

STURGEON
COUNTY[illegible]

ARROWUTILITIES.CA    



	<p>Steven vanNieuwkerk requested that his comments be forwarded to CEO Polkovsky and Director de Bruijn. He began by asking whether it was appropriate to issue the RFP on ARROW Utilities letterhead.</p> <p>Jeff Acker responded that the Board does not have natural person powers and must therefore rely on ARROW Administration to post the RFP, filter responses, and manage the process.</p> <p>Steven vanNieuwkerk then raised the issue about whether issuing the RFP could negatively impact the reputation of ARROW Utilities.</p> <p>Ken MacKay replied that the Subcommittee concluded the intent of the review was to build external confidence in ARROW's operations.</p> <p>Steven vanNieuwkerk sought clarification on whether the review would prioritize governance or finance, noting that the original Board motion referenced the financial review first.</p> <p>Ken MacKay confirmed there was no precedence of one over the other.</p> <p>Steven vanNieuwkerk commented further that he did not believe the Board had a bylaw on procurement practices, noting this should be aligned with best practices.</p> <p>Ken MacKay reiterated that the Board must rely on Administration to facilitate postings and related procurement processes.</p>	
--	---	--



	<p>CEO Polkovsky recommended that all inquiries from respondents be submitted in writing by a set deadline rather than addressed verbally to mirror how the auditor request for proposal process is handled.</p> <p>Steven vanNieuwkerk then suggested adding a pricing table to ensure comparability among proposals, along with clarification on lump-sum pricing and cost breakdowns.</p> <p>CEO Polkovsky noted that Director Mason could assist with an example of evaluation weightings.</p> <p>Ken MacKay asked that CEO Polkovsky send this to Jeff Acker for inclusion in the RFP.</p> <p>CEO Polkovsky also proposed including unit and hourly rates for clarity.</p> <p>Steven vanNieuwkerk raised the need for a background documents section, so proponents are clear on what resources will be available.</p> <p>CEO Polkovsky recommended that the RFP include a generic listing of documents available to respondents.</p> <p>Steven vanNieuwkerk also noted the need to clarify the role of ARROW staff in the process, as the RFP only explicitly referenced Board involvement via interviews.</p> <p>Ken MacKay agreed this should be stated clearly.</p>	
--	--	--



	<p>Regarding Section 4.1 of the draft, Steven vanNieuwkerk suggested removing language that focused particularly on Train 4, cautioning that a deep dive into that area could be costly.</p> <p>Jeff Acker explained it was included as a case study example.</p> <p>Brian Kelly commented that Train 4 was a significant driver of organizational activity and should be included at least as a portion of the review, suggesting 10–20% of the effort.</p> <p>Steven vanNieuwkerk suggested balancing this by listing 3–4 focus areas, such as budget presentations, Train 4, the UMP, and the full budget approval process.</p> <p>Rob Wiedeman asked whether it would be acceptable for respondents to subcontract elements of the work and whether there was sufficient time for responses.</p> <p>Ken MacKay responded that timelines were tight given the September 26 budget and municipal appointments, and the award would likely fall to the new Board.</p> <p>Steven vanNieuwkerk raised concerns regarding the broad language in Section 3, suggesting Board goals should be explicitly stated.</p> <p>Jeff Acker pointed to Section 2.2, which outlines goals.</p> <p>Steven vanNieuwkerk suggested they be explicitly tied to Board Goals. He also noted that Section 10 lacked clear</p>	
--	--	--



	<p>evaluation criteria, recommending weightings such as price and content.</p> <p>On the subject of payment terms, Steven vanNieuwkerk questioned whether the Board had authority to set these and whether ARROW would be able to withstand the payment terms set by the Board.</p> <p>CEO Polkovsky noted that legislatively, 30 days would be the maximum, and invoices would be signed by Administration in line with Board direction.</p> <p>Brian Kelly asked whether the Board had passed a resolution to amend the 2025 budget for the \$150,000 for conducting the review.</p> <p>CEO Polkovsky stated that a motion to allocate the funds could be made today.</p> <p>William Choy advised that a motion to amend the 2025 budget was unnecessary, noting that the expense would be allocated to the 2026 operating budget since the original motion did not specify a budget year and, given the timing, payment is unlikely to occur in 2025.</p> <p>CEO Polkovsky explained that if any invoice was received in December 2025, for example, it would be addressed through a contingency fund.</p> <p>Brian Kelly asked for clarification on whether the existing Board or the incoming Board would award the contract.</p> <p>Ken MacKay stated that, given the timing, the award could not be made before the</p>	
--	--	--



	<p>current Board's final meeting on September 26, 2025, and would therefore take place in November under the new Board.</p> <p>Steven vanNieuwkerk asked whether a legal review of the RFP could be completed.</p> <p>CEO Polkovsky advised that once the Subcommittee has incorporated the desired changes into the RFP, they will send back to Administration who will then have a legal review completed. Following that review, Administration will forward the findings back to the Subcommittee.</p> <p>The Board discussed whether it was necessary to meet again to review the Draft RFP with the changes proposed at the August 18, 2025, Special Meeting.</p> <p>William Choy said that aside from wording changes, nothing substantive had changed in the proposal, and recommended going forward with issuing the RFP after the changes were made by the Subcommittee.</p> <p>BM42-25</p> <p>MOVED BY Ken MacKay THAT the Board direct the Subcommittee to work with Administration based on the updates to the RFP at the August 18, 2025, Special Board Meeting, and direct Administration to post the amended RFP to Alberta Purchasing Connect 2 business days after finalization.</p>	
--	--	--



		APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY
Closing Remarks/Adjournment	Chair Ken MacKay adjourned the meeting at 10:03 am.	
Next Meeting	September 26, 2025.	

These minutes approved this _____ day of _____, 2025.

ARROW Utilities Board Chairperson

Chief Executive Officer

Recorder:

Layne Quickstad

Executive Assistant

UNADOPTED