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 held on February 10. The Vendor Evaluation form, Guidelines for Administering the Supplier Evaluation Process and the Vendor Evaluation Workflow chart had been reviewed, discussed, and suggestions provided. Citizens committee members had conducted internal meetings to discuss and implement changes to those items. B. Glidden would take the lead on incorporating discussed modifications to the draft documents and getting those updated drafts distributed to the sub-committee prior to the February 24th meeting.
   b) Regarding evaluation of sub-consultants, the sub-committee determined that this would be better handled by the Prime firms. However, the ACEC members suggested that perhaps the sub-evaluations could be provided to Citizens for possible future reference. The committee 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 performance rating items they would want included for evaluation of subs. An initial draft of these sub performance rating items was provided to B. Glidden on February 17.
   c) Subsequently, R. Rampone contacted B. Glidden to discuss a concern regarding the proposed approach to the sub-evaluation process. Including the sub-evaluations on page 3 of the Vendor Evaluation form could pose challenges for projects having multiple subs and the timing of their respective participation in the project. He suggested putting this item on the February 24 meeting agenda.

3. Review of Draft Evaluation Forms
   a) B. Glidden and D. Bardhan outlined the revisions made to the Vendor Evaluation – Engineering and Professional Services form. The two construction phase evaluation boxes were consolidated into one box – titled 'Construction Phase/Consultant Support During Construction (if applicable)'. The total available evaluation points was also reduced to 100. However, if an evaluation box was not applicable in a particular evaluation, the service provider would not be rated at all for that specific evaluation box, instead of being provided 3’s as previously
indicated. In those cases, the overall evaluation rating would then be determined based on the actual total points (if not 100).

b) The next step for Citizens would be to distribute the draft evaluation items to their project managers, the persons who would actually be performing the evaluations, for review and comments.

c) Discussion was then held regarding if and how to incorporate the sub-evaluations on the prime evaluation form. R. Rampone suggested that the sub-evaluations be kept completely independent of the prime evaluation forms due to the possible complexity and timing of performing sub-evaluations, especially if multiple subs are involved. Also, Citizens signature of the evaluation form might be taken as concurrence/authorization of the sub-evaluations provided by the Prime. D. Kiesel suggested that perhaps a brief summary of the sub-evaluation could be provided on the prime appraisal form. After further discussion, the Citizens members indicated that they would further discuss this internally and determine an approach.

d) Regarding the Guidelines for Administering the Supplier Evaluation Process, B. Glidden stated that the only revisions needed were to remove references to the Corps of Engineers and to verify that the ratings corresponded to what was in the evaluation form.

4. **Evaluator Training**

   a) D. Bardhan and D. Kiesel stated that each director would meet with their respective managers and project managers to review and discuss the vendor evaluation forms, the guidelines for administering the supplier evaluation process, and the evaluation process.

   b) The ACEC members inquired if perhaps presentation and/or training regarding the revised evaluation process may be helpful to Citizens. The Citizens members will consider this request.

5. **Action Items**

   a) Schedule next meeting – D. Bardhan indicated that the ACEC members would like additional time, at least several weeks, prior to the next sub-committee meeting to have some internal discussions and also to enable distribution of the draft evaluation items to the Citizens project managers for review and comments. Citizens’ goal is to have updated draft evaluation items ready for distribution to the main ACEC – Citizens committee members for review, at least one week prior to, and for possible discussion at their next meeting in mid-April. R. Rampone indicated that Debi could notify him when the ACEC members are ready to hold the next sub-committee meeting.

The meeting concluded at approximately 11:00 AM.