



CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

TO: Mayor & City Council

DATE: February 24, 2012

FROM: John McDonough, City Manager

AGENDA ITEM: Consider Awarding Contract for Downtown Master Plan and LCI

MEETING DATE: For Submission onto the March 6, 2012, City Council Regular Meeting Agenda

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: (Attach additional pages if necessary)

See attached:

Memorandum
Material

APPROVAL BY CITY MANAGER: gjm APPROVED

_____ NOT APPROVED

PLACED ON AGENDA FOR: 3/6/2012

CITY ATTORNEY APPROVAL REQUIRED: () YES () NO

CITY ATTORNEY APPROVAL: wkw

REMARKS:

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: John McDonough, City Manager

DATE: March 2, 2012 for Submission on the March 6, 2012 Council Meeting Agenda

ITEM: Report on Submissions Received Under RFQ 12-363, City Center Master Plan and LCI Update and Recommendation of Award

Background

City Council revised its established priorities in 2011 to place a greater emphasis on downtown redevelopment. To further this priority, Council allocated significant funding in the FY12 General Fund Budget for the preparation of a Downtown Master Plan to help guide the City's decision-making process regarding public policy and investment in the City Center area.

Goals of Planning Process

As previously stated, the City has a number of goals for the planning process, including:

- Public investment as a catalyst for redevelopment
- Give the City maximum return on investment
- Create sense of place
- Improve walkability
- Create multi-generational appeal for current and future demographics
- Solve existing problems
 - Lack of Stormwater Infrastructure
 - Lack of available Parking
 - Lack of Greenspace/Open Space
 - Lack of Transportation Infrastructure
 - Aesthetics such as Overhead Utilities

Phases of Planning Process

In furtherance of these goals, the City issued an RFQ to identify a nationally recognized planning firm to develop the Master Plan for the Central Business District of the City and a 10-year update to the Downtown Sandy Springs LCI Study. The RFQ was released on January 5, 2012. Submissions were received on January 30, 2012 and were evaluated by a team assembled by the City Manager.

*City
Manager*

RFQ Evaluation Process

Thirteen proposals were received in response to the RFQ, with one deemed non-responsive for failure to submit all required documents. Therefore, the evaluation team evaluated 12 proposals.

In addition to the City Manager, the Evaluation Team was composed of Mr. Cecil McLendon, Assistant City Attorney; Ms. Nancy Leathers, Retired Community Development Director; Mr. Lee Duncan, Planning Commission Chairman; and Mr. Kevin Walter, Public Works Director. A chartering session for the Evaluation Team was held on February 3, 2012 at City Hall.

The Evaluation Team members then evaluated each of submissions independently, based on the criteria set forth in the RFQ document. Firms were also required to demonstrate:

- National experience in Master Planning;
- Redevelopment planning and demonstrated implementation;
- Suburban retrofit, particularly addressing moderate density development and walkability;
- Innovative, market-driven approach; and
- Civic partnership with property owners and the development community (Critical).

The Evaluation Team reconvened on February 10, 2012 to discuss the proposals and shortlisted four firms who were invited to participate in interviews. The shortlisted firms were:

- TSW • Collaborative, LLC
- Perkins + Will
- Goody Clancy
- DPZ (Duany Plater-Zyberk)

Interviews were held February 22 and 23, 2012 at City Hall. During the interviews, the shortlisted firms were required to address the following questions in their presentations:

1. Your proposal listed each of the staff members that would compose your team. Please provide a brief overview of who will be responsible for what deliverable and the reporting structure, including an organizational chart and the percentage of time that key personnel will be dedicated to the project.
2. Describe how your team will interact with City staff and stakeholders. Please provide examples of how your team has facilitated a successful public involvement process.
3. Give at least two examples of plans developed by your team that have been implemented and explain what worked and why.

4. What do you know about the City of Sandy Springs? Please identify the major impediments to achieving our goals and explain your approach to address each impediment.
5. Please explain your proposed scope of work and deliverables and recommended implementation steps.
6. What level of effort do you anticipate will be required to complete the proposed work? Are there things that are unknown to you now that may impact cost? Based on what you currently know about this project, please give us a ball-park estimate of your anticipated cost.

After the interviews, the City narrowed the field to two firms and asked Goody Clancy and DPZ to provide detailed responses for the following deliverables, which are identified by the Evaluation Team as key work products of the City Center Master Plan process:

- **Economic Analysis by Parcel/Node** – Please describe the scope and methodology of the economic analysis that will be used. Describe to what extent it will be conducted on an individual parcel basis.
- **Charrette/Public Information Meetings** – Please include a listing of the number of meetings that are proposed and who will be responsible (from your firm or your teaming partners) for facilitating the meetings. Also include the desired level of City Staff support for each meeting.
- **Downtown Master Plan** – Please provide a discussion of the level of detail anticipated in the final report.
- **Form Based Code** – The City desires to have a draft Form Based Code for the Downtown City Center area that can be adopted "as is" with little to no revision. Please discuss this deliverable and name and describe the experience of your teaming partner, if any.

Each firm was also required to submit their Best and Final Offers (BAFO) along with the responses to the above items. Responses to these items were due to the City by 12:00 PM (noon) on Thursday, March 1, 2012.

References were checked for both Goody Clancy and DPZ to gauge client satisfaction with the previous relevant work performed by the firms. Staff also reviewed prior work products of both firms. Both Goody Clancy and DPZ presented qualified, competitive proposals and are highly experienced in the service area.

Due to the identified importance of the key work products; in particular the preparation of an economic analysis by parcel/node as a primary driver of redevelopment; the Evaluation Team determined that Goody Clancy presents the best approach to meet the needs of Sandy Springs. Upon final analysis, the Evaluation Team recommends that a contract be awarded to Goody Clancy in the amount of \$350,000 to develop a

Downtown Master Plan and complete the 10 year Downtown Sandy Springs LCI Update. The attached description of deliverables and BAFO will serve as the scope of work for the project.

Attachment

1. Detailed Description of Deliverables/Best and Final Offer

1 Economic Analysis by Parcel/Node

As we noted during the interview, we believe strongly in planning informed by a full understanding of underlying markets. We have worked repeatedly with ZVA (housing markets) and W-ZHA (commercial markets, financial feasibility, public/private partnerships) because they bring complimentary expertise, maintain strong, collaborative working relationships, and participate effectively in community education and engagement throughout the work process. ZVA (Laurie Volk) uses a demographics-based approach that quantifies changing and emerging markets that are not adequately reflected in current market data. W-ZHA (Sarah Woodworth) uses original market data and focus groups to project demand for different types of office, retail, hotel and other commercial uses for which the study area would be competitive.

<p>MARKET ANALYSIS AND DEMAND PROJECTIONS</p>	<p>HOUSING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demand (total units) by individual market segments (e.g., empty nesters and retirees, traditional and non-traditional, families, younger singles and couples, etc.) • Breakdown of demand and annual absorption by specific housing types (condo, townhouse, contemporary or traditional lifestyle, etc.) • Breakdown of demand for each housing type by ownership or rental • Price points by housing types for ownership and rental <p>COMMERCIAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demand (SF) for retail, office, hospitality, and other uses and annual absorption for each use • Preferences for types of space, locations, amenities, etc. for each use • Price points for each use 		
<p>DEVELOPMENT FEASIBILITY</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportable SF/units, price points over 20 years (scale of redevelopment) • Financial feasibility for all uses and identification of gaps and/or potential to support structured parking, a street grid, and similar “transformation” costs • Residual land value associated with each use to determine development-value thresholds necessary to trigger redevelopment, given existing parcel values • Assessment of the competitive position of different sites for specific uses • Identification of amenities, infrastructure, transportation and/or other elements that would enhance competitive position for specific uses 		
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="371 1249 917 1936"> <p>ROSWELL CORRIDOR DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market-based phasing strategy and identification of early-action parcels • Public/private partnership (PPP) strategies (e.g., TIF, development agreements, improvement districts) to fund transformational infrastructure—street grid, stormwater, public realm, and similar • Longer-term positioning for the corridor • Economic analysis for variety of purposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Test zoning alternatives. > Illustrate the need for public/private investment to fund infrastructure, achieve community goals. > Demonstrate financial benefits of redevelopment to property owners or prospective investors. </td> <td data-bbox="917 1249 1479 1936"> <p>EARLY ACTION; CATALYST NODES/PARCELS (First 5-7 years—e.g., “Target” and City Center sites)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify target development areas based on market strength, implementation and impact considerations. • Prepare preliminary development plan (land uses and SF). • Market analyses identify supportable rent by land use. Operating costs reflect W-ZHA’s experience and industry standards; development costs are derived from regional market data. • Test financial feasibility of development program, given private-investment yield thresholds. • If adequate private investment yield is not achieved, financial analysis will identify subsidy needed to attract private investment. • Explore innovative financing techniques as possible sources of gap financing. • Develop preliminary public/private development structure. • Economic analysis will inform the sequencing of development, as appropriate. </td> </tr> </table>	<p>ROSWELL CORRIDOR DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market-based phasing strategy and identification of early-action parcels • Public/private partnership (PPP) strategies (e.g., TIF, development agreements, improvement districts) to fund transformational infrastructure—street grid, stormwater, public realm, and similar • Longer-term positioning for the corridor • Economic analysis for variety of purposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Test zoning alternatives. > Illustrate the need for public/private investment to fund infrastructure, achieve community goals. > Demonstrate financial benefits of redevelopment to property owners or prospective investors. 	<p>EARLY ACTION; CATALYST NODES/PARCELS (First 5-7 years—e.g., “Target” and City Center sites)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify target development areas based on market strength, implementation and impact considerations. • Prepare preliminary development plan (land uses and SF). • Market analyses identify supportable rent by land use. Operating costs reflect W-ZHA’s experience and industry standards; development costs are derived from regional market data. • Test financial feasibility of development program, given private-investment yield thresholds. • If adequate private investment yield is not achieved, financial analysis will identify subsidy needed to attract private investment. • Explore innovative financing techniques as possible sources of gap financing. • Develop preliminary public/private development structure. • Economic analysis will inform the sequencing of development, as appropriate.
<p>ROSWELL CORRIDOR DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market-based phasing strategy and identification of early-action parcels • Public/private partnership (PPP) strategies (e.g., TIF, development agreements, improvement districts) to fund transformational infrastructure—street grid, stormwater, public realm, and similar • Longer-term positioning for the corridor • Economic analysis for variety of purposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Test zoning alternatives. > Illustrate the need for public/private investment to fund infrastructure, achieve community goals. > Demonstrate financial benefits of redevelopment to property owners or prospective investors. 	<p>EARLY ACTION; CATALYST NODES/PARCELS (First 5-7 years—e.g., “Target” and City Center sites)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify target development areas based on market strength, implementation and impact considerations. • Prepare preliminary development plan (land uses and SF). • Market analyses identify supportable rent by land use. Operating costs reflect W-ZHA’s experience and industry standards; development costs are derived from regional market data. • Test financial feasibility of development program, given private-investment yield thresholds. • If adequate private investment yield is not achieved, financial analysis will identify subsidy needed to attract private investment. • Explore innovative financing techniques as possible sources of gap financing. • Develop preliminary public/private development structure. • Economic analysis will inform the sequencing of development, as appropriate. 		

2 Charrette/Public Information Meetings

In addition to the meetings noted below, the project will include additional community engagement components: advisory committee (meet every trip), community survey, and website.

TRIP	MEETINGS	TEAM	CITY SUPPORT
#1 (3 days)	Initial team briefing (half day)	Full team	Prepare briefing materials, identify participants, participate.
	Stakeholder interviews (elected officials, city staff, property owners, neighborhood leaders, local business owners, etc.)	Full team	Identify stakeholders, arrange meetings and space; possibly attend all or some interviews.
#2 (2 days)	First community-wide Town Center Forum (introduce team, small group discussions on values, aspirations, concerns re Roswell Road Corridor, team members serve as resources)	Facilitator: David Dixon	Venue, publicity (team will prepare materials), refreshments
	Meet with stakeholder organizations (community groups, etc.)	David Dixon, Ben Carlson	Arrange meetings
#3 (5 days)	Education workshops (Wednesday and Thursday evenings—present findings) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transportation (J. Smith) • Development (L. Volk, S. Woodworth) • Urban design (D. Dixon, B. Carlson) 	As noted, conducting workshops	Venue, publicity (team will prepare materials), refreshments
	Charrette <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Friday evening through Sunday mid-day • Sunday mid-afternoon: public review results 	Facilitator: David Dixon; team members as resources	Venue, publicity (team will prepare materials), refreshments
#4 (2 days)	Workshop with city staff, advisory committee + stakeholder check-in meetings as required		
#5 (2 days)	Stakeholder check-in meetings as required		Arrange meetings
	Second community-wide Town Center Forum (present draft plan, small group discussions)	Facilitator: David Dixon	Same as first forum
#6 (2 days)	Stakeholder check-in meetings as required		Arrange meetings
	Third community-wide Town Center Forum (present plan, small group discussions)	Facilitator: David Dixon	Same as first forum

3 Development Plan

- **Part I: Foundation**, issued as a working paper for the Charrette, revised and incorporated in the final document. Essential information on the context for redevelopment: land ownership, values; access and circulation; market analysis and demand (see above); environmental issues; urban design issues; and similar data.
- **Part II: Vision**, issued as a working paper after the Charrette, revised and incorporated into the final document. Summary of results of community engagement to date, vision statement, principles that shape redevelopment, and similar information that forms the foundation for the master plan
- **LCI Update**, issued as a separate document that addresses LCI requirements, including a Lifelong Communities Assessment and Green Communities Concepts; incorporated into the final document.
- **Part III: Master Plan**, issued as a draft before the second forum, revised and incorporated into the final document. All study findings. The document will provide specific guidance for the form-based code, describe clear direction for corridor-wide redevelopment, and set out specific templates for early action parcel/node redevelopment. Graphic material will include a land use plan; development-capacity diagram; public realm plan; building-height and -massing diagrams; conceptual phasing plan; street grid plan; access and circulation diagrams; sustainability plan; illustrative

conceptual site plan; and three illustrative before-and-after images. In addition, for early action parcels/nodes, includes:

- > three alternative redevelopment scenarios (program, building envelopes, design character);
- > for the recommended scenarios—illustrative, detailed site plans; rendered site plan and illustrative before-and-after images; and
- > parcel-development guidelines that describe preferred building envelope, public space use and character, roadways and parking, sustainability measures, and similar information intended to be provided directly to developers or incorporated into City-issued RFPs from developers.

4 Form-based Code

We have asked Farr Associates to assist the team in preparing a form-based code. We worked with Farr's director of planning, Leslie Oberholtzer, in preparing Dublin, Ohio's code, and she would lead code preparation for Sandy Springs (she is already very familiar with the city and the corridor). Farr places a particular focus on ease of use: easy-to-use, well organized codes that illustrate concepts both graphically and with carefully crafted, straightforward narrative. We chose Farr because the firm, and Leslie in particular, have demonstrated a strong commitment to active participation in master planning and community engagement. Farr ranks among the most active firms in preparing form-based codes, including current and recent work in suburbs facing issues similar to those in Sandy Springs, such as Des Plaines and Evanston (Illinois) and Lakeland (Tennessee), and cities such as Denver and Philadelphia.

The code will include a regulating plan (zoning map), use standards, building-form standards, block standards, landscape and signage standards, and street standards. The team recommends organizing the code by zoning districts to allow for easy incorporation into your existing zoning code. Other options may be considered, however, such as an overlay district. The document will be a highly illustrated to clearly communicate intent. Plan drawings, elevations, and tables throughout the document will detail code requirements in summary form, ensuring that they are easily understood by City staff and officials, developers, property owners, residents, and business owners alike.

We will develop an appropriate variety of building forms for the area, based on the master plan. For each building type, the code will establish standards for building placement, height, facade characteristics, entrances, access, service, use, density, and appropriate special design features. The code will include tables that enumerate reduced parking requirements associated with various use mixes (e.g. housing/office, office/retail). One of the most important aspects of a form-based code is the interrelationship between buildings and the street. We will work with the team to codify appropriate street types for any new streets, focusing on the development and design of the pedestrian realm.

We strongly recommend two additional dimensions for this code not always incorporated into form-based codes.

- **Sustainability.** Codes can address a wide range of sustainability issues, from reducing vehicular trips to development of more energy-efficient buildings. The team's involvement in development of the LEED ND standards and the Star Community Index gives us unique insight into the development of sustainability metrics. Those metrics have been very useful in writing more sustainable codes. We will review existing codes and make recommendations for revisions to allow for alternative energy systems, water-reuse systems, and other key sustainable-development practices.
- **Incentives.** The code can include incentives that make desired development easier to entitle. It can also address density and related incentives tied to better development practices, such as reducing energy use significantly, participation in shared parking, incorporation of parks or other valued public spaces, and similar public benefits.

5 Best and Final Pricing

We propose to complete the work above, and the additional task items described in our proposal, for an all-inclusive fee of \$350,000. This figure includes a form-based code (incorporating signage and landscape in addition to standard material) and the more intensive of the two levels of effort described for Sarah Woodworth (W-ZHA) in our letter of January 27, 2012.