

**Minutes**  
*Berrien County Transit Consolidation Feasibility Study*  
*Selection Committee Meeting*  
 February 7, 2011  
 8:00 AM, Berrien County Admin. Building Room 4C

<b>STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:</b>	Juan Ganum, City of Niles Community Development Bill Marx, City of Buchanan Bill Purvis, Twin Cities Area Transportation Authority / Twin Cities Dial-A-Ride Dennis Schuh, Berrien County Transportation / Community Development Dick Stauffer, Lincoln Township (No-service area)
<b>SOUTHWEST MICHIGAN PLANNING COMMISSION (SWMPC) STAFF PRESENT:</b>	Kim Gallagher Christina Pippen Anna Rahtz
<b>OTHERS PRESENT:</b>	Kelly Getman-Dissette, Niles Dial-A-Ride Transit Deb Panozzo, Berrien County Board of Commissioners

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

- Rahtz called the meeting to order at 8:06 A.M. and led the group in introductions.

**2. PURPOSE OF STUDY:**

- Rahtz gave an overview of the purpose of the Berrien County Transit Consolidation Feasibility Study, stating that it was determined to be the next necessary step by the Berrien Coordinated Transportation Coalition, a group of transit agency staff and social service agency staff that was formed in 2009 during the development of the Transit – Human Services Coordination Plan.

**3. WORK PLAN AND OUTLINE OF PROCESS:**

- Rahtz gave an overview of the study timeline. She stated that SWMPC is hoping to schedule interviews with the top tier of candidates sometime in March, gain approval for the hiring of the selected consultant at the April SWMPC board meeting, and then kick off the project in May. The study timeline is 29 months; however, Rahtz mentioned that several proposers are proposing to complete the project in a shorter period of time.
- Getman-Dissette mentioned that Niles DART just selected RLS Consultants to complete a Transit Development Plan for them. This is a ten-month study process. There was discussion of how the data gathered for this plan could be used in the Berrien County Transit Consolidation Feasibility Study.

**4. FINALIZE WEIGHTED CRITERIA FOR CONSULTANT SELECTION:**

- Rahtz mentioned that she had sent out a draft criteria sheet for the committee members to use in selecting the consultants. Schuh had been the only one who had responded about the weights for the criteria, so she had included his weights on the scoring sheet but would like to invite discussion about which criteria should carry which weights.
- Stauffer asked if the criteria match up exactly with the requirements in the Request for Proposals (RFP) so that the committee members can easily find them. Rahtz responded no, but she could change the criteria to what the committee members would like to use.
- Rahtz also mentioned that she and Schuh had been discussing the fact that “Completeness” should not be scored because if a proposal is not complete, it should be disqualified. However, she passed out a chart she had made showing whether each proposer had met each requirement of the RFP. There were several requirements that had not been met by several proposers; thus it is not black and white whether a proposal is complete or not.
- There was discussion about which requirements should be “disqualifiers” and which should not. It was

decided that Task Descriptions and Management Approach are substantial enough pieces of a proposal that proposals missing those requirements should be disqualified. Other requirements, such as Statement of Conflicts of Interest, Title VI Assurance, Proof of Insurance Requirements, Work Samples, and Proposal Signature, could be obtained from the proposers at a later date without impacting their eligibility to be considered. It was noted that there may have been a misunderstanding of these particular requirements in the wording of the RFP.

- Because of failure to include task descriptions and/or management approach sections, three of the proposals were disqualified.
- Getman-Dissette asked whether assigning scores to each proposer could cause the staff to have to explain to each proposer why they had been assigned a certain score. Schuh, Purvis, and Rahtz responded that they had been told by Fred Featherly at MDOT that it is required to have a quantitative scoring system. Rahtz noted that she is documenting why each decision is being made, and will be willing to explain that to the proposers if they ask.
- Getman-Dissette offered the advice from her experience going through this process that it may not be possible to assign weighted values to each criterion at this point in the process, because committee members may find that the criteria are more or less important than they had thought once they read the proposals. She recommended still scoring each proposal on each criterion, just without a weighted value just yet.
- Gallagher suggested adding a criterion for Experience with Similar-Sized Areas and Projects, and it was agreed that this should be placed toward the top of the sheet. It was agreed that this criterion, along with Understanding of Purpose of Project and Understanding of How to Accomplish Project, would be the most important criteria for a proposer to move on to the next round of selection.
- Purvis suggested removing Completeness from the project scoring sheet because the committee had just thoroughly reviewed the completeness of each proposal and made cuts based on completeness.
- The committee members noted that the following other information would be important to consider, and Rahtz noted that she would add it to the bid information sheet:
  - Travel expense
  - Total hours of work on project
  - How much percentage of work is being done by project/firm principals

#### **5. NEXT STEPS:**

- It was decided that the committee members will review the proposals over the next few weeks. At the next meeting they will agree on three or four proposers to interview, as well as decide on weights for the scoring sheet.

#### **6. ADJOURNMENT: 9:30 A.M**

- Next meeting is February 28, 2011 at 8:00 AM at the Southwest Michigan Regional Airport.

*Compiled by: Anna Rahtz Transportation Planner, 2/7/11*