

Allegan County Board of Commissioners



County Services Building
3283 – 122nd Avenue
Allegan, MI 49010
269-673-0203 Main Office
269-686-5331 Main Fax
<http://www.allegancounty.org>

Steve McNeal, Chairman
Larry "Casey" Jones, Vice Chairman

DISTRICT 1
Terry Burns
616-403-0427
tburns@
allegancounty.org

DISTRICT 2
Steve McNeal
269-751-7271
smcneal@
allegancounty.org

DISTRICT 3
Paul VanEck
616-688-5619
pvaneck@
allegancounty.org

DISTRICT 4
Mark DeYoung
616-681-9413
mdeyoung@
allegancounty.org

DISTRICT 5
Dean Kapenga
269-751-8586
dkapenga@
allegancounty.org

DISTRICT 6
Max R. Thiele
269-673-4514
mthiele@
allegancounty.org

DISTRICT 7
Don Black
269-792-6446
dblack@
allegancounty.org

DISTRICT 8
Tom Jessup
269-637-3374
tjessup@
allegancounty.org

DISTRICT 9
Fritz Spreitzer
269-673-4131
fspreitzer@
allegancounty.org

DISTRICT 10
Jon C. Campbell
269-694-4632
jcampbell@
allegancounty.org

DISTRICT 11
Larry "Casey" Jones
269-664-5362
lcjones@
allegancounty.org

Jail Professional Services Workgroup - Draft Minutes
Thursday, April 10, 2008 - 7:30 A.M.
Nederveld Conference Room - County Services Building

County Administrator RSarro called the meeting to order at 7:40 AM.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Paul Van Eck
Commissioner Jon Campbell
Fred Anderson, Prosecuting Attorney
Mike Day, Circuit Court/FOC Administrator
Jim Hull, Undersheriff
Linda Lenahan, District Court Administrator
Rob Sarro, County Administrator
Bob Wakeman, Facilities Management Director

OTHERS:

Commissioner Steve McNeal
Denise Wilson, Executive Assistant

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1. ***Consultant (Jail Planner)*** - the goal is to get this RFP discussed and ready for the Board. We decided we would recommend the professional services of a planner, architect and CM. BButler was able to put some of these together. He thanked him for his continuing dedication in moving forward with the jail project. Pages 1-9 on each are identical. FAnderson - asked wouldn't a consultant have the expertise for doing the architect RFP. RSarro - It's a matter of checks and balances - if the consultant is allowed to run the RFP, there's a risk that there might be some bias. There has been no formal RFP to date; we did have Landmark do some preliminary services in the past.

Comments:

- MDay - asked what is sequencing for timeline is.
- RSarro - Bring on all three within six months. There may be some overlap in getting the proposals out there. Each takes approximately 90 days from start to finish.
- SMcNeal - title - "pre-bid" should be pre-proposal; trade discounts and prices - not a matter of professional services (asked if f should be deleted); on M - typically not on professional services - normally a construction item; Q - liability insurance is usually less than \$5M - one or

Mission Statement

"The Allegan County Board of Commissioners shall plan, develop, and evaluate the necessary policies and resources to ensure our county continues to progress and prosper"

two million is more ordinary. O - compliance - usually contractors, not professionals - contractors, yes. W - inside says 10% retainer; ordinary for contractors but not for professional services. It all boils down to we're asking for professional services, not a contractor.

- FAnderson - said they don't have to bid on those.
- RSarro - Q - MMRMA would review and they can comment on that portion. With respect to M - the way it's worded takes care of the fact that it doesn't allude to just services - but we can eliminate if everyone thinks so.
- SMcNeal - most planners can't even obtain performance bonding. Might not even get planners who are willing to provide it.
- RSarro - it doesn't detract or cost us anything to leave it in and just let them state whether they will comply with those sections or not. There was discussion on how issues get dealt with in the pre-bid conference.
- JCampbell - feels they would know which sections would apply or not. (Decision was to leave in section M.) Left O as is. Denise will send the RFP to Keith Potter. W - payment terms; we have paid as we go through previous projects - to keep them attentive to the project.
- MDay - would like to see the planner involved throughout the entire project.
- JCampbell - regarding F - they'll know what services they're going to offer. They won't answer and it will be taken care of in the pre-bid. Item Z talks about questions be directed to Kriss (ask her if she can answer if this section has been problematic or not).
- RSarro - would like to make sure there is one point of contact - he prefers that KKraker maintains the central process (rather than the County Administrator).
- SMcNeal - it is also important to log and publish all questions that are asked of bidders. Strike - "process for further information".
- JCampbell - wondered on page 8 if the date were respective to this project and RSarro replied - no all the dates have to be adjusted. Finance will need to put dates in there that they will be able to work with. reiterated - we can consider these sections have been discussed for all three RFP's.
- ***Pages 10 - 12*** gives information pertinent to the Sheriff Department and JHull will look through that to make sure it is accurate - staffing and population numbers. He'll get back to Administration by Tuesday.
- ***Page 13 - Section C general intent.*** BButler recommended whomever selection team is should also be the project team. Question - Do we want to make a recommendation or leave the section blank.
- JCampbell - doesn't want to presume the Board will want this group to necessarily be the project team. RSarro thinks it should be named before the project goes out. We've included it because this is the group working with it to this point, but that would need to be clarified by the

Board. Resolution stated that this team would recommend the RFP and the selection process back to the Board. JCampbell - call it out in the document since it has to be approved by the Board anyway. They'd have to approve the RFP and what they want to do with this section.

- PVanEck - doesn't think that the planner bid should be sufficient in this area.
- MDay - "unsafe conditions" should be inserted in this area somewhere. Steve - might want to include "shared medical services". Infrastructure for feeding and laundry. Jon - thinks the term should be "safety concerns" instead of "unsafe conditions".
- **Section D - background.** RSarro - asked if we should take 1-8 and make it a little more general. FAnderson suggested including PONI in the first paragraph. RSarro has verbiage to add to that paragraph.
- **Section E -** SMcNeal - estimated build out - should mention it might be as little as 200 and as much as 800 beds. Currently resolution states 400 with the build out to 800 beds. RSarro - this is only to give them an idea (estimated). Need to also bring up there is a regional jail that is also being considered. PVanEck - they need to be aware that we are considering the regional jail. Should give them some kind of time span that we will require them to go by rather than a scope. RSarro - it is stated under the PONI process. FAnderson - should be mentioned under background instead of under the scope. JCampbell's verbiage - Allegan County is currently a partner in a feasibility study pertaining to a regional corrections solution, which bears consideration within this project. Site location - is there any consideration by this project team to consider the option to the site. MDay - we should move on the basis of what we know right now; what the Board has approved. RSarro - if there is going to be a formal comparison, it needs to be done with a formal process. We'll move forward with leaving the site locations as it is. PVanEck - on general project budget; wonders how we intend to handle the percentage bid. Feels we should stick with the acreage that we've already identified-stay specific to this site. RSarro - on budget; there is no formal budget - just say a budget has not yet been established.
- **Page 15-16 - scope of services.** Section 1 - SMcNeal - feels it is important, where it applies, to not base on prevailing or union rates. PVanEck - wasn't familiar with the specific document that is referred to. SMcNeal - might want to review that specifically at some point. Section 2 - took out phase 3 on selection of. Section 3 - additional step would be to specifically look at an in-depth investigation and should include the vertical vs. horizontal construction. There was discussion on direct and indirect costs. Decision was to add verbiage on both.

- **Page 17** - RSarro mentioned areas that have already been crossed out. SMcNeal - master plan should be sure to include future expansion consideration should be added.
- **Timeline** - trying to put the specific dates would be difficult. Is it unrealistic to think that a decision could be made within 2 weeks after presentations were made to the Board? RSarro - feels the team could recommend award of bid, then strike the next three. There will be an RFQ and RFI. Will open qualifications first and if they don't meet needs won't open others. Intend to have one person receive and respond to questions.
- **Specifics on submission** - add that it should also be supplied in PDF format. SMcNeal - bottom on 22 item 2 wants to increase 3 to 10. Attachment D - explains previous work history. MDay - doesn't know why it needs to be on a separate document. Leave it to them - take it out. Consensus was to take that paragraph out. #3 - we'll have MMRMA look at this section. References - want all projects completed and occupied that are law enforcement related. Add something about omitting any projects. 7 - Work plan session should be referenced in the scoring - is an important section. Wants to add something after 9 and 10; should include submission of a proposed contract.
- **Section on pricing** - this would only be reviewed if qualifications are even met. We're saying they need to provide a total price. We haven't necessarily excluded percentages. We could reference the per diem request in this area. Total price (lump sum) and breakdown of the hours is required. Requested rates in case the services go beyond the project.
- **Evaluation section** - we should create the forms and include with presentation to the Board. Jack Krause is interested in doing the process when making architect selection. Discussion on questions that will be asked during oral presentation. See what we get from the pre-bid meeting. Intend to have the oral presentation - we should probably not give the forms to the Board since they would then become public information. Discussion on inviting commissioners to pre-bid and presentations. Committee is responsible for the work being done.

2. Architect - next meeting.

3. Construction Manager - TBD.

NEXT STEPS:

RSarro will make the corrections and get that back out to the team; see if any final items there. Schedule a similar meeting for the architect bid.

ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting adjourned at 10:37 AM. Next meeting to be determined. Sometime after next week for next meeting; Denise will coordinate. Wants to send revisions out and get an email back on any changes and then bring it right to the Board at the next weekend. We can present these to them as we get them done; they don't have to go in one package.