



**PUBLIC UTILITIES  
REVENUE BOND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
CONTRACTING WORKING GROUP  
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
AGENDA**

**Public Utilities Commission Building  
525 Golden Gate Ave., 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, San Joaquin Conference Room  
San Francisco, CA 94102**

**Monday, December 9, 2013 - 9:30 AM**

**Special Meeting**

*If a quorum of the Public Utilities Revenue Bond Oversight Committee (RBOC) members is present, the chair will hold a Special meeting of the RBOC to discuss items on this Contracting Working Group Agenda.*

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

John Ummel, Chair (Holdover status)  
Kevin Cheng (Holdover status)  
Holly Kaufman

- 2. Public Comment:** Members of the public may address the Revenue Bond Oversight Committee Contracting Working Group on matters that are within the RBOC's jurisdiction but are not on today's agenda. (No Action)

- 3. Revenue Bond Oversight Committee Preliminary Request for Proposals - Scope of Work regarding "Evaluation of Lessons Learned."**  
(Discussion and Action)(Attachments)

**Issue/Action:** Discussion ensued at the November 18 RBOC meeting regarding RBOC's proposed scope of work involving lessons learned. Specifically, WSIP Director Julie Labonte expressed reservations surrounding the disputed cost portion of the assignment. WSIP staff submitted comments on the draft scope for consideration and expressed a desire to be involved at a future scoping session. Karen Kubic, SSIP Director, was also contacted and expressed that she too wanted to be involved in any future reworking of the scope. RBOC agreed and reserved the meeting on December 9th for all parties to comment on a revised scope. WSIP and SSIP staffs have been invited to attend.

In consideration of the SFPUC's concerns, the attached revised scope was amended. It should be noted, however, that the item involving the disputed cost assignment has

remained in the scope in order that a proper airing of this matter can occur before the RBOC. In any event, three major changes were made to the scope. First, the examination of lessons learned has been restricted to a review of eight project/program elements; five to be selected by RBOC, two by the SFPUC, and one by the consultant. There are no less than 20 project/program elements a consultant could examine for lessons-learned. That breadth of scope is far too broad, expensive. Second, the scope now contains a provision that the consultant and the SFPUC will concur—at the start of the assignment—on how best to proceed on the matter of disputed costs. Finally, the estimated budget for this assignment was increased to \$300k. This amount could be revised downward if RBOC decides to limit the review to something less than eight project/program elements.

**Recommendation:** With input from SFPUC staff, RBOC needs to review the revised draft scope/RFP and make any necessary changes. In particular, RBOC needs to validate or amend those 5 project/program elements initially selected by the Vice Chair (Ummel) currently in the scope. If changes to scope need further refinement beyond those made at today's meeting, the Contracting Working Group should be authorized to make such changes and work towards submitting a final scope/RFP to Contracts Administration as soon as possible.

4. **Approval of RBOC Contracting Working Group Minutes of October 21, 2013.**  
(Discussion and Action) (Attachment)
5. **Future Agenda Items/Meeting Dates.** (Discussion and Action)
6. **Adjournment**

### **Agenda Item Information**

Each item on the agenda may include: 1) Department or Agency cover letter and/or report; 2) Public correspondence; 3) Other explanatory documents. For more information concerning agendas, minutes, and meeting information, such as these document, please contact RBOC Committee Clerk, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102 – (415) 554-5184.

Audio recordings of the meeting of the Revenue Bond Oversight Committee are available at:

[http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=97](http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=97)

For information concerning San Francisco Public Utilities Commission please contact by e-mail [RBOC@sfgov.org](mailto:RBOC@sfgov.org) or by calling (415) 554-5184.

### **Public Comment**

Public Comment will be taken before or during the Committee's consideration of each agenda item. Speakers may address the Committee for up to three minutes on that item. During General Public Comment, members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on the agenda.

### **Disability Access**

RBOC meetings will be held at the Public Utilities Commission, 525 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA. The Committee meeting room is wheelchair accessible. The nearest accessible BART station is Civic Center (Market/Grove/Hyde Streets). Accessible MUNI Metro lines are the F, J, K, L, M, N, T (exit at Civic Center or Van Ness Stations). MUNI bus lines also serving the area are the 5, 6, 9, 19, 21, 47, 49, 71, and 71L. For more information about MUNI accessible services, call (415) 701-4485.

The following services are available on request 48 hours prior to the meeting; except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline shall be 4:00 p.m. of the last business day of the preceding week: For American sign language interpreters or the use of a reader during a meeting, a sound enhancement system, and/or alternative formats of the agenda and minutes, please contact Mike Brown at (415) 487-5223 to make arrangements for the accommodation. Late requests will be honored, if possible.

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.

### **Know Your Rights Under the Sunshine Ordinance**

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review.

For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact by mail: Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102; phone at (415)554-7724; fax at (415) 554-7854; or by email at [sotf@sfgov.org](mailto:sotf@sfgov.org).

Citizens may obtain a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance by printing Chapter 37 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet , at <http://www.sfbos.org/sunshine>.

**Cell Phones, Pagers and Similar Sound-Producing Electronic Devices**

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

**Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements**

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code §2.100, et. seq] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at: 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 581-3100; fax (415) 252-3112; web site [www.sfgov.org/ethics](http://www.sfgov.org/ethics).

# **Revenue Bond Oversight Committee (RBOC) Proposed Evaluation of Lessons-Learned**

## **CS-???**

Revised 12/4/2013

DATE:

TO: Prospective Consultants

FROM: SFPUC Contract Administration Bureau

DEADLINE: Submission instructions are at the end of this document. All submissions must be received before 11:00 AM PST on \_\_\_\_\_. All requests for information concerning this RFP must be in writing and directed to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission at [rfp@sfgwater.org](mailto:rfp@sfgwater.org). ATT: CS-???

On behalf of the Revenue Bond Oversight Committee (RBOC), the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) requests the services of a project/program management (PM/CM) consultant. To be eligible to submit a proposal, a Prime Proposer or all JV Partners (if an Joint Venture) must be prequalified under Project Type 1 on the Office of the Controller's Construction Contract Audit and Project Consulting Services List as of \_\_\_\_\_, 2013. Information on the Construction Contract Audit list can be found at the following website address: [http://\\_\\_\\_\\_\\_](http://_____).

Firms that worked on the SFPUC's Water System Improvement Program (WSIP) or Sewer System Improvement Program (SSIP) involving pre-planning, planning, environmental review, final engineering design, construction management, project controls and/or project communications are not eligible to participate on this project.

**I. Introduction:** In 2012, the Revenue Bond Oversight Committee contracted with RW Block to conduct an evaluation of various aspects of the Water System Improvement Program (WSIP). This culminated in a final report in May 2013: *Evaluation of WSIP Program – Project CS-254*. Subsequent recommendations by RW Block included an examination of program delivery (soft) costs incurred in WSIP (Water System Improvement Program) and application of lessons learned to SSIP (Sewer System Improvement Program). As such, the RBOC recommended a follow-up review dealing with lessons-learned in order to better understand key program/project management elements that worked well (or didn't) under the Water Enterprise's WSIP or could be improved upon with a particular eye towards application to the Sewer Enterprise's SSIP.

**II. Project Justification:** Generally speaking, lessons learned involve sharing knowledge about the elements of a specific project/program that went according to plan, the parts that could be improved upon, and plans to address these issues before moving on to the next phase. However, lessons learned are often done superficially and resisted. Inevitably crucial knowledge gained from a project/program is not always documented or communicated for subsequent use by others in the organization. The sharing of lessons learned knowledge can be particularly problematic in large organizations that consist of autonomous departments or enterprises. These factors can contribute to increased project costs,

extended schedules, poor communication, and considerable and costly mistakes. <sup>(1)</sup> The SFPUC has received numerous awards for its \$4.6B WSIP and reviews/audits by RW Block, the City's Controller, and an Independent Review Panel suggest that despite the size and complexity of a program this size, the WSIP is well managed. What lessons learned under WSIP have applicability for SSIP, a \$6.2B program that is just getting underway?

**III. Description of Services.** By examining the SFPUC's lessons-learned *process* and the degree to which key program and project elements\*under WSIP were successful or unsuccessful, the consultant will be able to identify whether such lessons-learned have applicability under SSIP. For example, could the lessons learned regarding the program management structure under WSIP be useful to SSIP for purposes of leveraging resources in order to achieve a more lean approach to project delivery? Besides understanding the lessons learned process used by the SFPUC, this effort will also require the consultant to hold interviews with key staff/consultants of both programs to better understand the program management differences and similarities of the two capital programs. Finally, a cursory examination of the SSIP projects involved will assist the consultant in identifying which lessons learned on WSIP might be applicable to SSIP.

**IV. Objective:** This task is designed to provide information in three areas: 1) a description of the SFPUC's lessons-learned *process*; 2) an assessment of key program/project management elements RBOC believes are aligned with its stated mission of independent oversight and are critical to the successful implementation of WSIP (or any large capital improvement program, including SSIP); 3) and assessing how these lessons-learned might be incorporated/applied to SSIP. For example, if one of the key project/program management elements examined involves the change order process, then the consultant will be reviewing the lessons learned associated with this process and how it can be best applied to SSIP.

**IV. Scope of Work:** In order to meet the objectives as stated above the consultant will conduct this review to include (but is not limited to) the following review requirements:

A. Describe and assess the SFPUC's lessons-learned *process* and framework for implementation.

- Does the SFPUC have stated goals and objectives for its lessons-learned process/program? If so, what are they? If applicable, are stated goals and objectives being met?
- When is the lessons learned process implemented? For example, at the end of the project? After each phase? After a serious breach in a milestone or budget?
- How and when does the SFPUC go about capturing, documenting, conveying and implementing lessons-learned; either as it applies to the WSIP program or other capital programs? For example, are lessons learned put in report, data base, or other repository for future use?
- Identify the personnel and/or positions involved in the lessons-learned process and their respective roles. Assess whether lessons learned are vetted by key decision-makers and at what stage of the process? .

---

(1) ***“Learning From Lessons Learned: Project Management Research Program”***. American Journal of Economics and Business Administration, Kam Jugden et.al., 2012, Volume 4, Issue 1.

- Assess how stakeholders and personnel involved view the SFPUC’s lessons-learned process; a “report card”, if you will, of how well those involved in the process believe it to be adding value. Assess the level of communication among the parties involved. For example, does the organization accept change in procedures and processes by visionary, energetic employees ?
- Provide recommendations for improving / institutionalizing the lessons learned process for the SFPUC’s capital programs.

B. Provide examples of lessons-learned involving the SFPUC’s capital project/program elements. Among the project/program elements listed below, a total of eight (8) will be examined for lessons learned with five (5) elements selected by RBOC, two (2) by the SFPUC, and one (1) by the consultant. **(Those five elements initially chosen by RBOC (to be confirmed at the scoping session on Dec 9<sup>th</sup>) are numbers 2, 9, 12, 16 and 17.)**

Project/Program elements include but are not limited to :

1. Organizational/management framework,
2. Budgetary and accounting controls including delivery (soft) cost management,
3. Financing,
4. Design,
5. System engineering/hydraulics,
6. Bidding and estimating,
7. Environmental review/permitting/mitigation,,
8. Scheduling,
9. Forecasting,
10. Public outreach, including client interface/involvement
11. Inter-Intra agency coordination,
12. Project personnel utilized (in-house v. contract)
13. Reporting regimens,
14. QA/QC,
15. Risk management,
16. Change order process/claims management, including dispute resolution
17. Delivery methods (e.g, design-build)
18. Construction management including CMIS
19. Use of technology
20. Labor relations,
21. Close out procedures, etc.

- Among the selected project/program elements, to what degree were these elements successfully implemented? Provide specific examples - problems or challenges - that exemplify how the SFPUC went about solving them and the lesson learned. For example, did any of the elements interfere with meeting project/program goals and, if so, how did the SFPUC respond/correct it?
- What caused a particular challenge/problem to occur and/or why was the problem undetected? For example, what project/program circumstances were not anticipated? What would you have done differently if you were able to start the project over?
- What could the project team have done better to mitigate either the impact of the risk or the probability of the risk occurring?

- How were lessons-learned used; how was the process modified/changed to avoid future problems or reduce the impact should the problem reoccur? What workarounds were used? Did they work?
- Identify any lessons-learned involving delivery (soft) costs\*. Are there opportunities to save significant soft costs in the remainder of the WSIP? How much? What would you recommend?
- It seems soft costs as a percent of the program should be much less under SSIP than the WSIP because projects are all within SF. SSIP has initially chosen to use WSIP's soft cost factor of 43%. What makes up the 43% and is this an appropriate factor to use on SSIP; why or why not? What would you recommend?

*\*As defined by the SFPUC, delivery costs – often referred to as soft costs or non-construction related costs – include project and program management, planning, engineering, environmental review and permitting, construction management, engineering support during construction, and other City staffing costs such as real estate services, legal services, public outreach, operations support, etc.*

- Identify the root cause and verify the process used to classify the root cause of each change order/dispute/claim in CMIS.

**Note: The consultant and the SFPUC will agree ahead of time in establishing a dollar threshold, number of items, and parameters for identifying a subset of change orders/disputes/claims for the consultant to review.**

- Gauge the performance (quantitatively and qualitatively) of the SFPUC's overall process for mitigating/resolving change orders/claims/disputes. For example, is the SFPUC following up accordingly to recover related costs where appropriate, for example, from the designer, or addressing the issue where associated with in-house design errors? If not, determine why such follow-up is not taking place.
- Comment on how major disputed costs are included in cost and schedule forecasting models. For example, were disputed costs anticipated in the trend/risk registers for said project; accuracy of the trend/risk register in terms of gauging cost; and were there any disputes that should have been anticipated at some early stage in development of the trend/risk register but were not?
- Assess WSIP's use of alternative delivery methods and appropriateness for entertaining such methods within SSIP. What were the lessons learned after-the-fact? In other words, were there any projects that, in hindsight, could have benefitted from alternative delivery methods?
- Gauge how successful WSIP has balanced the use of in-house versus contract consultants? What were the lessons learned?

C. Identify the most applicable lessons-learned that have been or should be incorporated to the SFPUC's other capital programs; specifically the Sewer System Improvement Program (SSIP).

- Gain familiarity with the SSIP management / organizational process. Interview key personnel and assigned roles.

- Become familiar with the size and scope of the SSIP.
- Identify similarities and differences between SSIP and WSIP for purposes of understanding where lessons-learned might help and/or might not be applicable.
- Identify and discuss the most applicable lessons-learned from WSIP that might be transferrable to SSIP or have already been considered/incorporated.
- As a result of this lessons-learned review, provide recommendations to RBOC on future follow-up studies or audits specific to the SSIP.

#### **V. Consultant Qualifications and Requirements**

A Prime Proposer or all JV Partners (if a Joint Venture) must be prequalified under Project Type 1 on the Office of the Controller's Construction Contract Audit and Project Consulting Services List as of March 15, 2012. **Submissions from non-prequalified firms will be rejected at the initial screening stage and will not be evaluated by the Selection Panel.** The successful RFP submittal shall demonstrate that the consultant/firm has the appropriate professional and technical background as well as access to adequate resources to fulfill the stated scope of services.

Required professional expertise, knowledge and skills include, but are not limited to the following, all in relation with large public infrastructure programs and projects:

- a. All aspects of program, project and construction management.
- b. Schedule and cost control and forecasting, with strong emphasis on construction costs and schedules.
- c. Budgeting, scheduling, cost control and cost estimating.
- d. Knowledge management.
- e. Earn value management (CPI, SPI, and other indicators)
- f. Construction contract administration/oversight.
- g. Public utility governance and financing.

Desirable professional experience, knowledge and skills include, but are not limited to the following:

- a. Planning, design and construction of large and complex potable water projects and programs.
- b. Risk assessment/management of infrastructure projects.
- c. Environmental regulations/requirements and their impacts on project delivery.
- d. Stakeholder relations.
- e. Feasibility analysis and analysis for construction projects and programs.
- f. Lessons learned processes and procedures
- g. Familiarity with the SFPUC's Water and/or Waste Water capital programs/projects

The consultant's proposal will include all necessary expertise and personnel required to successfully complete the scope of services.

**VI. Deliverables:** The consultant will provide the SFPUC and RBOC with a complete *preliminary draft* report. The SFPUC, RBOC and interested stakeholders will provide feedback on the consultant's preliminary draft report for the consultant's consideration. Comments received on the preliminary draft and any subsequent responses made by the consultant shall be included in a *final draft* report presented to RBOC at a public meeting. The final draft report will be provided both electronically and in hard copy including all key backup information used to substantiate the consultant's findings/recommendations.

Depending on the outcome of this meeting, RBOC may request the consultant to incorporate certain changes into a *final report*. See timeline below.

## **VII. General Information**

1. As part of the proposal process, the consultant is required to review the most current SFPUC WSIP and SSIP project/program information generally accessible to the public as well as the most recent report by RW Block. This information is posted on the SFPUC website.
2. The consultant's work plan must describe the method used to evaluate the eight (8) project/program elements (inclusive of the one element selected by the consultant) for lessons learned.
3. Consultants can submit additional follow-up written questions to better understand the breadth and specifics of the defined tasks by 5:00pm, \_\_\_\_\_. Technical or other substantive questions will **not** be accepted after \_\_\_\_\_. All questions should be sent to [rfp@sfgwater.org](mailto:rfp@sfgwater.org).
4. **In order to be considered for the work described herein, a consultant must submit a proposal to the SFPUC Contract Administration Bureau by 11:00 am on \_\_\_\_\_.** The final consultant fee will be negotiated to a not-to-exceed amount.
5. The selected consultant will be required to sign a non-disclosure agreement.
6. Consultants or firms that have worked on WSIP involving Preplanning, Planning, Environmental Review, Final Engineering Design, Construction Management, Project Controls or Project Communications are not eligible to participate on this project.
7. The selected consultant will enter into a contract with RBOC and shall be responsible directly to RBOC. RBOC shall appoint a representative to serve as a point of contact for the consultant throughout the review.
8. The SFPUC will also provide a contact person that will facilitate the consultant's access to information, key SFPUC staff, SFPUC consultants, construction contractors and/or other needed contacts.
9. The consultant shall keep RBOC's representative informed of key requests for information made to the SFPUC and any delays in response.
10. The consultant will confer with SFPUC staff on establishing a review schedule that accommodates the WSIP and SSIP staff but recognizes the consultant's timeline for meeting reporting milestones.
11. The consultant's review and analysis will culminate in a *preliminary draft* and subsequent *final draft* before a *final report* is issued. The SFPUC, RBOC, and interested stakeholders will have the opportunity to provide written comments regarding the consultant's preliminary draft. Comments received on the preliminary draft and any subsequent responses made by the consultant shall be included in a *final draft* report presented to RBOC at a public meeting.
12. The consultant will provide one oral progress report to the full RBOC and/or its working group sub-committee at approximately 30 days after NTP or as determined by RBOC and the consultant. This progress report can be delivered via teleconferencing. In addition, the consultant will provide weekly progress updates (via email) to the RBOC representative. Finally, the consultant will provide an oral report, in person, to the full RBOC upon submittal of the *final draft*.

## **VIII. Estimated Timetable:**

TBD

## **IX. Proposal Contents and Submission Instructions**

Proposals are due no later than 11:00 AM on December 20, 2013 and can be delivered to the following location:

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission  
Contract Administration Bureau  
RE: CS-??? RBOC Evaluation of Lessons Learned  
525 Golden Gate, Customer Services, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Proposals may be mailed to the following location:

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission  
Contract Administration Bureau  
RE: CS-??? RBOC Evaluation of Lessons Learned  
525 Golden Gate, Customer Services, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Note: Mailed proposals must arrive by the 11:00 AM deadline on December 20, 2013 or it will be rejected. Late submissions will not be accepted. Faxed or emailed proposals will not be accepted. Postmarks will not be considered evidence of delivery.

The text in the main proposal report, excluding any appendices (e.g., resume), shall not exceed twenty-five (25) pages. Proposers shall print their proposal double-sided (one double sided page counts as two pages) and use a minimum font of 10 pts. Every page shall be numbered, beginning with the cover letter. The proposer shall submit one original unbound proposal plus one electronic version of the proposal and any supporting documentation on a CD in pdf format.

The proposal shall contain the following:

- A. A cover letter signed by an individual authorized to obligate the Proposer to fulfill the commitments contained in the Proposal. The cover letter must include 1) a statement identifying the Lead Proposer if a JV responding to this RFP; 2) a contact for all communications pertaining to the Proposer's Proposal; 3) a statement of the Proposer's overall ability and qualifications to conduct the work; 4) and a statement that the Proposer, if selected, agrees to sign a non-disclosure agreement.
- B. Proposer Qualifications. Demonstrate that the Prime Proposer (or JV Partner), Non-Leading JV Partner (if applicable), and sub-consultants meet all the qualification requirements outlined in Section VI. Provide sufficient information in the proposal for the Selection Panel to evaluate Proposer's ability to successfully complete the work outlined in the Scope of Services which may include:
  - Description and background summary of firm
  - A description of a minimum of three construction/project management assignments your firm has been involved with. Each project description shall include a scope summary, proposer's role and responsibilities, client references, dates when the project was performed, and dollar value of the engagement. Proposers should indicate if the project/assignment was performed on schedule and on budget. Ideally, the CM/PM

assignments described should be those involving projects/programs of a similar nature, size and/or complexity as found in the WSIP.

- C. Team Member Organization, Availability, Qualifications, and Resumes. Demonstrate that team members are able to work the amount of time specified by the Proposer and have the background and experience to perform the work. Briefly describe the role, responsibilities, and qualifications of each team member as it applies to Sections IV, V and VI. Attach resumes of *key* team members.
- D. Work Plan. Using the scope of work as outlined in Section IV, describe your approach in conducting the review. Explain any unique approaches you believe are relevant and would result in a better work product. Be sure to describe how you would go about examining the eight (8) project/program elements studied for lessons learned. Include the names of the team members who will be doing the work and estimated number of person-hours required. Lack of a detailed work plan may render the proposal non-responsive.
- E. Project Schedule. Delineate a timetable for work completion based on the work plan which must meet the timeline outlined in Section VIII.
- F. Fee Proposal. The fee proposal shall show the estimate cost to complete the review. Include estimated hours by each team member involved, respective hourly rates, and all applicable indirect costs/charges. The final consultant fee will be negotiated to a not-to-exceed amount. RBOC's estimate to complete the lessons learned review is \$250,000 - \$300,000.

**X. Evaluation and Selection Criteria.** Prior to submitting proposals to a Selection Panel for review, SFPUC staff will review each proposal for initial determinations on responsiveness and responsibility. Proposals found to be responsive and submitted by responsible proposers based on this initial screening will be forwarded to the Selection Panel for evaluation per the evaluation process described below. Proposals found to be non-responsive or that were submitted by Proposers who do not meet minimum qualification requirements will be rejected and will not be considered. Elements reviewed during the initial screening include, without limitation, proposal completeness, compliance with format requirements, verifiable references, and compliance with minimum qualification requirements.

The Selection Panel will be comprised of individuals who are knowledgeable on the subject and may include staff from the SFPUC, RBOC, or other City agencies/organizations.

Each responsive written proposal must obtain a minimum score of 45 points out of 75 (60%) to be considered. The written proposals will be scored using the following point scale:

Work Plan: 25 points

Proposer Qualifications: 20 points

Team Member Organization, Availability, Qualifications, and Resumes: 30 points

The Proposer with the highest total score will be identified as the highest-ranked Proposer eligible to proceed with the award of an Agreement with RBOC.

END OF DOCUMENT

\\SKYFALL\Folder Redirection\jummel\Documents\RBOC\RBOC RFP Scope of Work -Lessons Learned.docx



**PUBLIC UTILITIES  
REVENUE BOND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
CONTRACTING WORKING GROUP  
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
MINUTES - DRAFT**

**Public Utilities Commission Building  
525 Golden Gate Ave., 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Yosemite Room  
San Francisco, CA 94102**

**Monday, October 21, 2013 - 10:30 AM**

**Special Meeting**

*If a quorum of the Public Utilities Revenue Bond Oversight Committee (RBOC) members is present, the chair will hold a Special Meeting of the RBOC to discuss items on this Contracting Working Group Agenda.*

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

John Ummel, Chair  
Kevin Cheng  
Holly Kaufman

The meeting was called to order at 10:45 a.m. On the call of the roll, Members Ummel, Cheng, and Kaufman were noted present. There was a quorum.

RBOC Members Brownlow and Harper were noted present and the RBOC Contracting Working Group Meeting, constituting a quorum of the Public Utilities Revenue Bond Oversight Committee. A Special Meeting of the Public Utilities Revenue Bond Oversight Committee was convened at the hour of 10:45 a.m.

Present: Members Ummel, Cheng, Kaufman, Brownlow, and Harper

- 2. Public Comment:** Members of the public may address the Revenue Bond Oversight Committee Contracting Working Group on matters that are within the RBOC's jurisdiction, but not on today's agenda.

Public Comment: None.

- 3. Revenue Bond Oversight Committee Preliminary Request for Proposals - Scope of Work regarding "Evaluation of Lessons Learned" and "WSIP Disputed Costs."**

Member Ummel provided an overview of the RBOC preliminary request for proposals and scope of work.

Mike Brown and Jeet Bajwa (SFPUC); Mark Blake (City Attorney's Office); presented information concerning the matter and answered questions raised during the hearing.

Public Comment: None.

Continued to the next meeting of the RBOC Contracting Working group by a unanimous vote.

4. **Approval of RBOC Contracting Working Group Minutes of July 31, 2013.**

Public Comment: None.

Member Kaufman, seconded by Member Cheng, moved to approve the RBOC Contracting Working Group July 31, 2013, meeting minutes. The motion passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Ummel, Cheng, Kaufman.

Noes: None.

5. **Future Agenda Items/Meeting Dates.**

The next meeting of the RBOC Contracting Working Group is tentatively scheduled for November 18, 2013, at 10:30 a.m.

6. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11:23 a.m.

### **Agenda Item Information**

Each item on the agenda may include: 1) Department or Agency cover letter and/or report; 2) Public correspondence; 3) Other explanatory documents. For more information concerning agendas, minutes, and meeting information, such as these document, please contact RBOC Committee Clerk, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102 – (415) 554-5184.

Audio recordings of the meeting of the Revenue Bond Oversight Committee are available at:

[http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=97](http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=97)

For information concerning San Francisco Public Utilities Commission please contact by e-mail [RBOC@sfgov.org](mailto:RBOC@sfgov.org) or by calling (415) 554-5184.

### **Public Comment**

Public Comment will be taken before or during the Committee's consideration of each agenda item. Speakers may address the Committee for up to three minutes on that item. During General Public Comment, members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on the agenda.

### **Disability Access**

RBOC meetings will be held at the Public Utilities Commission, 525 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA. The Committee meeting room is wheelchair accessible. The nearest accessible BART station is Civic Center (Market/Grove/Hyde Streets). Accessible MUNI Metro lines are the F, J, K, L, M, N, T (exit at Civic Center or Van Ness Stations). MUNI bus lines also serving the area are the 5, 6, 9, 19, 21, 47, 49, 71, and 71L. For more information about MUNI accessible services, call (415) 701-4485.

The following services are available on request 48 hours prior to the meeting; except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline shall be 4:00 p.m. of the last business day of the preceding week: For American sign language interpreters or the use of a reader during a meeting, a sound enhancement system, and/or alternative formats of the agenda and minutes, please contact Mike Brown at (415) 487-5223 to make arrangements for the accommodation. Late requests will be honored, if possible.

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.

### **Know Your Rights Under the Sunshine Ordinance**

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review.

For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact by mail: Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102; phone at (415)554-7724; fax at (415) 554-7854; or by email at [sotf@sfgov.org](mailto:sotf@sfgov.org).

Citizens may obtain a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance by printing Chapter 37 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet , at <http://www.sfbos.org/sunshine>.

**Cell Phones, Pagers and Similar Sound-Producing Electronic Devices**

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

**Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements**

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code §2.100, et. seq] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at: 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 581-3100; fax (415) 252-3112; web site [www.sfgov.org/ethics](http://www.sfgov.org/ethics).