Montana Public Employees' Retirement Board
RFP Committee Meeting Minutes
July 26, 2006

The RFP Committee meeting was called to order at 10:00 on Wednesday, July 26, 2006. Committee members present were: Board members Elizabeth Nedrow and Terry Smith, by conference call, Employee Investment Advisory Council member Jim Christnacht, Paula Stoll and Mary Spaulding, and MPERA staff members Melanie Symons by phone, Rob Virts and Kathy Samson. Brad Sanders and Devin Garrity from the State Procurement Bureau were also in attendance.

The Committee started with review and approval of the July 12, 2006 meeting minutes.

The Committee started with discussion and questions for Mr. Sanders and Mr. Garrity relative to some of the standard RFP template language and processes. The areas with the most questions were relative to:

- non-responsive or non-responsible determinations; who makes them and when
- offerors and the Board's opportunities to correct or clarify
- minimum points standard or points assigned
- ability to adjust points or previous criteria.

The general answers were:

- non-responsive or non-responsible determinations can be made any time throughout the process by either State Procurement or the Board
- the Board may initiate clarification questions to offerors as often or many times as needed
- offerors may only ask their clarification questions through the process and during the clarification period
- criteria and points assigned must be stated in the RFP; once stated they are pretty much set in concrete; some flexible language such as "up to XX points or % may be used."

The Committee also had significant questions relative to the Board's interview and how it is scored. Mr. Sanders and Mr. Garrity specified that assigning points to the Board interviews is optional. However, if points are assigned, the criteria for the Board's points and number of points must be defined in the RFP. Generally, in this case, the points for the written responses are added to the points for the Board interview to determine the highest scoring offeror.

Alternatively, if points are not assigned in the RFP, the criteria for the Board interviews may be developed based upon the written responses and the previously established criteria. The results from the Board interviews are then used to "modify" the previous scores and determine the highest scoring offeror. The Committee generally felt the second option would be difficult as the Board will not be doing any of the original scoring of the written responses. Uhmmm…things to think about.

The Committee then began their review of the Recordkeeping Services Scope of Services. In this area, the Committee spent the majority of the time reviewing and discussing the website capabilities, the voice response system and customer service representatives' services. The

Committee thought that, generally, that recordkeeping of account balances and trading requirements were probably fairly standard services and decided to focus more on those services that may be distinguishable or noticed more by plan participants. This resulted in further break-out of these three named services and addition of some possible requirements for the customer service representatives including specified training on the plans with MPERA staff.

The Committee finished by setting the next meeting date and agreeing that each individual would review the Scope of Services and provide their individual comments, corrections or additions to Kathy. This process would free up the Committee to begin work at the next meeting on the Evaluation Section.

The meeting next meeting was set for August 11 and 8:30 am in the PERB boardroom.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:00 p.m.