

Third Party Review Sub-committee Meeting: RFP Candidate Interviews

October 22, 2012 at Moose Hill Chambers in Town Hall, Londonderry, NH

Sub-committee Members present: Leitha Reilly- Chairperson, Maria Newman, Rick Brideau

Sub-committee Member not present: Scott Benson

Also Present: Cynthia May, John Vogl, Janusz Czyzowski, John R. Trottier

Chairperson Leitha Reilly opened the meeting at 3:35 pm, welcomed the first team to be interviewed and made introductions. The schedule proceeded as follows:

3:35 – 4:35pm CMA Engineers (with RSG and Ironwood Design Group)

4:45 – 5:45pm DuBois & King (with ORW Landscape Architects and Planners, DiStefano Architects and Transportation Specialist Lucy Gibson)

- Dinner in break-room -

6:25 – 7:15pm Stantec

Following each interview, sub-committee members and Town staff were asked to fill out an Interview Evaluation Scorecard (see attached). Firms were ranked utilizing a score of either 0 (does not meet expectations/has not demonstrated), 5 (meets expectations), or 10 (exceeds expectations), in response to criteria in each of the following categories: Experience and Personnel (40%), Knowledge of Engineering/Construction/Planning (30%), Mechanisms for Timely Execution of Duties (20%), Proposal Format and Quality (10%).

Discussion of candidates was not permitted until all interviews had concluded and all scorecards surrendered to J. Vogl for entry into a master spreadsheet. Discussion regarding each of the candidates ensued.

The CMA team demonstrated that they had studied the Town's regulations and procedural requirements in advance of the interview. CMA's organizational structure drew questions concerning personnel in contact with the Town and the ability to deliver the scope of services in a timely and effective manner. While RSG and Ironwood would complement nicely for projects with larger scope, CMA appeared to have experience mostly with smaller towns where 100,000ft²/year averages are typical. Their approach to offer engineering design alternatives went beyond the realm of review services. Advocacy of 'peer review' versus 'application review against regulations' was a common theme throughout the interview and less of a response to the RFP and more of an effort to market their team in a general way.

DuBois & King, together with their team, provided an impressive proposal. Projects with large transportation-related components and requiring landscape and architectural design would benefit from the expertise of the applicant’s team; however, DuBois & King appeared suitable to projects of smaller scope and size as many municipalities they work with appear to have either a small staff and/or no engineering staff. They appeared unfamiliar with our regulations and there was general consensus that the firm lacked resources to handle the Town’s anticipated workload.

Stantec, the Town’s third party review consultant for the past 15 years, possessed a thorough knowledge of both the town’s regulations and its processes. The portfolio of communities they serve, coupled with the breadth and depth of services they provide to those municipalities are more closely aligned with Londonderry’s. The inclusion of an architect with an historic preservation background on their team suggested an understanding of the Town’s desire to maintain its character and history. The overall impression was that Stantec was ‘ready’ – they have the resources, the expertise, and are loyal to their clients. Their commitment to maintain competitive pricing, respond to requests in accordance with regulations and Town-preferred methods (i.e. checklists), avoid conflicts of interest real or perceived and make available all necessary resources in a timely manner, all contribute to a compelling value proposition.

At the conclusion of each interview, candidates were asked if they expected and/or required exclusivity in their contract with the Town should they prevail as a front runner. Both CMA and DuBois & King indicated they had no issues with the arrangement. Stantec responded that, while it is not their preference, they would comply based on their lengthy and valued relationship with the Town.

Given that the RFP stated that a quality-based selection would be used, the bid envelopes were not opened and reviewed. It was understood that prices would be negotiated after approving a candidate. The sub-committee reached consensus that Stantec should be forwarded as the preferred candidate and therefore would be recommended to the Planning Board as the Town’s Third Party Review Consultant.

Scorecard tabulations were calculated and the results published on the projector for group review. Below is a summary of results:

| Final, Combined Review Scores | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|-------|------|--|------|-------|------|--|---------|---------|---------|
| | Team | Staff | Both | | Team | Staff | Both | | Team | Staff | Both |
| | CMA | CMA | CMA | | D&K | D&K | D&K | | Stantec | Stantec | Stantec |
| Experience and Personnel 40% | 5.2 | 3.9 | 4.5 | | 6.5 | 5.8 | 6.1 | | 8.1 | 9.5 | 8.9 |
| Knowledge of Engineering/ Construction/Planning 30% | 7.1 | 5.9 | 6.5 | | 6.3 | 5.0 | 5.6 | | 7.5 | 8.4 | 7.8 |
| Mechanisms for Timely Execution of Duties 20% | 5.8 | 4.7 | 5.5 | | 6.3 | 4.4 | 5.0 | | 8.3 | 9.1 | 8.6 |
| Proposal Format and Quality 10% | 6.3 | 5.6 | 5.6 | | 7.5 | 5.3 | 5.6 | | 8.8 | 9.1 | 8.8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 6.0 | 4.8 | 5.4 | | 6.5 | 5.2 | 5.7 | | 8.0 | 9.1 | 8.5 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Final Rank | 3.0 | | | | 2.0 | | | | 1.0 | | |

Motion to approve the minutes from last meeting by R. Brideau, seconded by L. Reilly at 7:35pm

Motion to adjourn by R. Brideau, seconded by M.Newman at 7:36pm

Submitted by Leitha Reilly 10/25/12

LONDONDERRYPLANNING BOARD REVIEW SERVICES - INTERVIEW EVALUATIONS

Firm Name

Reviewer Name

Rank each Firm utilizing a score of 0, 5 or 10

| PROPOSAL REVIEW CRITERIA | Score |
|--|--------------|
| Experience and Personnel 40% | |
| 1. Complete Team w/Expertise in Critical Areas per the Dicipines listed in the RFP | [] |
| 2. Single Contact/Lead per Project | [] |
| 3. Commitment of Regular Interaction with Staff through Project Completion | [] |
| 4. Effective Communication Skills | [] |
| 5. Municipal Land Use Review Experience | [] |
| 6. Ability to Assess and Articulate the Impacts and Benefits of each Project to the Community | [] |
| 7. Experience with projects similar in scope to local developments | [] |
| 8. Familiarity with PUD | [] |
| Subtotal | |
| Knowledge of Engineering/Construction/Planning 30% | |
| 1. Civil Engineering Review | [] |
| 2. Construction Inspection | [] |
| 3. Knowledge of planning principles | [] |
| 4. Detailed Knowledge of NH Land Use Statutes and Practices | [] |
| Subtotal | |
| Mechanisms for Timely Execution of Duties 20% | |
| 1. Organizational Support | [] |
| 2. Commitment to participate at public meetings, as necessary | [] |
| 3. Commitment to Meetings as Defined in the RFP | [] |
| 4. Commitment to Timely Execution and Completion (availability for expedited review) | [] |
| Subtotal | |
| Proposal Format and Quality 10% | |
| 1. Organization, Clarity, Comprehensiveness | [] |
| 2. Graphics that Explain and Support Text | [] |
| 3. Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest | [] |
| 4. Community and Regional knowledge | [] |
| Subtotal | |
| Total Score | |
| <p>Critical disciplines include: Roadways, storm water, environmental, traffic signals, traffic impacts and mitigation, structural/geotechnical review, municipal and private utilities, planning, architecture, urban design, planned unit developments (PUD) including experience with new urbanism concepts, cost containment methods, and compliance with state and federal regulations)</p> | |