File #: 18-0306, **Version:** 1 **Item #:** A-1

CC - (1) Discussion of the General Plan Update (GPU) Advisory Bodies, Request for Qualifications (RFQ) Submittals Summary, Draft Qualified Consultants List, and Draft Request for Proposals (RFP); and (2) Direct the City Manager as Deemed Appropriate.

Meeting Date: November 16, 2017

Contact Person/Dept: Ashley Hefner/CDD

Phone Number: (310) 253-5744

Fiscal Impact: Yes [] No [X] **General Fund:** Yes [] No [X]

Public Hearing: [] **Action Item:** [] **Attachments:** [X]

Commission Action Required: Yes [] No [X] **Date:**

Public Notification: (E-Mail) Meetings and Agendas - City Council (11/14/17)

Department Approval: Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director (11/14/17)

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the City Council (1) discuss the General Plan Update (GPU) Advisory Bodies, Request for Qualifications (RFQ) submittals summary, draft qualified consultants list, and draft Request for Proposals (RFP); and (2) Direct the City Manager as Deemed Appropriate.

BACKGROUND

On August 30, 2017, City Council approved issuance of the GPU RFQ and discussed various aspects of potential GPU advisory bodies. The Council directed that further discussion of advisory bodies take place at the September 11, 2017 meeting.

On September 6, 2017, the City issued an RFQ for GPU services with a due date of September 29, 2017. The submittals were provided to the City Council members for review on October 3, 2017. The City Council Subcommittee met on October 30, 2017 to prepare a list of qualified consultants and to identify any necessary changes to the draft scope of services based on review of submittals.

The discussion of GPU advisory bodies requested for the September 11, 2017 meeting was re-

agendized and heard at the October 23, 2017 meeting. At that meeting, City Council requested that staff provide further information regarding the function, role and organization of the advisory bodies.

DISCUSSION

GPU Advisory Bodies

At the October 23, 2017 meeting City Council asked the following questions about formation and operation of advisory bodies. In consultation with the City Attorney's Office, staff provides the following responses:

1. Current City policy doesn't allow committee members to serve on more than one committee at a time. Is there any flexibility or can this be changed for the GPU?

   Culver City Municipal Code (CCMC) Section 3.03.005 provides: "No person may serve on more than one (1) Commission at the same time." Although the CCMC specifically applies to Commissions only, it has been the past practice and policy to apply this principle to boards and committees. However, since this is a policy, the City Council could provide direction to change such policy for the purpose of the General Plan Update project. Such a policy change would allow a Commissioner to also serve on one of the GPU advisory committees. This would also apply to a member of one of the City's existing boards or committees.

2. Will the committees be subject to the Brown Act (i.e. will they be able to hold closed working sessions)?

   With the exception of ad hoc subcommittees, any committees that are created by the City Council are considered legislative bodies and are subject to the Brown Act, which requires the meetings be open to the public. This includes committees consisting of solely members of the public, as well as committees consisting of a combination of members of the public and one or more City commission, board or committee members.

3. What can be done to ensure to limit conflicts of interest with committee members that may sit on other boards and commissions?

   If current commission, board or committee members are also permitted to sit on a GPU advisory committee (as discussed in No. 1 above), it is important to ensure their role on the advisory committee is compatible with their role on their existing commission, board or committee. If the performance of the duties of either position could have an adverse effect on the other, the roles may be incompatible, and staff will review any potential issues with the City Attorney's Office.

4. What can be done to ensure diverse representation on advisory bodies; especially for those in the community whose voices are not typically heard?

   The City can conduct outreach for particular expertise that may be available in the community. The process would not be unlike what the City Council does to solicit members of the public to serve on City commissions, boards and committees. This can be done citywide and/or on a

geographically specific basis to ensure widespread representation. The City can also advertise in local papers and use social media through the City Clerk's office to solicit committee involvement.

5. Will the Planning Commission have an advisory role and if so how should their role be defined relative to their function as a recommending body on the General Plan?

   Pursuant to CCMC Section 17.620.020, the Planning Commission makes a written recommendation to the City Council whether to approve, approve in modified form, or disapprove a proposed amendment to the General Plan. If the City Council also desires to have members of the Planning Commission involved in the GPU process as technical advisors to work with City staff, the Commission could appoint an Ad Hoc Subcommittee for this purpose.

With regard to any formation of advisory committees, potential issues are driven by specific scenarios and facts; therefore, staff will work closely with the City Attorney's Office as this process moves forward to ensure there are not potential conflicts or Brown Act issues with any specific committee and/or committee member that may be considered for appointment.

RFQ Submittals Summary

Approximately one-fourth of proposals received by staff were from teams of firms; the remainder were from individual firms. Some firms included in team submittals also submitted individual qualifications; other firms submitted qualifications with multiple teams.

Staff and the City Council Subcommittee individually evaluated submittals, then met on October 30, 2017 to prepare a list of qualified consultants and to identify any changes necessary to the draft scope of services outline based on review of submittals. Further details on the consultant list are provided below; it was determined that no changes to the scope of services were necessary.

Draft Qualified Consultants List

Staff and the City Council Subcommittee used the following evaluation criteria in their review of submittals:

- 35 pts: Firm qualifications
- 35 pts: Staff qualifications
- 20 pts: Critical commentary exercise
- 10 pts: Fee schedule

The RFQ stated that references would be evaluated on a pass-or-fail basis and that firms receiving unsatisfactory review from third-party reference would be disqualified. The Subcommittee decided to defer checking references until its review of full proposals during the RFP phase. Submittals reflected the full range of disciplines described in the RFQ, including: engagement, planning, urban design, mobility, economics, cultural planning, environmental, equity, climate change, health planning, web

tools, and smart cities. For the most part, firms were deemed unqualified only when submitted qualifications were not sufficiently relevant for the project. Below is the recommended qualified consultants list:

AECOM
Alta Planning + Design
Arup
Ascent
Brendle Group
Calthorpe Analytics
Circlepoint
CityFi
Community Arts Resources
Cultural Planning Group
Deborah Murphy
DiviningLAB
Dr. Richard Jackson
Dyett + Bhatia
ESA
Fehr & Peers
Fuscoe Engineering
Gehl
Gibson Transportation
Happy City
Here LA
HR&A Advisors
iSEEED
Iteris
James Lima Planning + Development
Johnson Fain
Kittelson & Associates
Mia Lehrer + Associates
MIG
MK Planning
Nelson/Nygaard
Opticos Design
Perkins + Will
Perkins Eastman
Placeworks
Project for Public Spaces
Raimi + Associates
Raju Associates
RCLCO
Sitelab
Skidmore, Owings & Merrill
Steer Davies Gleave
Stoss Landscape Urbanism
Strategic Economics

STUDIO V Architecture
SWCA
The Robert Group
Torti Gallas + Partners
Transpo Group
Tree People
Urban Insight
Utile
Veronica Tam + Associates
Wilson & Company
Winter & Co.
WXY

All firms listed above were determined to be qualified based on separate review of each set of qualifications it submitted, whether by team or individually. As stated in the draft RFP, firms not listed as qualified are not excluded from submitting proposals.

Draft RFP

The draft RFP (Attachment 2), described as follows, includes all information required by the City Attorney's Office and Finance Department:

I. Request Summary
II. Introduction
    A. Community Profile
    B. Context and Background
    C. General RFP Submittal Information
    D. RFP Questions
    E. Schedule
III. Scope of Services
    A. Project Scope
    B. Major Deliverables
IV. Proposal Outline to be Submitted
V. Questionnaire
VI. Evaluation of Proposals

The RFP differs from the RFQ in that proposals must include an approach and cost for each task outlined in the RFP, and must identify subconsultants where necessary. The draft scope of services in Section III describes the following line items in further detail and clarifies that proposers may suggest alternative approaches to meet project objectives:

1. Project management and coordination
2. Project initiation
3. Public engagement
4. General Plan Update
    a. Update of existing and required elements
    b. Addition of optional topics

5. Zoning Code and Map consistency recommendations
6. Environmental and technical analyses
   a. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documentation
   b. Technical analyses
      - Background report
      - Land use and build-out analysis
      - Health impact assessment
      - Market and fiscal analysis
      - CEQA technical studies
7. Travel demand forecasting program for SB 743 compliance
8. Hearings, meetings, and events

Review, and approval of issuance of, the final RFP is tentatively scheduled for the week of January 8, 2018 (refer to Attachment 3, Updated Schedule).

NEXT STEPS

1. Approve the final form of the draft RFP
2. Approve issuance of final RFP (special meeting week of January 8, 2018)
3. Continue to formulate the roles and organization of the advisory bodies

FISCAL ANALYSIS

There is no fiscal impact associated with these discussion items.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft advisory body framework and details
2. Draft RFP
3. Updated schedule

MOTION

That the City Council:

1. Discuss the General Plan Update (GPU) Advisory Bodies, Request for Qualifications (RFQ) submittals summary, draft qualified consultants list, draft Request for Proposals (RFP); and

2. Direct the City Manager as deemed appropriate.