ACEC - CEG Vendor Evaluation Process Sub-Committee Meeting Minutes
Langsdale Facility - Waterway Conference Room
April 27, 2016 (1 – 2:00 PM)

Attendees:
Rick Rampone, Jay Thorne, Tim George, Jeff Drake, Luke Leising
Beth Glidden, Debi Bardhan, Andy Lutz, Dave Kiesel, Carly Senak

1) Brief review/summary of previous sub-committee meeting and main ACEC – Citizens committee meeting

Rick began the meeting by summarizing the progress of the effort to date.

The group discussed that the forms can be used as a snapshot in time of a project, and that forms could be completed with only partial areas scored, as a way to document a project.

2) Review/discussion of ACEC member firm comments

Comments to the guidelines document:
1. The Who section will be revised as such: “The subconsultant performance evaluation process shall be administered by the responsible Citizens employee who engages with consultants to perform work on Citizens’ projects.”
2. Clarification was issued regarding the “appropriate milestones” statement within the When section. The milestones will vary project to project, but the intent is that this is discussed and agreed upon during the kick-off process, and documented on the kick-off meeting minutes. Also, the following will be added to the final sentence of that section: “and/or as deemed necessary by the Project Manager; the consultant performance evaluation will be conducted for at least one occurrence during each phase of the project.”

Comments to the consultant evaluation – engineering and professional services form:
1. Section 2.d. – Willingness to present ideas for project improvements – This category will be added to the Innovation section.
2. Section 3.d – The word “Investments” will be replaced with “Demonstrates commitment”. CEG will add training language for their staff to address how to evaluate and score this category.
3. Section 4.a – CEG will add training language for their staff to address how to evaluate and score this category.
4. Page 3 of 3 – minor alignment changes made to check boxes above the Citizens Director Review signature line.

Comments to the consultant evaluation for sub-contractors form:
1. The opening sentence shall be revised to read “This is a standard template that will be used to evaluate sub-contractors.”
2. The text “If rating is anything other than 3, please provide explanation below” will be added.
3. The text “Consultants’s comments” will be added to the appropriate box.
4. CEG will add a section to list the sub-consultants’ scope of work on the project.
5. This form will also be added to the kickoff meeting documentation package.

Comments to the Rating Table description document:
1. The note section for Meets Expectation will be revised as such:
   “NOTE: If a Consultant is performing at a Meets Expectation level, and not
   performing beyond the requirements of the contract, Consultants will not be
   assessed a rating lower than Meets Expectation.
2. The “NO” in the second sentence will be revised as “no”.

a. The following questions were also posed:
   a. In regards to the Consultant Evaluation for Sub-Contractors document, is that independent
      of the consultant evaluation workflow, and just between the prime consultant and
      subcontractor? – YES
   b. Does that evaluation get included in the documentation for the prime evaluation, or is it
      independent of the prime evaluation? - YES
   b. From the main committee meeting on April 13, request to possibly improve the second portion of
      the Note on Meets Expectations (page 2 of the guidelines) – Addressed in a previous comment
   c. Also from the main committee meeting on April 13, request to be able to insert the scope of work for
      the subs into the Consultant Evaluation for Sub-Contractors form - YES
   d. Page 1 - Should the document be classified as a “Guideline”? This seems to make it optional.
      Perhaps call it a policy or procedure so everyone knows it must be completed? - “Guideline” will
      be replaced with “Procedure”.
   e. Page 1 – under “When”, perhaps more attention should be given to completing the evaluation after
      each milestone. Although it is mentioned that it will be agreed upon when the evaluations will be
      completed, but doesn’t say anything about actually completing the milestone evaluations. –
      Addressed in a previous comment
   f. Page 1 – under “Why”, suggest something along the lines of “it is a critical piece of information
      used in the consultant selection process for future engagements. To be fair, it must be applied
      consistently for all consultants”. – Addressed in a previous comment
   g. Page 2 – under “Rating” – suggest that abbreviations are not needed (since they are not used
      anywhere else in the document). – Text will remain as it is.
   h. Page 2 – would it perhaps be possible to provide specific examples for each rating? - NO
   i. Page 2 – under Rating 5, last sentence of note – possibly clarify if it is intended for category or
      project? – The intent is to be specific to the Project.
j. Page 2 – under Rating 3, under Note – “NO” shouldn’t be capitalized – Addressed in a previous comment

k. Page 3 – insert kickoff meeting and define evaluation milestones before item 1. – Addressed in a previous comment

l. Page 3 – item 1 – add “for each milestone” to the end of the sentence. – Addressed in a previous comment

m. Page 4 (work flow) – step 4 should say “and include Director” instead of “and include Manager”. – Comment already addressed in the workflow chart, text will remain as is.

n. Pages 5-6 – text under ratings reference contractual requirements, but not all categories have contractual requirements. Suggest developing separate language for each category group or deleting this text. Maybe separate categories into Contractual and Non-Contractual Requirements (objective and subjective)? - The word “contractual” will be added to ratings descriptions, as to be consistent across all ratings.

o. Page 6 – category 3.d. – why is this included for a project milestone? Is seems like this is more important for consultant selection evaluation. – Addressed in a previous comment

3) Workshop/Conference – Background on Citizens Operations / Consultant Evaluation Process The group discussed the conference / workshop idea for vendors – to cover areas of not only the consultant evaluation process, but also procurement, supply chain, and other issues. ACEC will continue to work with Citizens staff as requested to set this event up in the future.

4) Other topics? - No other topics were discussed.

5) Summary and Action Items – These minutes will be distributed to the ACEC membership to indicate their comments and suggested revisions were received and discussed at the subcommittee meeting and outline any resulting revisions to the consultant evaluation procedures and forms.

6) Next Meeting? - No future meeting has been scheduled at this time.