

An aerial photograph of a city, likely Miami, showing a large marina with many sailboats on the left, a central area with several tall skyscrapers, and a mix of lower-rise buildings and green spaces. The city extends to the water's edge in the background.

MAYOR'S 8/28 ALLIANCE

Request for Qualifications Process Sub-Committee Report

August 23, 2013

CONTENTS

Purpose Statement

Section – 1 Summary of RFQ Sub-Committee Recommendations

Section – 2 Expanded RFQ Sub-Committee Recommendations for
the Selection Process

Section – 3 Background Information on RFQ Modifications

PURPOSE STATEMENT

Provide recommendations to the Mayor for a process of designing and selecting a new Pier in the event the referendum is successful.

Summary of Recommendations from the Pier Request For Qualifications Sub-Committee

Task 2: Provide recommendation to the Mayor for a process of designing and selecting a new Pier in the event the referendum is successful.

Recommendation Summary:

- A. Utilize a modified RFQ consultant selection process to include a design concept element
- B. Revise the RFQ language to suit the new process
- C. Include information provided by the Pier Task Force to be part of the RFQ
- D. Perform a City-wide survey of citizens to obtain input for what they wish the Pier to be
- E. RFQ initial qualifications review to be performed by City Technical Staff with at least 2 professionally-qualified citizen participants
- F. Final review and ranking to be performed by a representative Jury to include 3 City Administration, 4-5 outside professional persons, 5 citizens (Possibility of 1 Council Person)
- G. Utilize varied media outlets to build consensus
- H. Engage highest ranked firm in Schematic Design contract
- I. Sign full contract if Schematic Design is accepted by City and Community

(See SECTION – 2 + 3 for a more detailed explanation and background to this Summary)

RFQ SUB-COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SELECTION PROCESS

1. Prior to or in tandem with the formation of a new RFQ, the financial and market study should be updated
2. Public forums - TV - Newsprint - surveys - and other media should be implemented to find out what people really want on their Pier. This effort should be directed and focused to a few options to allude a thousand thoughts. Ex., Do you want restaurants over water? Do you want public transportation to the Pier head? This would have to be an educational exercise as well; community needs to know the related expenses associated with each option. This could be provided in a square foot-range format.
3. Writing of the RFQ (after the referendum): This step should be done by the City with the input and review of the Alliance. This might be a different Alliance group than the current one and will be determined by the Mayor.
4. Advertising for submittals should be open to all firms/individuals with a full effort to to engage the same media sources for crating awareness as was used in the first RFQ.
5. Use standard Competitive Consultant Negotiation Act (CCNA) and not a "design Competition". The "Design Competition" involves certain criteria and a process as outlined by the American Institute of Architects. We determined a modified RFQ process to include a "Concept Stage" prior to final qualifications selection would be a more advantageous process for the City to manage. The City is bound by the statues on this RFQ process.
6. The RFQ will affirm that the basis for design guidance for the new RFQ process should be the 2010 Pier Advisory Task Force Report with the modifications approved by the Mayor's 828 Alliance and supplemented by the results of the survey and other community input. The Pier Task Force's Vision Statement should be included in the RFQ along with a statement as to the importance of the Design Approach in the selection weighting.
7. City Selection Team, made up of City Staff and at least 2, up to 5, professionally qualified citizens chosen by the Mayor, would receive submittals and develop a "long list" of the top10 most qualified firms.
8. Criteria Package is distributed to each of the 10 firms for the "Conceptual Design Stage" preparation. Criteria for this task should be clear, detailed and prepared by City, professional, and Community participants.
9. Firms would be given up \$15,000.00 stipend and 6-8 weeks to prepare design concepts.
10. Mayor establishes a Design Selection Jury made up of 3-City Staff, 4-5 Design/Technical Professionals and 5 +-Citizens (could consider 1 Council person); the Jury should total an odd number of participants.
11. The firms present conceptual thoughts to the Jury in a public meeting.
12. The options are distributed to community via various media outlets to be sure that most people have an opportunity to see them and form some opinion. The Community would then have an opportunity to weigh-in on their choice of concepts

through a broad, professional survey. The results of the survey and other comments would be made available to the Jury.

13. After a period of 30-45 days, the Jury would rank the concepts 1 through 10 on the basis of their opinions and those of the Community.
14. The ranking would then be sent to the Mayor to make the final selection and recommend to City Council to negotiate a contract with the top ranked firm.
15. The contract negotiation would be limited to the Schematic Design Phase only and would only proceed to the Design Development and Construction Document Phases after the firm has provided a preliminary design, preliminary budget and amenities that satisfies the general desires of the City's and the Community's stated criteria for the development of the Pier Project. This could be determined by a survey or other means.
16. The selected design team would be given 3-4 months to develop the Schematic plans, which would be a refinement of their design concept and inclusion of certain criteria outline in the Schematic Design Phase Tasks.
17. The Construction Manager could be made available at this stage to assist in sharing information regarding costs, permitting requirements, constructability, etc. already developed in the first process.
18. Plans would be presented to the City/Jury and Community at a 75% complete milestone to seek City/Jury and Community input. Elements of this input should then be incorporated into Schematic Design phase final documents.
19. Final presentation of the Schematic Design Phase would be presented to City/Jury and Community. It is recommended that a further education/marketing approach be pursued, with the intent to solidify consensus.
20. The City/Jury would then proceed with a full contract with the Design Team for the completion of the plans and specifications.
21. Should the City/Jury not wish to proceed to a full contract with this firm, the City would have the option of negotiating with the second ranked firm under the same process.

Background Information on RFQ Modifications

The following information was derived from a page-by-page review of the City's original Pier Project Request for Proposals. This Section is a compilation of each Sub-Committee member's review and supports, as background, the recommendations stated in SECTIONS 1 & 2 of this Report. (Page numbers refer to the original Pier RFQ)

Page 1. Introduction -

- No international design competition – recommend using a “modified” Standard RFQ (drop all reference to "international design competition").
- Include redesign or use of elements of the existing Pier as an option to replacement – offer opportunity to refurbish the existing pier head or parts of the existing pier should a team wish to pursue this avenue.
- Overall budget is 45 million budget with a construction budget of 37 million (known cost estimates should be presented in the RFQ).
- Not sure about the term "two stage design competition" - this should be more of a Standard RFQ approach with a Conceptual Development component - there will 2 stages to the selection process as stated herein.
- Omit anything about Jury selection in this paragraph.
- Stage-1 - All OK except City staff (it was suggested that 2 to 5 professionally qualified citizens be a part of this process) will do initial qualifications review and develop a "long list" of up to 10 firms.
- Add a summary of the process used to develop recommendations for the new Pier, including the Task Force Report and work of the Alliance. Both the Task Force Report and the Alliance amendments should be included in the new RFQ.

Page 2. Design Submission

- Stage-2 – Develop a separate jury made up of City staff, design professionals, and members of the community totaling 11-13 (possibility of 1 Council member). The Alliance group could be a part of this Jury.
- Suggest a stipend of (\$15K) be provided each "long list" team.
- A time period of 6-8 weeks should be given the teams for the Conceptual Design phase.
- Selected teams are to provide (discuss each firm offering more than one design option) design sketches (no more than 3 - 36x48" sheets (un-mounted), up to 3 of the same drawings/graphics mounted on 36"x48" boards and no more than 10 pages of accompanying descriptive text. (Exact requirements would be provided to the teams with a requirement to adhere to the criteria at the risk of default.)
- The statements in paragraph 2 are still appropriate.
- Must add the public presentation piece – Conceptual plans will be presented by each team to the Jury in a public forum for review and comment. This would be

televised, in newspapers, on Facebook, etc. so that the community has every opportunity to see the conceptual work of each firm.

- Public will weigh in on the designs through a City Survey online, in monthly utility bill and/or other means of disbursement.
- "None of the Above" would be an option - City reserves the right to not select any of the proposed concepts (this option was available to the City in the last RFQ).
- After review of the survey data, the Jury would then review the concepts and qualifications and rank the firms from 1 to 10. The ranking would be sent to the Mayor for further action

Page 2. Awards

- The top ranked firm would, at the direction of the Mayor and acceptance by City Council, enter into contract negotiations for the Schematic Design Phase only. (This action would allow the top ranked firm to provide more detailed information about their concept without committing to a total design contract).
- Criteria for this submittal would be provided to the team with clear and concise tasks to be addressed in the Schematic Design Phase.
- Specific elements would be required to be included in these documents focused on community desires and concerns, i.e., operating expense, refined construction budget, functions, permitting, etc. (this criteria could be developed through the public process).
- This level would require another 3 to 4 months to develop the requested specific topics in the refinement of their design to a Schematic level with a presentation to the Public (the Jury could still be involved or the City and Jury could take this on once the ranking is presented to the Mayor).
- Somewhere around the 75% Schematic level development, the firm could present their refined ideas to the Jury and City in a public forum to receive input before the final submission of the Schematic Design (this step may, or may not be, necessary).
- Final Schematic Plans would be presented to the Jury and the public through various media options for review, with the possibility of another survey taken before the approval of Council to go forward with the balance of the design contract.
- Should the community clearly reject the direction shown in the Schematic Plans, the City would have the opportunity to go through the same process with the #2 ranked firm.

Page 3. IV - Project Description

- Language could better reference an opportunity to rework the existing pier if the designer chooses to do so.
- The term "icon" or "iconic" should have some level of explanation related to the character of the community as a way to describe the new pier facility.
- A review of the project's goal bullet points should be made by the RFQ formation team after the referendum to be clear on what is to be required of the design

teams. This should include a statement as to the inclusion of the Pier Task Force Report as a point of reference.

- A summary of the Pier Task Force's Vision Statement should be included under "Vision"

Page 4. Design Parameters

- Should be more focused on the Conceptual phase, offering designers the opportunity to best address these items with their concepts - this could provide better solutions if considered initially.
- The Jury - (should be as described above).

Page 7. Competition Rules and Regulations

- Drop the word "competition" - should call this something else- "RFQ Process" - "Pier RFQ", etc.
- Change email and website title as well
- Not sure we need an "advisor" if we do not have a competition as such; City should decide this point.

Page 8. Registration and Statement of Qualifications (SOQ)

- Should there be the ability to add experts in various capacities to enhance a team after the selection?
- VII-Design Approach – include a request for "Design Approach" as was done in the first process to obtain information regarding the applicant's design approach and philosophy; initial vision; initial ideas regarding how the Pier will fit into the downtown waterfront context; perceived urban design opportunities; and understanding of the design issues. This section should heavily weighted.

Page 9.

- The RFQ asks for "completed" projects within the last 10 years. This would not provide for design projects that were never built, but may offer a glimpse as to their abilities.
- Should ask for one or the other of the submittal forms, not either (makes it more difficult for the reviewers).

Page 10.

- 5 - the City Staff will evaluate the submittals and provide a list of up to 10 firms to provide Conceptual designs (these will be made up of firms that are "qualified" to provide the necessary services).
- VIII - Stage 2: Design Concept Submission (the City staff hands off this portion of the process to the selected Jury of 11-13 people made up of individuals as previously stated.
- Guidelines for the submittals would be generated with a mandatory visit to the City by each firm (a representative could be sent - City could pick up travel expense for 1 individual from each firm).

Page 11. Concept Submittal Requirements:

- These items could be established after the referendum result
- Delivery criteria mentioned above
- 5. Jury and invited other professionals could make comments on each of the concepts.

Page 12.

- 6. Would be covered by a myriad of media outreach methods.
- 8. Jury ranks (or states "none of the above") then presents to Mayor for final selection.
- X – The weighting of criteria be changed to give greater weight to the design concept information as included under "Design Approach" (we are as much interested in the design team's "initial ideas" about the Pier's redevelopment project issues and design philosophy and we are their qualifications and experience)
- Balance of the items to be completed after the referendum results.

Page 14. Schedule - Stage 1, 2 and 3 (to be completed after the referendum results).

Page 17. 6. (of note) City did have the right to reject all submittals, both in content and in the negotiation phase.

Page 18. Exhibit D - General Conditions

- 5. All documents prepared under authority of this project, shall become property of the City of St. Petersburg.

Page 19. Note 12. Trade secrets exemption

Page 22, 23 & 24. Exhibit E

- Explanation of "overwater" and "upland" as areas; this is OK, other items can be reviewed after the referendum.

STAGE II

This phase would incorporate the concepts presented by the "long list" of qualified firms and should be re-written accordingly. As it stands, only parts of this section should be retained in the new RFQ (See the Recommendations for Selection Process)