

**LAKE WORTH COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY**

**RFP #02-2015: Retail Feasibility, Strategic Planning & Business Recruitment (Retail Market Study)**

**CRA CONFERENCE ROOM**

**TUESDAY, MAY 19, 2015**

**2:30PM**

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:**

**Mr. Chris Dabros – *Lake Worth CRA***

**Ms. Joan Oliva – *Lake Worth CRA***

**Ms. Dolores Key – *City of Lake Worth***

**Mr. John Paxman – *Lake Worth CRA Board Member***

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

**City of Lake Worth Commissioner Andy Amoroso**

The meeting was called to order at 2:35pm.

All committee members introduced themselves.

Committee members were reminded that this RFP was made known to the public on February 20, 2015. Responses were due back to the CRA office by March 27, 2015. The CRA received three responses. The committee members unanimously agreed that the CRA should rank all responses and enter into negotiations with the top ranked firm.

Ms. Key and Ms. Oliva both mentioned that they did not score the proposal from Erica Francis due to the lack of a information sheet and drug free workplace certification form. They did not believe the proposer adequately understood the scope of work.

Ms. Key believes that The Retail Coach put more of an effort into their proposal. She liked that the Retail Coach uses the ESRI GIS tool. However, Ms. Key believes that the Retail Coach will act as more of a coach and not as hands on. She believes that Retail Strategies will act as an extension of City Staff, which is beneficial. Ms. Key likes the experience that Retail Strategies has in the State of Florida and feels that their results show a better return on investment.

Ms. Oliva agrees with Ms. Key's findings. Although she felt that Retail Coach provided a better presentation, Retail Strategies appears to be more hands on and less coaching the client. Ms. Oliva likes that Retail Strategies appears to attend many conferences and has experience in Florida.

Mr. Paxman said that although he scored the Retail Coach highly, he does not prefer the 'coaching' method and wants a more hands on consultant.

Mr. Dabros said that he likes that Retail Strategies will be developing and providing marketing material for their clients. Mr. Dabros liked that Retail Strategies timeline is more aggressive that the Retail Coach. However, he does not like that CRA Staff will be responsible for obtaining traffic counts and images for Retail Strategies. Mr. Dabros liked that the Retail Coach will identify 10 sites for redevelopment and reach-out personally to 10- 20 development teams in the State of Florida. He also liked that the Retail Coach will be making a minimum of 3 visits to the City.

The committee members then tallied and provided their scoring sheets to Mr. Dabros, below are the final average scores and scores out of a total of 400 possible points:

| FIRM                              | SCORE (out of 400 possible points) | TOTAL AVERAGE SCORE |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Erica Francis (individual)</i> | 60                                 | 15                  |
| <i>Retail Strategies</i>          | 334                                | 83.5                |
| <i>The Retail Coach</i>           | 328                                | 82                  |

Based on the members' scores, the committee recommends that CRA Staff enter into negotiations with *Retail Strategies* and create a contract for the CRA Board to review. The CRA Board will be encouraged to review all proposals and select their desired firm at an upcoming regularly scheduled CRA Board meeting.

The respondents were thanked for attending and the meeting was adjourned at 3:20pm.

*Below is the detailed scoring sheet for all respondents:*

| Proposer  |  | Erica Francis  | Retail Strategies  | The Retail Coach   |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Location  |  | Lake Worth, FL   | Birmingham, AL   | Tupelo, MS   |
| Point of Contact  |  | Erica Francis  | Matthew Petro  | C. Kelly Cofer   |
| <b>Scope of Services</b> – firm has clear understanding of services needed, the local economy and demonstrates administrative and staffing ability to complete the project in the time specified. - 20 points |  | Dabros: 10<br>Paxman: 5<br>Key: 0<br>Oliva: 0            | Dabros: 18<br>Paxman: 15<br>Key: 18<br>Oliva: 20           | Dabros: 19<br>Paxman: 20<br>Key: 20<br>Oliva: 10           |
| <b>Statement of Qualifications</b> - past record of professional accomplishments with similar studies. Respondents should provide staff resumes. - 20 points  |  | Dabros: 5<br>Paxman: 5<br>Key: 0<br>Oliva: 0             | Dabros: 15<br>Paxman: 15<br>Key: 20<br>Oliva: 20           | Dabros: 15<br>Paxman: 20<br>Key: 17<br>Oliva: 17           |
| <b>Previous Experience</b> – past record of professional accomplishments with similar studies and recruitment efforts. - 35 points  |  | Dabros: 5<br>Paxman: 10<br>Key: 0<br>Oliva: 0            | Dabros: 20<br>Paxman: 20<br>Key: 32<br>Oliva: 33           | Dabros: 20<br>Paxman: 25<br>Key: 30<br>Oliva: 30           |
| <b>Timetable for Deliverables</b> – ability to design an approach and work plan to meet project requirements. - 10 points   |  | Dabros: 5<br>Paxman: 10<br>Key: 0<br>Oliva: 0            | Dabros: 8<br>Paxman: 10<br>Key: 10<br>Oliva: 9             | Dabros: 8<br>Paxman: 10<br>Key: 8<br>Oliva: 5              |
| <b>Project Costs</b> – quotation of rates, fees or charges and other detailed cost-proposal or cost-breakdown information is reasonable and within budget. - 15 points  |  | Dabros: 5<br>Paxman: 0<br>Key: 0<br>Oliva: 0             | Dabros: 14<br>Paxman: 10<br>Key: 13<br>Oliva: 14           | Dabros: 15<br>Paxman: 15<br>Key: 14<br>Oliva: 10           |
| <b>TOTAL' s:</b>  |  | <i>Dabros: 30<br/>Paxman: 30<br/>Key: 0<br/>Oliva: 0</i> | <i>Dabros: 75<br/>Paxman: 70<br/>Key: 93<br/>Oliva: 96</i> | <i>Dabros: 77<br/>Paxman: 90<br/>Key: 89<br/>Oliva: 72</i> |
| <b>TOTAL (average):</b>   |  | <b>15</b>  | <b>83.5</b>  | <b>82</b>  |