Approval of 2006-2005 Scope of Work for Submission to the Board

Scopes of Work

Don expressed that the ultimate objective of the meeting is to come up with a recommendation to give to the CCC Board of Directors. He asked the Advisory Council if there were any minor refinements or input on the previously sent scopes.

1. Ken informed the group that PG&E was in the process of addressing the existing building program design issue on their own. They have hired Jim Flannigan to do this. They will be using the PEC tool lending library. The CCC needs to coordinate with the Utilities to make sure that the work is not overlapping. The CCC should take a high-level perspective. The utilities are constrained by the PUC’s requirements and the goal for the next 3 years is to reduce energy. Ken asked that this be represented in the Program Design project (Program 1, Subproject 1). The project should address what the characteristics of a good program are, a best practices approach, and should identify program characteristics that work for all sides.

2. Scott would like to add Facilities Management Institute (FMI) to the list of owner groups to reach out to (Program 2, Subproject 5).

3. Scott asked if there were any projected numbers of the demand for commissioning providers. Phil said that this was an interesting idea, but the complexity of the scope would make it a very rough estimate. Phil
recommended that we bring it up at the next meeting. It will be added to the Educational Analysis and Development of Educational Opportunities project (Program 5, Subproject 3).

4. Scott brought up the idea that commissioning would be a good educational opportunity for consultants and engineers. It would give them opportunity for in building work. By consultants and engineers getting commissioning experience in the beginning parts of their careers, the need for building commissioning in the future would be reduced. We should possibly wrap this into the Controls Training project (Program 3, Subproject 4).

All members approved the slate of projects for recommendation to the board:

*The CCC Advisory Council has worked over many months to develop the attached slate of research and development projects. The feeling of the Advisory Committee is that these projects need to be conducted for CCC to perform its mission and achieve its objectives. Each of the projects has been ranked and the priorities noted reflect the Council’s sense of the importance of each project. The Council recommends that the CCC Board of Directors conduct all of the recommended projects. If funding is not available to conduct all of them, then we recommend that you conduct as many as possible with the highest priorities being conducted first.*

**Contract Selection Process**

David Jump requested that the projects be sent out to bid. Phil explained that the operational process that is currently in place is that some projects are given to staff, some are sole sourced, and some are put out to bid. Several people asked for clarification of the bid process. There was concern about bidding on price. Phil explained that the bid process would allow for different groups to provide a slightly different scope at a slightly different price. The budgets on these scopes are rough estimates and may be off. The bid process would allow for some flexibility and would ensure that the budgets are in line. Phil said that if anyone wanted to vet the process before it went to the Board, they are welcome to. It was recommended that we use different process for selecting contractors based on the size of the project. It was also recommended that an outside group (to the pre-qualified list) set the criteria for implementation. Pete would like this process to be as transparent as possible.

Don recommended that we send it to the board as is, but with the wording “We further recommend that project be done by a variety of contractors and that the Board should identify the programs that they would like to be done by contractors. The Board should develop criteria that the Advisory Council can use to suggest a process for selecting contactors for projects.”

All members voted for the following recommendation to the Board:
We further recommend that projects be done by a variety of contractors and that the Board should identify the programs that they would like to be done by contractors. The Board should develop criteria that the Advisory Council can use to suggest a process for selecting contractors for projects.

Advisory Council Organization and Meetings
Glen asked about the structure and development of the Advisory Council. How long do they serve? How are they replaced? This will be a topic for the next meeting.

Scott recommended that we have a call one month ahead of the advisory council meetings to develop the agenda.

It was also recommended that we ask attendees if they want to have any announcements added to the agenda, and ask that background materials be made available beforehand to reduce the time needed in the meeting.

Next Meeting
The next Advisory Council Meeting will be May 16th in Southern California

Agenda for May 16th Meeting
1. Structure and management of the Advisory Council
2. Discuss decision by Board of Directors regarding 2006-2007 program plan
3. Project Monitoring Sub-committees and Advisor assigned to oversee each project
4. Discussion of inputs needed for near-term projects (Market Development, Program Design, and Toolkit projects)
5. Summary presentations of existing Cx, RCx, and MBCx program structures
6. Open mike, both spontaneous and pre-arranged announcements.

Action Items
1. Make the minor refinements to the scopes
2. Send updated scopes of work to the Board
3. Find someone to host the Southern California meeting
4. Post materials and a short synopsis from the Green Construction meeting
5. Send out request for announcements for the next AC meeting