



The COMET Committee Meeting Minutes are prepared and presented in summary form, audio recordings of the meetings are on file at The COMET and are part of the approved minutes. If you would like to hear the recording from the meeting, please contact Paige Jernigan at cometadmin@thecometsc.gov.

Per SC Code of laws, Title 30, Chapter 4, Section 30-4-80 - - Per SC Code of Laws, Title 30, Chapter 4, Section 30-4-80 All public bodies shall notify persons or organizations, local news media, or such other news media as may request notification of the times, dates, places, and agenda of all public meetings, whether scheduled, rescheduled, or called, and the efforts made to comply with this requirement must be noted in the minutes of the meetings. The COMET complied with the notification of this meeting on Wednesday, November 22, 2019 at 3:15 p.m.

**Central Midlands Regional Transit Authority
TRANSIT OPERATOR RFP SUBCOMMITTEE WORKING GROUP MEETING
Monday, November 25, 2019 -11:00 A.M.
3613 Lucius Road, Columbia, SC 29201 - Small Conference Room**

Members Present:

John V. Furgess, Sr.
Andy Smith

Guests Present:

Leo Auger, Auger Consulting*
Col. (R) Roger Leaks, Jr.
Lill Mood
Dr. Robert Morris

Absent:

Derrick Huggins

**Indicates participation by phone.*

The COMET Staff Present

John Andoh, Executive Director/CEO
LeRoy Deschamps, Director of Administration & Operations/COO
Paige Jernigan, Administrative & Customer Service Specialist
Dr. Arlene Prince, Director of Regulatory Compliance & Civil Rights Officer

1. CALL TO ORDER & DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Mr. Furgess, Vice Chair delegated Ms. Mood to serve as the acting Chair in Mr. Huggins absence. The meeting was called to order at 11:11 a.m. by Ms. Mood.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Motion:

A motion was made Mr. Furgess and seconded by Mr. Smith to adopt the agenda.

Approved: Furgess, Smith

Absent: Huggins



Motion passed.

3. DISCUSSION & ACTION ITEMS

A. Discuss Draft Request for Proposals Scope of Work

In continuation to the meeting held on November 20, 2019 Mr. Auger reviewed slide 11, Staffing Qualifications. He mentioned that the main qualities for the General Manager, based on feedback from the Request for Information meeting are leadership skills, team management, accountability and transit knowledge were important characteristics in the contractor's key personnel.

Dr. Morris asked how transit knowledge is measured? Mr. Auger explained that it is a combination of years of experience and their transit knowledge to put service on the street. Dr. Morris suggested quantifying the number of years of experience. Ms. Mood agreed. Mr. Auger suggested using a range of experience, for example 8-10 years.

It was deliberated and concluded to use the verbiage of "3-5 years of executive transit management experience or equivalent." If the candidate does not fall in the range of experience, then the Evaluation Committee should ask for clarification on how to lessen that risk. Mr. Furgess specified that with the usage of the word "management," may block upward mobility.

Mr. Auger added that typically the support staff has the opportunity for advancement, upward mobility. Mr. Andoh stated that if we support upward mobility in the key personnel, we need to be set to be the training ground for that candidate. It was determined that Mr. Andoh and Mr. Auger would choose a candidate based on industry standards and expertise.

Mr. Andoh mentioned that by defining "key personnel," we are identifying the staff, in the past, the Contractor identified the key personnel for us. Mr. Andoh referred to slide 13 and added that the underlined support positions are new, and they may be subcontracted. Discussion continued regarding certain positions: Administrative Analyst, Safety and Training Specialist and Customer Service Analyst. Mr. Smith stated that we should use the term "support functions" instead of "support positions."

Mr. Auger stated that we will not provide a suggested number of functions, but they will have access to our present Contractor for comparison. Mr. Andoh added that the ratio (example, mechanics to buses) will be important in finding a Contractor. Mr. Andoh stated that the Cooperative Research Board and the Federal Transit Authority have set the ratios for industry standards.

Mr. Andoh referred to slide 14 and detailed that this is sample key personnel language that Capital Metro uses, and many agencies use this as their template. He reviewed the Qualifications of Staff section and the Staff Guarantee portion. He then described the evaluation process provided for the General Manager in this contract sample. Mr. Andoh pointed out that the contract language used



here, states that “key personnel should have a minimum of four (4) years of recent, (within the past eight (8) years) experience in their field of expertise managing a transit operation of similar size, scope and complexity.”

Mr. Andoh discussed slide 16 and noted that currently there are vacant positions at Transdev so implementation of 8.5.2 which states “the Service Provider shall maintain the Key Personnel” identified in the proposal will prevent this issue in the future contract. He specified that the contractor will have an opportunity to request a change in service in a separate section.

Mr. Andoh referenced slide 17, 8.5.5 addresses liquidated damages if change in General Manager occurs within twenty-four (24) months of the contract start date. He then referenced 8.5.6 and explained the liquidated damages for a vacancy lasting more than sixty (60) days.

Mr. Auger mentioned that if an interim is put into place, the liquidated damage would not apply. Mr. Andoh asked that if an interim comes in and they are paid at a lower salary, should that equal a rebate of fixed salary? Discussion occurred and it was agreed that a rebate would be arranged.

Mr. Andoh reviewed 8.5.8 which outlines the replacement of key personnel and an expectation of a high level of respect for the Board and entity. This allows us the opportunity to interview and have input in the proposed key personnel.

Mr. Andoh reviewed 8.5.9 which covers the General Manager as being the representative of the contract and that person will supervise the work of the contract employees. He added that the Executive Director will communicate with the General Manager directly and not the contractor staff if issues arise. It was explained that the “duly authorized representative of the General Manager as designated in writing” would mean a short/long term leave and the appointment of the acting General Manager.

Mr. Andoh explained 8.5.10 stressed the importance of customer service in general.

Mr. Andoh reviewed 8.5.11 outlining the process of temporary or long-term absence with the key personnel. He stressed this would not include personnel with earned leave or vacation time. The Committee agreed that the important thing is this is communicated clearly, and someone is designated to take on responsibility.

Mr. Andoh briefly reviewed the following:

8.5.12. A 90-day notice if key personnel is leaving.

8.6.4. The service provider is required to attend periodic meetings, etc.



8.6.5 states that no key personnel will live outside the service area served by CMRTA without proper approval. It was discussed that living close by supports availability. Dr. Morris further added that the penny tax could impact the location of where the key personnel resides. Mr. Smith suggested developing language that allows living within the designated area after a six-month appointment or more for flexibility.

Mr. Andoh briefly touched on 3.15, 1, 2, 3 regarding copies of headways for fixed route service, run cutting services and schedule information to meet the obligations for selection of work. On time performance was discussed.

Mr. Auger referred to the Proposed Key Performance Indicators Incentive and Disincentives Program, slide 22. The incentives and disincentives goal proposed is 85%. Dr. Morris questioned if these numbers were being compared to other transit agencies. Mr. Auger agreed and stated that this number is reasonable in comparison. Mr. Andoh mentioned that at mid-year of the contract, The COMET could make changes to this goal number. Ms. Mood added that it would encourage all working closely with the City to examine routes, stops, etc.

Mr. Furgess mentioned that our current Key Performance Indicators could impact the incoming contractor. He suggested that the contractor should get a six (6) month grace period to study the key indicators but overall this number should not decrease. All agreed. It was discussed that Mr. Andoh would work with Davis and Floyd, Mr. Warren, to see if the bus stops could be consolidated to help with On Time Performance percentage.

Mr. Auger gave examples of liquidated damages: Minority Based Enterprise compliance, maintenance related failures, safety and security related issues, vehicle cleanliness, administrative requirements and reporting and operational related failures. He added that the contractor has the right to explain the unmet requirement providing documentation and collaborative analysis, if so, no charge would be assessed.

Mr. Auger stated that the Prime Contractor should submit a base bid and have innovation concepts as a separate option. We are proposing changing the contract from five (5) year plus five (5) one-year option to five (5) years plus a three (3)-year option plus an additional two (2)-year option, totaling ten (10) years. We are asking for five (5)-year proposal pricing only, with Consumer Price Index for option years. He added that we will evaluate price based on the 5 years cost without startup cost. Mr. Auger stated that the startup cost is negotiable and will vary per company. Mr. Andoh stated that we will need to let the bidders know that the last two years could be impacted due to the penny tax.



Mr. Auger referred to slide 27, regarding the evaluation criteria. Mr. Auger explained the evaluation criteria: company qualifications, key staff qualifications, Minority Business Enterprise Participation, Innovation, and Pricing.

Breakdown of scoring criteria:

- Company qualifications - 20 points
- Key staff qualifications - 30 points (key emphasis due to current contractor)
- MBE Participation - 20 points
- Innovation - 10 points
- Pricing - 20 points (scored last)

Ms. Mood questioned who should be asked to participate on the Evaluation Committee. Mr. Andoh stated that the people need to be highly technical and it is not advised to have Board members sit on this Committee.

Evaluation Committee recommendations:

- Transit Consultant - Mr. Auger (technical piece)
- Staff - (2) Mr. DesChamps, Dr. Prince
- Legal - Attorney Baker (procurement, rules, regulations)
- State selected official

It was discussed that if the recommendation from the Evaluation Committee is not chosen, the Board would authorize the Executive Director to negotiate between the top candidates after detailed staff/Evaluation Committee analysis.

Timeline for the Committee:

- Draft in advance by December 9, 2019 (scope only)
- Committee meeting December 16, 2019 at 11:00 a.m.
- Draft to Board on December 19, 2019 (Note: this is a change in Board meeting date)

Mr. Auger summarized the Request for Proposals Schedule:

Friday, December 20, 2019	Publish/Release RFP
Tuesday, January 7, 2020	Pre Proposal Meeting
Friday, January 10, 2020	Questions from Proposers (upwards of 100 questions)
Friday, January 17, 2020	Answers to Questions (published online)
Friday, February 14, 2020	Proposals Due
February 25 -27, 2020	Interviews/Presentations
Wednesday, March 25, 2020	Board of Directors meeting to award the contract



Wednesday, July 1, 2020

Commencement date for Fixed Route,
Flex Route and Paratransit Services

4. ADJOURN

Motion:

A motion was made by Mr. Furgess and seconded by Dr. Morris to adjourn the meeting.
The meeting ended at 2:16 p.m.


CENTRAL MIDLANDS REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY

Adopted this _____, 2019, Agenda Item _____

Prepared by:

Paige Jernigan, Administrative & Customer Service Specialist

Approved by:



Andy Smith, Secretary