#### CITY OF PASADENA REDISTRICTING TASK FORCE

SEPTEMBER 19, 2001 - 7:00 P.M.

#### City Hall Management Conference Room, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Room 323 100 North Garfield Avenue

### SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES 7:00 P.M.

Chair Crowfoot called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

Members Present: Gilbert Cadena, Michael Coppess, Chair Bill Crowfoot, Vannia

De La Cuba, Maguerite Hougasian, Richard McDonald, Jean

Owen, Timothy Wendler

Absent:

Joel Bryant

Staff Present:

Scott Rasmussen, Assistant City Attorney

Prentice Deadrick, Assistant City Manager

Jane Rodriguez, City Clerk

### CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by Chair Crowfoot at 7:02 p.m.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

There were no public comments.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES - AUGUST 27, 2001

It was moved by Member Wendler, seconded by Member Coppess, to approve the minutes of August 27, 2001. (Motion unanimously carried) (Absent: Member Bryant)

### REVIEW OF TASK FORCE ACTION PLAN TIMETABLE

The Committee accepted the Task Force Action plan.

# MEETING LOCATION FOR REGULAR MEETINGS/SCHEDULING OF PUBLIC HEARING(S)

It was noted that Members McDonald, Owen, and Hougasian would not be available to meet on October 3, 2001.

The Task Force Committee agreed to meet on Saturday, the 29<sup>th</sup> of September, to interview the final candidates for the Redistricting Consultant. The interviews would take place at the City Hall Management Conference Room, 3rd Floor.

The Committee agreed to conduct future meetings in City Hall Management Conference Room 323 until such time that additional public participation is expected. The City Clerk noted the Council Chambers are reserved and may be utilized when public participation required a larger venue. In response to a question, the City Clerk noted the Task Force budget allows for one televised meeting which is targeted for a public hearing.

## REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF REDISTRICTING CONSULTANT CANDIDATE PROPOSALS

Mr. Scott Rasmussen, Assistant City Attorney, provided a brief summary of the process and the methods for rating the Redistricting Consultant. He distributed a rating sheet indicating the ratings per category and the three different methods of calculating the proposals. He also indicated that some of the submitted proposals included services for outreach consulting and attorney fees in addition to redistricting.

Task Force members disclosed their individual scores for each proposer for the experience category, which were tabulated and resulted in the following group scores (out of a total of 70 allotted points):

<u>Proposer</u>	Experience Points
Pactech Data and Research, Inc.	62.28
National Demographics Corporation	59.28
Guerra and Associates	58.0
The Institute for Urban Research and Development	56.14
Cris Cofer	39.71
Reapportionment Group	37.28

It was noted that the proposal for Institute of Urban Research and Development (IURD) was in a price range. The scoring of the proposals for the price category used three methodologies: Method 1 was based on IURD's average price; Method 2 on IURD's low price; and Method 3 was based on IURD's high cost.

Discussion ensued regarding the weight to be given to the written RFP's and the interview process, the necessary qualities of the selected Consultant, and the number of finalists to interview.

Following discussion, it was moved by Member McDonald, seconded by Member Owen, to interview The Institute for Urban Research and Development, Guerra and Associates, National Demographics Corporation, and Pactech Data and Research, Inc. on September 29, 2001; that the interview scale be 0-100 points; and that the interview score be added to the points on the evaluation criteria. (Motion carried, with Members Wendler and Coppess objecting) (Absent: Member Bryant)

Discussion ensued concerning the proposals that included outreach consulting, ranges for services; and whether or not to leave the inclusions concerning outreach services out of the calculations.

After further discussion, it was agreed that Method Three would be utilized for the rating of the proposals.

Mr. Rasmussen requested to receive direction in order to validate the scoring system

used from the City's Purchasing Administrator.

It was moved by Member McDonald, seconded by Member Cadena, to direct staff to validate the numbers and provide to the Task Force before the 29th of September, with the number for each of the four finalist on to which the Task Force would be tacking the scores from the interviews; and the method of tabulating using Methodology Three. (Motion unanimously carried) (Absent: Member Bryant)

Chair Crowfoot requested staff provide one score for each proposal and not variations; and to advise the Task Force of the methodology used to calculate the scores.

#### **OUTREACH CONSULTANT**

The City Clerk suggested to the Task Force doing a separate RPF process for the Outreach Consultant, as this would allow an equal opportunity for other outreach vendors as well as the proposers to bid on the project.

It was the consensus of the Task Force to obtain an Outreach Consultant.

Chair Crowfoot requested that the RFP process for the Outreach Consultant be completed by September 29, 2001, if possible.

The City Clerk indicated that September 29th was a very tight timeframe, however, a best effort would be given to meet the timeframe. She further provided an overview of the anticipated work to be performed by the Outreach Consultant.

It was noted that it was important for the Outreach Consultant to be able to handle diversity in the community and have access to a variety of languages.

Mr. Rasmussen expressed that he believed it was important to clarify the attorney services referenced in two of the proposals and that he would like to prepare a letter to have the consultants provide answers, in writing, concerning the attorney services mentioned in their proposals.

Discussion ensued regarding the interpretations of the attorney roles to the consulting firms, preparation of a letter requesting clarification, distribution of the letter to the Task Force, and having this issue addressed during the interviews of the candidates.

It was the consensus of the Task Force to have Mr. Rasmussen prepare a letter to the two proposers so that a written response could be provided to the Task Force at the time of the interview.

Mr. Douglas Johnson, National Demographic Corporation, offered comments regarding the rating system.

Discussion ensued as to the process for the oral interviews. There was a general consensus that from 8:30 a.m. through 9:00 a.m., the Task Force would review and discuss the interview questions, that the four interviews would be scheduled in half hour intervals from 9:00 a.m. through 11:00 a.m., and from 11:00 through 11:30 a.m., the Task Force would rate and select the top candidate.

Chair Crowfoot requested that Task Force members forward any particular questions for the interviews to Mr. Rasmussen.

A question was raised regarding whether or not the interview process was subject to the Brown Act.

It was noted that the meeting was considered an open meeting. However, Mr. Rasmussen indicated that he would research the matter.

# WORK TO BE ACCOMPLISHED BEFORE THE NEXT MEETING/AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING

Chair Crowfoot requested that future agendas include and item for comments from the Task Force members.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

čitv Clerk

On order of the Chair, the meeting adjourned at 9:27 p.m.

Bill Crowfoot, Chair