

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

ALASKA WATER AND SEWER CHALLENGE
ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONEMNTAL CONSERVATION

PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE

November 6, 2013

Anchorage, Alaska

Present:

- Bill Griffith
- Sonja Love-Hestnes
- Deborah Pock
- Tim Allen (telephonic)
- Kate Johnson (telephonic)
- Brian Lefferts (telephonic)
- Simone Seballo (telephonic)
- Whit Hicks (telephonic)
- Judy Hicks (telephonic)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

Marv Brownell (telephonic)

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (On record at 8:57 a.m.)

3 THE REPORTER: Okay. We'll go on the record at 8:57 a.m.

4 MR. GRIFFITH: Okay. You ready?

5 MS. LOVE-HESTNES: Okay. Good morning. Thank you for
6 your interest in the Alaska Water and Sewer Challenge. Can
7 everybody hear me?

8 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yep.

9 MS. LOVE-HESTNES: Okay. Just a little bit of
10 housekeeping first. Callers, please do not put your phone on
11 hold and when we do get to the roll call if you would please say
12 your name and spell your last name.13 In the room today we have Deb Pock, our Procurement
14 Manager, Bill Griffith and myself, Sonja Love-Hestnes. Our
15 transcriber is Teresa.16 This is a public meeting and will be transcribed and
17 posted online with the finalized questions and answers that are
18 compiled today. We anticipate to answer some of the questions
19 today. Some may need additional research. If you do leave
20 today or disconnect you have until tomorrow, close of business,
21 for any additional questions. For those not aware, Addendum
22 number 3 and Amendment number 4 have been posted on the Alaska
23 online public notice system.24 Okay. Lets start our roll call. Is there anyone outside
25 the U.S.? Again, is there anyone outside the U.S.? Within the

1 Continental U.S. we'll do it by region again. Northeast?

2 MR. BROWNELL: This is Marv Brownell of Yukon
3 Construction. We're out of town, out of -- we're up here in Tok
4 and having a tough time hearing you.

5 MS. LOVE-HESTNES: How is that, is it better?

6 MR. BROWNELL: It is, thank you.

7 MS. LOVE-HESTNES: Okay. Again, roll call. Northeast?
8 Within the U.S.? Southeast? Southwest? Northwest? Midwest?

9 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: (Indiscernible).

10 MS. LOVE-HESTNES: Hello?

11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hey it's working this time.

12 MS. LOVE-HESTNES: Thank you. We are just taking roll
13 call. Anyone within the Continental U.S.? Okay. Within
14 Alaska, Northern region above Fairbanks?

15 MR. BROWNELL: Marv Brownell with Yukon Construction.

16 MR. GRIFFITH: Do you want him to spell it?

17 MS. LOVE-HESTNES: Could you please state your name and
18 spell the last name?

19 MR. BROWNELL: It's Marv as in Marvin. Brownell is the
20 last name, B-r-o-w-n-e-l-l. I just emailed you my list here. I
21 know I was supposed to turn it in sooner, but you have it on
22 your computer anyway.

23 MS. LOVE-HESTNES: Thank you. Interior? Western Region?

24 MR. LEFFERTS: I think that's us. This is Brian with
25 Yukon Kuskokwim Corporation.

1 MS. LOVE-HESTNES: And the last name please and spell?

2 MR. LEFFERTS: Lefferts, L-e-f-f-e-r-t-s.

3 MS. LOVE-HESTNES: Anyone in Southeast Region?

4 Southcentral?

5 MR. ALLEN: With COWATER Alaska, Tim Allen

6 MS. LOVE-HESTNES: Spell last name? A-l-l-e-n.

7 MR. ALLEN: Yes.

8 MS. LOVE-HESTNES: Is there anyone else on the line that
9 has not specified name and.....

10 MS. SEBALO: Simone Seballo from Zender Environmental.

11 MS. LOVE-HESTNES: Can you spell the last name please?

12 MS. SEBALO: S-e-b-a-l-o.

13 MS. LOVE-HESTNES: Okay. Thank you. Anyone else on the
14 line that has not specified name?

15 MS. JOHNSON: Hi, this is Kate Johnson with ERM. J-o-h-n-
16 s-o-n.

17 MS. LOVE-HESTNES: One more, anyone else? Okay. Thank
18 you. I'll turn it over to Bill.

19 MR. GRIFFITH: Okay. Thanks. We're just moving around
20 the phone here so I can make sure everybody can hear me. I
21 believe this will be the -- hold on, the last of the Pre-
22 Proposal Conferences either in person or teleconference. It's
23 the last one that we have planned. Hopefully people have been
24 able to get their hands on the transcripts to the first two of
25 these. This one is of course teleconference only, so I didn't

1 really plan to do a lot of introduction to this one. I thought
2 we'd just see whether there are questions. We wanted to give
3 this final opportunity for people on the phone since obviously
4 we had technical difficulties at the last conference that we had
5 here in Anchorage. Did somebody just join us? I'll check in
6 here.

7 MS. HICKS: Yes, this is Whit and Judy Hicks in Delta
8 Junction.

9 MR. GRIFFITH: Can you spell the last name?

10 MS. HICKS: H-i-c-k-s.

11 MR. GRIFFITH: Okay. Thank you.

12 MS. HICKS: Thank you.

13 MR. GRIFFITH: Okay. So without further ado I think we'll
14 just move into questions and I'll try to provide an answer. If
15 we're not able to do that -- we are planning to spend some time
16 over the next few days and go back over all the transcripts and
17 identify areas where we indicated that we would be getting back
18 to people and I wanted to include this, these questions that
19 come up today too, and kind of do one round of catch up on
20 questions that we didn't fully respond to at the three Pre-
21 Proposal Conferences. So we'll do our best to respond today and
22 see what we have left over along with the last two. Okay. So I
23 suppose you want to -- do you want people to state their name
24 when they.....

25 THE REPORTER: Yes, please.

1 MR. GRIFFITH:ask their question? So just remind us
2 of your name again and any question that you might have. I
3 don't think there's enough people on line to worry about doing
4 anything too formal here. We'll just see what questions there
5 are. So anybody want to jump in and get it started that'd be
6 fine.

7 MR. ALLEN: Yeah, this is Tim Allen from COWATER Alaska.
8 And in the case of some of the large institutions such as
9 universities and some equipment suppliers as well as some of the
10 larger -- largest engineering firms, they have been approached
11 to provide people for teams and the question is whether or not
12 these -- whether or not a single entity can provide or a single
13 business or university or supplier can provide more than one
14 person to work on the teams or once a -- you know, once a -- say
15 a university is either fielding a team or provided a member of a
16 teams does that preclude anyone else from that university or
17 firm from participating in another team?

18 MR. GRIFFITH: Have to admit that's a question we hadn't
19 heard before. So the question is if an organization --
20 presumably we're probably typically talking about some kind of a
21 nonprofit organization, like you say a University or something.

22 MR. ALLEN: Or a large engineering firm or even an
23 equipment supplier.

24 MR. GRIFFITH: Yeah. Could.....

25 MR. ALLEN: Any of those types of things.

1 MR. GRIFFITH: Could they have people on different teams.
2 You know, I think rather than venture an opinion at this point
3 that's a good question that we're going to want to kick around
4 with our procurement staff within the State and provide a
5 written response to here over the next week or so. So thanks
6 Tim, that's a good question. We hadn't really thought about
7 that one. It had not come up previously. So we'll put
8 something out here in the next few days on that one. Obviously
9 there's some.....

10 MR. ALLEN: Thank you.

11 MR. GRIFFITH:there's some time issues here, so
12 we'll try to get that out here fairly quickly.

13 MR. LEFFERTS: This is Brian Lefferts. I have a bit of a
14 follow-up question. There's no -- nothing that would preclude
15 us from adding quite a few more people from our own organization
16 to continue later that we didn't identify early on in the FSU as
17 team members. As long as they're -- you know, I mean if we
18 identify later on in the process that new resources are needed
19 we can go out and get those. Right?

20 MR. GRIFFITH: Yeah. Obviously teams may identify the
21 need to use different resources as the project goes along.
22 We're looking for the kind of lead people on these -- in these
23 various areas of expertise, but if you identify the need to get
24 assistance, particularly from your own organization, as the
25 project goes along we don't see a problem with that. You know,

1 the team members are not the only people that can work on the
2 project. They're just the lead in the various areas.

3 MR. LEFFERTS: Okay. Good. Yeah, we kind of suspected
4 that, but just needed clarification.

5 MR. GRIFFITH: Other questions?

6 MS. JOHNSON: Hi. This is Kate Johnson with ERM. I have
7 a question. The RFP includes separate provisions for supply of
8 treated and untreated water. However, for wastewater there's
9 only one option available is that .25 cents per gallon. I'm
10 wondering if we can consider wastewater, grey water and black
11 water separately.

12 MR. GRIFFITH: Absolutely and we probably should -- at
13 least at this point I want to clarify that we don't mean to
14 suggest that the only option for handling wastewater is to have
15 it hauled away. We just wanted to explain that if that's what
16 needs to be done with wastewater that's the cost that you should
17 assume for that service. You can look at other options for
18 handling wastewater and you can certainly handle gray water and
19 other wastewater, including black water. You can certainly
20 handle those waste drains differently. And you may even have an
21 idea or an approach that deals with that wastewater in some way
22 other than having it hauled away or maybe deals with a portion
23 of that wastewater in some manner other than having it hauled
24 away. So, you know, thanks for bringing that up. We didn't
25 mean to suggest that that's the only way to handle wastewater.

1 We just wanted to make sure that if a particular approach needed
2 to have wastewater hauled away we wanted to make sure everybody
3 used the same cost for that service.

4 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you.

5 MR. HICKS: This is Whit Hicks. I have a question about
6 the scoring.

7 MR. GRIFFITH: Yes.

8 MR. HICKS: The timeline is what -- is a little confusing
9 to me, trying to -- reading the transcripts from the last
10 meetings and so forth. The phase one versus phase two is sort
11 of -- it seems like it might combined in there, but the timeline
12 that you would be looking for phase one, is that -- is it for
13 phase one or is it actually for proposal development?

14 MR. GRIFFITH: Yeah, thanks for that question. This is
15 one that we have tried to make clear and I know it remains a
16 little bit confusing. So at this time we're just looking for
17 the formation of teams with the team qualifications are the
18 submittal that we're asking for at this time. We're not
19 actually asking for a proposal on how the team would solve the
20 problem. Just looking for the teams to be put together, let us
21 know about the qualifications for the people on that team.
22 There's a few other things that they're asking for, so read
23 carefully what the submittal requirements are in the
24 solicitation document. But that's all we're looking for at this
25 time and then we will -- we'll score based on the scoring

1 criteria that's in the RFP. And again, that's primarily based
2 on the qualifications of the people that are on the team. And
3 then based on that scoring we'll select the top teams to enter
4 into contracts with and we will help to fund the development of
5 their proposals and how they would go about, you know, solving
6 the problem that's identified here and what their actual ideas
7 are. So phase one is just the formation of the team. That's
8 all we'll be scoring at this point. And then based on that
9 we'll enter into contracts and we'll be looking for the top
10 scoring teams to develop proposals. Does that clarify it for
11 you?

12 MR. HICKS: Not exactly. What I understand it right now
13 the goal would be having our team give an interview. And as
14 part of the scoring, I suppose that you'll start scoring to
15 select the teams that are going to get an interview. And again
16 one of those things in there was presenting a timeline and
17 management plan which seems like the timeline would pertain to
18 -- that would be part of our proposal if we were selected to do
19 a proposal. So is it -- would we lose points if we don't have a
20 timeline submitted at this point?

21 MR. GRIFFITH: Yeah. I don't -- we're not actually asking
22 so much for a timeline. We certainly do ask for a management
23 plan. We want to understand how the team would go about
24 managing their work and the various team members. But again,
25 the step -- step one is to -- we're going to evaluate the

1 written statement of qualifications for the team. So that's
2 things like the team's understanding of the project, the team
3 member qualifications, the management plan, an innovation plan,
4 an acceptance and use plan. Then based on the scoring for just
5 those items only we'll select the top scoring teams at that
6 point to come in for interviews. And then we'll total up the
7 scores for all the teams that we interviewed, both written and
8 the interviews, and we'll select the highest scoring teams based
9 on both steps to submit proposals. But I don't think we asked
10 for a timeline per se unless I'm missing something here. And
11 I'm sorry if I'm.....

12 MR. HICKS: You said under step one, written statement of
13 qualifications, section C, item C, it says under management plan
14 for the project does the timetable seem reasonable and within
15 the schedule (indiscernible). The timetable is underneath --
16 it's underneath -- it's sort of underneath the management plan
17 of the project.

18 MR. GRIFFITH: Right. And the timetable we're referring
19 to there is -- like for instance on page 12 of the RFP it talks
20 about the period during which phase one would take place, 2013,
21 three months. Phase two would be six months during 2014,
22 presumably the first half of '14. Phase three is 12 months.
23 Phase four is 12 months. Phase five is 12 months. We're
24 looking for some I guess, you know, understanding of whether or
25 not that timetable can work for the team, how they would intend

1 to meet that timetable, that kind of information. So the
2 timetable we're referring to is the one that's in the RFP there.

3 MR. HICKS: Okay. So we wouldn't be creating a timetable
4 to present. We would just simply be stating that we could meet
5 your timetable.

6 MR. GRIFFITH: Yeah, exactly, and any -- we're just
7 looking to understand whether that seems reasonable and within
8 the -- does -- within the schedule. So is that something that
9 you can do, are there arrangements you need to make to meet it.
10 That's all we're looking for, just a little I guess confirmation
11 that the timetable we've laid out will work for the team.

12 MR. HICKS: So a commitment to your timetable is what you
13 would be scoring then.

14 MR. GRIFFITH: Exactly.

15 MR. HICKS: Okay. If that was a little clearer that would
16 have been great. (Indiscernible) on me now. Thank you.

17 MR. GRIFFITH: Okay.

18 MS. JOHNSON: Hi, this is Kate Johnson with ERM. I have a
19 question. When the RFP refers to team members specifically I
20 wanted to (indiscernible). Are team members individuals
21 involved in the project or are team members each organization?

22 MR. GRIFFITH: Thank you. We've been getting a fair
23 number of questions about that. We are talking about
24 individuals, but we do recognize that they may work for
25 organizations and, as asked earlier, there may be other people

1 in that organization that assist that individual. We also
2 understand that individuals may be replaced as the project goes
3 along. We just want to be included in understanding, you know,
4 who may be coming in to replace somebody and have some kind of
5 assurance that we're not losing some significant expertise or
6 understanding about that area. So just to clarify, we are
7 talking about individuals, but with the understanding that there
8 may be others helping out and they may be replaced as the
9 project goes along.

10 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you.

11 MR. ALLEN: Bill, this is Tim Allen again from COWATER.
12 The time is drawing nigh as to when we need to have our list of
13 qualifications submitted and there are some pertinent unanswered
14 questions from the previous questions still.

15 MR. GRIFFITH: Huh-hum (interrogative).

16 MR. ALLEN: Do you have a timeframe as to when, you know,
17 we might expect to see those? And I don't mean to put you on
18 the spot or under the gun or anything, but all of us are
19 starting to feel a little bit of completion pressure.

20 MR. GRIFFITH: Sure, sure. We want to get all of that out
21 by next week, Tim. Hopefully give you a -- still a month. And
22 I don't think we're going to be talking about changes so much to
23 the RFP but, like you say, some clarifications and responses to
24 some of the questions that have been asked. So we're looking to
25 get that all out by next week.

1 MR. ALLEN: All right. Thank you very much.

2 MR. GRIFFITH: Any other questions?

3 MS. LOVE-HESTNES: Okay. Well, thank you for your
4 interest today. If you have any questions please send those to
5 Sonja Love-Hestnes in writing by the end of tomorrow, November
6 7th, close of business. I appreciate your participation.

7 MR. GRIFFITH: Thank you.

8 MS. LOVE-HESTNES: Thank you.

9 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Appreciate you doing this.

11 MR. GRIFFITH: That was short and sweet.

12 THE REPORTER: Off the record? Okay. Off the record at
13 9:22.

14 (Off record at 9:22 a.m.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I, Nicolette Hernandez, hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 2 through 15 are a true, accurate and complete transcript of proceedings of Alaska Water and Sewer Challenge Pre-proposal Conference for the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, held November 6, 2013, in Anchorage, Alaska, transcribed by me from a copy of the electronic sound recording to the best of my knowledge and ability.

Date Nicolette Hernandez