

Furlong: It can be handled either way.

Featherston: Right now we have a separate firm that involved with the negotiations versus CDM Smith. CDM Smith is the current program manager, their extent of communications with EPA or DOJ has been more of status meetings or meetings relevant to Region 6.

Norman: I guess the information that will need to be used to be negotiated with will be with the firm that is doing the work.

Featherston: It was different from the start where we didn't have a program manager at the beginning of that process.

Norman: I guess I'm asking that do feel comfortable with the firms that you think are better at than others or that all of them are qualified.

Furlong: I don't think that's criteria selection for program manager.

Coe: Anyone else wanting to speak up? I'll speak up then. I was concerned that there were only three. Of the three we got I certainly think there is a lot of depth there. There were two in particular that seemed to have much more vast experience with program management particularly not project management those are really different things. Of those two, Burns and McDonald to me, and out of town firm, but from experience of what I saw in their documents the seem to have a lot more depth consent decree; far more experience with consent decree than water and sewer projects than the other two. My biggest concern, no question in my mind, I don't know if this goes into negotiation with a contract, I still have some confusion with their partner firm Bonton and what exactly they're doing. When they say 90% of what they're doing is being done in Shreveport and Bonton is a 50% partner does that mean Burns and McDonald is doing only 40% of the work and are they doing it here? There is a fundamental

confusion to me for that particular point. My secondary concern for the Bonton association is they are sort of waiting on us before they open a Shreveport office. They are already doing work here, I don't know why that is up to us for them to found an office in Shreveport. That being said that is a minor concern to me in terms of the weight of Burns' experience overall. My second ranking would be HGA but my concern there was that I truly did not get a good sense as to how much consent decree work they have truly done compared to Burns. They have certainly done monumental disaster recovery projects that are entirely complex undoubtedly, but I am not certain of the depth of knowledge with EPA and DOJ in respect to this very particular water and sewer issues as it relates to the consent decree. And lastly and I will say, in open here, that I was misquoted in the paper yesterday in that I did not exclude Balar at all however it is my understanding they don't have program management experience as opposed to design and building and overseeing their own construction engineering projects. So, frankly to me I don't think they even meet the threshold criteria of the RFS and would be hesitant to put their name forward as one of the three to the mayor. To me I think there is only the choice of putting two to the mayor and I don't think we are obligated to put three to the mayor. So those are my feelings and I welcome further discussion from the other members.

Featherston: Burns and McDonald submittal that Bonton has an office on Texas Street. I think the proposal suggests that that would be expanded significantly, there's a difference in having two or three people in an office as opposed to 40 people.

Coe: At the moment that office is only a regional office and just used as needed. I mean I have a regional office and that's not a real office to be frank about it.

Featherston: I mean I don't know I was just looking at an address.

Nickelson: Temporary space.

Coe: Yes temporary space. I take him at their word and that he is actively looking and wanting to be part of the community. I would rather he have a fulltime Shreveport office instead of a Baton Rouge office but I still had confusion specifically with the part about their role.

Featherston: Ok, I can appreciate that. I would like to just make a couple of comments. I have a little bit, while I'm not involved day to day like Patrick is and while this is near and dear to my heart as I've managed this from the first call from the EPA. I've known all of these firms and some better than others. Balar, I've been working with them since I moved to Shreveport in the early 90s. I agree and I disagree a little bit. My thoughts on Balar's proposal, I appreciate the local presence, I appreciate the fact that when their water bill goes up they are paying for this whole program and that's important. I do have some concerns, I do understand that their program management experience as related to disaster work in south Louisiana and managing hundreds of contracts with the grant programs and their portion may not be the same it's still very similar. As far as the expertise, I probably would have been a little bit more comfortable with their submittal if their sub Black & Veatch would have played a little bigger role because Black & Veatch is the firm that did our negotiations for us and has done program management work all over the country. Not to take anything away from Balar's experience and their thoughts and experience that I thought were very good and very from the heart and clever I would keep them in the mix because of that. The other two firms, my only real concern with

HGA is the program experience not necessarily in water and sewer. While some people feel program management is program management but I like to talk shop and speak directly about certain types of rehabilitation or, I know it's not in the qualifications but I look at the experience with DOJ and EPA and there were limited amounts because and we didn't ask for that. I'm sure that the sub that they have with WayTrim, I am only familiar with them because I did work with them before I came here, they are not a name with people here in Louisiana are very familiar with. So those are my thoughts and now I'll just wait for Patrick before I put my rankings out there to make any substitution motions.

Furlong: I'll run through the firms and everything and give some remarks it was very difficult to make recommendations because they are all very qualified applicants. I'll speak about them in alphabetical order just like the interviews were. Balar – there have been concerns that Balar may not have the experience to do as a program manager but I think they can. Yes it would be difficult for a local firm to manage a program of this size but with their national partner, nation firm Black and Veatch as a program advisor and serving in other roles on their team I feel that's how they can accomplish it. There was not an enfaces in their interview of Black and Veatch and they were not here so maybe that is why some committee member have their doubts. But they are in their submittal and they will be part of my recommendation. The Burns McDonald Bonton team is a very impressive team. Burns and Mac clearly have experience managing programs very similar to Shreveport. We have had a good relationship with Burns and Mac on another project. It's encouraging to see Bonton to have the desire to work here and to have a permanent office. And of Guillary's ambition to bring her business to Shreveport that is also very encouraging. HGA – I really didn't have many questions for them in the interview process because their interview was so thorough. Their submittal was great and their company has excelled in program management. They've had an office in Shreveport for a very long time and their headquarters is just down the road in Ruston. So I think HGA is a great option also, very impressive company and team.

6.1.2 Furlong: So like I said, it was difficult for me to rank them but my recommendation to the committee is to rank number one Burns and McDonald and Bonton, number two Balar, number three HGA.

6.1.3 Discussion

Coe: Anyone else in the committee want to speak up as to recommendations?

Lawler: Perhaps not recommendations but more of insight, what you basically said Mr. Coe is that you would not want to put any of these firms in front of the mayor.

Coe: Yes.

Lawler: That one particular firm that those you who have spoken you question their program management. The early conversation was about the magnitude of this and now I can't get rid of that thought that we may make recommendations. So that just concerns me that we have one person at the table who believes we should not put even one firm in front of the mayor.

Furlong: I understand his concerns. Just think that that a local engineering firm managing projects, I understand the concern the team is more than that to me and I feel that we should include them.

Coe: And I understand that you think that but it didn't come through like that in the interview or the proposal.

Nickelson: Isn't it correct that the other two firms have extensive program management across the United States and across the world?

Furlong: Yes

Nickelson: Is it also correct that Balar is a local firm that appears to have no program management experience on this scope? Is that true?

Furlong: Be sure your also taking the experience of Black and Veatch that is part of their team.

Featherston: It's safe to me to say the HGA has no program management experience in sanitary sewer overflow type programs. But they are relying on WayTrim to back stop them.

Coe: Which is exactly my concern.

Featherston: And so there's different ways of looking at that and their team. And I agree, I was a little disappointed in Balar's submittal because I've known Black and Veatch since I've moved to Shreveport in the early 90s. And have worked on multiple City of Shreveport projects from the other side and was a little disappointed they weren't here for the interview to have that presence to have those things that Balar would need some support on. I don't think it's out of and having worked for a large local firm and working on this program as the assistant city engineer at one point, I think that they can pull it off. Would they be my number one selection, probably not. But I appreciated their presentation in their interview.

Nickelson: My perception of Balar as a very successful local firm with many many talents and professionals and my comments are not meant to suggest otherwise.

Featherston: Oh no no no

Nickelson: : I'm not an architect or engineer so my my perceptions of ours, my perception of BALAR is a very, very excellent local firm with many, many thousands of professionals and so the comments are meant to suggest otherwise but it's a fact that they don't have program management experience on the scale of above the other two. I think there's no argument , there's no.. can't be any argument about that right?

Featherston: That's correct.

Councilman Nickleson: And so, given the fact that they do not have program management experience and the scale of this project, the biggest the city has ever undertaken. Like Mr Coe, I don't know, I would be comfortable recommending them in the first, second or third slot to the Mayor. And I'll just call the committee – y'all know this.. We have authority to recommend up to three firms and a firm that we do not recommend cannot be selected. So the decision of whether or not to include a firm on the rebels on the list of three is much more significant as a practical matter. So the decision of whether or not to include a firm [inaudible]on the list of

three is much more significant as a practical matter than the decision of how to rank them because the Mayor and his staff are free to select from the first, second and third without any further input from us.

Councilman Nickelson: So in my mind, the biggest decision and make the day is should we include BALAR on the list given its lack of relevant program management experience, given the size of this project.

Coe: Correct me if I'm wrong, in the last go around the Mayor did not pick our first recommendation, is that right.

Featherston: Previous mayor from two years ago.

Coe: Okay. Understood. But it happens.

Norman: I'd just like to say something. I am part of the staff and I know sometimes it looks like staff is just supporting staff, but I think a lot of the decisions that we make based on the impressions that people that we know have experience with different firms that call, I don't know you and I'm not certainly not questioning. You're obviously a very, very talented person, very intelligent and that sort of a [inaudible] question. You know, where you're going with your, with your concerns of it. I do know that I want to Patrick and you know on a day to day basis and I know the sincerity that he has with his job and his knowledge. And so I do trust a lot of what I hear from, from Patrick, but I'm, you know, I'm not an engineer or architect trying to base my decisions on what, I'm hearing. I do [inaudible] some time what I hear on in a, in a presentation that people are going to tell you what they want you to hear, which goes back to the first legitimate references and things that you have. But I do weigh a lot on what, uh, you know, both Patrick and Barbara have to say about it because I know they have some personal involvement with, with the companies and I know them very well. And um, you know, Patrick is going to be the one who is going to have to work with them.

Coe: Well, the wisdom of the committee is that we have three citizens, two City Council people and City Directors. So that is ... it is good to have that ...difference of opinion. Uh. Any other comments about or thoughts? Mr. Henderson, do you have any thoughts about how you would rank them or, or thoughts about the interview process or submittals?

Henderson: I have my ranking and of course I'm a little bit from a different perspective from you all. You professionals. I'm just a citizen this look at it and I have it basically the same way as you had it because I don't know how you got there. I can tell you I got there. I saw the sheet that said 50% participation for Fair Share program. I know it probably didn't bother y'all but that's stood out to me. The criteria and years of experience [inaudible] and my [inaudible] is basically the same as yours.

Coe: Ms Kuba, any...

Kuba: Well, it's [inaudible] the IT component and I didn't hear anybody bring that up. I think that's something that stood out to me with the Burns & McDonnell group [inaudible]. I appreciate the fact that they had [inaudible] for not only the citizens but also for our staff council questions come up. I thought that was really good and I appreciated that there was a

large IT component that was built into this whole system. I also, um, I'm ranked very similar to Mr. Coe as far as...

Featherston: Hga had a really nice unit [inaudible] is very impressed.

Kuba: Yeah. So I was pretty impressed with that. I mean as far as national teams teams, we deal with this from a lot of stuff. I think having Federal contacts probably won't be part of this project but that's such a big deal when you're dealing with projects like what we are dealing with. I think that's an important factor in this that they should have the contracts, you know with EPA and everybody else is when you get into a bind it's nice to have a contact to call, and not try to figure out who you need to get in contact with.

Coe: I had the same impression that you did about their IT and I appreciate [inaudible] the system. [inaudible] their willingness to bring down two or three candidates to be the face to face project manager, and let the City interview that person in a sense have a say or a hand in that selection. That is incredibly important. The third thing that stuck out with Burns & Mac's presentation is the breadth of the knowledge that they had with this very specific type of work. Although this may be subjective, there is a tenaciousness there that I think we may need to rely on, particularly with the Federal government. Also, the only [inaudible] at the moment, one of two things in particular, the rating between one and two and then what to do with the BALAR firm and whether we put them forward to the Mayor. I'd make a motion that we do not put BALAR forward

Henderson: That's not the recommendation of the...

Furlong: Well, my recommendation to the committee is for somebody in the committee make a motion.

{01:24} Councilman Nickelson: [inaudible] Having heard Mr. Furlong's recommendations, my motion is that we submit a ranked list with Burns and Mac and HGA second to the Mayor for this project.

Lawler: I second that motion.

Councilman Bowman: Can I just... Can you state your recommendation again.

Furlong: My recommendation: Burns & McDonnell/Bonton one, BALAR two, HGA three.

Councilman Nickelson: My motion is that we submit a list with Burns & McDonnell & HGA and that we not include BALAR in the list[inaudible].

6.2. Councilman John Nickelson made a sub-motion

1. Burns McDonald/BONTON (joint venture)
2. HGA

6.2.1. Discussion

Gary Norman: I can support the way you are going but based on what Patrick (Furlong) is saying hate to exclude BALAR.

Coe: I think that's far too big of a risk just to say, I think they can do it. To me...

Councilman Nickleson: They've never done this kind of work as a prime. And that that's what I'm hearing. How do I justify as a public selecting a firm that has never done program management as a prompt to manage the biggest project capital project, the city has ever had. That's a no way at the disparagement of their skills as engineers. They just haven't done this. And I don't think that we need to be their first try at this kind of work. And it's not more complicated than that and [inaudible] their work and their skills over the years but they have not, haven't filled the role before and I don't want the city of Shreveport to be their first opportunity to do. So I really, uh, [inaudible]

Furlong: It's a very good view. It's a good view, but, but from the inside I kind of see it differently. You know, reading through their submittal... they didn't, they were more specific at what changes they want to make. They didn't, they didn't spell them out in the paragraph that data points, the changes that they know that need to be made. So they already know well then of applicants are going to have to spend weeks and weeks and weeks to determine they had been working with this consent decree for years. So your comments are right, but, but there is, I feel like there's more to it than that. They're very familiar with the program.

Furlong: You know, they're, they're the boots on the ground, but they would have to rely heavily on Black and Veatch to analyze the program and structure the program and as far BALAR being the prime, the people they have in place, it's.... I don't know the exact percentages of the team members but the BALAR personnel is not the highest percentage of members on the team. When you, when you look at the org chart, it's not a high percentage. So the people that do have in there that I'm comfortable with the roles they would be performing with the support and the direction of Black and Veatch. So your opinion is valid but that does just kind of some my insight from having the most with this from years and seeing that and their submittals

Coe: Well, I appreciate the [inaudible] bullet points about what needs to happen...what the next steps are. I get that the focus is also part of city staff job to matter what firm it is outlay that as well. So I mean I appreciate {inaudible} that they ...thought to put that in the proposal, but that doesn't mean other firms don't also know that. And, and it's also up to city staff to tell them new for whoever it is, what those steps are. So I don't think that automatically qualifies them as better than the other firms.

Furlong: No. I didn't say that.

Councilman Nickelson: Well I've made my motion my suggestion [inaudible]

Coe: ..[inaudible] a second?

Lawler: Second

Coe: Any further discussion?

Henderson: So, this motion is that that'd not be put on the list at all?

Coe: Right

Councilman Nickelson: [inaudible] My motion is to Burns & McDonnell, Hga and that the list that we submit to the Mayor. Yes sir.

Coe: We have a second. Let's take a vote on it.

Motion failed by mixed vote: Yes 4 No 5 Abstain 0

Coe: So what's the next step?

6.3. Furlong: I want to make a motion to send a recommendation to the Mayor.

1. Burns McDonald/BONTON (joint venture)
2. BALAR
3. HGA

Coe: Yeah. I...sorry.

[inaudible]

Councilman Bowman: McDonnell, BALAR & HGA. The same as [inaudible]

6.4. Featherston: I make a substitute motion that we go with Burns & Mac, HGA & BALAR

1. Burns McDonald/BONTON (joint venture)
2. HGA
3. BALAR

Seconded by Charles Henderson

Coe: We have a sub motion. We need to take action on the sub action first , which is we rerank the firms with Burns & Mac first, HGA second and BALAR third. Any discussion on this issue. All in favor of the sub motion. Opposed. Abstaining. Sub motion carries the ranking being burns and Mac. Hga and BALAR.

Motion passed by mixed vote: Yes 6 No 3

6.5. Norman: On [inaudible] do we just submit a list or...

Furlong: Purchasing submits a list. So we're going to give some information to the Mayor to make the decision.

Coe: That's a good point. And that's the point I raised that our very first meeting last week was because there was no ranking criteria in the RFS and therefore we seemingly are permitted.

Featherston: Don't we send the minutes with the recommendation?

Wagnon: Not with them but he does get them once complete.

Featherston: It would be helpful to have the committees thoughts ...the discussion.

Coe: Yeah, I don't know if it's like the supreme court to [inaudible] opinion.

Featherston: Well, I think that if he gets a copy of the minutes then he'll know

Attorney Creal: He'll be aware of everyone's concerns. He will be able..

Featherston: So you're say he won't get the minutes until after he gets the list.

Wagnon: but we will send them over...

Featherston: I will be much more comfortable because I think it's important to understand everyone's position, all of the concerns. And I think that committee,

Attorney Creal: Yeah... and I can just point...When Wendy... when she sends that to him, she can communicate the desire. I mean you can't requiring him, but it's the community's desire to have the mayor review the minutes before making the final selection

Councilman Nickelson: Is it correct that this is recorded.

Wagnon: It is.

Councilman Nickelson: Is there a reason that we cannot send him verbatim from this meeting? ...if we made a motion to require that? I think that would ensure that everybody's comments are communicated to him to the extent that [inaudible] and so I'll make a motion that the committee has indicated [inaudible] that the committee [inaudible] verbatim minutes [inaudible]

Attorney Creal: If I could just interject... Wendy has indicated that it is possible for him to get the recording of the meeting.

Councilman Nickelson: I still would like for him to have the minutes. I've got lots of recordings and all for so it'll take less time to read the minutes to review a transcript and make it more accessible to him and anybody else who cares to review the proceeding. No prohibition against verbatim minutes.

Attorney Creal: I don't know if there is a prohibition, I just don't know that it's ever been done before. Now I don't know how that will be carried out with nobody on staff or prepare for a better than minutes of the committee for question. Yes sir. Okay so that's my motion

Coe: Mr. Bowman seconds. All in favor? Aye. Opposed? One abstaining. Motion carries. [inaudible] might be a couple of weeks.

Motion passed by mixed vote: Yes 8 No 0 Abstaining 0

6.6. Norman: Can we have later today, Wendy. [laughter]

Furlong: That is my concern...

Wagnon: Gary (Norman), if you join me my office, later.. yes.

Furlong: I mean it might be a couple weeks.

Featherston: No, it shouldn't ... it shouldn't take a couple weeks.

Furlong: Workload.

Featherston: I mean, I type fast...

Councilman Bowman: I do want to go on record just to say that, I mean, I would be a hypocrite if I didn't even say this. I do believe ... someone who does not have experience in a certain aspect but when will they get the experience or how can they be able to get that experience. I do believe in that but agreeing with Councilman Nickelson on the magnitude of the scope of work, but I see where we are going with that but I do want to go on record and say... I do want to help those of see those through that did not have experience in certain areas And that's from, from anywhere ...from teaching ...that's from law experience or whatever. At some point if we don't give them that experience, I'll give them I saying this to to, to, to do the work and how will they be successful?

Coe: Okay. Well, we put a wrap up. I again just want to stress the importance of the upcoming executive session. I think one of the things we'll have to address, which we talked to last week was this issue ranking criteria, and this is a good example. I mean we've now made a decision to give three names to the mayor. There was some disagreement about of the firms, but yet the Mayor is going to see three names on a black and white piece of paper, with absolutely no legitimate or objective criteria and it shows how far away the firms were ranked from each other and I think that it's just not the way to make such a gigantic selection so I really want all of you as members to think about it in advance of executive session. I think we need to really kind of rework our strategy.

Featherston: We need to talk about that. We need to talk about [inaudible] briefly.... Committee emails going back and forth Saturday on selection criteria. Because the RFP request for proposals process is similar . The criteria and the weights that are spelled out in the RFP. There's Fair Share, Offer's commitment, all kinds of different things and there's weighted criteria. Depending on the committee members. Again, I may be just really loose with my numbers and my, my number one firm gets a hundred points. My number two firm gets, you know 90 points. Well you're pretty, you know, you're looking at every little detail and you're number one from your top rank gets 70 points. There could be some significant skewing and so with the a proposal process, there's.... what outweighs the scoring is the number of number one votes. So you and I may have the same....five people in this committee, you can have the same number one. But because of that point skewing and somebody, a couple of people gave their number two really high points cause they gave everybody there can be, the numbers can work out cause that's what I do to be an issue with the total number. Um, and and but yet the majority of the committee picked the same person. And so I will discuss that I think in the scoring to have that similar and that's what's on the RFP scoring sheet is how many members

they get, you know, so that way there's.... in the event of a tie, you know, this is something first, it should be the majority of the committee who they would recommend for number one.

Coe: Yeah. Well we'll take this up in executive committee. I've been doing this whole long time and it's always closer than you think. It's not as far away as

Featherston: when you were, when you werewhen you have people on a committee and I'm not talking about people but when you are very specific service and it's going to be architects or engineering services. And have people on a committee -that that's not what they do for a living. I mean it can be, all of those things are still there weighted, but they're very subjective.

Coe: Just a point of information here...when I first brought this up last week, I was told that we couldn't use that in criteria because it wasn't in the FSS as now you're telling me it was in the FSS.

Featherston: No, no, no, no, no. In the RFP process, in an RFP process...

Furlong: ...which is different than this. This is an RFS.

Featherston: It has never been in an RFS. In in an RFP process request for proposal, which include pricing

Coe: I am speaking specifically of an RFS.

Featherston: It's not... it has never been in any RFS.

Coe: I think that's a flaw with the system in our RFS, which I want to take up in executive session

Henderson: [inaudible] and that HGA said in their submittal that they would start workforce program training mentor program. I won't be able to track [inaudible]that.

Councilman Nickelson: My appreciation [inaudible] is that the Mayor and his staff negotiate contract with the submitter that they select and I would hope and expect that the contract would address that issue along with . [inaudible] of others. So it will, it will be up to staff direction to track compliance with that.

Featherston: [inaudible] You get a proposal and it looks great and they're [inaudible] and rightfully so. Sometimes scopes change, priorities change. What seems to be important at one moment when you get into the program at the beginning of the program. Nobody was thinking about back then that they're digging up three quarters city and the restoration process, which has become the overwhelming issue with the consent decree and, and so, you know, tracking those things and making people kind of make good on those, those warm, fuzzy components of their proposal, which are sometimes difficult to measure. Um, I agree. It's, it's important and it will be up to...I'm glad I'm not Patrick because he's got to manage, he's got to manage it. And his staff, David, get to, you know, make sure that, that, you know, is he was taking care

7.0 Adjournment

- 7.1. Coe: Alright. Any other items? Okay. Meetings adjourned.
Meeting adjourned at 10:34 a.m. by Christopher Coe.