

ROSEVILLE
REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION

Date: 10-15-12
Item No.: 12.a

Department Approval

City Manager Approval



Item Description: Approve LHB Consulting as Lead Consultant for the Park and Recreation Renewal Program

BACKGROUND

On November 3rd, 2010 the City Council adopted the Parks and Recreation System Master Plan.

On July 11th, 2011, the City Council authorized a \$19.025M Park and Recreation Renewal Program (PRRP).

On January 9, 2012, the City Council authorized the staff to work with Arizona State University (ASU) to implement the Best Value Procurement Method for the PRRP.

The PRRP was on hold until the litigation was cleared on July 23rd, 2012.

The first step to the implementation process is to select a lead consultant for a scope as follows:

- Coordinate planning efforts in concert with the community and city staff
- Review projects, costs, staging of improvements and implementation schedules
- Facilitate public meetings during the planning phase
- Create detail concept plans for parks and facilities
- Develop system wide design and construction standards
- Assist in the selection of sub-consultants
- Assure consistency with the adopted system wide master plan

A Request for Proposal (RFP) was prepared using the ASU Best Value Procurement format and language with final City Attorney approval.

On July 25th, 2012 the RFP was issued to (19) known qualified firms and was posted via the city web site; McGraw Hill plans exchange and other web sites.

On August 8th, 2012 a mandatory pre-proposal education/training session was held for any and all interested firms.

31 On August 20th, 2012, six proposals were received. The Best Value Procurement selection process
32 began with a five member evaluation team made up of staff from Parks and Recreation and Public
33 Works and a representative from the Parks and Recreation Commission. All firms were within the
34 \$194,500 anticipated budget, although costs and firm names were not known to the evaluation team
35 until the interview time.

36
37 The best value process uses six selection criteria:

- 38 • Past Performance Information (PPI)
- 39 • Project Capability
- 40 • Identification and Mitigation of Risk
- 41 • Value Added
- 42 • Cost
- 43 • Interview of Key Personnel

44 The submittal evaluation process is “blind” (no bias from knowledge of consultant names by the
45 selection committee), minimizes the decision making of the selection committee, and forces the
46 consultants to show dominant and clear reasons as to why they should be hired. The process connects
47 value with price, forcing consultants to show dominant value. To further minimize the bias of the
48 selection committee during the submittal evaluation process, the selection committee does the
49 following:

- 50
51 1. Rates all criteria separately.
- 52 2. Justifies any high rating.
- 53 3. Does not see the price breakout and PPI until after the prioritization of the consultants.
- 54 4. Does not see the prioritization of consultants until after the prioritization is completed.

55 On August 28th, 2012 interviews were conducted with the project lead only from all six firms. The
56 purpose was for them to describe their proposed plan and approach to the evaluation team.

57
58 On August 31st, 2012, the highest ranked Potential Best Value Lead Consultant was identified as LHB
59 Consulting, at which time the clarification phase began. The clarification phase consisted of
60 understanding better; their scope, milestone schedule, financial arrangements, assessment of risks and
61 mitigation plans and value added plans of the proposal. The following list includes all 6 firms and their
62 total evaluation score and base cost:

63 Firm	Total Evaluation Score	Base Cost
64 LHB Consulting	996.3	\$172,338
65 Stantec	923.6	\$169,800
66 SEH	838.8	\$173,000
67 HGA	782.6	\$193,100
68 SRF Consulting Group	740.4	\$190,000
69 WSB and Associates	706.2	\$185,500

70
71 LHB Consulting offered a strong recommendation on a well thought out Value Added Plan that will
72 help to facilitate continued discussion with staff, citizens, community groups and other consultants for
73 an additional cost not to exceed \$22,080. This proposal specifically offices the lead project manager
74 from LHB at City Hall 2 days per month throughout the contract to provide that ongoing coordination.

75

76 Community input has been a very significant part of the Master Plan Update, Implementation Process
77 and the identified Park and Recreation Renewal Program. For the Renewal Program to continue to be
78 highly successful, it is very important that this continue. The Value Added proposal underscores the
79 understanding of LHB Consulting on the importance of resident input/involvement in creative ways will
80 make the difference. The Evaluation Team recommends this approach.

81
82 After completing the Best Value Procurement process and LHB demonstrating their understanding of
83 the project, approach, fees, costs and deliverables, the evaluation team is recommending that the City
84 enter into an agreement with LHB Consulting as the Lead Consultant for the Parks and Recreation
85 Renewal Program (PRRP) for a scope as outlined for a cost of \$194,418 including the Value Added
86 Item as described to be taken from the City Park and Recreation Renewal Program (PRRP) Budget.

87
88 The anticipated time to perform the work of the lead consultant is expected to be 9 months.

89
90 The next steps in the process will be to:

- 91 • Finalize the agreement between the City of Roseville and LHB Consulting
- 92 • Finalizing plan to accommodate Recreation Programs
- 93 • Finalize project packaging and schedules
- 94 • Coordinate timing of projects

95
96 **POLICY OBJECTIVE**

97 It is the policy of the City to use the Arizona State University (ASU) Best Value Procurement Method
98 Model for the Park and Recreation Renewal Program to deliver the best value for the community.

99
100 **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS**

101 The total cost of the Lead Consultant as outlined is \$194,418 including the value added item. The cost
102 would be paid for out of the budgeted PRRP for the identified planning and construction management
103 costs.

104
105 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

106 Based on LHB Consulting firm being ranked the highest using the Best Value Procurement Method
107 Model and the extensive community interaction proposed by LHB, staff recommends that the City
108 enter into an agreement with LHB, in the amount of \$194,418, including the Value Added Item as
109 outlined, to be taken from the PRRP Budget.

110
111 **REQUESTED COUNCIL ACTION**

112 Motion authorizing the Mayor and City Manager to enter into a professional services agreement with LHB
113 Consulting for services as referenced in the attached pre-award document to assist in leading the Park and
114 Recreation Renewal Program as outlined for a cost of \$194,418 including the Value Added community
115 interaction item to be taken from the Park and Recreation Renewal Program Budget and with final City
116 Attorney review and approval.

117
118 Prepared by: Lonnie Brokke, Director of Parks and Recreation
Attachments: Pre-Award Document

119

City of Roseville
Lead Consultant
for the
City of Roseville
2012-2015 Parks and Recreation Renewal Program

PRE AWARD DOCUMENT

Prepared By:



LHB, Inc.

21 September 2012

SECTION 1 – FINANCIAL SUMMARY

Approved Value Added Options

NO	DESCRIPTION	COST (\$)
1	To more effectively coordinate parks renewal efforts with the Parks and Recreation Department and other city departments, other jurisdictions, park users and user groups, and the general public, LHB will hold “office hours” at City Hall. Staff from LHB will be housed at City Hall for at least one day every two weeks during the course of the Lead Consultant contract. This work will be performed on an hourly basis not exceeding the amount indicated provided all work occurs within the specified project duration.	\$22,080
2		
3		
4		
5		
<i>Total Approved Value Added Options:</i>		\$22,080

Client Requested Scope Changes

NO	DESCRIPTION	COST (\$)
1	None	
2		
3		
4		
5		
<i>Total Approved Client Scope Changes:</i>		\$0

Final Cost Proposal

NO	DESCRIPTION	COST (\$)
1	Original Proposal Cost	\$172,338
2	Total Approved Value Added Options	\$22,080
3	Total Client Requested Scope Changes	\$0
Final Project Cost		\$194,418

SECTION 2 – PROJECT DURATION SUMMARY

Approved Value Added Options

NO	DESCRIPTION	DURATION
1	To more effectively coordinate parks renewal efforts with the Parks and Recreation Department and other city departments, other jurisdictions, park users and user groups, and the general public, LHB will hold “office hours” at City Hall. Staff from LHB will be housed at City Hall for at least one day every two weeks during the course of the Lead Consultant contract.	0 days added
2		
3		
4		
5		
<i>Total Approved Value Added Options:</i>		<i>0 days added</i>

Client Requested Scope Changes

NO	DESCRIPTION	DURATION
1	None	
2		
3		
4		
5		
<i>Total Approved Client Scope Changes:</i>		

Final Project Duration

NO	DESCRIPTION	DURATION (Calendar Days)
1	Original Proposal Duration (Days)	270
2	Total Approved Value Added Options (Days)	0
3	Total Client Requested Scope Changes (Days)	0
Final Project Duration		270

SECTION 3 – PROJECT SCHEDULE

A complete project schedule identifying **major** activities and actions/decisions required from the client

No	Activity / Task	Duration	Start Date	End Date
1	Receive Notice to Proceed	0 days	10/22/2012	10/22/2012
2	Define public engagement strategy	14 days	10/22/2012	11/05/2012
3	Conduct program review (sequencing of concept planning, staging of improvements, cost review, distribution of investment)	14 days	10/22/2012	11/05/2012
4	Develop concept framework for parks with early implementation potential by non-Roseville entities	14 days	11/12/2012	11/26/2012
5	Select consultant for trails, natural resources	7 days	10/29/2012	11/05/2012
4	Review trails, natural resources policies with selected consultant	14 days	11/19/2012	12/03/2012
7	Identify potential trails, natural resource projects	14 days	12/03/2012	12/17/2012
8	Define implementation actions for trails, natural resource projects	14 days	12/17/2012	12/31/2012
9	Initiate construction and design standards process	7 days	01/07/2013	01/14/2013
10	Develop concept plans (Parks Concept Design series 1)	45 days	01/21/2013	03/04/2013
11	Review concepts to best accommodate parks programs	7 days	01/28/2013	02/04/2013
12	Conduct review of needs for construction and design standards	7 days	03/04/2013	03/10/2013
13	Facilitate review of concepts for Parks Concept Design series 1 by Park and Recreation Commission and City Council	14 days	03/11/2013	03/25/2013
14	Select consultant(s) for Final Plan Development for Park series 1	7 days	03/04/2013	03/11/2013
15	Develop concept plans (Parks Concept Design series 2)	45 days	03/04/2013	04/15/2013
16	Review concepts to best accommodate parks programs	7 days	03/11/2013	03/18/2013
17	Facilitate review of concepts for Parks Concept Design series 2 by Park and Recreation Commission and City Council	14 days	04/22/2013	05/06/2013
18	Select consultant(s) for Final Plan Development for Park series 2	7 days	04/15/2013	04/21/2013
19	Develop concept plans (Parks Concept Design series 3)	45 days	04/15/2013	06/03/2013
20	Review concepts to best accommodate parks programs	7 days	04/22/2013	04/29/2013
21	Finalize construction and design standards	7 days	06/03/2013	06/10/2013
22	Facilitate review of concepts for Parks Concept Design series 3 by Park and Recreation Commission and City Council	14 days	06/10/2013	06/24/2013
23	Select consultant(s) for Final Plan Development for Park series 3	7 days	06/03/2013	06/10/2013
24	Present master plan modifications to commissions and city council	30 days	06/17/2013	07/15/2013
25	Update master plan document	14 days	07/15/2013	07/29/2013
26	Prepare parks inventory	30 days	06/17/2013	07/15/2013
27				
28				
29				

Contractor tasks are in "black", Client tasks are in "blue", Risky activities are in "red"

SECTION 4 – RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN

A complete list of all pre-identified risks that the Vendor does not control.

<p>Identified Risk 1:</p>	<p>Park improvement cost escalation beyond projected budgets</p>
<p>Solution / Strategy:</p>	<p>Staff has indicated that cost projections were updates prior to issuance of the RFP and budgets were adjusted accordingly. Still, as indicators of economic activity suggest more construction activity in the coming years, the city might expect costs to increase.</p> <p>LHB will assess estimated costs at the concept plan stage of every park’s development using internal and, if necessary, external information sources. Internal review of cost projects will utilize historical data for similar construction projects and in-house staff with significant construction cost estimating experience. If necessary, especially for non-typical improvements and unique construction, LHB will contact two to three qualified contractors to review the work and understand the likely range of potential costs. Using that information, LHB will work with staff to assess costs and distribution of investments across the system to ensure alignment with funding mechanisms. We will also encourage the final design consultants to perform an independent assessment of the costs of implementation based on the final design/construction document drawings.</p>
<p>Identified Risk 2:</p>	<p>Failure to gain agreement on a solution for a new park in southwest Roseville</p>
<p>Solution / Strategy:</p>	<p>In the Master Plan, no conclusion is reached on a specific or preferred direction for a park in this part of the community. However, the Master Plan and the city’s Comprehensive Plan clearly indicate the need for a park in southwest Roseville and articulate policy aimed at the creation of suitable park resources for those residents. LHB intends to use the Master Plan (and the Comprehensive Plan) as a starting point for discussions—general and intensive—with residents in that part of the community. We recommend a neighborhood-based charrette (an intensive design workshop) as a method of directly engaging those residents in pursuit of a solution. The key, we believe, is to invest people in the process of finding a reasonable answer, and charging them with responsibility to assisting the city in defining appropriate solutions.</p> <p>While a charrette was not a part of the Master Plan engagement activities, it seems wholly appropriate that it be used for this specific park improvement. Details of a charrette will be determined with staff during the public engagement definition task (Task 2 in the Project Schedule).</p>
<p>Identified Risk 3:</p>	<p>Lack of performance by consultants selected for parks projects</p>
<p>Solution / Strategy:</p>	<p>The goal of the city’s renewal program is implementation of improvements to the community’s parks and recreation system. The citizens of Roseville benefit by having these improvements accomplished earlier in the process, and consultants selected to assist in the process of delivering the improvements need to be aligned with that direction.</p>

	<p>LHB, while not contractually responsible for the work of other consultants, will provide concept plans developed to guide consultants' work in alignment with the Master Plan, with detail demonstrating key concept level directions for park configuration and layout, grading, stormwater management, natural resources amenities, planting and turf establishment, site furnishings, building locations and types, and special features. The concepts will also define directions for accommodating existing or planned recreation programs and activities, concepts for protecting the public during construction activities, and desired implementation dates.. .. The key element of maintaining a schedule is to define appropriate and necessary timelines, require the consultant to identify issues that might delay their work, and, once under contract, assess consultant progress on a regular schedule, all of which we understand will be documented or requested in the city's Requests for Proposals for the preparation of final design/construction documents. If delays in delivery of consultants' work becomes apparent during the Lead Consultant contract period, LHB will work with staff to determine remedies, including, if amenable to the city, reassignment of work to other consultants</p> <p>LHB has made a suggestion that the trails and natural resources consultants be engaged early (Task 5 in the Project Schedule) so that their work can inform the development of concept plans. Because so much of the critical direction (including cost estimates and public engagement) is focused around the development of the concepts, these consultants must be keenly aware of the need for delivery of their work products. We envision a close relationship with these consultants during the first several months of the Lead Consultant process in order to ensure delivery of their work as the first series of park concept plans are generated.</p> <p>A consultant's deviation from the accepted/approved concept plans as the final design/construction documents are completed, whether in design direction, schedule, or details, will not become the responsibility of the Lead Consultant unless the city directs the Lead Consultant to participate outside the terms of the Lead Consultant agreement.</p>
--	--

Identified Risk 4:	Displacement of programmed park activities during implementation of improvements
Solution / Strategy:	<p>Staff has noted the need to closely coordinate implementation planning to ensure planned park and recreation programs are not displaced. LHB intends to work with parks program staff during the development of concepts for the parks to understand the impacts of changes and to strategize methods of accommodating park programs even during construction activities. Priority will be on direct accommodation, public safety, but we may also need to consider providing temporary facilities can be defined as a part of the park improvement contract, sequencing of improvements (which may have an impact on construction costs), and, likely as a last resort, relocating activities to another park. A part of this effort will also require an assessment of the impressions of the construction site on the public and defining through the concept planning process key practices for maintaining an organized and</p>

	<p>secure work zone.</p> <p>This concern was identified during the first meeting of the clarification phase. It was not directly considered during the development of LHB’s work plan, but accommodation of park programs during renewal efforts is a task that fits the concept planning stage. We will meet with staff (using “office hours” already dedicated as a value-added element of our work) to review park plans as they are conceived, frame options for accommodating park programs, and determine an optimal solution to be carried forward to the final design/construction phase.</p>
--	---

Identified Risk 5:	Slow progress toward agreement on a concept plan
Solution / Strategy:	<p>Significant public engagement during the Master Plan process allowed the city to move forward with confidence toward renewal. Still, LHB believes that an interested public will become more active at the time when real change will be considered for <i>their</i> park. While we intend a public engagement process that encourages broad and active participation, we also intend to use the Master Plan (as the adopted policy of the City of Roseville) and its various components as the starting points for discussions with parks stakeholders. We’re not starting over; it’s a process of refinement and, if we’re intending the Master Plan as a guide, citizens need to be apprised of its key directions as they share ideas and concerns during the park concept planning process.</p> <p>To aid in the public’s understanding of the concept planning process, the process of engaging the community and parks stakeholders will include a review of the key directions of the Master Plan at the outset of the park concept planning process (with a consistent message conveyed to the community and parks stakeholders for each park). We will demonstrate the importance of a concept plan relative to the Master Plan by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · reviewing the concept planning process and their role in that process; · defining the timeframe for their input; and · framing the bounds of decision-making for their participation. <p>By carefully articulating HOW the public is involved, we believe the process of arriving at a decision point can be better accommodated—simply, the public is made aware of the key role they play, and our experience suggests they respond appropriately with sound direction for our work to progress.</p>

SECTION 5 – SCOPE OVERVIEW

A clear description of “what’s in” and “what’s out” of the scope.

The city’s Request for Proposals provided a description of those services and tasks to be delivered by the city. The city shall provide public notification of meetings and other engagement activities. However, we can be supportive in that process by providing descriptions of meetings and other supportive materials.

The “brief feasibility study” for the Victoria Ballfield Complex is understood to be an exercise in configuration, not economics. LHB will study alternative layouts and orientation for the ballfield complex that support a tournament configuration, with associated support facilities for parking, concessions, restroom, storage and maintenance that accommodate the complex. The city will be responsible for any work related to assessment of revenue generation potential. As in other concept planning exercises, LHB’s work will assess the impacts of implementation on existing programs and activities and offer recommendations for accommodating those programs and activities.

LHB has only preliminarily addressed grouping of parks for the concept planning stage. The city will refine and confirm the parks that will become a part of each of the three series of concept planning explorations as a part of Program Review (Task 3). We know there are parameters, but the definition we’ve provided in our original milestone schedule was our interpretation, and it merits assessment by staff. Park program accommodation might also play a role in defining the sequence of parks considered in each series.

LHB has defined a list of deliverables related to each task in our originally submitted Milestone Schedule. That list should be incorporated as a part of this section of the Pre-Award Document.

SECTION 6 – PROJECT ASSUMPTIONS

A detailed list of all proposal assumptions that may impact cost, schedule, or satisfaction.

Assumption 1:	All work will be completed within a nine month timeframe
Solution / Strategy:	<p>If our assumption was incorrect, we will work with the city at the outset to reframe the schedule of activities to better align our work with expectations. We framed this schedule as a reasonable approach with the understanding that the goal was delivery of park improvements under the renewal program and our work could be accomplished within 270 calendar days.</p> <p>Should the need arise during the project to reduce the pace of work to better accommodate the interests of the public, we will make adjustments to our milestone schedule. An extension of the time required for public review will not trigger an increase in fees, however LHB’s participation at additional meetings may result in additional fees. Should LHB be asked to participate in additional meetings, we will assess the status of billings and work remaining and offer an assessment of potential additional fees. No work will proceed without an agreement being reached for any adjustment of the “Standard Agreement for Professional Services.”</p> <p>If the city determines that reworking of a prepared by unapproved concept plan is warranted as a result of public input after the concept plan stage for that park, the reworking of the concept plan may result in additional fees. As with participation in additional meetings, we will assess our billings and work remaining to understand the impacts on the overall budget. No work will proceed without an agreement being reached for any adjustment of the “Standard Agreement for Professional Services.”</p> <p>Extending the term of LHB’s engagement or reworking concepts would be most necessary to ensure the public has proper time to respond to proposals for change—that they are satisfied with the improvements resulting from this work.</p> <p>The project schedule included as a part of this document assumes a start date of 22 October 2012. That schedule will be adjusted should there be a delay in the Notice to Proceed.</p>

Assumption 2:	
Solution / Strategy:	If our assumption was incorrect, we will....

Assumption 3:	
Solution / Strategy:	If our assumption was incorrect, we will....

SECTION 7 – PROJECT ACTION ITEM CHECKLIST

A separate checklist should be created for the Client Representatives and the Vendor that includes the major activities, tasks, or decisions that will need to be made.

Vendor Action Item Checklist

No	Activity / Task / Decision	Due Date	Impact (Cost / Time)	Responsible Party
1	Define public engagement strategy (Task 2 of Project Schedule) – This task will require coordination of efforts for any parks where early implementation activities might occur; knowing which parks might have early implementation (such as Villa Park) may require advanced notice to park stakeholders to allow fair engagement prior to development of a concept plan.	11/05/2012	*	Schroeder
2	Identify trails and natural resource projects (Task 7 of the Project Schedule) – This task needs to be accomplished so that projects can be integrated into the concept planning effort. Special effort will be required for any parks where early implementation and early concept planning will occur, with deliverables needed for those parks occurring prior to the Due Date indicated.	12/17/2012	*	Schroeder
3	Develop concept plans (Task 10, 15, 19) – This task aligns directly with the transfer of design responsibility to a consultant charged with final design/construction documents.	03/04/2013 04/15/2013 06/03/2013	*	Schroeder
4				
5				

** costs are addressed in Original Proposal Cost; timing is addressed in Section 3 – Project Schedule*

Client Action Item Checklist

No	Activity / Task / Decision	Due Date	Impact (Cost / Time)	Responsible Party
1	Conduct program review (sequencing of concept planning, staging of improvements, cost review, distribution of investment) (Task 3 of Project Schedule) – This task will be performed jointly by the city and the Lead Consultant; having the proper alignment of parks in each Concept Planning series will allow the work of the Lead Consultant and the trails and natural resources consultants to be more clearly connected to the concept planning work scheduled to begin in mid-January and to allow any necessary public notices to be disseminated.	11/05/2012		Evenson
2	Develop concept framework for parks with early implementation potential by non-Roseville entities	11/12/2012		Evenson

	(Villa Park) (Task 4 of Project Schedule) – This action requires the city to define the parameters for those parks where some implementation may be performed by non-city entities. This activity will be led by the city with input from the Lead Consultant.			
3	Select consultant for trails and natural resources (Task 5 of Project Schedule) – If some parks are slated for early implementation activities or early concept planning, having the trails and natural resources consultants available is critical to achieving the goals of the Master Plan. Allowing these consultants adequate time to perform their work prior to the start of the concept planning effort requires adherence to the completion date indicated. This activity will be led by the city with input from the Lead Consultant.	11/05/2012		Evenson
4	Select consultants for final design/construction documents (Task 14, 18, 23) – With concepts plans approved, the process of implementation is expedited by having these consultants ready to proceed with their work on final design and construction documents.	03/11/2013 04/21/2013 06/10/2013		Evenson
5	Review concepts to best accommodate parks programs (Task 11, 16, 20) – The ability to manage implementation activities while accommodating current park programs requires direct input from staff prior to finalizing concepts.	02/04/2013 03/18/2013 04/29/2013		Evenson
6	Facilitate review of concepts by Parks and Recreation Commission and City Council (Task 13, 17, 22) – Concepts must be reviewed and approved prior to initiating final design/construction documents.	03/25/2013 05/06/2013 06/24/2013		Evenson

SECTION 8 – CONTACT LIST

Provide a list of critical individuals on this project (Client Representatives, Contractor, Subcontractors, Suppliers, etc)

No	Name	Company/Position	Phone	Email
1	Michael Schroeder	LHB, Inc.	612.868.2704	michael.schroeder@lhbcorp.com
2	Lydia Major	LHB, Inc.	612.752.6956	lydia.major@lhbcorp.com
3	Jason Aune	LHB, Inc.	612.752.6926	jason.aune@lhbcorp.com
4	Lonnie Brokke	City of Roseville	651.792.7101	lonnie.brokke@ci.roseville.mn.us
5	Jill Anfang	City of Roseville	651.792.7102	jill.anfang@ci.roseville.mn.us
6	Jeff Evenson	City of Roseville	651.792.7107	jeff.evenson@ci.roseville.mn.us