

North Santiam Sewer Project
RFQ Review Committee

September 25, 2019 – 4pm

In Attendance:

Danielle Gonzalez, Marion County Economic Development	McRae Carmichael, MWVCOG	Krista Ulm, Marion County Contracts Specialist
Matt Knudsen, Marion County Public Works	Tim Kirsch, Mill City	Ken Woodward, Detroit
Jim Hensell, Gates	Daniel Tucker, Gates	Jerry Marr, Gates
Janet Zeyen-Hall, Mill City	Shelley Engle, Detroit	

Executive Notes:

McRae started the meeting stating that there was a quorum of the committee present, and that this is a public meeting.

McRae asked if everyone had received and reviewed the two proposals, the response was yes. McRae also asked if anyone had been approached by either proposer and asked to discuss the RFQ since it was posted. Danielle advised that both Keller and HBH reached out to her and she referred all RFQ questions to McRae.

The initial scoring tally showed that Keller came in 13 points ahead of HBH. The initial ranking is 5 Keller, 4 HBH.

McRae had not heard from or received scores from either of Idanha's representatives. Scores also not completed by Reviewer as he believed he did not have enough information to score either proposal. He wanted interviews. Therefore, no scores were submitted and no scores were tallied for reviewer.

Reviewer Discussion:

Reviewer indicated both proposals looked good. Good experience for both. Keller had a representative at some canyon meetings until talks of an RFQ started. Keller has a lot of experience, but how much in the area. They have several out of state. They say they have lots of experience, but do not show local.

Reviewer indicated that both applicants have similar amounts of experience. Keller shows more of thinking outside the box around Three Basin Rule and similar applications in other states. HBH has specific experience in Three Basin Rule in Oregon. There would be value in having the author of the rule. (Author works for HBH now.)

Reviewer indicated that he read the proposals several times and did a lot of research. Keller has experience but much of it is out of state. While they attended meetings and said how they had some experience in the Canyon, they had their representative at our meetings and still called it a sewer district not a sewer authority. They named several people and mentioned the chair and co-chair in their proposal.

Danielle advised that it was frustrating to see her name called out in the Keller proposal but tried to ignore it as she believed they were trying to show their local knowledge albeit in a bad way.

Reviewer indicated Keller states they were the most familiar but do not show it. Schedule on communication does not directly say all communities. Many mistakes in the proposal.

Danielle advised scores and decisions can only be made by what is within their proposals or from references or referenced materials, but not from outside information.

Reviewers advised that Keller has less experience locally but experience in other areas. HBH is associated with Jacobs who has lots of experience but there are no examples in the proposal of their involvement with each other. How does HBH stand alone? HBH did feasibility studies in Detroit in 2009 and 2015, but no plans were created from those studies. Studies concluded not able to be accomplished due to Three Basin Rule. Reviewer indicated that could be considered a failure since the job of the firm would be to provide a pathway even if not easily feasible.

Danielle indicated that the proposal states HBH would be the Project Manager.

McRae asked Reviewer #5 about the 25 point difference between the proposals. Reviewer said Keller's project shows more and outside of the box thinking.

Reviewer states Keller has current project outlined in project management plan. Easy to read. HBH has projected out for additional phases but difficult to read.

Reviewer indicated looking at the proposals; HBH and Keller have similar local experience. The differentiator is HBH's experience in the Three Basin is specific to Oregon, but Keller has a large presence in Idaho not as specific to the Three Basin Rule. There is value in having the Three Basin Rule author on the project. Matt indicated that Keller's proposal shows a good relationship with DEQ for last 10-15 years.

Reviewer indicated there may be a concern with having the Three Basin Rule author as they indicated in their proposal the key stakeholders would have them talking to Salem and Stayton first not the task force. Reviewer highlighted that HBH in their proposal utilized Detroit as an example of their Three Basin Rule experience but Detroit could not move forward and they only gave one real option, as the other was a cursory non-real alternative. The multiple feasibility studies Detroit paid for, done by HBH, indicated a sewer project was not feasible. There was no creativity or real alternatives provided. Their plans were not actionable.

Reviewer concurred with previous reviewer that the HBH studies for Detroit should have produced some meaningful alternative and that it could be considered a failure on their part to find any solution. The Reviewer indicated there was value in HBH's proposal in an outside consultant for the communications plan (Libby) and the person selected was well known and respected locally. Indicated it was too bad the communication consultant could not work with Keller as they had a weak communications plan.

Reviewer said HBH proposal has an outside outreach consultant. There is significant value in the communication plan offered by HBH. Lots of time dedicated to the communications plan narrative. McRae said outreach plan for Keller was weak.

Reviewer indicated on HBH proposal page 6, there is no substance.

Danielle indicated Jacobs has experience in water reuse which may be helpful.

McRae said we can award based on the current scoring, or do interviews. We will need to come up with questions. Both applicants must be asked the same questions. We could draft the questions here today. Interview would not change scoring as there are no points associated with an interview.

Reviewer indicated the submissions are the interview.

Reviewer advised talking won't change what's in the applications, go with what you got.

All attendees agreed proposals are sufficient except one individual who did not score their sheets.

Mcrae and Danielle confirmed with everyone that they agree to not interview proposers.
No Interview-8, Yes interview-1

Reviewer indicated that Jacobs does not have a long history of experience as they were previously known as CSM or CH2M Hill.

Reviewer advised reviewer had experience with them and would not spend the money again.

Reviewer states Keller proposal did a graph but did not make reference to construction.
Reviewer states he found the info as he read further into the proposal.

McRae advised the task group that they can award the contract with the scores presented or said we can cancel the RFQ and start over which will take another five to six months.

Reviewer stated he would keep his vote the same as the communications plan with HBH and the qualifications of Libby is the best.

McRae and Danielle offered to do a blind straw poll. A blind straw vote was taken on paper, opened, and read aloud. HBH received 2 and Keller received 6. Danielle asked if everyone is ok with the final poll for the Keller selection. Confirmed.

Reviewer advised the reviewer would be ok with this decision even if not agreed.

The Unscored reviewer indicated they were not voting as they would like the interviews to decide.

Reviewer asks how we get communications into the contract. McRae explains process. Reviewer advised that we need a link from one website to the other.

Reviewer suggests adding website to show progress in the selection process and a link from the feasibility study.

Score changes must be submitted to McRae for final tally. Committee was asked to not discuss the decision with anyone and to let MWVCOG contact the proposers.

The decision will be announced and a formal notification issued by the MWVCOG. This will allow them to begin contract negotiations with Keller Associates.

End of Selection Review

Other businesses:

Danielle is sending out the most recent Draft #3 for input and review of Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA).