

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



To: Jim Scholl, City Manager

Through: Donald Leland Craig, AICP Planning Director

From: Ashley Monnier, Planner II

Meeting Date: June 7, 2011

RE: (RFP) #005-11 Evaluation and Appraisal Report Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.

Action Statement: .

Request City Commission hear presentations (if desired), approve the City Manager appointed Selection Team's recommended ranking (as enumerated below) or rank the top three (3) firms based on presentations (if desired) and the supporting proposal documentation provided herewith.

Authorize the City Manager to negotiate a contract with the highest ranked proposer. In the event the City Manager is unsuccessful in negotiating a contract with the highest ranked proposal, authorizing the City Manager to negotiate a contract with the second highest ranked proposer. And, in the event the City Manager is unsuccessful in negotiating a contract with the second highest ranked proposer, authorizing the City Manager to negotiate a contract with the third highest ranked firm.

If the City Manager is unsuccessful in negotiating an acceptable contract with any of the three (3) highest ranked proposers the City Manager will cease discussions with all proposers and report back to the City Commission.

If an acceptable contract is reached with one of the top three (3) ranked firms, the City Manager will submit the resulting contract to the City Commission for review and approval.

Background:

The City of Key West is seeking a consultant to prepare the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) based amendments to the City's Comprehensive Plan. The last major update to the Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 1993. The City's first EAR was due in 1998; however, it was not until 2005 that the EAR was found to be sufficient by the state. The second EAR was due in 2006 and was found in compliance by the state in 2007. However, although the evaluation and appraisal processes were complete, the amendments identified in both reports were never drafted. There is little difference between the 2005 and 2007 reports or the resulting recommended amendments. However, data and analysis to

support proposed amendments included in the reports was minimum or had become obsolete, therefore background updates to several identified areas have been drafted by the Planning Department to provide a basis for a more thoughtful, up to date amendment process. In addition, state statute has changed since 2007 as it relates to Capital Improvement Planning and Water Supply Planning. Thus, the scope of necessary amendments has been expanded to contain other statutory requirements.

According to the project scope of services, the scope of work includes EAR-based amendments to the Goals, Objectives, and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan as well as the completion and/or provision of the data and analysis necessary to support the EAR-based amendments. The scope also includes updates to the Capital Improvement Element and a Water Supply Plan, as required by state statute. The proposed work is not expected to constitute a complete update to the Goals, Objectives, and Policies or the data and analysis of the Comprehensive Plan; rather, it is intended to implement EAR-based amendments and other statutory update requirements, and to ensure that any further required data and analysis to support these specific issues are provided. The RFP ranking was publicly advertised and held on Thursday, April 21, 2011 according to the City's procurement procedures.

Purpose and Justification:

The City received four proposals for RFP #005-11. The respondents were evaluated by the City Manager-appointed selection team (comprised of Monroe County Growth Management Director, Christine Hurley, Senior Project Manager, Doug Bradshaw, Interim Planning Director, Donald Craig, and Planner II, Ashley Monnier), and were ranked into a short list for City Commission consideration at a publicly advertised meeting on April 21, 2011. The selection team evaluated the respondents based on the following criteria and point system:

- Past performance on similar projects: 20 points
- Approach and understanding of the project: 25 points
- Experience of key personnel: 15 points
- Demonstrated community engagement experience: 10 points
- Cost proposal: 20 points
- References: 10 points

The Team ranked the responding firms in the following order:

1. Calvin, Giardano, & Associates, Inc.

2. The Corradino Group, Inc.
3. LaRue Planning & Management Services, Inc.
4. Ty Symroski Land Use Planning, LLC

The short list created by staff consists of the following firms in ranked order:

1. Calvin, Giardino, & Associates, Inc.
2. The Corradino Group, Inc.
3. LaRue Planning & Management Services, Inc.

Copies of the short-listed proposals are attached. According to the RFP, these respondents may be required to make a presentation to the City Commission. Once final award is made by the City Commission, a final contract, including detailed scope and fee, must be negotiated and then approved by the City Commission.

Options:

Option 1.

City Commission could approve the recommended ranking of the City Manager appointed Selection Team; authorize the City Manager to negotiate a contract with the highest ranked proposal.

Option 2.

City Commission could elect not to accept the recommended ranking of the City Manager appointed Selection Team and review and hear presentations (if desired) of the three highest rated responses, make a selection and authorize City Manager to negotiate a contract with the City Commission highest ranked firm.

Option 3.

City Commission could elect to reject all proposals.

Recommendation:

City Manager and the Selection Team recommends approval of Option 1.

Attachments:

Attachment A: RFP #005-11

Attachment B: City of Key West Consultant Ranking Forms

Attachment C: Calvin, Giordano & Associates, Inc. Proposal

Attachment D: The Corradino Group, Inc. Proposal

Attachment E: LaRue Planning & Management Services, Inc. Proposal

Attachment F: Ranking Committee Minutes