



# City of Culver City

Mike Balkman  
Council Chambers  
9770 Culver Blvd.  
Culver City, CA 90232  
(310) 253-5851

## Staff Report

---

**File #:** 19-695, **Version:** 1

**Item #:** A-1

---

**CC - Interviews with the Raimi + Associates and Interface Studio Teams for General Plan Update (GPU) Services in Response to Request for Proposals (RFP) #1802.**

**Meeting Date:** January 24, 2019

**Contact Person/Dept:** Ashley Hefner/CDD

**Phone Number:** (310) 253-5744

**Fiscal Impact:** No      **General Fund:** Yes

**Public Hearing:** No      **Action Item:** No      **Attachments:** Yes

**Commission Action Required:** No

**Public notification:** (E-Mail) Meetings and Agendas - City Council (01/17/2019); Notify Me - Culver City News and Events, General Plan Update, and Public Notifications (01/17/2019); and City's Social Media Accounts (various dates).

**Department Approval:** Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director (12/24/18)

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends the City Council interview the Raimi + Associates and Interface Studio teams for General Plan Update (GPU) services in response to Request for Proposals (RFP) #1802.

### **BACKGROUND**

- August 20, 2017: City Council approved issuance of GPU Request for Qualifications (RFQ) #1819
- September 6, 2017: RFQ was issued
- September 29, 2017: 36 submittals received in response to RFQ
- November 16, 2017: City Council approved qualified consultants list based on submittals to RFQ
- April 23, 2018: City Council approved issuance of GPU Request for Proposals (RFP) #1802

- April 26, 2018: RFP was issued
- June 21, 2018: Nine proposals received in response to RFP
- September 6, 2018: City Council GPU Subcommittee decided to interview the four top scoring teams, based on proposal scores
- October 18, 2018: Four top scoring teams were interviewed
- November 6, 2018: City Council GPU Subcommittee recommended the City Council interview the two top teams, based on proposal and interview scores

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Proposal Evaluation**

The City Council GPU Subcommittee and Advance Planning staff reviewed, evaluated and scored the proposals. Cultural Affairs; Current Planning; Economic Development; Finance; Housing; Parks, Recreation and Community Services; Police; Public Works; and Transportation staff reviewed proposal excerpts relevant to their programs. Advance Planning staff reviewed the comments, which were minimal and did not change scoring.

The teams' proposals were scored using this criteria:

- |  |        |
|--|--------|
| • Project understanding                      | 25 pts |
| • Scope of work                              | 25 pts |
| • Lead firm qualifications and experience    | 15 pts |
| • Project team qualifications and experience | 15 pts |
| • Implementation schedule                    | 10 pts |
| • Total                                      | 90 pts |

These teams' proposals scored highest out of a possible 90 points<sup>1</sup>:

- |                      |        |
|----------------------|--------|
| • Raimi + Associates | 89 pts |
| • Interface Studio   | 80 pts |
| • AECOM              | 79 pts |
| • PlaceWorks         | 78 pts |

The five other proposals scored less than 70 points including: Dialog, Team Ivy, SOM, Torti Gallas + Partners, and Arup. These teams did not move on to the interview phase.

### **City Council GPU Subcommittee/Staff Interviews**

The four top scoring teams were interviewed by the following panelists<sup>2</sup>:

- Thomas Small, Mayor and GPU Subcommittee member
- John Nachbar, City Manager
- Sol Blumenfeld, Director, Community Development
- Charles Herbertson, Director, Public Works
- Ashley Hefner, Advance Planning Manager, Community Development
- Diana Chang, Planning Manager, Transportation
- Brent Oltz, Advance Planning Associate, Community Development

Interviews were two hours long and consisted of: 10-minute presentation by consultants; 45-minute question and answer period (Attachment 1 includes questions), and an hour long practical exercise. For the exercise, a prompt distributed beforehand (Attachment 2) asked teams to facilitate an engagement activity to show how they would work through a policy response to a difficult housing or mobility challenge with the public and City representatives (role played by panelists).

The teams' interviews were scored using this scale:

1. Did not meet expectations
2. Partially met expectations
3. Met or exceeded expectations
4. Outstanding achievement or ability

The teams' interviews were scored using this criteria:

- Experience
- Project understanding and approach
- Scope of work
- Project management
- Communication and engagement
- Practical exercise

These teams' interviews scored highest out of a possible 144 points:

- |                      |           |
|----------------------|-----------|
| • Raimi + Associates | 143.5 pts |
| • Interface Studio   | 131 pts   |

The PlaceWorks and AECOM teams scored notably lower, which led to the GPU Subcommittee decision to move the Raimi + Associates and Interface Studio teams only to the City Council interview phase.

### **Added Services Requested after Interviews**

A Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emission Inventory is required to inform the climate adaptation and resiliency element in the GPU. The GPU RFP didn't request an inventory scope because the Public Works Department is preparing one on a separate track (funded by Southern California Edison (SCE)). After issuing the GPU RFP, Advance Planning staff realized that due to SCE funding constraints, that inventory will address energy emissions only; i.e., not land use, buildings, transportation, and industry.

As such, staff requested a scope and budget from the top two teams to prepare a comprehensive inventory addressing all relevant emissions. The existing environmental planning subconsultants on both teams can provide this service. The energy section of the comprehensive inventory will rely on the 'SCE energy-only inventory' and update as needed. Both teams' schedules and budgets have been updated to include a GHG Inventory.

During GPU Subcommittee/Staff Interviews, a recommendation from some panelists was to strengthen the Raimi team's expertise on arts and cultural planning. The Cultural Planning Group has been added to the team and a final scope and budget<sup>3</sup> will be presented at the interview. Attachment

5 includes a preliminary scope and subconsultant qualifications.

### **City Council Interviews**

Each interview will be one hour with a half hour presentation and a half hour for questions and answers. City Council Members will hold its deliberations of the proposals until the January 28, 2019 regular meeting. Below is a snap shot of team schedules, budgets, and subconsultants. Attachment 3 includes a more detailed summary.

The Raimi + Associates team's scope of work requires about three years to complete at a cost of \$1,829,835<sup>3</sup> and subconsultants are listed below. Attachments 4 to 8 include the proposal, information for added services discussed above, budget, and schedule.

- ESA
- HR&A
- Perkins + Will
- Nelson/Nygaard
- Rally
- Sherwood Design Engineers
- The Cultural Planning Group
- Urban Systems
- Veronica Tam + Associates

The Interface Studio team's scope of work requires about three years to complete at a cost of \$1,998,241 and subconsultants are listed below. Attachments 9 to 12 include the proposal, information for added services discussed above, budget, and schedule.

- Barry Miller
- Circlepoint
- Estolano Lesar
- Fehr & Peers
- Here LA
- Katz & Associates
- Ludlow Kingsley
- Michael Baker
- Sherwood Design Engineers
- Stoss
- Strategic Economics

### **NEXT STEPS**

On January 28, 2019, City Council will:

1. Discuss January 24, 2018 GPU Services interviews;
2. Select, and approve a professional services agreement with, the team led by Raimi + Associates to perform General Plan Update (GPU) services in response to Request for Proposals (RFP) #1802 in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$1,829,835; or
3. Select, and approve a professional services agreement with, the team led by Interface Studio

to perform General Plan Update (GPU) services in response to Request for Proposals (RFP) #1802 in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$1,998,241; and

5. Authorize the City Attorney to review/prepare the necessary documents; and,
6. Authorize the City Manager to execute such documents on behalf of the City.

## **FISCAL ANALYSIS**

There is no fiscal impact associated with this item.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Interview questions
2. Practical exercise prompt
3. Top two team details
4. Raimi + Associates team proposal
5. Raimi + Associates team Arts and Cultural Planning preliminary scope and subconsultant qualifications
6. Raimi + Associates team GHG Inventory scope
7. Raimi + Associates team budget<sup>3</sup>
8. Raimi + Associates team schedule
9. Interface Studio team proposal
10. Interface Studio team GHG Inventory scope
11. Interface Studio team budget
12. Interface Studio team schedule
13. Request for Proposals #1802

## **NOTES**

1. 'References and satisfaction of previous clients' is a scoring criteria in the RFP, but was not scored as only two raters actually conducted the checks. They were mostly positive and the results were shared with the GPU Subcommittee for consideration.
2. Vice-Mayor and GPU Subcommittee Member, Meghan Sahli-Wells, agreed to be absent from GPU Subcommittee/Staff Interviews due to scheduling conflicts. Staff briefed her afterward.
3. The Raimi + Associates budget does not include fees for The Cultural Planning Group, which will be presented at the Council interviews.

## **MOTION**

That the City Council interview the Raimi + Associates and Interface Studio teams for General Plan Update (GPU) Services in response to Request for Proposals (RFP) #1802.