



WESTCHASE PROPERTY MANAGEMENT REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL COMMITTEE MEETING

Agenda and Meeting Minutes

March 4, 2024

Call to Order: 5:02 pm; the meeting adjourned at 6:09 pm

Members Present: John Mogge, Terry Lanzar, Eric Holt, Rick Goldstein, Dyan Pithers, Mike Oostenbrink; the meeting was also attended by Joe Oda

Members Absent: Russ Crooks

Agenda:

Approval of Feb 26 Minutes: The minutes were approved.

Review of Action items (AIs) and Continuity of Effort Items (CoE)

All – review and provide comments on the draft RFI and Responses (complete)

All – review the draft RFP for any changes needed by the RFI responses (Complete) The only change needed was the due date for proposal submittal on Page 7.

Discussion items:

Changes to the RFP from the RFI process – all – leads to the agreement to issue the final RFP; The RFP will be sent out to all potential bidders on March 8, 2024.

Review the scoring matrix and discuss how we want to conduct the evaluation process – See below for the list of questions that were reviewed below. After much discussion with respect to subjective vs objective outcomes, and whether to split these up or review each one as a team, it was decided that the committee would review each technical proposal individually and then as a team to collaborate and consolidate scores. The current scoring in Appendix A (0-5) will remain the baseline for scoring. John took an action to provide the overview of our process in detail for the March report to the board. Mike will be responsible for capturing the individual and consolidated scoring for record.

Open Discussion or any new business:

The committee revisited the question by bidders on whether to include a copy of the budget. This has been public information and hosted on the WCA portal in the past but was taken down by a recommendation from a board member. However, real estate agents distribute this information to potential buyers. The committee recommends that one sheet (2024 budget only) without supporting worksheets would give other vendors the same advantage as GPI. John will reach out to the board to obtain approval to send out with the final RFP on March 8. Michiel will re-look and send the one-page budget for inclusion to ensure no proprietary information is included.

Recorder - Recap of AIs and CoEs from this meeting:

- Action to John to document the detailed evaluation process for the March report to the board.
- John to request approval of the board to include the one-page 2024 budget.

- Michiel to ensure that no proprietary information is included and send John and Terry the file for inclusion with the final RFP.
- Terry to send the final RFP (PDF), Appendix A (Excel) and 2024 Budget (PDF) on March 8.

Next Team Meetings: TBD

Updated Workplan up to the board recommendation – Activity, Milestones, leader:

Date	Activity	Milestone	Lead (s)
March 4	Evaluation Process and Final RFP	Ready to send for bid	Team & Terry
March 8	Issue Final RFP		Terry on the website
April 26	Proposals Due	Tips off review period by committee	Terry to disseminate
April 27 – May 24	Proposal Evaluations		Russ and Terry
May 25 – May 30	Develop recommendations for the board		Team
End of May	Committee presentation and recommendation to the board	Special Board Meeting Proposed	Team

Attachment 1 - Some thoughts on the WCA RFP Proposal Evaluation Talking Points & Questions for the meeting on the 4th

Do we need to establish our internal priorities for services so everyone is aligned? If yes can Michiel resurrect that from his versions or do we need to redo via a discussion for the benefit of Russ and Dyan?

How do we or is there a need to try and protect the WCA from being sued as result of our recommendation and the board’s action on it?

Do we/can we have an independent (non-committee member) scorer? We are all pretty close to the process and might have unconscious biases.

Do we want to try and do a calibration scoring to see how we each view a 1, 2 or 9 and 10?

Do we want to ask for SLK to be involved? Should they at a minimum be asked to do diligence on the top 3 or 4 from a business license and registration standpoint or do we take what is given us at face value?

If we feel a need for clarification from an offeror, should we seek it and if so how?

If a portal is available online or if other information is offered via a commercial website is that considered as part of their proposal. If so do we view that collectively or in small teams?

If we get 10 – 13 proposals should we break have 2 teams?

If we have less than 10 proposals should we work as a team – perhaps 2 per meeting for 5 nights?



Do we see a need for a non-scoring member – a sort of ombudsman role.

Cross referencing pricing and technical proposals – how should we do that to be comparative?

Do we need a master scoring sheet and should Russ or Terry be the owner? (This is likely a document we need to have to be able to defend a challenge to our recommendation.)

Record keeping – we have a duty to be transparent in our evaluation to the offerors – what guidelines do we want to have as far as notes and working papers/scoring sheets?