

Request for Proposals (RFP) Sub-committee Meeting

September 24, 2012 at Moose Hill Chambers in Town Hall, Londonderry, NH

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

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

Also Present from Public: James Niedzinski- The Derry News.

Chairperson Leitha Reilly opened up the meeting at 7:03 pm. Scott Benson, who is also on the Sub-committee, could not attend this evening due to being sick.

John Trottier asked what the Sub-committee was charged with to do regarding the Third Party Engineer for the Town of Londonderry. Leitha R. explained as per the RFP, a scorecard was developed for proposal evaluations which we have four of. The criterion to rank each proposal is such: Experience and Personnel (40%), Knowledge of Engineering/Construction/Planning (30%), Mechanisms for Timely Execution of Duties (20%), Proposal Format and Quality (10%).

The Sub-committee was issued a directive to select two firms Quality based following creation/approval/distribution of the RFP. As such, the competing firms had no knowledge of this prior to their submittal and presumably desire exclusivity with respect to the resulting contract with the Town. Nevertheless, the Sub-committee is prepared to select two firms as requested from the four to be interviewed on Oct. 22, 2012; however, this requirement presents complications in our process. For instance, if this requirement/directive stays in place, we feel inclined to place a courtesy call by October 11th to all parties being interviewed. Questions we anticipate from the applicants, and ones we should answer ourselves, would be:

- What will the resulting rules of such an arrangement be?
- Will we require both firms to agree to a common rate structure and process? If not, who dictates who has to use the higher priced firm?
- Is it reasonable to expect that any business looking to secure a contract with the Town would share jobs that they've stated they are qualified and have ample resources to complete, or that they'd be willing to perform according to a process and rate structure that they didn't propose and which may run contrary to the efficiencies they have in place?
- Will we alternate firms when we have available projects? If not, who decides who is awarded which projects? The developer? The consulting firm? Town Staff?
- At what point will the process be perceived as unfair?
- What if one consultant continually gets the 3-lot sub-divisions and the other regularly sees projects like WireBelt's expansion?
- If the idea is to offer choice, how do you insure that it's a fair choice? We are aware of one town that tried this system but went back to a single consultant. (Hudson).
- Would the consultants withdraw their contract once they understand that they will be one of two Engineering consulting firms for the Town?

These questions and discussion will be on the Agenda for the October 3rd Planning Board meeting.

Cynthia M. reiterated that the importance of a consultant is to execute in a timely, thorough manner. That the consultant would always have the best interest of the Town and that the completed work would be what is expected. It was discussed that there is a checklist in place of requirements of each project. One of the expectations that are being changed is the process of going from a 30 day site plan or subdivision plan review to a 15 business day review. This requirement was outlined in the RFP.

Leitha R. suggested that we do not discuss each of our individual scores this evening. We would save that for the next meeting after we have the interview process and when our 4th member, Scott Benson would be in attendance. It was also discussed that the scorecard for the interview process vs. the proposals would be different in the scaling process to best meet all the interview criteria.

Discussion went on to evaluate each proposal received. After much discussion the Sub-Committee decided that one consulting firm Provan & Lorber Inc. does not meet the criteria outlined in the RFP document for the following reasons:

- They did not demonstrate adequate staffing and experience.
- Proposed time line does not meet the standards as outlined in the RFP.
- Although they demonstrated that they could provide services for other towns, the Sub-Committee felt that they would not be able to handle the size and scale of the anticipated development in Londonderry.

Due to our discussion, the Sub-committee decided not to interview Provan & Lorber Inc. Upon review of all the other candidates' proposals, the Sub-Committee decided that they will interview the other three candidates on October 22, 2012.

Motion to adjourn by Leitha Reilly and second by Rick Brideau at 9:16pm.

Submitted by Maria Newman 9/26/12