

## MINUTES OF HUMAN RELATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

### LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS

April 27, 2015

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on April 26, 2015, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, a meeting of the Lane Transit District Board of Directors Human Relations Committee was held at 2:00 p.m. on Monday, April 27, 2015, in the District's conference room at 3500 E 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Gary Gillespie, Chair  
Julie Grossman  
Gary Wildish  
Roland Hoskins, Director of Administrative Services  
David Collier, Human Relations Manager  
Mary Talentinow, Purchasing Manager  
Ron Kilcoyne, General Manager  
Jeanne Schapper, Clerk of the Board  
Mackenzie Cowan, Human Relations Secretary

**CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL:** Mr. Gillespie called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m. and called the roll.

**EXECUTIVE SEARCH FIRM REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS:** Ms. Talentinow presented Lane Transit District's new e-bid system, an electronic web-based system where potential vendors can submit bids in response to a Request for Proposal (RFP). She said that it allows internal staff to monitor the entire solicitation process; it also allows potential contractors to register with the website. Once they are registered, contractors can select categories of service. If one of LTD's RFPs matches a category a contractor has selected, the contractor will receive a notification that will invite him/her to view the RFP. Any time changes are issued in the RFP process, contractors also will receive a notification of the changes.

Ms. Talentinow said that she will setup each HR Committee member with a login to the e-bid system. Mr. Wildish asked if any person could log in to the system. Ms. Talentinow said that any person could register with the site, though any person that registers must provide information such as a company name, e-mail address, and mailing address. She said that it is a free service for vendors; and LTD pays an annual subscription fee, which is based on a specific number of employee users.

Ms. Talentinow described the e-bid process and how to access proposals that have been submitted for the executive search firm RFP. Mr. Wildish asked when the bid results become public. Ms. Talentinow said that it depends on the type of solicitation. Generally, after the results have been read, they are considered public. She said that a proposal is different, because there is a different way of scoring. A proposal is scored on different components, such as qualifications or references.

Mr. Wildish asked when a bid would be disqualified. He said that it is possible that LTD will receive bids that may not meet the criteria of the RFP. Ms. Talentinow said that such bids are generally rejected without opening. She said that with e-bid, sometimes the bid must be reviewed to know that it is not an acceptable bid (aka, a "non-responsive" bid). If a bid is rejected, it does not become part of the official bid results, but could be requested in a public records request.

Ms. Talentinow presented a log in the website that details all of the conversations that LTD has had in the e-bid system. She also showed the Committee how to look up more information on a company using the e-bid system.

Ms. Talentinow presented the executive search firm RFP to the Committee. She said that no potential bidders have submitted any questions regarding the RFP.

Mr. Gillespie asked if some changes that had been discussed in the previous HR Committee meeting had been incorporated in to the current RFP. Ms. Talentinow confirmed that they had.

Ms. Talentinow showed the Committee which firms had viewed the executive search firm RFP. She said that one viewer was a bidding house, which will share the RFP with a third party that hires them for their service.

Mr. Gillespie asked if the RFP was sent out to various recruitment firms. Ms. Talentinow answered that when RFPs were sent out in paper form, they would be sent to entities for viewing, but LTD no longer does that with e-bid. She said that when LTD first began to use the e-bid system, staff sent invitations to approximately 600 contractors, inviting them to register with the e-bid system. Ms. Talentinow said that she spoke with several recruitment firms specifically about the executive search RFP to invite them to register in LTD's e-bid system.

Ms. Talentinow said that if not a lot of activity is seen over the next couple of days, then the due date may be extended. Mr. Collier said that they could make a decision to extend the RFP on Wednesday or Thursday, depending on whether or not there were any more interested parties. Ms. Talentinow said that a Notice of Extension could be sent out through e-bid. She said that the other choice would be to see what bids are submitted; and if there are any that the Committee likes, they can go through the process with a smaller number of proposals.

Mr. Wildish asked how they would be able to tell which firm was most qualified. Mr. Hoskins said that they would pick the firm with which they were most comfortable, unless it was above the price range by an exorbitant amount.

Ms. Talentinow presented the Committee with the criteria score card. She explained that the score card details the criteria upon which the proposals will be graded. Cost criteria is only worth 20 points, while Scope and Quality of Services is worth 25 points, Examples of Similar Work is worth 25 points, and Qualifications to Perform the Work and References Provided is worth 30 points. The Cost criteria carries the least weight. She said that an Independent Cost Estimate (ICE) will be required from Mr. Hoskins to establish fair and reasonable cost. She said that the ICE forms a preliminary budget for estimating purposes, and it serves as a sort of benchmark for use in determining the selected proposer's price to be fair and reasonable.

Ms. Talentinow said that the RFP asks bidders to submit certain criteria in their proposals, and those proposals match up to the criteria for scoring. She said that the evaluation committee may only score the proposals based on what is asked for in the RFP.

Mr. Hoskins asked if the Committee could score proposals as they saw them, or if the proposals had to be scored in a batch. Ms. Talentinow said that there is no requirement that the proposals be scored altogether; they could score one proposal at a time or part of a proposal at a time.

Ms. Talentinow handed each Committee member a Conflict of Interest form to sign, which, when signed, affirms that they have no conflict of interest in scoring the proposals. Mr. Collier asked if the Committee wanted Mr. Hoskins, Ms. Cowan, and him to also score the proposals. The Committee answered in the affirmative. Ms. Talentinow handed Conflict of Interest forms to Mr. Hoskins, Mr. Collier, and Ms. Cowan.

Mr. Gillespie asked if the Committee would see every proposal submitted. Ms. Talentinow said that she would look at the proposals and tell the Committee if any seemed non-responsive and could possibly be rejected; otherwise, the Committee would see every proposal.

Mr. Hoskins said that after all the bids are scored, Ms. Talentinow will facilitate a discussion to help those that scored the proposals understand the final rankings. Ms. Talentinow said that each person will look at the proposals on their own and use the score card provided in the meeting packet to score the proposals. The scorers identify the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal before assigning them a point score for the category. She said that the RFP asks proposers to provide specific information in their proposal, and if the firm has done that, they would typically score near the top. Mr. Hoskins said that as long as each scorer remains consistent in their scoring, the process will be consistent.

Ms. Talentinow said that after all individuals have scored the proposals, they will meet and develop a consensus score: an average of all of the scores, so long as each individual is comfortable with the score. If there is a discrepancy between how scorers rated the proposals, Ms. Talentinow will facilitate a discussion on why the scorers rated the proposals a certain way so that the scorers may reach a consensus on a score. The top rated firms can then be identified, and the Committee can determine which firms they would like to interview. Mr. Collier said that an electronic version of the score card will be sent out to the Committee members after the meeting.

**GENERAL MANAGER RECRUITMENT: COMMUNITY MEMBERS' INVOLVEMENT:** Mr. Collier presented the Committee with a list of community leaders who had been contacted during the previous general manager recruitment process; Mr. Collier updated the list to reflect any positions that had new people in those roles. Mr. Collier said that he and Mr. Hoskins would interview a few of the contacts on the list to gain input into the selection process, but asked that the Committee provide them with any additional contacts with whom Mr. Collier and Mr. Hoskins should speak. He said that they would make every effort to meet with Springfield City Manager Gino Grimaldi and Eugene City Manager Jon Ruiz.

Ms. Grossman recommended speaking to a representative of Better Eugene-Springfield Transit (BEST), specifically Rob Zako. She also recommended speaking to George Grier from LaneACT and Gerry Gaydos. Mr. Wildish recommended speaking to Rob Bennett. Mr. Hoskins said that he would like to have some discussions with users of the transit system. Mr. Wildish said that employees of Pearl Buck use the system. He said that Jan Aho may be a good contact for Pearl Buck. Mr. Gillespie said that it may be advantageous to speak to someone from Alternative Work Concepts and the Valley Van Program.

Mr. Hoskins said that he and Mr. Collier will speak to Jon Ruiz and Gino Grimaldi to get their perspectives as executives in the community. Ms. Grossman recommended speaking to David Funk, as he will ask difficult questions and is knowledgeable about the community. Mr. Gillespie recommended speaking to Steve Lee and Jozef Siekiel-Zdzienicki. Mr. Collier said that he and Mr.

Hoskins will speak to a few individuals on the contact list and report back to the Committee. He said that afterwards, the Committee could split the list and gain feedback on general manager qualities.

**GENERAL MANAGER RECRUITMENT PROCESS AND TIMELINE:** Mr. Collier said that the RFP closes on Friday, May 1. He said that having December 1 as the anticipated start date for the new general manager creates an aggressive timeline. To stay on schedule, the Committee will need to meet during the next week to discuss the RFP scores; the week of May 13 would be reserved for conducting phone interviews with potential executive search firms.

Mr. Collier said that he believes it's important to understand that the recruitment process isn't about merely completing the process as quickly as possible. He said that it is important that everything in the process is done correctly and that LTD finds the candidate that will best fit the organization. With the timeline, the goal is for the Board to select an executive search firm by June 8 at the latest. Mr. Hoskins clarified that the first deadline for selecting an executive search firm is May 20, but the final deadline is June 8.

Mr. Hoskins said that an additional Board meeting will be held in the next couple of weeks for Board members to begin discussing the leadership characteristics desired in the next general manager.

Mr. Hoskins said that in the BEST meeting he attended earlier in the day, he told the attendees that the Committee needs to formulate questions for community members that will prompt them to respond with the behavioral characteristics that they believe would be advantageous for the new general manager. Sample questions could pertain to what LTD's role is and how the District may become more attractive to the community. Such questions may prompt community members to think about what they value in LTD. He said that another possible question for community leaders would be to ask how *they* engage the hearts and minds of their employees and prompt them to move forward.

Mr. Hoskins said that LTD's Board of Directors is a relatively new Board, and he would like the Board members to begin to think about their roles in the organization. He said that in many organizations, Board members provide a particular skillset or perspective to the organization. One or two members typically serve to expand the Board's perspective or bring connections. In business, a member might understand a new market segment that is important to the growth expansion and possess connections that may make such a market accessible to the organization. He said that as a Board member of LTD, the higher up a person is in an organization, the more a person's role shifts from technical to relationship building in the community.

Mr. Hoskins said that the last strategic decision a Board made, other than the founding pieces of the organization, was to pursue bus rapid transit; and that was 20 years ago. He said that the Board should begin to consider the overall direction of the organization. He added that there has been beneficial change in the organization, regarding new employees and dialogue within LTD.

Mr. Wildish noted that he sees one of the roles of Board members as public relations. He added that he would like to know more about various projects in which LTD is involved. Mr. Hoskins said that he has received feedback about community engagement being an important piece in LTD's future direction.

Ms. Grossman said that she believes that the staff are fully capable of managing LTD's various projects; Mr. Gillespie and Mr. Wildish concurred. Mr. Gillespie asked what the role of LTD's

employees would be in the general manager recruitment process. He said that he would like to see employees involved in the interview process.

Mr. Hoskins said that the Committee could form an external group of community members from the community members who will be interviewed. He said that if there were a group of approximately 10 individuals that would commit to serving as an outside opinion, than such a group could serve as a resource if the executive search firm had questions they wanted answered. He said that both representatives of union and non-union employees have expressed interest in being involved in the process, and that they could be included in the process.

**NEXT MEETING:** The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for Monday, May 4, 2015.

**ADJOURNMENT:** There was no further discussion, and the meeting adjourned at 3:42 p.m.

---

Recording Secretary