



MEMORANDUM
310 Court Street, 2nd Floor
Clearwater, FL 33756
P: 727-464-8250
forwardpinellas.org

THE PLANNING COUNCIL AND METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION FOR PINELLAS COUNTY

TO: All Qualified Proposers

FROM: Sarah Caper, AICP, Principal Planner

DATE: April 9, 2020

SUBJECT: Procurement by Competitive Proposals, #20-01 Forward Pinellas Planning Consultants, Summary of April 8, 2020 Selection Committee Meeting

The #20-01 Forward Pinellas Planning Consultants selection committee consisting of Rodney Chatman (Forward Pinellas), Chelsea Favero (Forward Pinellas), Lauren Matzke (City of Clearwater), Christina Mendoza (Forward Pinellas) and Joan Rice (Pinellas County) met on April 8, 2020 at 1 p.m. The meeting was open to the public and the selection committee, members of the public and Forward Pinellas staff were in attendance. Given the current situation, the meeting was held virtually through Zoom. Information on how to access the meeting was provided to all qualified proposers, posted on the Forward Pinellas website with the procurement information and on the Forward Pinellas calendar online. The meeting was a continuation of the April 6, 2020 selection committee. That meeting was also held virtually (through GoToMeeting) and was also open to the public, with members of the public, selection committee and Forward Pinellas staff in attendance. Information on how to access the April 6, 2020 meeting was available in the same places as the April 8, 2020 meeting.

Both meetings began with a discussion of the procedures and objectives of the meeting. At the end of the April 6, 2020 meeting, the selection committee discussed the logistics for the April 8, 2020 meeting so that the selection committee could continue reviewing proposals.

The 52 proposals were discussed. The following is a brief review of the discussion related to each proposal.

- **AECOM.** Good discussion and understanding of Pinellas County and linkage of major areas of concentration from 2020 with team member project experience, understanding of challenge
- **Alta.** General MPO service firm with a variety of experience but did not show specific understanding of Forward Pinellas and Pinellas County context, people first focus
- **Asakura Robinson.** Beautiful package, creative outreach, balanced proposal with discussions on equity, neighborhoods and districts, housing and resiliency, lacking detail on management components, unsure if understand role of Forward Pinellas
- **Atkins.** General purpose firm, lacking a specific approach, emphasized experience with MPOs, does not clearly demonstrate a correlation between their staff and how they can support Forward Pinellas, good understanding of the relationship between land use and transportation planning, fairly generic

- **Ayres.** Strong focus on visualization and engagement, lacking detail on relevant experience
- **Building a Better Block.** Lacking information on how the firm can meet Forward Pinellas's needs and role, liked AARP experience
- **Bruce McLaughlin Consulting.** Understand Forward Pinellas, low cost, tool for local governments but need to show more on why Forward Pinellas could benefit, lacking detail
- **CALTRAN Engineering Group.** Has provided similar services for several communities, discusses safety, transit, bike/ped, "Big Data" and public involvement challenges/needs, good general overview and discussion of Pinellas County's challenges and needs, lacking link between references, projects and resumes, unsure of experience and fit with Forward Pinellas
- **Calvin, Giordano & Associates (CGA).** Well rounded, good description of approach, demonstrates understanding, could better incorporate staff and key personnel in project discussion
- **Clearview Land Design, PL.** Provides options, establish community character, basic understanding of challenges facing land use and transportation, infill experience, little discussion on approach and project management
- **Corradino Group.** Interesting TOC, good understanding of Forward Pinellas responsibilities and role, current conditions, transportation experience is by PEs involved in project implementation
- **CallisonRTKL (CRTKL).** Approach lacking detail, showed basic understanding of Forward Pinellas and linking their roles to anticipated planning functions, would like to see more on digital storytelling
- **Egret+Ox.** Showed basic understanding of Forward Pinellas's needs, but did not demonstrate understanding of the agency's responsibilities and role within Pinellas County, strong graphics
- **evolveEA.** Strong graphics, lacking detail and demonstration of Forward Pinellas's role, unclear project management
- **Fehr and Peers.** Strong performance metrics discussion, addresses Pinellas County challenges and showed understanding of the area
- **Gannett Fleming.** Lacking good examples of innovation related to performance metrics, liked summary chart, showed broad understanding
- **George F Young.** Focused on traffic engineering, complete streets and roadway design (more like an implementing agency), lacking understanding of how firm would meet Forward Pinellas needs, lots of experience
- **HDR.** Light on performance measures, solid experience and examples, good understanding of Forward Pinellas and relationship between transportation and land use
- **HW Lochner, Inc.** Strong visualization tools, recognizes change is not easy, shows understanding of Forward Pinellas's roles and responsibilities
- **Interface Studios LLC.** Graphic approach to planning, varied experience in unique places, good overview and demonstrated understanding
- **Jacobs.** Standard proposal, concerned about depth of staff, demonstrated understanding in various focus areas, good project approach narrative

- **JRB Solutions.** Understanding of the local area and needs from a transit and bike/ped perspective, lacking in approach and project experience
- **Kimley Horn.** Solid project understanding and description of Forward Pinellas needs, innovative ideas
- **Kittelson & Associates.** Good project approach, focus on equity, health and resiliency
- **Lambert Advisory.** Focus on economic and real estate analysis, narrative explains key aspects of economic/market related services
- **Landis Evans + Partners (LE&P).** Solid project understanding, good discussion of density, safety, walkability and context-sensitive choices
- **The Lunz Group.** Generic but clear approach
- **Maser.** Lacking project approach/project management mechanisms, would be most helpful to local partners
- **Ninigret Partners.** Lacking connection to Pinellas County and Forward Pinellas, unclear on project manager, proposal was not organized, unique approach
- **NUE Urban Concepts.** Solid understanding of Forward Pinellas needs, would be helpful to local partners, unclear if the team has worked together before
- **Pennoni.** Focus on municipal planning, did not clearly demonstrate understanding of Forward Pinellas needs, unclear connection between references and experience
- **Partners for Economic Solutions (PES).** Limited project approach, good description of Pinellas County conditions, speaks to importance of collaboration, lacking QA/QC discussion
- **Pritchett Steinbeck Group (PSG).** Good understanding and narrative of Pinellas County and its challenges, lacking approach and project management discussion
- **Rundell Ernstberger Associates (REA).** Experienced with major redevelopment and vision plans, good use of visuals and storytelling, lacking project approach, would like to see greater understanding of Pinellas County and its challenges
- **Renaissance.** Tailored proposals to Forward Pinellas needs, experience with public-friendly reporting methods, discussion on approach and project management is lacking
- **Sam Schwartz.** Solid understanding of needs and area, challenges
- **Sand Country Studios.** Most of experience is in rural and suburban areas, unclear who would be the project manager
- **SB Friedman.** Good explanation of project management process
- **S&ME, Inc.** Solid understanding of local needs, lacking in project management and approach
- **Stantec.** Solid project understanding
- **Tindale Oliver & Associates (Tindale Oliver).** Good project management approach, would have liked to see more details, relevant recent projects

- **Toole Design.** Good graphics work, clear description of key personnel and roles, includes matrix of work and on call experience
- **Torti Gallas + Partners.** No discussion of project management tools, lacking clear linkage to Forward Pinellas needs
- **TransPro.** Strong focus on performance management but mostly tied to internal operations and processes, primarily works with transit agencies and cited transit service planning projects
- **Urban Arts.** Lacking approach to Forward Pinellas needs, missing discussion on costs and schedule controls, good planning concept illustrations
- **Urbanomics.** Lacking project approach, no discussion of challenges facing Pinellas County
- **The Valerin Group, Inc.** Solid approach and understanding of needs, good project management chart, strong SPOTlight discussion and experience with visualization and storytelling
- **VHB.** Clear understanding of scope, good discussion and understanding of Pinellas County
- **Waldrop Engineering, PA.** Transportation planning work is mostly PEs not planners, broad submittal, would have liked to see more detail
- **WGI.** Clear understanding of needs but limited approach details, diverse examples of relevant projects
- **Wallace Roberts & Todd (WRT).** Strong understanding and approach, good use of visualization, strong project management description
- **WSP USA, Inc.** Clear understanding of needs, tailored approach

The shortlist score totals were reviewed and then confirmed after the meeting after the signed score sheets were received. As mentioned at the meeting, signed score sheets are required from all proposers and must be confirmed to finalize the scores, particularly given the format of the meeting. **Final score totals will be made available to all firms following the last selection committee meeting.** All firms scoring over 470 points at this time will be invited for presentations:

- | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| • AECOM | • Interface Studio LLC |
| • Kimley Horn | • Calvin, Giordano & Associates, Inc. |
| • HDR | • S&ME, Inc. |
| • WSP USA Inc. | • Kittelson & Associates |
| • Jacobs | • Asakura Robinson |
| • SB Friedman | • Toole Design |
| • The Valerin Group, Inc. | • VHB |
| • Renaissance | • Gannett Fleming |
| • Fehr & Peers | • The Corradino Group |
| • Tindale Oliver | • Sam Schwartz |
| • Stantec | |
| • WRT | |
| • HW Lochner, Inc. | |

These firms will be contacted regarding scheduling and will be given the following directions:

- Presentations will be scheduled for 30 minutes on a virtual platform. Forward Pinellas will be the host. Firms will have 15 minutes for a presentation then 15 minutes for questions and answers and to account for the virtual technology platform.
- The presentation should identify the most pressing need facing Forward Pinellas and Pinellas County and how the firm would craft a scope of services to address that need.
- The project manager must speak during the presentation.

Forward Pinellas staff will contact all firms with the same presentation information as listed in this memorandum. Firms will be responsible for reaching out with Forward Pinellas to schedule their presentation timeslot. Once scheduled, Forward Pinellas staff will confirm the presentation timeslot and virtual meeting access information. Forward Pinellas staff will start the presentation five minutes in advance of the meeting and allow the firm access to the meeting at that time. Forward Pinellas will start as the host, begin introductions, then turn it over to the consultant for their presentation.

Thank you to all proposers for your submittal and patience as we work through the current circumstances.