



## CITY OF MARSHALL AGENDA ITEM REPORT

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	Tuesday, May 25, 2021
<b>Category:</b>	NEW BUSINESS
<b>Type:</b>	INFO/ACTION
<b>Subject:</b>	Consider signing a contract with SRF for City of Marshall 2021 Comprehensive Plan
<b>Background Information:</b>	<p>At its November 24, 2020 meeting, the City Council authorized staff to advertise a request for proposal for the new City of Marshall Comprehensive Plan. The Request for Proposal was posted on the City’s website and social media and advertised on the League of Minnesota Cities website. At its January 26, 2021, the Council Established the Comprehensive Plan Proposal Review Committee for review of proposals, which were due on February 3, 2021. The established Committee included two Council members (Dr. Steve Meister and Don Edblom), one Planning Commission member (Amanda Schroeder), one EDA Board member (Dan Herrmann), One Chamber of Commerce representative (Eric Eben), and two city staff (Laurent Deutz and Ilya Gutman). Five proposals were received by the due date: They were from Bolton &amp; Menk, Short Elliott Hendrickson Inc. (SEH), SRF Consulting Group, MSA Professional Services, Inc., and Praxis Strategy Group.</p> <p>The Committee first met on February 19, 2021 and reviewed the scoring sheet compiled by staff. All proposals were sent out shortly thereafter and scored by the Committee members based on merit and technical issues only. Each firm included a separate cost envelope along with their proposals; however, these cost envelopes were not open until after the first round of scoring. At the next meeting on March 8, 2021, the Committee discussed all proposals and summarized all evaluations. Proposal from one firm was unanimously found to be too weak and not worth consideration. The other four proposals were all deemed very close; in fact, the difference in scores between them was within 3 percent. The next Committee meeting took place on March 10, 2021; this time discussion included costs considerations, but three proposals suggested almost identical cost and the fourth one was just slightly more expensive. The discussion centered on proposals’ inclusions and additional costs. At the end, the decision was to limit consideration to just two firms, mostly based on the number of hours they included in their proposals and covered Plan components. Finally, at its March 17, 2021 meeting, the Committee decided to recommend SRF Consulting Group to the Council.</p> <p>At its March 23, 2021 meeting, the City Council authorized staff to enter into contract negotiations with SRF with additional \$5,000 allowance to provide for flexibility with the type and number of meetings and some additional Plan inclusions. In a follow up phone conversation, staff conveyed Council’s approval to SRF and requested an updated summary of work with included additional services that were authorized by the Council. That updated summary was received by staff and reviewed a few days later; in its review, staff noticed that the number of hours listed was significantly lower than the number of hours listed in the original proposal. Subsequently, SRF provided an explanation that the number of hours listed in their proposal was in error and offered to increase the number of hours, in part by reassigning tasks. The proposed contract reflects the new increased number of hours, which is still lower than originally proposed.</p> <p>Staff reached out to the Proposal Review Committee asking their opinion on SRF mistake and further actions but have heard only from a few members with one selection committee member questioning SRF’s attention to detail and ability to deliver on behalf of the city following their errant tabulation of hours on the project. Staff believe that SRF made an honest error in their proposal, and that SRF has made a good, honest attempt to compromise and increase the number of hours that they intend to provide on this project. Staff also negotiated some aspects of the</p>

	<p>scope of work and requested that several changes and additions to scope of work be made. Staff believe that SRF is a firm that is very capable of delivering a quality product, giving us a Comprehensive Plan that the City can use as a guide for the next 15-20 years.</p> <p>The last complete City of Marshall Comprehensive Plan was done in 1996. It was partially updated in 2004 and has not been touched since. General recommendation is to update comprehensive plans every 10 to 15 years and our Plan is over 16 years old even if we consider the update. Out of all comparable cities, Marshall seems to have the oldest Comprehensive Plan. It is becoming increasingly difficult to conduct zoning operations, development, and enforcement, considering how much conditions in the City have changed since 1996 and even since 2004. According to the League of Minnesota Cities, a comprehensive plan is an expression of the community's vision for the future and a strategic map to reach that vision. It is an important tool to guide future development of land to ensure a safe, pleasant, and prosperous environment. The process of its adoption also creates an extensive opportunity for residents to participate in guiding community's future and all proposals include extensive public participation provisions.</p> <p>The schedule proposed by SRF calls for final Plan to be ready by April 2022.</p>
<b>Fiscal Impact:</b>	The costs will be financed through General Fund reserves.
<b>Alternative/ Variations:</b>	None Recommended
<b>Recommendations:</b>	that the Council approves attached contract and scope of work for the new City of Marshall Comprehensive Plan from SRF Consulting Group with the cost of \$64,955 with additional \$5,000 contingency