

Link to the editable version of the revised

RFP: https://1drv.ms/w/s!AvMaYtZT1ZgLkwMdMZ7y_X5EFLFL

Link to the evaluation matrix: <https://1drv.ms/w/s!AvMaYtZT1ZgLkwd-ZMoV9Gs7LyJI?e=AFQAPA>

Attendees:

Sally Greene
Jim Northrup
xPatrick Abele
Earl McKee
xCatharine Rice
Kathy Zopfi
Doug Noell
Travis Myren
Jim Northrup
Victoria Deaton
Patricia Hull
Todd Broucksou
xKeith Conover
Terri Buckner
Paul Cardillo
Sally Kadle

Marilyn Carter
Charles Burnham
Tony Blake

Action Items:

- Michael Harvey to provide synopsis of permitting/service levels presented at meeting
- Change vendor to vendor(s) in RFP in case some are partnering
- Provide language for attestation – to the effect of from bidder “we will provide 100/100...” – Finance (Jovana)
- Ask Legal and Finance if Task Force can have second pass if scores are all equal - JN
- Need to put together a protocol for reference interviews – JN/IT Staff
- Add language “Company agrees to employ 2 or more OC residents for this contract” so 10/5/0 scoring can still work
- Hand off RFP and Matrix to Jovana (Finance) and James (Legal) for their review; will send out to group after Legal/Finance review - JN
- Add agenda item for Victoria to present training updates at next meeting (8/25)

DRAFT AGENDA August 25, 2021 @ 5:30 PM DRAFT AGENDA

5:30 PM Welcomes and introductions - Greene/McKee

5:33 PM Approve Minutes (August 11, 2021) - Greene/McKee/Group

- 5:35 PM RFP Matrix Ranking - Greene/McKee/Group
- 6:15 PM RFP Discussion - Greene/McKee/Group
- 6:25 PM Durham Tech Training Update - Deaton
- 6:30 PM Old Business/New Business/Housekeeping - Greene/McKee
- 6:30/7:00 PM Adjourn

Welcomes and introductions – Thanks to all involved in changes to the RFP; a lot of good work

Approve Minutes – motion to approve Todd; Victoria seconds; all approve

RFP Matrix Ranking – Terri background => matrix put out last week (after last meeting) unchanged, asked for discussion; Pat had good ideas, suggestion to remove attestation #2 (shouldn't limit ourselves to 1st \$5million); Pat suggests different scoring numbers – wasn't saying she wanted it changed, was just thinking it would be partial scores; TB – do scores work as wholes or should they be partials?

- Remove #2 attestation? Greene and McKee agree that it should be removed
 - o Greene prefers to change “attestations” to “thresholds”; TB – believes purpose of question is to force vendor to say “yes we will do this” or “no we won't/can't”; Jim – refers to Jovana's email regarding attestation; TB – suggests have a statement then have vendors sign to attest; Jim says Jovana will provide language for this; from bidder “we will provide 100/100...”
- McKee – minimum of 100/100; if their proposal only covers 500 of 5000 homes, how would we score them?; McKee would score them as 0; TB – if 2 vendors said they would each cover 2600 then even though neither is covering all 5000, working together they would cover all. If vendors are partnering, then their proposal will show that; question #5 should address this; what's best way to have vendors identify partner/bidders; Jim suggests RFP needs to ask vendors what percentage of 5000 households vendor intends to cover - covered in 3.4 in RFP; SG - should cover the concern about how many households covered – it says 100%; Jim – AT&T and CenturyLink won't go into areas outside of their service area so they would have to partner with another vendor; McKee – go for the whole ball of wax (all 5000 homes)
- ACTION: Change vendor to vendor(s) in RFP in case some are partnering (confirm ~ 6:04)
- McKee – are we in agreement that 20/10/0 is satisfactory? Would be okay with 10/5/0; 10 = meets standards, missing anything at all then it's a 5; Todd's okay with scoring numbers; no one is lobbying for numbers other than the ones proposed; PaulC – challenge is that potential for several vendors to end up with the same score; McKee – same scores would need to be ironed out by group; Victoria - possibly in a second pass review; unless one vendor is just way ahead of all others, likely will need another pass; Greene – any risk of “bid protest”?; award not based on points; Jim – needs to do a qualitative analysis by not using absolutes; ACTION: Jim to ask Legal and Finance if Task Force can have second pass if scores are all equal
- Should we go with 20/10/0 or a range? Paul – Exceeds expectations (2), meets expectations (1), does not meet expectations (0)?; Doug – likes the point system, doesn't think there will be multiple vendors with same score; not a fan of gradient, but if do that then maybe add a column for 15 (20/15/10/0)

- Terri – items are written very generically; structure that anticipated would go into the RFP; once published then need to come up with a cheatsheet – what does it mean that it meets technical standards?; cheatsheet would have keywords to look for or have Doug (for example) review all proposals for each item because of their technical background; don't have any affordability standards in RFP currently; Greene likes idea of cheatsheet AND having experts review technical proposals; Jim – at a certain point James and Jovana may override what group decides in which case will come back to the group with their suggested changes – will need another meeting or resolve in email
 - o Poll -> 10/5/0 or 1-5/6-10/0
 - Terri – 10/5/0
 - Paul – 10/5/0
 - Doug – 10/5/0
 - Todd – 10/5/0
 - Victoria – 10/5/0
 - Pat – 10/5/0
 - McKee – 10/5/0
 - Greene – 10/5/0
- Categories
 - o Network structures – questions 1-5; Jim - #5, 100% is yes/no question; Greene suggests replacing 5 with 0 (because it's an absolute); no objections
 - o Company qualifications – Terri – question for staff; request that they provide references from communities they work with; who will call references and do interviews? Jim – probably come from IT staff or a member of Task Force; basically ask how vendor did on the project?; ACTION: need to put together a protocol for reference interviews
 - o Question 8 – do they need to have staff in OC? Intent – if there was a problem they have staff in OC to fix it in a timely fashion; OpenBB – said they would hire OC residents once they got the RFP; ended up hiring someone from Wake County; Jim – do we want this to generate jobs in OC? (economic development – county \$\$ staying in the county and our \$5million invigorating our economy); Todd – doesn't need to be an office but need Technical Support to be close enough to be onsite within 30 minutes, call center and billing office doesn't need to be in OC; Terri – nice to have someone local in OC for immediate service; Jim – will be including SLA in contract once RFP is awarded to make sure residents are covered; under 3.5 there's an item asking how company will have a local presence in OC;
 - Victoria – does discussion about Durham Tech training course and hiring local trainees factor into the discussion; Todd – will need techs to put fiber in; later will need techs to come fix fiber cuts (two different types of techs); “fiber cuts” person more likely to be local; laying fiber will be crew coming in to do that work so likely not local
 - ACTION: Add language “Company agrees to employ 2 or more OC residents for this contract” so 10/5/0 scoring can still work
 - McKee – most crews are local companies that specialize so not AT&T, etc; except for small companies which may
 - o County Capital Contribution – Jim => what if it's \$5.1million – is it a partial score or 0 points; Terri – 0; change the scoring to 10/0/0; all okay on scoring
 - o County Ownership (extra credit item) – Jim => 5234 households trying to address; encourages competition from smaller vendors; Greene – 10/0/0

- Jim will hand off RFP and Matrix to Jovana (Finance) and James (Legal) for their review; will send out to group after Legal/Finance review
- All good with matrix? No issues
- RFP changes? No...earlier suggested change will be covered in vendor response
 - Pg 14 – question about appendices? Should be part of the standard template.
 - All group good with RFP
- Durham Tech Training Update
 - Victoria – in front of senior leadership (JD Buxton); hope to have update in time for next meeting
- Old Business/New Business
 - Thanks to Terri and Catharine for work on matrix and RFP
 - Will need to think about composition of interview and evaluation teams
 - Greene believes elected officials should be on the committee
 - Jim thinks everyone would be doing scoring; not everyone would be interviewing; group would come up with questions
 - Jim spoke with Representative Meier – concerned funds would be restricted by current legislature; FCC maps determine eligibility of funds; everyone acknowledges that FCC maps are flawed; legislation includes language that if counties don't agree they can provide better maps/data to build their case for more funding; BIO maps are more accurate; spending ARPA money would that exclude us from getting state money and sounded like wouldn't be a problem; legislation passed by Oct 1; if RFP coming in end of Oct or early Nov, we should know if our RFP meshes with state plan; possibly can get state funds to augment the money we currently have allocated
 - McKee – OC (tier 3) is perceived to be a wealthy county and is therefore often not given priority when state funding is being allocated; many places in OC that are ; all but 17 households of the 5234 fall into rural census tract so are eligible for state funding
 - McKee – express appreciation for folks' participation; position we're in now puts us at a tactical advantage over other counties because of diligence and effort of Task Force; Greene – everyone's participation

Adjourn 7:20pm