# MANATEE COUNTY GOVERNMENT INTENT TO NEGOTIATE

SUBJECT	Professional Consulting Services for an Impact Fee Update	DATE POSTED	MC 4 30 15 / SE DS 4 30 15 / SE CC 14 A
PURCHASING REPRESENTATIVE	Matt Donley, ext. 3062	DATE CONTRACT SHALL BE AWARDED	Upon Completion of Successful Negotiations
DEPARTMENT	Financial Management Division	CONSEQUENCES IF DEFERRED	None % 202 (llee
SOLICITATION	RFP #15-1079FL	AUTHORIZED BY DATE	Melissa M. Wendel, CPPO April 29, 2015

## NOTICE OF INTENT TO NEGOTIATE

Notice of Intent to Negotiate with TischlerBise, Inc., Bethesda, Maryland to provide professional consulting services for an impact fee update.

# **ENABLING/REGULATING AUTHORITY**

Federal/State law(s), administrative ruling(s), Manatee County Comp Plan/Land Development Code, ordinances, resolutions, policy.

Manatee County Code of Laws

### **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

## PROJECT BACKGROUND:

The intent of this Request for Proposal and resulting contract is to provide Manatee County with professional consulting services for an impact fee update.

This Request for Proposal was for the update of the impact fee documents for unincorporated Manatee County for all impact fees, except educational facilities impact fees which may be for all of Manatee County including unincorporated and incorporated areas. The following Tasks I-Impact Fee Study, Task II-Impact Fee Schedule, and Task III-Impact Fee Administration are for Manatee County Government. Task IV-Educational Facilities Impact Fee Study and Development of Fee is related to educational impact fees and will be provided consistent with an interlocal agreement between the Manatee County School Board and the Board of County Commissioners.

#### **SOLICITATIONS:**

The RFP was advertised on the Manatee County website, DemandStar, and was also provided to the Manatee County Chamber of Commerce for release to its members. Five (5) proposals were received.

Manatee County Firms that were directly solicited:

None

Manatee County Firms that submitted proposals:

None

Local firms that submitted proposals include:

Tindale-Oliver & Associates, Inc. - Tampa, Florida ("Tindale Oliver")

INTENT TO NEGOTIATE (continued)

ATTACHMENTS (List in order of attached)	None	FUNDING SOURCE (Acct Number & Name)	1070	0015700-531000 Funds Verified Insufficient Funds
COST	The estimated expenditure is \$221,000 for completion of all phases of the impact fee update.	AMT/FREQ OF RECURRING COSTS (Attach Fiscal Impact Statement)	N/A	

## Other (non-local) firms that submitted proposals include:

Keith and Schnars, P.A. - Fort Lauderdale, Florida (Keith and Schnars)

James Duncan and Associates, Inc. – Austin, Texas ("Duncan and Associates")

TischlerBise, Inc. - Bethesda, Maryland

Willdan Financial Services - Temecula, California ("Willdan")

# **EVALUATION COMMITTEE (VOTING) MEMBERS:**

Dan Schlandt Deputy Cou

Deputy County Administrator, County Administrator's Office

Mike Pendley

Executive Planner, Manatee County School District

Sharla Fouquet

Impact Fee Program Manager, Financial Management Department

Clarke Davis Transportation Planning Manager, Public Works Department

Matt Donley Contracts Negotiator, Purchasing Division, Financial Management Department (Chairperson)

# Non-Voting Staff Attending:

None

#### **EVALUATION RESULTS:**

Evaluation Committee ("Committee") Meeting #1 convened on March 30, 2015 to review evaluation guidelines, Committee responsibilities and the Florida Sunshine Law as applicable to public meetings. The Committee proceeded to discuss and deliberate on the five (5) proposals received for the professional consulting services engagement for an impact fee update. All proposals were deemed responsive to the requirements of the RFP. The Committee discussed the qualifications of each proposer and reviewed each proposal against the RFP evaluation criteria. As a result of the discussion and based on the content of the proposals the Committee felt there was adequate information to proceed to a vote. The Committee unanimously voted that 1) oral interviews would be required and 2) TischlerBise, Tindale Oliver and Duncan and Associates would receive oral interview invitations. Keith and Schnars and Willdan were eliminated from consideration.

Evaluation Committee Meeting #2 was convened on April 10, 2015 and held oral interviews with Duncan and Associates, Tindale Oliver and TischlerBise.

After the oral interviews took place, the Committee Meeting #3 (final meeting) was convened on April 10, 2015. The Committee met to discuss the oral interviews conducted. Based on the results of the oral interviews in conjunction with the content of the proposals the Committee felt there was adequate information to proceed to a vote. The Committee voted 3 to 2 that TischlerBise be recommended for an Intent to Negotiate designation. The Committee ranked the firms as follows for the purpose of negotiating a contract with the top ranked firm:

Firm A: TischlerBise, Inc. - Bethesda, Maryland ("TischlerBise")

TischlerBise demonstrated exceptional capabilities in their proposal and presentation which exceeded the criteria set forth in the RFP. Of particular importance was the firm's strong grasp of the Scope of Service and meeting the County's objectives in the most timely and efficient manner of the three (3) proposers. The proposal provided evidence of the firm's strong foundational knowledge regarding the subject matter as specifically applied to the County's request. TischlerBise outlined a project approach

INTENT TO NEGOTIATE (continued)			
at focused on ensuring the timely and efficient project approach, utilizing the vast experience of the firm's personnel. The firm emonstrated strong legal, technical and financial capabilities. TischlerBise personnel have provided the County with a high lever service in the past. The Committee concluded that TischlerBise should be ranked first based on the firm's perceived ability to rovide an impact fee update that will best overall meet the needs of the County.			
Firm B: Tindale-Oliver & Associates, Inc. – Tampa, Florida ("Tindale Oliver")			
Findale Oliver presented its capabilities in a clear and concise manner. The firm provided a professional proposal and made a concise presentation to the Committee. Their proposal highlighted a solid knowledge base with respect to the requested scope of services. The firm's subject matter knowledge coupled with a reasonable project approach made the firm a strong candidate for consideration. As stated in their proposal, Tindale Oliver is an experienced firm with qualified staff capable of providing the professional services for the County. The ranking of the Proposals was extremely close but the Committee ranked Tindale Oliver second.			
Firm C: James Duncan and Associates, Inc. – Austin, Texas ("Duncan and Associates")			
Duncan and Associates submitted a satisfactory proposal and presentation. The firm had many strong evaluations and studies it performed for other jurisdictions and had a vast academic background in the field. The oral interview did not convey enough of a narrowly tailored response to the County's requested information when compared to the other interviewees. While the proposal contained adequate qualifications, the solution offered is not the best fit to meet the needs of the County. Thus, Duncan and Associates was ranked third.			
REMAINING RESPONDENTS:			
The remaining respondents, although well qualified, were not selected based on a comparison of capabilities of the selected firms:			
Keith and Schnars, P.A Fort Lauderdale, Florida Willdan Financial Services - Temecula, California			

**ESTIMATED COST OF SERVICES:** 

**FUNDING:** 1070015700-531000

The above justifications are a generalized summary of major observations intended only to provide the County Administrator a sufficiently detailed overview of the main observations of a majority of Committee Members. Each Committee Member may have considered one or more facts or factors more or less important than the other Committee Members when voting, and this summary of the Evaluation Committee's decision is not an attempt to exhaustively describe each of the relevant factors which motivated each of the Committee Members to select the rankings described.

The Evaluation Committee voted 3 to 2 to proceed with negotiations with TischlerBise, Inc., Bethesda, Maryland.

The resulting agreement will be managed by the Financial Management Division.