

RFQ 15-04-09-MS
MASTER COMMENTS SHEET
REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING 1 ON 4/12/16 AT 2:00PM

CRITERIA/VENDORS	Keith and Schnars	Redevelopment Management Associates	The Mellgren Planning Group
CRITERIA 1 Submittal Overview: Follow Submittal format to make sure content and form is correct.	It is important to point out that the City is under negotiations with them for the Comprehensive Plan. They make some references that there could be some cross time between the tasks of the Comprehensive plan and the tasks of the East Sunrise Master Plan; however since the timeline in which the qualifications for the Comprehensive time was submitted and the negotiations we've had over that contract, we significantly reduced some of the time they originally needed for meetings and public hearings, so I don't think the overlap exists. But I don't think they knew that at the time they submitted this qualification package. It is not clear how we could potentially save time or money if they work on the Comprehensive Plan and the East Sunrise Master Improvement Plan at the same time if there is one Project manager assigned for each. It is true they would overlap but the Comprehensive Plan does not drive the other, since the East Sunrise Master Plan is more of a visioning and the projects are totally independent. We reviewed the tight project deadlines and high party projects that resources are being issued to. The consultant seems not to understand the scope of the project. The East Sunrise Master Plan is to be done under a year but the consultant seems to projects it much further but the reason might be that they take into consideration the time that is needed for counsel or guidance after the implementation of the recommendations they the firms usually provide like code amendments or economic incentives. The whole purpose of the project is to come up and look at the data out there and look at what we have and come up with a plan and find out how the City can be the catalyst out there, then we have to take that forward; it is not the scope of the consultant to take it forward. It seems they want to hang on after the recommendations for additional meetings or for two years. Keith and Schnars are more of an engineering firm and the planning expertise is associated with engineering component not the vision nor economic development component. When we look at the project examples they provided, we don't see what we are looking for. We were not impressed with the resume of the Project Manager assigned to this project. All firms have a tendency to always recommend CRAs (Community Redevelopment Agency) but the City is not interested in going that route.	We think overall that the projects they listed in the submittal are on par with what we're looking for in the East Sunrise Master Plan. Overall we are extremely impressed. The submittal that they put together shows that they get the power of graphics and presentation, we can get a product that we need to be proud of, that we are not putting on a shelf, that we are going to be implementing, that we can get a work of art. The very end of the submittal shows all the data of all the things that they can do e.g. branding. Branding is going to be so important, and the last two pages show what we are looking for; something that is energized, revitalized, something that the community can be proud of. We need somebody who can give a different perspective to business owners and residents. This clearly shows they have the capability to do that.	We were not impressed with the submittal. Their submittal was very dry which shows they did not make any efforts to provide an engaging document. Based on their submittal, the consultant is more of a long range planning, land developer firm and not involved with the visioning the City is looking for.
CRITERIA 2 Firm Qualifications: Ability to show that the firm is fully qualified to deliver the East Sunrise Improvement Master Plan. Firm or individual must demonstrate to City staff its capabilities, financial stability, adequacy of professional personnel, past record, references, experience and performance.	The two principals Keith and Schnars have split and they were primarily know as being good at engineering projects. They have done FDOT projects. They have been roadway traffic consultants. We are personally aware of the projects they have listed and have seen the results. There are projects in the Florida Keys that we've seen personally but the projects were roadway projects. I think we are looking for a planning and creative company as opposed to a nuts and bolts one. We need a different mind set. There will be nuts and bolts that will have to come out of it but down the road after the vision. Even though they have done Master Plans with other municipalities, they did not submit an example of a similar Plan we are looking for. The Downtown Development and Corridor Master Plan they submitted to the City of North Miami is looking more to the corridor and right of way as opposed to the private property. While the corridor and right of way are important for us, we want to incentivize people on the private property, bring the energy, we want to be a catalyst for people investing. We want to understand the community because the community voices is a big part of it. They do have a lot of experience regarding public events; they have RVs, banners and signs and popcorn machines that are designed to get people to come out for events. It's good that they would physically go out and interview people, knock on doors, etc.	City of Margate has a large piece of land that has been stagnant for over a decade, they contacted RMA and they found a developer to do the land. That's what we need; someone who is going to reach out those people to do the work together. And that's the point because the City owns two pieces of land and hopefully we are going to have more and they recognize the opportunity to be a catalyst, where the other firms did not pick up on that and this information was part of the RFQ document. RMA is a group that is being looked to for leadership in this area. They understand the City's perspective as well as the private sector. Oakland Park management is very pleased with the Culinary Arts District because they did an excellent job to the area. They have done amazing things to Pompano Beach arts facilities and arts programs. They have a good reputation and clients speak to their stability as well. Northwood Village is a site that they've worked on and it shows the importance they put into marketing, branding, business support to revitalize the area; they have clinics on "How to write a Menu" that is appealing to the people to come in to restaurants, store design, what to put in the window; so it shows that they get that is all interval to the process.	For a planning firm, they did not provide a lot of relevant information. The examples of projects are old and not relevant to the work and some of the clients are with RMA currently, which shows the type of quality of their work. They show too much reliance on subconsultants. We are not confident that the firm is qualified to provide us with the East Sunrise Master Plan. They are more technical oriented than visioners.
CRITERIA 3 Staffing Plan: Ability to show that the firm has the right number of people with the right skills to fulfill the delivery of the Master Plan.	They have a lot of subconsultants and we are concerned with their location and quality. The marketing person is in Texas. We are concern their staff is not even going to get the temperature of the neighborhood, etc. It is important also that the firms understand that this is a multilingual area. We want a firm to represent the City at the table as "you tell us" and then we are going to use the information about what people want and create it. We are not that sure she can get that message across. Bob Kendrick is one of the best because he used to work for the State but he is just going to be part of the final phase, but his experience might not be needed because this project is not technical. All the staff has a lot of experience that is geared towards different types of projects than what we are envisioning. The project submitted to Opa Locka is more of a strategic plan. They are listing a lot of people that we don't think we are going to be using. Something that is important and is lacking is staff with real state development background.	They have an entire department in charge of finding the right people. It seems they took the cream of the crop and made a firm. They have the right mix in terms of staffing because they have experience not only with the creativity and the vision but with the practical "I've done it before, I've been there, done that", which is important because this is not an easy task and you have to be immersed in it every day. In this field the "who you know" is important and they proved to have good relationships. They listed only two subconsultants that are going to be used as a resource. One of the subs is Chen More and Associates who we think have done great work that includes recommendations like the importance of lighting, police and safety which are high priorities for residents in that community and gets at the heart of what we need in that neighborhood. They have amazing Marketing and Communications staff.	It seems the subconsultant did every job that the consultant listed in the document. It looks like two firms gave us one package as a dual submission, which will potentially increase the final contract cost significantly. Davidson Design Studios adds no value to the submittal since they are a landscape architecture firm, which shows their staff is not aligned to the scope of services.
CRITERIA 4 Project Control experience: Ability to show willingness to meet time and budget requirements, location, recent, current, and project workloads of the firms.	They could meet the timeline and deadlines but I think they are proposing a little bit more than we discussed. We think they haven't scope this out specifically for our RFQ. They propose a retreat style meeting that might not be aligned with our budget.	They expect and estimated fast track of 9 months. They seem to look at the City as a partner as opposed to as a client, which is very different. Their schedule is more detailed, they provide an overview, they talk about their staff availability and willingness to deploy the necessary staff on a daily basis and that shows their commitment to this project. They start outlining the tasks in a way that show understanding of the RFQ scope and expectation. We like the fact that they provided a lot of emphasis in sustainability design. They show they are in tuned with what's out there in the market, with the latest and the greatest. Even though they have a good number of clients we think they can handle the work.	They say they can deliver but we think they are not capable of delivering what the City is looking for. The information provided is very vague. They did not show emphasis on the community outreach, which was very clear in the RFQ document that it was an important aspect.
CRITERIA 5 Scope of Services: Ability to show that the firm understands the scope and ability to show approach, activities and work needed to produce the East Sunrise Improvement Master Plan.	Their scope seemed standard plug and play language; usually if you are trying to win the project you put a little bid of where you are going in the submittal. This submittal seems like a boiler plate. They are not aligned a hundred percent with our scope, they were on the same road but different lanes.	There needs to be an element in the East Sunrise Plan that's going to talk about Public Private Partnership (PPP), not a CRA, and they spent a lot of time talking about that and they can identify who those people are. They understand it's a long range plan. They talk about the real world and the realistic approach as opposed to theory. They talk about the economic growth. They clearly understand what the City is looking for based on what they wrote for the scope of services which shows they can deliver what we need.	It is clear that they don't understand the scope of services.