

ROSEVILLE
REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION

Agenda Date: 7/25/2016

Agenda Item: 14.c

Department Approval



City Manager Approval



Item Description: Review draft Request for Proposal for the comprehensive plan update, and provide input on modifications to the draft, and direct staff to issue the Request for Proposals (**PROJ-0037**)

1 **BACKGROUND**

2 Based on input received from the Planning Commission on June 1, 2016, and from the City
3 Council on June 16, 2016, Planning Division staff has prepared a draft Request for Proposal
4 (RFP) as the first step in engaging a consultant to lead the effort in updating Roseville's 2030
5 Comprehensive Plan. The scope of the proposal is designed to meet Metropolitan Council
6 requirements for a 2040 Comprehensive Plan, to review and recalibrate (if necessary) the
7 community's goals, and to identify policies and action steps toward reaching those goals.
8 Minutes of the June 16 City Council meeting are included with this RCA as Exhibit A, and a
9 draft RFP is included as Exhibit B.

10 **PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT**

11 Beyond any feedback the City Council might have about the rest of the RFP, planning
12 Division staff wants to highlight the public engagement portion (Section II.D). The overall
13 public engagement strategy will accumulate input from the community on assorted topics and
14 at various points in the process, which the consultant will digest and synthesize into new or
15 updated content for the comprehensive plan. In this section, the RFP should clarify for
16 responding consultants what kind of "working group" will be reviewing consultant-generated
17 content, after community input has been received, in order for the respondents to gauge the
18 frequency and structure of work-product review meetings. Some options for the composition
19 of the working group for the Council to consider are:

- 20 • Representatives of various City departments
- 21 • Representatives of advisory commissions
- 22 • Representatives of City Council
- 23 • A combination of these

24 **REQUESTED ACTIONS**

25 **Provide input on modifications to the draft RFP, and direct staff to issue the RFP.**

Attachments: A: 6/13/2016 City Council
minutes

B: Draft Request for Proposal

Prepared by: Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd
651-792-7073
bryan.lloyd@cityofroseville.com

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "B. Lloyd", is positioned to the right of the contact information.

15. Business Items - Presentations/Discussions

a. Receive Information on the Upcoming Comprehensive Plan Update and Provide Direction on the Scope of the Update, the Public Engagement Strategy, and the Overall Timeline of the Process to Update the Comprehensive Plan (PROJ-0037)

Interim Community Development Director Kari Collins and Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd were present to provide an overview of information regarding the upcoming comprehensive plan update, as detailed in the RCA. Ms. Collins asked the City Council to provide direction to staff on the scope of the update, the public engagement strategy, and overall timeline of the process.

During the presentation, and as per the RCA, staff highlighted each chapter or section, and advised that the scope of the project defined by the City Council would inform the degree of outside consultant use for specific chapters versus in-house technical review of those deemed consistent with the 2008 update.

Public Works Director Marc Culver briefly reviewed those chapters under the Public Works realm, noting that a different outside consultant would be reviewing those chapters on a parallel track with other consultant work and including public input. Mr. Culver reported that all chapters would be presented together upon their completion for City Council final approval prior to seeking review and comment by other jurisdictions and agencies, before final submission to the Metropolitan Council. Mr. Culver noted that staff intended to integrate and update the Pathway Master Plan into the transportation chapter, including seeking public input on updated pathway priorities.

RCA Exhibit A

Specific to the economic development and redevelopment chapters, Ms. Collins noted the need to identify whether a consultant specializing in those areas was needed to assist the process, noting there would be some level of updating needed in transitioning from the Housing and Redevelopment Authority (HRA) to the Economic Development Authority (EDA), even though some of the policies and goals remained consistent.

Specific to environmental protection and utilities chapters, Mr. Culver advised that some consultant assistance may be needed for special modeling and data production, most of the work could be completed in-house by staff and then incorporated into the updated plan.

Mr. Culver highlighted the surface water management section, advising that this was already out for a Request for Proposals (RFP) due to timing with one of the three area watershed districts and their review slated for the city in August of 2017. However, Mr. Culver noted that this information would also be reviewed and presented to the public for their feedback.

Specific to the parks, open space and recreation chapter, Ms. Collins advised that the Park Master Plan and Park Renewal Program documents would be integrated into the comprehensive plan update.

Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd reviewed the implementation chapter as detailed in the RCA; as well as additional considerations as outlined in lines 119-195 of the RCA.

Ms. Collins noted Planning Commission input included in lines 196 - 216 of the RCA.

If the City Council had any additional considerations, Ms. Collins asked that they direct that information to staff. For those with little or no familiarity with the comprehensive plan or updates each decade, Ms. Collins referred them to the Metropolitan Council's local community handbook, opining it was a wonderful resource.

Ms. Collins reviewed the draft timeline for City Council consideration, noting it was mirrored against the 2007-08 plan update timeline, and addressed in lines 48 - 71 of the RCA. Ms. Collins advised that the significant time between November 2017 and December 31, 2018 was to allow review by local jurisdictions, agencies and the Metropolitan Council.

Prior to preparing an RFP, Ms. Collins advised that staff was seeking specific City Council guidance on their preferred scope of the update and preferred option(s) for public engagement strategies. The recommended choices outlined by staff were as follows:

Options for Scope of Update

- a) Technical update - system statements issued by the Metropolitan Council; OR
- b) Technical and content update; OR
- c) Technical update and full re-write/re-vision of the comprehensive plan.

-

Options for Engagement Strategy

- a) Engagement strategy developed with consultant, staff and various advisory commissions; OR
- b) Consultant suggested engagement process with Community Engagement Commission (CEC) representation in review of proposals; OR
- c) A steering committee process similar to that used for the 2008 update.

Scope

Based on her familiarity with the Comprehensive Plan, Councilmember McGehee stated she found the current plan pretty good. From her perspective, Councilmember McGehee opined the only piece missing from the engagement strategy used last time was that the process didn't go deep enough into small groups or districts thereby not allowing significant changes to be noticed and vetted by neighborhoods being affected by the corresponding changes as proposed. Without an opportunity for those neighborhoods or community areas to review those sections and goals, or to voice their concerns, Councilmember McGehee opined that negated ownership by those neighborhoods in the process. Otherwise, Councilmember McGehee opined that she thought the sections, goals and overall vision was good, but it simply lacked that necessary outreach component and engagement at the level neighborhood and community within the city for the whole plan.

Specific to the scope of the update, Councilmember McGehee stated that only a few technical updates were needed due mostly to legislative changes since 2008. Councilmember McGehee opined that the vision was fine, but the vision was before the new normal; and it didn't hurt in this process to take that vision back to smaller neighborhoods to take their pulse and make sure everything was still relevant.

Councilmember Willmus stated that he agreed with much of Councilmember McGehee's comments, opining he found it to be a good document and didn't require a rewrite or complete revision, but to simply look to the technical update to make sure a review of goals are still relevant to accomplish, those no longer valid, or those needing new things plugged in. Councilmember Willmus noted he included bringing the EDA into it. Councilmember Willmus stated that one thing he would like to consider bringing back into the focus of the comprehensive plan, was a review of the vision, goals and policies related to HDR

housing, and to take a second look at that based on recent presentations and former Community Development Director Bilotta's report on the amount of Roseville acreage zoned HDR versus what the community needs.

Councilmember Etten stated he would support a middle-of-the-road approach, or option "b" with a technical and content update. Councilmember Etten suggested some areas needing more time spend on them included housing and economic development; and expressed appreciation for Public Works Director Culver's intent to provide connectivity with the community's Pathway Master Plan, and suggested including that connectivity outside the city or regionally as well. Also as the city moves forward in reviewing development proposals, Councilmember Etten suggested a more in-depth look, from a public works or parks and recreation perspective, how those pieces connect (e.g. water, climate, health, etc.) and consider them part of the comprehensive plan as well.

Councilmember Laliberte stated her agreement with her colleagues for the most part, noting that the City Council and community had been addressing those areas of the 2008 plan that didn't seem right or needed refinement over the last few years. Regarding the scope, Councilmember Laliberte supported option "b" to make sure the updated plan was current. Councilmember Laliberte agreed that obviously the EDA and structural planning changes made since the 2008 plan update needed to be updated, including HDR designations.

Mayor Roe noted it was helpful that the city was already planning to review HDR designations, and integrate those analyses without the need for a separate outside consultant. Mayor Roe concurred with an option "b" scope as well as engagement strategies that made sure the goals and policy section of each chapter at a minimum met with acceptance of the general public for what the community was looking for and to make sure they were given time to specifically weigh in on goals. Mayor Roe noted that may have something to do with the Imagine

Roseville 2025 community visioning process to ensure those remained in play without opening up that vision again from a clean slate and starting over; but instead to use this opportunity as a check-in with the public to make sure the city is still on the right track or make adjustments as needed. Mayor Roe noted that one of the downsides of that community visioning process was that it had been huge and unwieldy. If that could be simplified to a simple draft of aspirations, which had proven to be unsatisfactory to him and Councilmember McGehee, Mayor Roe suggested that a more succinct process could prove more beneficial.

Councilmember McGehee agreed, opining that if groups were vigorously sought out and small enough for engagement and interaction, all components for goals, vision and a lot of HDR considerations and questions heard throughout the community could be addressed and HDR sites defined community-wide. Councilmember McGehee referenced the "Thrive" document, noting that it wasn't predicting much growth or increase in affordable housing needs; therefore not strapping the city to any unreasonable goals. Therefore, Councilmember McGehee opined that this should open up opportunities for environmental and sustainability components if that was part of climate change and more discussion about green steps to pursue (e.g. solar, community gardens, etc.), but reiterated the need to make these discussion groups smaller versus a giant district that were too intimidating for people to weigh in.

Engagement

Mayor Roe stated he didn't find the steering committee process used in 2008 to be the right process to repeat; and given the community's experience with engagement, didn't think a consultant-suggested process was needed either. In general, Mayor Roe stated his preference for a city-developed process.

RCA Exhibit A

Councilmember Willmus agreed, and also stated he didn't want this to fall into the lap of one particular commission, but to receive input from all advisory commissions as part of the process.

Mayor Roe clarified that he thought all city commissions had a role in informing the document's content, but considered the CEC's role to define the engagement process itself, but not tasking them with how something was or was not presented, or not functioning as a steering committee.

Councilmembers Etten, Laliberte and McGehee concurred.

Councilmember McGehee suggested that council members might consider attending some smaller group meetings help inform the council as a whole.

Mayor Roe noted that a lot of input in the Park Master Plan process had been achieved through the "meeting in a box" concept which was great for engagement, but may depend on a consultant versus CEC directed but could also be directed sufficiently to provide good results. Mayor Roe noted that consultants were the experts in defining those tools.

City Manager Trudgeon noted that the CEC had a better understanding that their role was to come up with best practices to present to the City Council, upon consulting with staff. Mr. Trudgeon noted those tools could include "meetings in a box," or other options; and anticipated those recommendations coming forward from the CEC within the next few months. Mr. Trudgeon advised that it was clearly identified for the CEC and he had reinforced to them that the CEC's role was not to serve as a steering committee for the comprehensive plan.

Mayor Roe expressed hope that tonight's scope and goal engagement would serve to inform the CEC's discussion.

Without objection, Mayor Roe confirmed to staff that the Scope option "b" was preferred; and engagement option was a combination of options "a" and "b."



REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

2040 Comprehensive Plan Update

July 25, 2016

Table of Contents

- I. **INTRODUCTION**.....Page 3
- II. **SCOPE OF SERVICES**.....Page 3 – 5
 - A. Metropolitan Council Requirements.....Page 3
 - B. Comprehensive Plan ChaptersPage 3 – 5
 - C. Other Planning ElementsPage 5
 - D. Public EngagementPage 5
- III. **REQUIRED PROPOSAL CONTENT**Page 5 – 7
 - A. Cover Letter/Title PagePage 5
 - B. Transmittal LetterPage 6
 - C. Statement of Qualifications.....Page 6
 - D. ProposalPage 6 – 7
- IV. **PROPOSAL SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS**Page 7 – 8
 - A. Inquiries.....Page 7
 - B. Proposal Submission.....Page 8
 - C. TimelinePage 8
- V. **PROPOSAL REVIEW**.....Page 8 – 9
 - A. Qualification Based Selection.....Page 8
 - B. Review and Recommendation Process.....Page 8
 - C. Financial Liability LimitationsPage 8
 - D. Rights of Review.....Page 9
 - E. Selection CriteriaPage 9

I. INTRODUCTION

Roseville is a fully developed, first-ring suburb in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. Located just north of Minneapolis and St. Paul, Roseville is the only community that shares common borders with both major cities. The community is well connected to the regional transportation system with direct access to Interstate-35W and Highway 36. This location gives Roseville residents convenient access to employment centers and amenities throughout the Twin Cities. Roseville’s location also provides local businesses with excellent access to customers, employees, and markets. Metro Transit has a transit hub in Roseville making both regional downtowns accessible via bus, and the A Line BRT runs through the community.

Roseville is 14.7 square miles and has an estimated population of 34,719 (by the State Demographer’s estimate in 2014). The community is approximately 30 percent industrial and commercial uses, which have generally occurred in the northwestern quadrant of the city (west of Snelling and north of Highway 36). This includes two large tank farms, regional shopping centers (Rosedale and HarMar Mall), and a mix of other manufacturing, warehousing, and transportation service facilities. Over the last 20 years, development and redevelopment in proximity to I-35W has been oriented toward office and light industrial flex space.

Housing in Roseville is dominated by single-family homes. Most of the homes in Roseville were constructed from the 1950s to the 1970s and many of them are still occupied by the original owners. Much of the new housing that has been constructed over the last 30 years has been age-restricted multi-family units, although infill development of single-family homes has also been steady.

Roseville faces the challenges of an older, first-ring suburb, such as aging building stock, and increasing competition from new suburban development. Yet many potential opportunities are afforded by our unique position within the metropolitan area, and our diversifying population. The comprehensive plan update will strive to identify land use, housing, and economic development policies and implementation techniques to promote quality residential renovation, creative infill projects, and innovative commercial and industrial redevelopment to allow the community to prosper and thrive into the future.

II. SCOPE OF SERVICES

The City of Roseville, Minnesota, is seeking proposals from qualified consultants to assist in development of an update of Roseville’s 2030 Comprehensive Plan. Our desired outcome is to update and improve upon this existing plan, which is generally well regarded by City officials and staff. The 2030 Comprehensive Plan can be found on Roseville’s website, at www.cityofroseville.com/CompPlan.

A. Metropolitan Council Requirements

The consultant will be responsible for ensuring that the comprehensive plan update complies with all Minnesota Statutes and Metropolitan Council requirements, including those contained in the Thrive MSP 2040 system statements as well as the Local Planning Handbook that are applicable to Roseville.

B. Comprehensive Plan Chapters

Each chapter of the existing comprehensive plan is in need of differing levels of revision. City staff has reviewed each of the chapters in the existing plan in a cursory fashion and has identified sections that require consultant-led assistance, and it is anticipated that upon review of the existing plan, each consulting firm will provide its insight as to the best method to implement these and other revisions. All updates should account for changes in physical

RCA Exhibit B

development and community preferences over the past decade, and the consultant will work with the review team to determine to what extent revisions are needed. The chapters include:

1. **Introduction:** Updates to this chapter will be necessary to reflect the current plan revisions and the additional planning history since the previous update.
2. **Vision for Roseville:** Evaluate the continued validity of the established vision statements of Imagine Roseville 2025 and the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, and update them as appropriate.
3. **Community Context:** Update to reflect recent physical development in the city and the demographics of the current population as well as the current projections of Roseville’s future population. City of Roseville staff will assist with internal data collection as well as map production.
4. **Land Use:** City of Roseville staff will assist with internal data collection as well as map production.
 - Identify parcels or areas with inappropriate land use designations and give them new guidance for their future use and development.
 - Evaluate the land use category designations and their descriptions to determine whether they are suitable or should be broadly reconsidered or slightly revised to better define the intent of each category.
 - Reassess the utility of the existing “Planning Districts” to determine whether a new structure would be beneficial.
 - Identify neighborhoods or small areas that may benefit from more intensive planning efforts and potential public investment.
5. **Transportation:** The content in this chapter will be updated by Roseville’s Public Works Department, in conjunction with another specialized consultant that will be will be responsible for ensuring the comprehensive plan update complies with pertinent Minnesota Statutes and Metropolitan Council requirements, and the consultant will integrate this content into the final Comprehensive Plan document.
6. **Housing and Neighborhoods:** The extent to which this chapter should be reviewed and updated will depend on the financial and staff resources committed to such activities; the newly-formed Economic Development Authority is currently developing strategies in this content area, which will help to guide the comprehensive plan update.
7. **Economic Development and Redevelopment:** Similar to *Housing and Neighborhoods*, the extent to which this chapter should be reviewed and updated will depend on the financial and staff resources committed to such activities; the newly-formed Economic Development Authority is currently developing strategies in this content area, which will help to guide the comprehensive plan update.
8. **Environmental Protection:** The content in this chapter will be updated by Roseville’s Public Works Department, in conjunction with another specialized consultant that will be will be responsible for ensuring the comprehensive plan update complies with pertinent Minnesota Statutes and Metropolitan Council requirements, and the consultant will integrate this content into the final Comprehensive Plan document.
9. **Parks, Open Space, and Recreation:** The content of this chapter will largely reference the 2010 System Master Plan and the 2012 Master Plan Implementation Process documents, and the consultant will integrate this content into the final Comprehensive Plan document.

RCA Exhibit B

10. Utilities: The content in this chapter will be updated by Roseville’s Public Works Department, in conjunction with another specialized consultant that will be responsible for ensuring the comprehensive plan update complies with pertinent Minnesota Statutes and Metropolitan Council requirements, and the consultant will integrate this content into the final Comprehensive Plan document.

11. Implementation: Updates to this chapter will be necessary to account for how the community has changed since the adoption of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan and to reflect updated goals and policies of the body of the plan.

C. Other Planning Elements

Other topic areas and ways of thinking about planning for Roseville’s future should be considered for incorporation into the 2040 Comprehensive Plan, perhaps as new chapters in the comprehensive plan, or as new categories of goals and policies within existing chapters, or simply as ideals that guide the act of reviewing and revising the plan’s goals and policies. Such topic areas might include:

- 1. Public Safety:** Because public safety is a core responsibility of the City, consideration should be given to incorporating public safety into the comprehensive plan in some manner.
- 2. Resilience:** As a complement to Roseville’s ongoing commitment to being an environmentally healthy community as demonstrated by Roseville’s 2015 attainment of Step 2 status among Minnesota’s GreenStep Cities, consideration should be given to adaptation policies and practices, which will help Roseville adjust to the effects of climate change, as well as resilience strategies that recognize the difficulty of predicting what the impacts of climate change will be and emphasize increasing our flexibility to thrive and prosper regardless of how climate change develops.
- 3. Thrive MSP 2040 Outcomes:** Use the five primary regional planning outcomes identified by the Metropolitan Council, namely Stewardship, Prosperity, Equity, Livability, and Sustainability, as lenses for reviewing and updating the goals and policies in Roseville’s comprehensive plan to improve our community and to make a positive contribution to the health of the region.

D. Public Engagement

The City of Roseville values the input of both its residential and business communities. Therefore, the Comprehensive Plan Update will require a creative public participation process that builds from the efforts of the Imagine Roseville 2025 community visioning process and engages a wide-range of community members. The consultant will be expected to propose an overall public engagement strategy, and the selected consultant will work with advisory commissions, staff, and the City Council to further refine the strategy to best suit Roseville.

III. REQUIRED PROPOSAL CONTENT

The following material must be received by 11:59 p.m. (CDT) on August 31, 2016 for a proposing consultant to be considered. During the evaluation process, however, the City of Roseville shall reserve the right to request additional information or clarifications from a consultant, or to allow corrections of errors and/or omissions.

A. Cover Letter/Title Page

Title page showing the following: request for proposal’s subject; the consultant’s name, address, telephone and email address of the contact person; and the date of the proposal.

RCA Exhibit B

B. Transmittal Letter

A signed letter of transmittal briefly demonstrating the consultant's understanding of the work to be performed, committing to perform the work within requested time periods, explaining why the consultant believes that it is best qualified to perform the services, and stating that the proposal is an irrevocable offer.

C. Statement of Qualifications

Submitted materials should demonstrate the qualifications of the consultant and of the particular staff to be assigned to this engagement.

1. General Information

- a. Provide general information and a brief history of the consultant's firm. Include similar information on key sub-consultants, if any, proposed for the project.

2. Project Understanding

- a. Include a summary of the consultant's understanding of this project as described in Section II (Scope of Services).

3. Personnel Qualifications – Resumes

For each member of the professional staff proposed to be assigned to this engagement, please provide the following information:

- a. Identification of key personnel who will manage the project and who can negotiate and execute a contract.
- b. Names and proposed roles of other individual team members.
- c. Education and experience biographies of all team members addressing the qualifications and considerations of the RFP.
- d. Describe the qualifications of the consultant to perform the work requested. Include information about pertinent prior experience.
- e. An outline of the proposed functions of the individuals and their back-up as well as their experience in the specific assigned functions.

4. References

- a. Include a list of municipal clients where similar services were provided by the professional staff proposed along with the name and telephone number of a person who may be contacted at that municipality.
- b. Include a list of previous or current services provided to the City of Roseville.
- c. Include a list of private clients for whom work has been or is being performed within Roseville, the type of project, the specific activities performed, and the name of a person who may be contacted at the private client.

D. Proposal

The purpose of the technical proposal is to demonstrate how the consultant, as a team and as individuals, will contribute to the comprehensive planning effort. The substance of the proposal will carry more weight than form or manner of presentation; the proposal should be complete and concise.

RCA Exhibit B

1. Proposed Work Plan and Tasks

- a. Provide specific approaches, methods, and assumptions that will be utilized to accomplish each work item in Section II (Scope of Services).

2. Schedule

- a. Provide a proposed schedule from project initiation to final completion. The schedule should include a listing of key tasks within each phase, key milestones and approximate dates, and deliverables.

3. Additional Information

- a. Include any other information that is believed to be pertinent, but not specifically requested elsewhere in this RFP.
- b. Describe the consultant's use of technology to enhance client services or reduce costs, including how the consultant leverages technology to do so.
- c. Describe research capabilities and references utilized.
- d. Provide a statement of how the workload of this project for the City of Roseville would be accommodated and what kind of priority it would be given, including capability to maintain reasonable response times.

4. Compensation/Fee Schedule

- a. Include the chargeable hourly rate for services or personnel not included in the scope. If multiple consultants are collaborating on the RFP submittal please identify the specific segment of the scope for each assigned consultant and the associated pricing.
- b. Identify pricing for each segment of the scope listed below:
 - Public Participation Process
 - Planning Services
 - o Update of Existing Plans and exhibits.
 - o Analysis of Future Issues and exhibits.
 - o Implementation and exhibits.
- c. Provide a fee schedule for incidental/disbursement services and any other costs the city will be charged in addition to those noted in 4.a. above.

IV. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

A. Inquiries

All responses, questions, and correspondence should be directed to Bryan Lloyd, Senior Planner for City of Roseville, using the contact information below. In the interest of fairness to all respondents, please do not contact other staff or elected or appointed officials unless instructed to do so.

Bryan Lloyd
City of Roseville
2660 Civic Center Drive
Roseville, MN 55113

bryan.lloyd@cityofroseville.com
651-792-7073

RCA Exhibit B

B. Proposal Submission

One electronic copy of the proposal, in Adobe PDF format, and five paper copies of the proposal shall be submitted to the addresses above. **The submission deadline is 11:59 p.m. (CDT) on August 31, 2016.** Please note that the maximum size for email attachments is 20MB; multiple emails with attachments are permitted.

C. Timeline

Roseville’s anticipated timeline is as follows, although the dates may be subject to change as the City deems necessary.

Issuance of Request for Proposal	July 29, 2016
Proposals Due	August 31, 2016, by 11:59 p.m. (CST)
Review of proposals.....	September 1 – September 8, 2016
Invitation of selected consultants to interview.....	September 8 – September 9, 2016
Interviews.....	September 12 – September 20, 2016
Recommendations to City Council	September 26, 2016
Negotiation and finalization of contract	October 2016
Commencement of new contract	November 2016
Anticipated completion.....	December 2017 – March 2018
Metropolitan Council submission deadline	December 31, 2018

V. PROPOSAL REVIEW

A. Qualification Based Selection

The City of Roseville intends to select and award an contract to the consultant or consultants evaluated to be best qualified to perform the work in Section II (Scope of Services) based on extent and quality of consultant’s resources, cost, communication and presentation skills, compatibility, and quality and extent of experience. Other performance factors may also be considered.

Qualified consultants will have:

- demonstrated experience in municipal comprehensive planning;
- well-developed skills and experience in designing and facilitating a thorough, effective public engagement strategy;
- experience engaging and working with diverse communities;
- familiarity with the Metropolitan Council’s comprehensive planning requirements and recommendations; and
- expertise in land use planning, urban design, landscape architecture, housing, and economic development.

B. Review and Recommendation Process

Based upon review of the submitted proposals a selected number of consultants will be asked to interview with City staff. The City staff will recommend one or more of these consultants to the City Council for final selection.

C. Financial Liability Limitations

The City shall not be liable for any expenses incurred by the applicant in connection with this solicitation, including but not limited to expenses associated with the preparation of the

RCA Exhibit B

statement, attendance at interviews, preparation of compensation fees schedule, or final contract negotiations.

D. Rights of Review

The City reserves the right to reject any and all proposals or to request additional information from any and all applicants.

E. Selection Criteria

Proposals will be independently evaluated by the Selection Committee. The following criteria will be used in order to ascertain which proposal best meets the needs of the City:

- Description of approach to prepare the update
- Relevance and suitability of the proposal to the scope of work
- Public engagement plan
- Qualifications and expertise of the key personnel to be assigned
- Experience of the firm and the project team with comprehensive plan updates
- Proposed schedule for completing the update
- Demonstration of ability to perform the proposed work within the proposed schedule
- Experience and working relationship with the Metropolitan Council
- Innovation and creativity
- Familiarity with Roseville
- Ability to interact positively and effectively with the public
- Ability to work as a team with City Council, advisory commissions and committees, and staff
- Demonstration of successful previous budget performance and experience in meeting project budgets
- Description of approach to budgeting
- Project cost