PUBLIC UTILITIES
REVENUE BOND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
AGENDA

Public Utilities Commission Building
525 Golden Gate Ave., 2nd Floor, Yosemite Room
San Francisco, CA 94102

Monday, August 20, 2012 - 9:30 AM

Regular Meeting

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

   Seat 1 Holly Kaufman
   Seat 2 Kevin Cheng, Chair
   Seat 3 Karen Donovan
   Seat 4 Larry Liederman
   Seat 5 Vacant
   Seat 6 Ian Hart
   Seat 7 John Ummel, Vice Chair

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

3. **Chair's Report:**
   A. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Staff Report: Ratepayer Assurance Policy and Technology Policy. (Discussion)

   B. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Staff Report: RBOC Account Statement. (Discussion)

   C. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Staff Report: Water System Improvement Program (WSIP). (Discussion)

4. **Request for Proposals - Evaluation of the Water System Improvement Program (WSIP).** (Discussion and Action) (Attachment)

5. **Approval of RBOC Minutes of July 16, 2012.** (Discussion and Action) (Attachment)

6. **RBOC Member Information Requests Raised at Today's Meeting and Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion and Action)

7. **Adjournment.**

Future Meeting Dates:

September 10, 2012
October 1, 2012 (Potential Special Meeting)
October 15, 2012
November 19, 2012
December 17, 2012

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

For information concerning San Francisco Public Utilities Commission please contact by e-mail bondoversight@sfwater.org or by calling (415) 487-5245.

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.

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.

RBOC Evaluation of the Water System Improvement Program (WSIP)
CS-254

DATE: August 2, 2012
TO: Prospective Consultants
FROM: SFPUC Contract Administration Bureau

DEADLINE: Submission instructions are at end of this document. All submissions must be received before 11:00 am PST on August 31, 2012. All requests for information concerning this RFP must be in writing and directed to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission at rfp@sfwater.org, ATTN: CS-254.

On behalf of the Revenue Bond Oversight Committee (RBOC), the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) requests the services of a construction management or project management consultant. To be eligible to submit a proposal, 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 (information on the Construction Contract Audit list can be found at the following website address: http://famis.sfgov.org/construction2012/). Firms that worked on SFPUC's Water System Improvement Program (WSIP) involving Preplanning, Planning, Environmental Review, Final Engineering Design, Construction Management, Project Controls or Project Communications are not eligible to participate on this project.

I. Introduction

San Francisco's Revenue Bond Oversight Committee (RBOC) is charged with confirming that proceeds from revenue bonds that support the SFPUC's Water, Power, and Wastewater Enterprise infrastructure improvements are being implemented in a professional and cost effective manner. Currently, RBOC is focused on reviewing the SFPUC's delivery of the $4.6B Water System Improvement Program (WSIP) which is now about 62% complete. The SFPUC is responsible for implementing the program, estimating and tracking project budgets, and developing and monitoring project schedules, forecasting costs and schedules and managing contingency.

In light of recent recommendations made to RBOC by Dr. William Ibbs (Ibbs Consulting) and a SFPUC Independent Review Panel, RBOC has requested that the SFPUC conduct a Cost Estimate at Completion (EAC) and Schedule at Completion (SAC) analysis for a representative sample of projects and that this analysis be reviewed by RBOC's consultant (Task A) for purposes of evaluating the accuracy, soundness, and quality of the SFPUC's cost and schedule forecasts and the WSIP's overall status with regard to cost and schedule.

In addition, RBOC has identified one additional task as part of its annual work plan. This task (Task B) involves a review of all forecasted delivery costs remaining to complete the WSIP based on the most current information available at the time of the consultant's analysis for purposes of verifying that such remaining costs reflect the phasing out of resources as the WSIP program winds down over the next few years.

II. Main Objectives

The main objectives surrounding tasks A and B require the consultant to answer these two fundamental questions:

- Does the current WSIP methodology for forecasting cost and schedule provide realistic, sound, and reliable projections?
- What is the confidence level that the program will be completed within the currently approved WSIP schedule and cost?

To answer these two questions, the consultant will review the SFPUC's EAC/SAC analysis and remaining delivery costs and provide RBOC with a report as to the accuracy, soundness, and quality of the SFPUC's forecasting practices at the project and program levels.

Task A. Examine the Process for Forecasting Cost Estimate at Completion (EAC) and Schedule at Completion (SAC)
Key questions to be addressed in Task A include but are not limited to: 1) To what degree of confidence does the EAC/SAC analysis of the representative projects suggest that these projects are on schedule and within the budget currently forecasted by the SFPUC? 2) To what degree of confidence does the EAC/SAC analysis suggest that the overall WSIP is on schedule/budget? 3) What issues/actions, if any, should be addressed and/or put in place to improve the project/program method for forecasting completion budgets and schedules?

Task B. Examine Remaining Delivery Costs*
Key questions to be addressed in Task B include but are not limited to: 1) How reasonable are the SFPUC's forecasted delivery costs based on the size and complexity of the WSIP? 2) How do the SFPUC's forecasted delivery costs compare with delivery costs of already completed projects? 3) How do the SFPUC's delivery costs compare with industry standards or other comparable programs? 4) What recommendations can you make that enable the SFPUC to more accurately forecast delivery costs, help reduce these costs, and phase-out resources no longer necessary as the WSIP program nears completion?

**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.*

III. General Information

1. A pre-submittal conference will be held in the **2nd Floor O'Shaughnessy Conference Room at the SFPUC Headquarters (525 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA) on August 15, 2012 at 9:00am** so that prospective consultant teams have a clear understanding of the WSIP and services requested. While this conference is not mandatory, proposers are highly encouraged to attend. The conference will include a brief presentation by the SFPUC on the overall forecasting practices currently in place for the WSIP. This presentation will help consultants understand the WSIP's various business processes and policies and the breadth and specifics of available data. To help expedite the pre-submittal conference, proposers can submit questions regarding the RFP in advance that will then be addressed during the conference. Questions submitted in advance should be received three days prior to the conference. All questions and answers received in advance and/or during the conference will be posted on the SFPUC website listed below, under CS-254.
   http://sfwater.org/bids/bidlist.aspx?bidtype=2
2. As part of the proposal process, the consultant is required to review the most current SFPUC WSIP project/program information generally accessible to the public as well as the most recent Independent Review Panel and Ibbs reports. This information is posted on the SFPUC website.
3. Consultants can submit additional follow-up written questions to better understand the breadth and specifics of the defined tasks by 5:00pm, August 20, 2012. Technical or other substantive questions will **not** be accepted after August 20th. All questions should be sent to rfp@sfwater.org, Subject: CS-254 Questions.
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 August 31, 2012.** That proposal will be based on the various studies or reports provided, information conveyed at the pre-submittal conference and any subsequent follow-up. The final consultant fee will be negotiated to a not-to-exceed amount.
5. Once the selected RBOC consultant is determined, the SFPUC will make additional WSIP records and data accessible, including additional reports generated at the project and program level and through the Construction Management (CM) Program to permit the consultant to review information specifically used in its forecasting.
6. The selected consultant will be required to sign a non-disclosure agreement.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. The consultant shall keep RBOC's representative informed of key requests for information made to the SFPUC and any delays in response.

11. This analysis is being conducted during peak construction activity. The consultant will confer with SFPUC staff on establishing a schedule for analysis that accommodates the WSIP staff/contractors but recognizes the consultant's timeline for meeting reporting milestones.
12. The consultant's review and analysis of both tasks provided to the SFPUC and RBOC 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.
13. The consultant will provide two oral progress reports to the full RBOC and/or its working group sub-committee at approximately 30-45 day intervals or as determined by RBOC and the consultant.

IV. Task A - EAC/SAC Review Requirements (Scope of Services)

Five projects have been selected for the EAC/SAC analysis. These five projects represent different large water infrastructure projects. All are costly - as well as complex - and represent unique challenges.

1. Calaveras Dam Replacement $416M
2. New Irvington Tunnel $320M
3. BDPL Reliability Upgrade Tunnel $307M
4. HTWP Long Term Improvements $277M
5. Crystal Springs/San Andreas Transmission Upgrade $165M

The consultant will review the SFPUC's EAC/SAC analysis for the five projects in sufficient detail to thoroughly understand if project costs and schedule assumptions, inclusions, projections, and contingencies are reasonable, and if the projects can be delivered as indicated in the current WSIP forecast at completion based on the information know at the time of the analysis.

The scope of services for Task A will include but not be limited to those items listed below:

1. Follow the SFPUC's forecasting process from beginning to end for each project and assess the thoroughness and accuracy of the EACs/SACs generated as part of the process.
2. Review SFPUC cost estimating and cost forecasting methodology, assumptions, accuracy, and processes used to determine forecasted final projects cost at completion.
3. Review the SFPUC's schedule projection and forecasting methodology, assumptions, accuracy, and processes used to determine schedule at completion forecasts.
4. Spot check key approved change orders (COs) to ensure they were approved in accordance with SFPUC policies and are essential to the successful completion of the project. (Note: Consultants' proposals must describe their approach/method used in checking these COs (e.g., % of number of COs, % of dollar value.)
5. Spot check pending and potential COs for both cost and time impacts to ensure that projections are realistic, thorough, and that assumptions for cost and schedule at

completion are sound and within industry norms. (Note: Consultants' proposals must describe their approach/method used in checking these COs (e.g.,% of number of COs, % of dollar value.)

6. Review project trend projections for both cost and time impacts to ensure that projections are realistic, thorough, and that assumptions for cost and schedule at completion are sound and within industry norms.
7. Confirm that all approved, pending, and potential COs and trends are included in the SFPUC's project cost and time completion forecasts.
8. Review the project risk registers to determine if all reasonable risks have been assessed and accounted for. Assess how best to bring greater visibility and clarity to the potential cost and schedule impacts that may result from WSIP's highest probability risks. Explain your rationale and analysis used to develop your opinion.
9. Review all project contingencies, both construction and non-construction, to determine if there will be sufficient contingencies to cover all costs for the projects at completion. Using the analysis of the 5 projects as a base, provide an opinion and the supporting rationale and data to extrapolate this information and determine the overall confidence level that the entire WSIP can be completed within the current contingency funding, including the Program Management Reserve Fund.
10. Interview the prime contractor for each of the five projects to gain the contractors perspective on the current and projected status of the work and current and future cost and schedule challenges to ensure that all reasonable cost and schedule issues are addressed in the SFPUC's EAC/SAC forecasts. The SFPUC's project construction managers for each of the projects shall participate in the interviews between RBOC's consultant and the prime contractor. *(Note: if the interviews are held at the construction site, the consultant will be responsible for adhering to all construction site safety protocols established by the contractor and the WSIP Program during visits to the site. The consultant will solely be responsible for safety training of their employees and their employees' safety on the sites.)*
11. Present a comprehensive written report to the RBOC giving the details and analysis leading to the consultant's findings and recommendations.
12. Provide specific actions that should be taken to provide more accurate EAC/SAC projections if findings indicate the need for revisions to the SFPUC current forecasting process.

V. Task B - Remaining Delivery Costs Review Requirements (Scope of Work)

Once a program is in construction, project costs are to a great extent fixed through the awarded construction contracts. However, costs may vary in two areas – construction change orders and delivery costs (often referred to as soft costs). With WSIP construction activities projected to peak in the fall of 2012, the WSIP team will need to start ramping down some activities in early 2013. Task B involves assessing the projected delivery costs for the remainder of the program and verifying that those costs reflect the phasing out of resources as the WSIP nears completion.

The scope of services for Task B will include but not be limited to the items listed below:

1. Examine the process by which the SFPUC controls and forecasts remaining delivery costs: a) Review all forecasted delivery costs remaining to complete the WSIP, including costs associated with program and project management, planning, engineering, environmental review and permitting, construction management, engineering support during construction, and other City staffing costs (e.g., real estate services, Water Enterprise operations support, legal services, etc.); b) Ensure that the definition of "remaining delivery costs" is fully understood so that comparisons with outside benchmarks or other programs can be assessed, if desirable. The analysis should include a review of all delivery cost forecasts (based on specific resource allocation projections of all key positions) and a review of how consultants and City staff are being transitioned out of the WSIP program.
2. Compare the SFPUC's forecasted delivery costs of active projects with the actual delivery costs to date for completed projects to allow for a project-level comparison of the delivery costs approved as part of the July 2011 Revised WSIP Program Budget.
3. Present a comprehensive written report to the RBOC giving details and analysis leading to the consultant's findings and recommendations.
4. Provide specific actions that should be taken to more accurately forecast or control delivery costs if findings indicate the need to do so.

VI. Consultant Qualifications and Requirements

As noted on page 1, as a minimum qualification to be eligible to submit a proposal, 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, cost control and cost estimating.
d. Critical Path Method (CPM) scheduling.
e. Earn value management (CPI, SPI, and other indicators)
f. Construction contract administration.
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. Construction risk assessment/management.
c. Primavera P6 project management platform.
d. Environmental regulations/requirements and their impacts on project delivery.
e. Stakeholder relations.
f. Feasibility analysis and analysis for construction projects and programs.
g. Delivery of public infrastructure projects.

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

VII. 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.

VIII. Tentative Timetable

Aug 2, 2012:	**Advertise RFP**
Aug 15, 2012:	**Pre-submittal conference**
Aug 20, 2012:	**Deadline for proposers to submit questions**
Aug 31, 2012:	**Deadline for proposals**
Sept 21, 2012:	**Firms shortlisted/firm selected**
Oct 1, 2012:	**RBOC authorizes execution of contract**
Oct 3, 2012:	**Notice to Proceed**
Nov 19, 2012:	**First oral progress report to RBOC/Working Group**
Dec 17, 2012:	**Second oral progress report to RBOC/Working Group**
Jan 11, 2013:	**Preliminary Draft Report sent to RBOC/SFPUC for review**
Jan 25, 2013:	**Questions/comments on draft report sent to consultant**
Feb 18, 2013:	**Final draft report presented to RBOC (public meeting)**
Feb 28, 2013:	**Final Report delivered to RBOC**

IX. Proposal Contents and Submission Instructions

Proposals are due no later than 11:00am on August 31, 2012 and can be delivered to the following location:

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Contract Administration Bureau
RE: CS-254, RBOC Evaluation of WSIP
525 Golden Gate, Customer Service, 1st Floor.
San Francisco, CA 94102

Proposals may be mailed to the following location:

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Contract Administration Bureau
RE: CS-254, RBOC Evaluation of WSIP
525 Golden Gate, Customer Service, 8th Floor.
San Francisco, CA 94102

Note: Mailed proposals must arrive by the 11:00am deadline on August 31, 2012 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., resumes), shall not exceed twenty-five (25) pages (note: one double-sided page counts as two pages). Proposers shall print their proposal double-sided on 8.5 x 11 inch paper (larger size paper can be used for figures and organization charts) and use a minimum font of 10 pts. with minimum margins of 1 inch for the preparation of their proposal. Proposer shall number every page of the proposal, beginning with the cover letter, including pages with tables and figures. The proposer shall submit one original unbound proposal plus one electronic version of the proposal and any supporting documentation on a Compact Disc (CD) in .pdf format. The proposal shall contain the following:

A. Cover Letter

The cover letter shall be signed by an individual authorized to obligate the Proposer to fulfill the commitments contained in the Proposal. The cover letter must include the following: (1) a statement identifying the Lead Proposer if a JV is 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 the Proposer's ability to successfully complete the tasks outlined in the Scope of Services which may include:

- Description and background summary of the 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, 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 assigned to Tasks A and B are able to work the amount of time as 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 and provide references for each.

D. Work Plan for Each Task

Using the scope of work for each task as outlined in Sections IV and V, describe your approach in analyzing Tasks A and B, demonstrate your understanding of the work to be done by highlighting the issues and concerns you noticed from your review of the RFP and associated documents and reports (e.g. Independent Review Panel Report) and explain any unique approaches you believe are relevant to either task and would result in a better work product. Include the names of the team members who will be doing the work and estimated number of person-hours required. Proposers are cautioned that lack of a detailed work plan may render the proposal non-responsive.

E. Project Schedule

The Proposer shall delineate a timetable for work completion based on the work plan which must meet the timeline outlined in Section VIII.

G. Fee Proposal

The fee proposal shall show the estimated cost to complete each task as well as a combined, overall total cost. Include the name of team members to work on the project, estimated hours assigned to each, billing rate(s), and all applicable indirect costs/charges. The final consultant fee will be negotiated to a not-to-exceed amount. **RBOC's estimate to complete Tasks A & B, inclusive of all charges, will be between one hundred to three hundred thousand ($100,000-$300,000) dollars**. Additional information regarding the fee will be discussed at the pre-proposal conference on August 15th.

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 in the evaluation process. 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 matter, and may include staff from the SFPUC, other City agencies, and/or other utilities or organizations.

The evaluation process may consist of two (2) phases – Written Proposal and Oral Interview. The scores from the Written Proposal and the Oral Interview will be combined and tabulated using the following overall scoring breakdown:

1.	Written Proposal	65 pts.
2.	Oral Interview	35 pts.
	Total	100 pts.

Proposers must obtain a minimum score of thirty-nine (39) points which is equivalent to sixty percent (60%) on their written proposal (first phase of the evaluation process) to be considered for the oral interview evaluation (second phase of the evaluation process). A score greater than thirty-nine (39) points or sixty percent (60%) on the written proposal will not automatically guarantee an invitation to the second phase of the evaluation process. Only the top three (3) ranked Proposers are eligible to be short-listed to continue on with oral interviews. Oral interviews may not be held if the second highest ranked proposer trails the highest ranked proposer by 10 points or greater after evaluating the written proposals.

The written proposal will be scored using the following point scale:

Work Plan: 21 pts.
Proposer Qualifications: 14 pts.
Team Member Organization, Availability, Qualifications and Resumes: 30 pts.

The Selection Panel may hold oral interviews with the short-listed Proposers as described above. The interview evaluation process will consist of a Proposer presentation followed by standard interview questions from the Selection Panel, and may include follow-up questions if clarification of Proposer's responses is necessary. The same set of interview questions will be used for all Proposers.

The Proposer with the highest total of written and oral (if necessary) scores will be identified as the highest-ranked Proposer eligible to proceed with the award of an Agreement with RBOC.

END OF DOCUMENT

PUBLIC UTILITIES
REVENUE BOND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MINUTES

Public Utilities Commission Building
525 Golden Gate Ave., 2nd Floor, O'Shaughnessy Room C
San Francisco, CA 94102

Monday, July 16, 2012 - 9:30 AM

Regular Meeting

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call** (00:00:00 - 00:00:30)

Seat 1	Holly Kaufman
Seat 2	Kevin Cheng, Chair
Seat 3	Karen Donovan
Seat 4	Larry Liederman
Seat 5	Vacant
Seat 6	Ian Hart
Seat 7	John Ummel, Vice Chair

The meeting was called to order at 9:45 a.m. On the call of the roll, Members Kaufman, Cheng, Donovan, Liederman, and Hart were noted present.

Member Ummel participated via teleconference.

2. **Public Comment:** (00:00:30 - 00:01:45)

Public Comment: None.

3. **Chair's Report:**

A. **San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Staff Report: Water System Improvement Program** (00:01:45 – 00:35.52)

John Kinneen; Estabio Elarosa; and Allen Johanson (SFPUC); Mark Blake (City Attorney's Office); provided information and responded to questions raised throughout the discussion.

Public Comment: None.

B. **San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Staff Report: RBOC Account Statement.** (00:35.52 – 00:42:52)

Mike Brown (SFPUC); and Mark Blake (City Attorney's Office); provided information and responded to questions raised throughout the discussion.

Public Comment: None.

4. **City Services Auditor (CSA) FY 2011-2012, 3rd Quarter Billing Invoice - $29,625.** (00:42:52 – 00:46:50)

Nancy Hom (SFPUC); provided information and responded to questions raised throughout the discussion.

Member Liederman, seconded by Member Hart, moved to authorize the payment of the City Services Auditor FY 2011-2012, 3rd Quarter Billing Invoice in the amount of $29,625.

The motion passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Cheng, Donovan,Liederman, and Hart.
Noes: None.
Absent: Kaufman.
Excused: Ummel (via teleconference).

Public Comment. None.

5. **Draft Request for Proposals - Evaluation of the WSIP Program.** (00:46:50 - 01:55:00)

Chair Ummel provided a summary report on the Draft Request for Proposals concerning the evaluation of the WSIP Program.

John Kinneen and Allen Johanson (SFPUC); Mark Blake (City Attorney's Office); provided information and responded to questions raised throughout the discussion.

Public Comment. None.

6. **Approval of RBOC Minutes of June 18, 2012.** (01:55:00 -)

Member Liederman, seconded by Member Kaufman, moved to approve the RBOC June 18, 2012, minutes.

The motion passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Kaufman, Cheng, Donovan, Liederman, and Hart.
Noes: None.
Excused: Ummel (via teleconference).

Public Comment. None.

7. **RBOC Member Information Requests Raised at Today's Meeting and Future Agenda Items.**

No Actions taken.

Public Comment. None.

8. **Adjournment.**

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 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

For information concerning San Francisco Public Utilities Commission please contact by e-mail bondoversight@sfwater.org or by calling (415) 487-5245.

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.

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.