



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: June 19, 2020

SUBJECT: Procurement by Competitive Proposals, #20-01 Forward Pinellas Planning Consultants, Summary of June 10 and June 17, 2020 Selection Committee Meetings

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 June 10, 2020 at 11 a.m. and June 17, 2020 at 1 p.m. virtually through Zoom. The meetings were advertised on the Forward Pinellas website and access information was also provided to all qualified proposers. Both meetings were open to the public and the selection committee, advisor Whit Blanton (Forward Pinellas Executive Director), members of the public and Forward Pinellas staff were in attendance.

Both meetings began with a discussion of the process. On the June 10, 2020 meeting, the idea of a potential second meeting was introduced at the beginning of the meeting. Staff reviewed the tasks facing the selection committee, which included a review, discussion and evaluation of each presentation individually, a pricing analysis and a recommendation for the Forward Pinellas Board. Staff mentioned the desire to have specialty firms, but that the procurement was open to all firms and that no set number of firms had been established for selection. At the June 10, 2020 meeting, the selection committee reviewed, discussed and evaluated firms and set a potential date to be confirmed for the next selection committee meeting, which was later confirmed via memo to be June 17, 2020 at 1 p.m., to continue with the remaining firms and other tasks.

On June 17, 2020, the selection committee meeting again began with an overview of the tasks facing the selection committee and where the selection committee ended at the last meeting. The selection committee resumed with a review, discussion and scoring of each presentation individually. The following is a brief review of the discussion related to each presentation and associated notes.

- **AECOM.** Solid team with experience in funding and programming, innovative virtual meeting capabilities, lacking in project management discussion
- **Alta.** Presentation felt like it was being read, delivery was lacking, missing innovation and specific proposal/most pressing need, good branding package examples, unclear how discussion could apply to Forward Pinellas

- **Asakura Robinson.** Presentation was somewhat fragmented with a lot of general information and not much specificity, innovative idea with equity along Central Ave BRT corridor that could have been explored further
- **Calvin, Giordano & Associates (CGA).** Did not demonstrate innovative methods and how they would apply to Forward Pinellas needs, data analytic capabilities were not incorporated into presentation and appeared limited
- **The Corradino Group.** Did not seem to address the most pressing need or how the firm would approach it, clear and concise project management discussion, conceptual scope lacking details
- **Fehr and Peers.** Innovative concept presented with relevant examples, strong graphics
- **Gannett Fleming.** Weak demonstration of innovation, clear project management discussion, incorporated performance measures with data driven approach
- **HDR.** Good discussion and use of data analytics, could have further explored equity and inclusion, strong approach
- **HW Lochner.** Solid team, presentation focused on people, generic discussion, would have liked to see more on project management processes and procedures
- **Interface Studio.** Innovative practices examples were hard to follow, broad discussion of most pressing need, good presentation delivery, extremely visual presentation highlighting storytelling approach
- **Jacobs.** Presentation began well but lost focus, touched on many issues but did not explore them fully
- **Kimley Horn.** Clearly understands Pinellas County, did not fully discuss innovative concepts or clear scope of services
- **Kittelson & Associates.** Strong experience, thoughtful scope of services, clear and concise presentation
- **Landis Evans + Partners.** Presentation included strong examples and ideas for low-cost, implementable solutions, balanced conceptual and practical
- **NUE Urban Concepts.** Small, tailored firm that focused on creative process, capabilities and a few relevant projects, good understanding of Pinellas County but approach lacking detail
- **Renaissance.** Strong discussion of Pinellas County's economic context, thoughtful approach that was easy to follow, demonstrated visualization and its importance, would have liked to hear more from project manager
- **Sam Schwartz.** Lacked understanding of some of the challenges working in Pinellas County where maintaining road capacity is a sensitive issue, lacking examples and innovation, approach was general
- **SB Friedman.** Unique perspective, comprehensive scope of services, demonstrated understanding of Pinellas County
- **S&ME.** Innovative renderings, strong interdisciplinary approach presented
- **Stantec.** High level presentation that touched on many points, but lacking in detail and innovative concepts outside of autonomous vehicle work
- **Tindale Oliver & Associates.** Demonstrated GIS analytics abilities, clear scope development process in a thoughtful manner but discussion of traditional transportation planning or traffic operations somewhat limited

- **Toole Design.** Unclear how firm would help address identified most pressing need (funding), good overview of team's experience in certain areas and innovative data-driven storytelling
- **The Valerin Group.** Thoughtful discussion and emphasis on building trust, but presentation did not neatly tie together strategies with most pressing need
- **Wallace Roberts & Todd (WRT).** Strong public engagement discussion with a range of strategies, presentation a little disjointed
- **WSP.** Clear, concise presentation with strong visualization that conveyed the firm's understanding of Pinellas County, impressive and innovative videos

The review, discussion and scoring of firms was followed by a pricing analysis, with the primary goal of determining generally fair and reasonable costs as the exact pricing is subject to negotiation during the agreement process. The selection committee discussed the pricing from the current agreements, with the classifications and ranges and the highs, lows, averages and medians of the firms that presented. Generally, the committee members felt the pricing was fair and reasonable, with a discussion favoring the averages and not using lower rates than the current ones.

After the pricing analysis, the selection committee discussed charts showing the final scores, with the presentations added to the earlier scores. Staff did not show the actual scores, as they needed to be confirmed with the signed evaluation forms and the spreadsheets reviewed for clerical errors and validation that all formulas and background calculations were accurate to ensure the final numbers are correct.

The selection committee felt the firms were strong overall. The discussion on a recommendation started with looking at the top ranked 12-15 firms. However, there was a clustering of firms and with the desire for specialty firms, the selection committee moved to a discussion of the top 19 or 20 firms. This would allow for more niche firms. Firms will be available for local government use, not only Forward Pinellas and so a larger number of firms selected was deemed acceptable and Forward Pinellas had not released a desired number of firms previously. **The selection committee confirmed that they recommend proceeding with the top 20 firms.** Should the final numbers alter the list showed on the screen, the committee recommends sticking with the top 20 firms. The final scoring of firms is provided at the end of this memorandum with the selected firms noted.

Staff mentioned that this is anticipated to be brought to the Forward Pinellas Board in July for approval based on the recommendation which would be provided to the Forward Pinellas Executive Director. **Firms can expect this to be on the July 8, 2020 Forward Pinellas Board agenda, unless otherwise noted.** A summary of the process and recommendation would be provided to the Forward Pinellas Board. Forward Pinellas staff will include anything unusual from the reference check to the board at that time as well. Following Forward Pinellas Board approval, staff will begin to negotiate agreements with the selected firms.

Thank you to all of the proposers.

Firm	Total Score
AECOM*	885
Alta	694
Asakura Robinson*	784
Atkins	445
Ayres	438
Bruce McLaughlin Consulting	298
Build a Better Block	346
CallisonRTKL (CRTKL)	380
CALTRAN Engineering Group	443
Calvin, Giordano & Associates	766
Clearview Land Design	384
The Corradino Group	744
EGRET+OX	398
evolveEA	415
Fehr and Peers*	851
Gannett Fleming*	791
George F Young	393
HDR*	851
HW Lochner, Inc*	799
Interface Studio LLC*	774
Jacobs*	828
JRB	386
Kimley Horn*	861
Kittelson & Associates*	806
Lambert Advisory	424
Landis Evans + Partners (LE&P)*	788

Firm	Total Score
The Lunz Group	363
Maser	403
Ninigret Partners	394
NUE Urban Concepts*	790
Pennoni	412
Partners for Economic Solutions (PES)	473
Pritchett Steinbeck Group (PSG)	444
Renaissance*	801
Rundell Ernstberger Associates	408
Sam Schwartz	762
Sand Country Studios	437
SB Friedman*	821
S&ME, Inc.*	785
Stantec	760
Tindale Oliver & Associates*	793
Toole Design*	785
Torti Gallas + Partners	396
Transpro	394
Urban Arts	441
Urbanomics	359
The Valerin Group, Inc.*	794
VHB	476
Waldrop Engineering, PA	393
Wallace Roberts & Todd (WRT)*	793
WGI	400
WSP USA Inc*	897

* Recommended firm