

**CITY OF PUNTA GORDA, FLORIDA
SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2018, 1:00 P.M.**

COUNCILMEMBERS PRESENT: Cummings, Keesling, Matthews, Prafke, Wein

CITY EMPLOYEES PRESENT: Kristin Simeone, Finance; Joan LeBeau, Lisa Hannon, Urban Design; City Attorney Levin; City Manager Kunik; City Clerk Smith

Mayor Keesling called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m., followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

NEW BUSINESS

EVALUATION & SELECTION COMMITTEE – U2017104/ENG-MASTERPLAN/1718

Public Comment

Ms. Luiza Leite, Dover, Kohl & Partners (Dover), stated Dover would be delighted to continue the work begun with the 2005 Citizens Master Plan (CMP), adding Dover had 30 years of experience in smart growth planning and had assembled a great team of economic, market and transportation specialists from various firms. She highlighted similar Dover projects in North Beach, Florida, and Thomasville, Georgia.

Ms. Michelle Demperio, Sweet Sparkman Architects (Sweet Sparkman), announced Sweet Sparkman was the architect of record for the Charlotte County Justice Center renovation and was also working on the Charlotte County Master Strategic Plan, both projects providing Sweet Sparkman with a great deal of local exposure.

Mr. Jared Beck, Stantec Consulting (Stantec), announced Stantec enjoyed a long history locally as well as nationally in urban planning, design, redevelopment, economics and other components applicable to the task at hand.

Discussion of Submittals by Committee

Ms. Marian Pace, Procurement Manager, confirmed none of the Councilmembers had been contacted by any of the submitters, adding she had received all member statements. She reviewed the steps of the evaluation process, noting Councilmembers could adjust their scoring this date.

Councilmembers then provided general comments on each firm as follows: Canin; Dover; DPZ CoDESIGN (DPZ); Stantec; Sweet Sparkman.

Mayor Keesling commended staff for conducting these types of reviews on a regular basis, asserting it was a difficult process.

City Attorney Levin clarified actual costs were not a relevant consideration at this point in the RFQ process, asking if it was appropriate to take price into consideration at this time.

Ms. Pace replied in the negative.

Discussion ensued with regard to the standard negotiation process.

Ms. Pace confirmed there were no further comments, requesting Councilmembers submit any changes to individual scores.

City Manager Kunik suggested City Council might want staff to assist with contract negotiations, opining it might be awkward for five Councilmembers to do so during a public meeting.

Results of Initial Evaluation

Ms. Pace announced each Councilmembers' ranking into the record, reporting the short list order as follows: 1, Stantec; 2, Canin; 3, Dover; 4, Sweet Sparkman; 5, DPZ. She advised Council could formally accept the rankings as presented or re-rank the firms.

Councilmember Wein **MOVED** to accept the short list order as presented, **SECONDED** by Councilmember Matthews.

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Discussion of Presentations/Interviews

Councilmembers discussed the number of firms to interview with consensus to invite the top four – Stantec, Canin, Dover, Sweet Sparkman.

Ms. Pace then asked how the final points would be applied for the final ranking.

Discussion ensued with regard to the desired percentages to be assigned to the qualification package (written score) versus the interview (presentation).

Councilmember Matthews **MOVED** to assign 25% to the written score and 75% to the presentation, **SECONDED** by Councilmember Cummings.

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Ms. Pace inquired as to specific topics to be included in the presentation.

City Manager Kunik confirmed the firm's background information should not be presented again during the interview.

Ms. Pace confirmed presenters would receive correspondence clearly delineating the desired topics.

Discussion ensued with consensus to require the presentations to cover the following: economic and budgetary analysis; accommodation of the charrette process in order to capture the most input; specific detail on the charrette schedule (not during season); address the Land Development Regulations; more detail on deliverables; opinion on

what the community was missing and/or over-emphasizing; what set the firm apart; how the firm's theoretical view will be applied to the practicality of preserving the community's historic and other unique characteristics (avoid new urbanism); explain coordination with sub-consultants; annexation policy; role of procurement in terms of the local economy.

Ms. Pace then asked if Council intended to score presenters on each topic or on a generalized basis.

Consensus was the latter.

Ms. Pace confirmed presentations would be 30 minutes plus 15 minutes for questions and answers. She stressed the 45 minute timeframe could not be exceeded.

City Attorney Levin suggested allowing public comment after all of the presentations were concluded but prior to Council's vote, utilizing Council's established policy of three minutes per person.

Ms. Pace explained the order of the presentations would be random.

Mayor Keesling noted presentations would be made on Wednesday, October 10, 2018; however, deliberations and a decision would not be made until the October 17, 2018 City Council meeting (time yet to be determined).

Councilmember Comments

None.

Citizens Comments

None.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:22 p.m.

Mayor

City Clerk