

**SUMMARY NOTES**  
**Yahara CLEAN Compact Executive Committee**  
**Friday, June 12, 2020**  
**10:10-11:10 A.M.**  
**Zoom**

**Attendance**

Present: Greg Fries, Kyle Minks, Coreen Fallat (chair), Janet Schmidt, Mark Riedel, Matt Diebel, Missy Nergard, James Tye, Paul Dearlove, Luke Wynn (note-taker), Alison Lebwohl (facilitator), Sarah Dance (UW fellow)

**Anticipated Outcomes**

(a) Decisions about:

- Next steps for completing Compact work (make vs. buy)
- Charge & objectives for Public Engagement Subgroup
- Sharing the income & expense status report with Steering Team

(b) Input into:

- Next steps for P-loading Subgroup
- Recommended changes to timeline
- Future work for subgroups, Steering Team, Executive Team (work plan)

**Notes from 5/27/20 special Executive Committee meeting**

No corrections or changes requested. *Summary notes from the 5/27/20 special Executive Committee session approved unanimously.*

**Getting the Work Done: Make vs. Buy Proposal (Dearlove, Diebel, Nergard, Tye)**

Diebel, Nergard, Tye, and Dearlove met on 6/3/20 to develop a Make vs. Buy proposal and timeline, with Lebwohl facilitating. The objective was to address what work activities we have the time and capacity to do ourselves, and what will require contracted assistance to achieve. A written proposal was shared and summarized, including:

- Compact goals and priority focus areas to convey to potential candidates
- 14-month contract period starting with an approximate, mid-September hire date
- Three broad categories of need (project management, public engagement, and plan development) with “make vs. buy” recommendations associated with each category
- Recommendation to follow a Qualifications-Based Selection (QBS) process
- Three-month timeline outlining the process for securing the needed assistance

Discussion:

- The transition from Phase 3 to Phase 4 represented in the logic model will require significant partner engagement, and with Yahara WINS in particular. That includes identifying actual on-the-ground projects and the associated funding/partner relationships they would entail.
- Questions were raised about how the QBS contracting model works. This led to discussion on the distinctions between and ways to implement a Request for Qualifications versus a Request for Proposals. Using a QBS approach, you choose the most qualified consultant that then collaborates with the Exec Committee on the development of a more refined scope, schedule and budget.

- Does the consultant that is selected to help develop scope, schedule and budget automatically win the contract?
- A little bit of up-front work with the RFQ helps create a much better proposal. The benefits of the process are clear, but what needs to be discussed is whether or not that RFP automatically goes to the contractor that helped develop it. If it then goes out for bid at that time, the timeline will need to be extended accordingly. That could easily add another four weeks.
- Reason why the Qualifications-Based Selection process is appropriate for our situation is we really do not have a well-defined public outreach plan. Bringing on an experienced contractor as soon as possible can really help us shape the missing pieces.
- In public work, in order to keep the process honest and open, the RFP bar is much higher than the RFQ. The two-step process keeps the RFQ writers honest and avoids a situation in which they would intentionally steer an RFP in their favor. If they don't have to compete for the RFP, there is less incentive to create a perfect, "higher bar" RFP.
- Based on city of Madison experiences, it would be legal for Clean Lakes Alliance as a non-government entity to hire a QBS firm without a formal bid. For a private company, the QBS process is more the norm. However, we are straddling the line of public money and private money.
- Multiple consulting groups have pointed us to the QBS process. You end up saving money and establishing a better relationship with the contractor. There are a variety of resources available to us, including free forms and process facilitators.

***Decision: Approval of Make vs. Buy recommendations as proposed. (All in favor)***

The following is the relevant excerpt from the proposal:

*Phase 1: Create Compact*

**COMPLETED**

*Phase 2: Determine Progress & Goals*

**Mostly MAKE** – Work mostly performed by P Loading Subgroup, but with consultant involvement and support. Consultant to help with project management; maintaining timeline; integrating subgroup work into larger effort; and facilitating internal and external communications.

*Phase 3: Identify Priority Actions*

**Mostly MAKE with some BUY** – Work mostly performed by P Loading Subgroup and Compact Steering Team members, but with structured direction and process support from the consultant. Third party expert can also help push Compact members outside of their institutional comfort zones.

*Phase 4: Develop Implementation Plan*

**BUY** – Contracted assistance completed by consultants and/or Compact members is needed. Major activities include public engagement campaign, information gathering, fact-finding research, and plan writing.

**Decision:** *Approval to proceed immediately with advancing a Qualifications-Based Selection process following the recommended 6/12 - 9/14 timeline, but to postpone a final decision on how to handle a Request for Proposals and hiring protocol until we learn more about the QBS model. (All in favor)*

### **Getting the Work Done: Steering Team Work Plan (Fallat & Riedel)**

Polling results from the May Steering Team meeting showed strong interest for us to begin moving into strategies and solutions. For July, it is proposed that the agenda feature a presentation and small group discussion related to the current 14 Yahara CLEAN actions. This could also include gathering input on each Compact member's perspectives on what is working well and where the future opportunities lie.

In addition, it was proposed that the Steering Team would not be asked to meet in August. Instead, only the Executive Committee would meet so the focus can be on advancing the process for bringing on needed consultants.

**Decision:** *Approval of Steering Team work plan for July 10<sup>th</sup>, and agreement that only the Executive Committee will meet in August. It was further agreed that communications would be maintained with the Steering Team to keep the group updated on progress. (All in favor)*

### **Additional Decisions & Consultations**

#### **Public Engagement Subgroup (Dearlove)**

**Decision:** *Approval of the Public Engagement Subgroup charge and objectives as presented in the 6/8/10 subgroup proposal. (All in favor)*

Charge: Formulate a recommended implementation strategy for how the Yahara CLEAN Compact will communicate with, engage, and empower diverse watershed communities to support our decision-making and plan development.

Objectives:

- 1) Recommend content and outreach-coordination strategies related to Compact messaging and information sharing.
- 2) Recommend specific questions to ask the public to inform plan development.
- 3) Recommend desired outcomes, methods, level of intensity, and timing for soliciting public feedback, particularly from specific communities or demographics.
- 4) Recommend how and by whom this work gets completed.

#### **Sharing Financials with Steering Team (Dearlove)**

An example financial report was re-shared (dated 3/3/20). In general, members were accepting of periodically sharing the financial reports with the full Steering Team. However, due to time limitations, it was agreed that further discussion at the July Exec meeting would be helpful to better understand the report and its assumptions.

**Decision:** *Approval to share an updated financial statement with the Steering Team after the Executive Committee has had a chance at the next meeting to discuss and finalize. (All in favor)*

**Next Steps for P Loading Subgroup (Diebel)**

Next on the P Loading Subgroup’s agenda is to begin evaluating past Yahara CLEAN 2.0 strategies.

**Changes to Timeline & Facilitator Contract (Dearlove)**

According to our project timeline, we are falling behind in the design and implementation of public-engagement activities. We will need to decide not just what needs to be done to effectively involve the public, but what we can take on ourselves while we proceed with trying to hire needed consultants to do most of the actual work.

Facilitator contract: In recent months, significantly more time has needed to be invested in Compact facilitation than originally anticipated (25-35 hours/month vs. 14 hours/month). This is predominantly the result of having to shift to the virtual meeting format, the need to facilitate additional meetings, and the additional involvement in project management and documentation while consultants are being sought. Some contract adjustments are now necessary to appropriately compensate Lebowohl for the extra time she is being asked to spend on the project. This will be included on the July agenda as a closed session action item.

**Closing**

Mark Riedel is next on the rotation to chair the July 10<sup>th</sup> meetings.