ACEC - Citizens Vendor Evaluation Process Sub-Committee
February 10, 2016 - Meeting Minutes
(2:00 PM at Langsdale 1B Operations Conference Room 110)

1. Attendees
Citizens - Debi Bardhan; Beth Glidden, Dave Kiesel, Andy Lutz
ACEC – Jeff Drake; Rick Rampone

2. Summary of Previous Meeting
a) R. Rampone provided a brief summary of the last meeting. The ACEC and Citizens members agreed that expectations for the evaluation process are: fair, consistent, objective, timely, and serve as a tool to improve performance and working relationship. The ACEC members learned a lot about the evaluation process which led to some discussions and questions. Some of the topics identified for possible further discussion were: evaluations of sub-consultants; clarity of performance metrics; scheduling and performing evaluations; the process for preparation, distribution, response, and signature of evaluations; responsibilities of Citizens directors and supervisors in the evaluation process; possible incorporation of a consultant self appraisal; and how Citizens plans to use the evaluation data.

3. Summary of Citizens Internal Discussions
a) D. Bardhan stated that the Citizens sub-committee members had held several internal meetings since the January 6 meeting. She then distributed a draft revised Vendor Evaluation – Engineering and Professional Services form, a draft Guidelines for Administering the Supplier Evaluation Process (dated 2/2/16), and a draft Vendor Evaluation Workflow chart (Rev 2/1/2016).

b) The Citizens members presented the major changes in the Vendor Evaluation form: performance metrics incorporate US Army Corps of Engineers performance evaluation rating descriptions; added construction phase consultant support both during construction and upon completion of construction to be able to track and evaluate how the project was actually delivered, not just designed; and signature page.

4. Discussion of Revised Evaluation Form, Guidelines, and Vendor Evaluation Workflow Chart
a) The Guidelines for Administering the Supplier Performance Evaluation Process was developed to provide better consistency and understanding to everyone involved in the vendor evaluation process, both at Citizens and vendors. The definition of rating metrics (from 1 – Unsatisfactory thru 5 – Exceptional) was incorporated from a USACE Past Performance Questionnaire (Form PPQ-0) to
address questions and concerns voiced at the initial sub-committee meeting about providing better clarity in the previous rating metrics.

b) Based on the revised form, the maximum available evaluation points is 110. All agreed that having just 100 available points would make it easier to assess overall performance, so further investigation will look at reducing available points from 110 to total of 100. Also, firms not involved in construction would receive 3’s for construction related evaluation items, even though no work was performed. The ACEC members suggested that could possibly skew the ratings. Follow up discussion considered not assigning any values for non-applicable items and determining percentages based on total available points.

c) Regarding suggested consultant self evaluations, the Citizens members pointed out that the revised signature page was structured to enable review and appropriate discussion between parties prior to Citizens director signature. This change in process would appear to remove the need for a separate consultant self-evaluation form.

d) Regarding sub consultant evaluations, after the internal discussions the Citizens members felt that task would be better performed by the prime firms. The ACEC members agreed with this approach, but suggested that perhaps the sub evaluations performed by the primes could be provided to Citizens to use for future reference purposes. After some discussion, committee members agreed that perhaps including the sub-evaluations on page 3 of the evaluation form would address the sub-evaluation request. The Citizens members requested the ACEC members to develop what performance rating items they would want included for evaluation of subs. R. Rampone indicated he would take the lead on that and coordinate with the other ACEC members.

e) D. Barden discussed the draft Vendor Evaluation Workflow chart. This chart provides a graphic representation of the internal evaluation process reviews for Citizens staff ranging from the Project Manager to Director and the steps prior to submitting to the vendor.

5. Action Items

a) Schedule next meeting – the Citizens members would like to try and meet at least at two week intervals going forward until the time that the new evaluation forms and process can be made available to the full ACEC – Citizens liaison committee in advance of the next meeting. After checking their schedules, the Citizens sub-committee members should be available on Wednesday, February 24 at 10 AM. R. Rampone will attempt to schedule the next sub-committee meeting on that day and time.

b) B. Glidden will take the lead on incorporating discussed modifications to the draft documents and get those distributed to the sub-committee for review prior to the February 24 meeting.

c) D. Bardhan will take the lead on any modifications to the Vendor Evaluation Workflow chart.
d) R. Rampone will take the lead on developing sub-consultant performance rating criteria, coordinating with the ACEC members, and providing that to the entire sub-committee prior to the February 24 meeting. He will also prepare draft agenda for February 24 meeting and coordinate with D. Bardhan.

The meeting concluded at approximately 3:00 PM.