

Supplier/Contractor Name: CRRC

Overall Rating Point 93.2571429

Evaluator's Name: Tai

Evaluation Rating Criteria: RFQ Pages 2-3
Scope of Work & Deliverables: RFQ Pages 6-22

Criteria 1: Expertise					Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
Qualifications of the members of the proposed team	42-46	Selected specifically for this project, diversity within the field	Potential differing vision	95	
Project team clearly understands project objectives and technical requirements		designed layout to reflect actionable plans	Can look past complex issues that do not reflect in the data	95	
Familiarity with the Town's Comprehensive Plan and process		Local knowledge and referenced 2009 plan in interview		95	

Criteria 2: Experience					Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
Experience and demonstrated success in performing similar work	19-20, Interview	Local plans	not everyone on the team has experienced comp plan scope	90	
Ability to manage projects of a similar nature, size, and scope	19-20	Various planning project and comp plan	Has limited experience together	96	
Experience completing projects on tight deadlines, within budget, and in a professional and thorough manner	page 19-20	Various planning projects and comp plan		90	

Criteria 3: Interpersonal and Communication Skills					Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
Working well with a wide variety of people possessing differing levels of understanding of complex topics	Prior work	All members have had numerous projects previously and projects were managed and completed effectively.	May be too known around town	97	
Facilitating groups and assisting communities develop visions, goals, and policies	Interview	May have more of an idea of complex demographics and pockets within our community. Excited to engage with all populations	mostly surrounding areas, may have tunnel vision	95	
Giving presentations to varied audiences	Interview	engaging with various types of presentations and letting the audience lead, -	not a great overall presentation for the bid	90	
Preparing written materials in a clear, concise, and compelling manner	RFQ	Layout of RFQ was engaging and clear		97	
Problem solving and conflict resolution	prior work- not sure we can count this	planning projects that were hot topics in the community with varied opinions and completing them successfully		0	

Criteria 4: Familiarity with Tompkins County and local issues, initiatives, organizations, and individuals that relate to this project	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
	Interview	Well documented understanding of local knowledge		99

Criteria 5: Thoroughness and clarity of the proposal	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
	page 5-10	Layout was informative and accurate to RFQ, but more importantly designed for specific project		97

Criteria 6: Project Timeline, Availability and flexibility in meeting Project Timetable and Deliverables.	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
	page 13 and interview	Local-Can be more flexible with time		98

Presentation and Interview					Total Points
Rate the quality of the consultant's presentation: substance, professionalism, engagement, energy, etc.	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points		
	Energy for this specific project was apparent. The different perspectives were heard and was nice to get feedback from each piece of the team.	Energy stuck out and may have limited their effectiveness to communicate verbally	95		
How well did they respond to presented questions, did they fully answer each of the questions, were responses clear and concise etc.	Answers had good specific examples and gave some opportunities for forward thinking and planning for implementation		97		

EVALUATION WORKSHEET

RFQ# 2025-45 Comp Plan Consultant

Supplier/Contractor Name: MRB

Overall Rating Point 89

Evaluator's Name: Tai

Evaluation Rating Criteria: RFQ Pages 2-3
 Scope of Work & Deliverables: RFQ Pages 6-22

Criteria 1: Expertise				Total Points
				91.666667
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Qualifications of the members of the proposed team	Page 12	Well established firm with many years of experience.	Not local and corporate	95
Project team clearly understands project objectives and technical requirements	page 5	designed layout to reflect actionable plans	Can look past complex issues that do not reflect in the data	90
Familiarity with the Town's Comprehensive Plan and process	Page 7 plan update page 8	Part of the group has worked with the town	May not be familiar with the towns prior plan. Did not reference the 2009 plan	90

Criteria 2: Experience				Total Points
				88.333333
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Experience and demonstrated success in performing similar work	Page 13 - 17	Provided examples of other comp plans	Could be too automatic and cookie cutter	90
Ability to manage projects of a similar nature, size, and scope	Page 13 - 17	Large team to delegate manageable areas of comp plan	May not be as effective for details and thoroughness due to segmented team.	85
Experience completing projects on tight deadlines, within budget, and in a professional and thorough manner	Page 13 - 17	Could be available through reference check of prior comp plan communities. References received were glowing		90

Criteria 3: Interpersonal and Communication Skills				Total Points
				74.8
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Working well with a wide variety of people possessing differing levels of understanding of complex topics	Interview	Good public speaking	Did not meet all of the team at interview	90
Facilitating groups and assisting communities develop visions, goals, and policies	Interview	Template form	May be too broad	90
Giving presentations to varied audiences	Interview	Good public speaking by the member of team who presented	Some and/or most contracted out and did not get to meet in person.	99
Preparing written materials in a clear, concise, and compelling manner	RFQ	Easy to understand	May not be engaging to some	95
Problem solving and conflict resolution	Not sure we know this			0

Criteria 4: Familiarity with Tompkins County and local issues, initiatives, organizations, and individuals that relate to this project	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
	Interview	Yes		90

Criteria 5: Thoroughness and clarity of the proposal	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
	Presentation at town	Yes		95

Criteria 6: Project Timeline, Availability and flexibility in meeting Project Timetable and Deliverables.	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
	Page 9			90

Presentation and Interview				Total Points
				96
Rate the quality of the consultant's presentation: substance, professionalism, engagement, energy, etc	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
	Well done	Seemed too sales pitch	97	
How well did they respond to presented questions, did they fully answer each of the questions, were responses clear and concise etc.	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
	Yes-They seemingly had the "right" answer for the questions we asked	Some of the answers need follow through and we won't know this until hired.	95	

EVALUATION WORKSHEET

RFQ# 2025-45 Comp Plan Consultant

Supplier/Contractor Name: CRRC

Overall Rating Point 90.5

Evaluator's Name: Ann DiPetta

Evaluation Rating Criteria: RFQ Pages 2-3

Scope of Work & Deliverables: RFQ Pages 6-22

Criteria 1: Expertise				Total Points
				88.3333333
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Qualifications of the members of the proposed team				85
Project team clearly understands project objectives and technical requirements				90
Familiarity with the Town's Comprehensive Plan and process				90

Criteria 2: Experience				Total Points
				91.6666667
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Experience and demonstrated success in performing similar work				90
Ability to manage projects of a similar nature, size, and scope				90
Experience completing projects on tight deadlines, within budget, and in a professional and thorough manner				95

Criteria 3: Interpersonal and Communication Skills				Total Points
				86
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Working well with a wide variety of people possessing differing levels of understanding of complex topics				85
Facilitating groups and assisting communities develop visions, goals, and policies				85
Giving presentations to varied audiences				85
Preparing written materials in a clear, concise, and compelling manner				85
Problem solving and conflict resolution				90

Criteria 4: Familiarity with Tompkins County and local issues, initiatives, organizations, and individuals that relate to this project	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				95

Criteria 5: Thoroughness and clarity of the proposal	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				90

Criteria 6: Project Timeline, Availability and flexibility in meeting Project Timetable and Deliverables.	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				95

Presentation and Interview				Total Points
				87.5
Rate the quality of the consultant's presentation: substance, professionalism, engagement, energy, etc	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
			85	
How well did they respond to presented questions, did they fully answer each of the questions, were responses clear and concise etc.	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
			90	

EVALUATION WORKSHEET
RFQ#

2025-45 Comp Plan Consultant

Supplier/Contractor Name: MRB

Overall Rating Point 95

Evaluator's Name: Ann DiPetta

Evaluation Rating Criteria: RFQ Pages 2-3

Scope of Work & Deliverables: RFQ Pages 6-22

Criteria 1: Expertise				Total Points
				95
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Qualifications of the members of the proposed team				95
Project team clearly understands project objectives and technical requirements				95
Familiarity with the Town's Comprehensive Plan and process				95

Criteria 2: Experience				Total Points
				95
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Experience and demonstrated success in performing similar work				95
Ability to manage projects of a similar nature, size, and scope				95
Experience completing projects on tight deadlines, within budget, and in a professional and thorough manner				95

Criteria 3: Interpersonal and Communication Skills				Total Points
				94
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Working well with a wide variety of people possessing differing levels of understanding of complex topics				95
Facilitating groups and assisting communities develop visions, goals, and policies				90
Giving presentations to varied audiences				95
Preparing written materials in a clear, concise, and compelling manner				100
Problem solving and conflict resolution				90

Criteria 4: Familiarity with Tompkins County and local issues, initiatives, organizations, and individuals that relate to this project	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				90

Criteria 5: Thoroughness and clarity of the proposal	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				95

Criteria 6: Project Timeline, Availability and flexibility in meeting Project Timetable and Deliverables.	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				95

Presentation and Interview				Total Points
				97.5
Rate the quality of the consultant's presentation: substance, professionalism, engagement, energy, etc	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
			100	
How well did they respond to presented questions, did they fully answer each of the questions, were responses clear and concise etc.	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
			95	

Niels Tygesen

From: Ann DiPetta
Sent: Thursday, May 9, 2024 4:53 PM
To: Rebecca L. Schneider; Niels Tygesen; alisonbecker006; comp.plan.steering.chair; abdc4251; Elizabeth Weatherby; klankowskik; Katelin Olson; ulyseestownsupervisor; moxie; rosemariéhanson; roxanne.m.marino; Tai Basilius
Cc: Mollie Duell
Subject: Re: CP Consultants Follow-up Info
Attachments: 2025 Comp Plan Consultant Evaluation Worksheet.xlsx

Hi all,

Apologies for being tardy with the scoring sheet and for being absent the past couple of meetings. I have attached my score sheet BUT did not have time to enter specific thoughts for my score so will notate ideas below.

MRB: 95
CRRC: 90

In terms of work experience, I agree that either group would likely get the job done. The obvious standout is that MRB knows how to engage an audience and the clear home-town advantage goes to CRRC with their intimate understanding of the local community. Overall though, I think MRB gets my vote b/c of their experience in doing similar work and ability to present the information in a clear and convincing way, in their proposal, slides and in-person presentation.

Engagement and clear communication is pretty high on my list of priorities - I have no doubt that the residents of Ulysses already have thoughts and ideas and the desire to communicate their aspirations for the town, the challenge will be to draw the public into the conversation and be able to analyze and synthesize the information in a way that makes sense and provides us with a direction forward. Based on what I've seen, I believe MRB would do a better job at this. They also have a large budget line (\$30K+) for engagement and I don't see a line item for this in CRRC's budget.

Really exciting to have two good candidates!
Ann

~~**From:** Rebecca L. Schneider <rls11@cornell.edu>
Sent: Thursday, May 9, 2024 4:00 PM
To: Niels Tygesen <Planner@townofulyssesny.gov>; alisonbecker006 <alisonbecker006@gmail.com>; Ann DiPetta <cpchair@townofulyssesny.gov>; comp.plan.steering.chair <comp.plan.steering.chair@gmail.com>; abdc4251 <abdc4251@gmail.com>; Elizabeth Weatherby <weatherby@townofulyssesny.gov>; klankowskik <klankowskik@gmail.com>; Katelin Olson <supervisor@townofulyssesny.gov>; ulyseestownsupervisor <ulyseestownsupervisor@gmail.com>; moxie <moxie@dr.com>; rosemariéhanson <rosemariéhanson@gmail.com>; roxanne.m.marino <roxanne.m.marino@gmail.com>; Tai Basilius <tbasili1@binghamton.edu>
Cc: Mollie Duell <mduell@townofulyssesny.gov>; Rebecca L. Schneider <rls11@cornell.edu>
Subject: RE: CP Consultants Follow-up Info~~

Folks

EVALUATION WORKSHEET

RFQ#

2025-45 Comp Plan Consultant

Supplier/Contractor Name:

CRRC

Overall Rating Point

84.2142857

Evaluator's Name:

Rose Hanson

Evaluation Rating Criteria:

RFQ Pages 2-3

Scope of Work & Deliverables:

RFQ Pages 6-22

Criteria 1: Expertise				Total Points
				83.3333333
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Qualifications of the members of the proposed team			Focus on Urban Regions	85
Project team clearly understands project objectives and technical requirements				80
Familiarity with the Town's Comprehensive Plan and process				85

Criteria 2: Experience				Total Points
				81.6666667
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Experience and demonstrated success in performing similar work			They haven't done a comp plan before	75
Ability to manage projects of a similar nature, size, and scope		They seem like they have all managed projects before		90
Experience completing projects on tight deadlines, within budget, and in a professional and thorough manner			Have they worked as a team before?	80

Criteria 3: Interpersonal and Communication Skills				Total Points
				82
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Working well with a wide variety of people possessing differing levels of understanding of complex topics				80
Facilitating groups and assisting communities develop visions, goals, and policies		They seem to have experience with this		95
Giving presentations to varied audiences			They didn't do a great job with this presentation	85
Preparing written materials in a clear, concise, and compelling manner			I did not find their proposal clearly written	75
Problem solving and conflict resolution		I'm sure they have experience in this		75

Criteria 4: Familiarity with Tompkins County and local issues, initiatives, organizations, and individuals that relate to this project	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
			Maybe too familiar? They may be coming with their own preconceived notions	95

Criteria 5: Thoroughness and clarity of the proposal	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
			Could have been written more clearly	80

Criteria 6: Project Timeline, Availability and flexibility in meeting Project Timetable and Deliverables.	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
		They live nearby		90

Presentation and Interview				Total Points
				77.5
Rate the quality of the consultant's presentation: substance, professionalism, engagement, energy, etc		Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				75
How well did they respond to presented questions, did they fully answer each of the questions, were responses clear and concise etc.		Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				80

EVALUATION WORKSHEET

RFQ# 2025-45 Comp Plan Consultant

Supplier/Contractor Name: MRB

Overall Rating Point 92

Evaluator's Name: Rose Hanson

Evaluation Rating Criteria: RFQ Pages 2-3

Scope of Work & Deliverables: RFQ Pages 6-22

Criteria 1: Expertise				Total Points
				93.3333333
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Qualifications of the members of the proposed team				95
Project team clearly understands project objectives and technical requirements				95
Familiarity with the Town's Comprehensive Plan and process			I assume based on their work with the town	90

Criteria 2: Experience				Total Points
				95
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Experience and demonstrated success in performing similar work	Ontario County work			95
Ability to manage projects of a similar nature, size, and scope				95
Experience completing projects on tight deadlines, within budget, and in a professional and thorough manner		Sounds like other clients were satisfied		95

Criteria 3: Interpersonal and Communication Skills				Total Points
				91
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Working well with a wide variety of people possessing differing levels of understanding of complex topics				90
Facilitating groups and assisting communities develop visions, goals, and policies				90
Giving presentations to varied audiences				90
Preparing written materials in a clear, concise, and compelling manner				90
Problem solving and conflict resolution				95

Criteria 4: Familiarity with Tompkins County and local issues, initiatives, organizations, and individuals that relate to this project	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				85

Criteria 5: Thoroughness and clarity of the proposal	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				95

Criteria 6: Project Timeline, Availability and flexibility in meeting Project Timetable and Deliverables.	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
		Matt Horn Lives in Geneva, 40 minutes away		90

Presentation and Interview				Total Points
				96.5
Rate the quality of the consultant's presentation: substance, professionalism, engagement, energy, etc		Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				98
How well did they respond to presented questions, did they fully answer each of the questions, were responses clear and concise etc.		Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				95

Comments from Rose Hanson

CRRC and partners - They seem like an enthusiastic group of talented individuals. In their letter with their proposal, they focused on development. They seem to have an urban rather than rural focus. They are very familiar with our area, which could be a positive or negative. I am very intrigued by WPD especially, and all the projects they have been involved in.

MRB - I liked that MRB focused more on the process of the Comp Plan, talking about their approach and giving examples of how they worked with a steering committee in Ontario that had different ideas and how they dealt with different viewpoints and wound up with a unified community vision. Their presentation/PPT focused on environmental stewardship and protecting the lake, while acknowledging the need to deal with pressures of growth.

Overall, I found the communication style of MRB, both the written proposal and in their presentations, more concise and clear than that of CRRC, and I think this is critical in the whole Comprehensive Plan process.

Supplier/Contractor Name: CRRC

Overall Rating Point 91

Evaluator's Name: Karol Klankowski

Evaluation Rating Criteria: RFQ Pages 2-3

Scope of Work & Deliverables: RFQ Pages 6-22

Overall Greatest Strengths of the Consultant Team	Overall Greatest Concerns with the Consultant Team
CRRC is genuinely excited to work with Town of Ullyses to update our comp plan. All 4 principals have a long history of working in Tompkins county. Gary and JoAnn have both been thru our steering committees current position of putting together comp plans from the perspective of the group tasked with executing the plan (Gary - Ithaca Commons, Downtown Ithaca 2020 plan, JoAnn - Ithaca city 2015 comp plan. All 4 are local - so in person meetings or community outreach can reasonably be supported.	small team - loss of any of the 4 principals could significantly impact their ability to complete our project.

Criteria 1: Expertise				Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Qualifications of the members of the proposed team	pg 10 para 1 thru 3 and pg 42 to 47 with details for each individual	All 4 principals have over 20 yrs each working in Tompkins county		95
Project team clearly understands project objectives and technical requirements	pgs 14 thru 18 under scope of work follow in sequence the 10 plan elements in our pg 10 of our RFQ	the teams long experience in Tompkins county makes them ideally suited to address our project objectives and technical requirements		95
Familiarity with the Town's Comprehensive Plan and process	Page 8 para 2 and during the interview JoAnn stated she has read thru the Ullyses comp plan twice to familiarize herself with it.	All 4 principals have long experience in developing comp plans and in executing them		89

Criteria 2: Experience				Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Experience and demonstrated success in performing similar work	Pg 38 Whitman Team relevant experience - current Cayuga lake water project, Pg 39 2015 City of Ithaca comp plan, Downtown 2010 Ithaca plan, 2030 Downtown/Westend comp plan	Long experience working with Tompkins county area and NYS		89
Ability to manage projects of a similar nature, size, and scope	pg 42 para 3 - Gary 24 yrs executive director Downtown Ithaca Alliance Pg 43 para 3 JoAnn 13 years as Director of Planning and Development for city of Ithaca	Pg 42 to 45 - all 4 principals have 15 yrs or more managing public projects		89
Experience completing projects on tight deadlines, within budget, and in a professional and thorough manner	Pg 42 para 1 Gary - Ithaca Commons Pg 43 para 1 JoAnn Pg 44 para 1 Scott	All have long experience working in Tompkins county to bring public projects to completion		89

Criteria 3: Interpersonal and Communication Skills				Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Working well with a wide variety of people possessing differing levels of understanding of complex topics	pg 9 para 3 to 5.	All 4 principals have long experience getting public projects completed in Tompkins county		95
Facilitating groups and assisting communities develop visions, goals, and policies	pg 12 community outreach and interview comments	interview statements about efforts to get stake holder inputs		95
Giving presentations to varied audiences	their interview performance to us and their Proposal Pg 5 para 2 & 3	Gary - 24 yrs as Executive Director downtown Ithaca Alliance, JoAnn 13 yrs as City of Ithaca Director of Planning and Development		95
Preparing written materials in a clear, concise, and compelling manner	Pg 8 & 9 of their proposal	Pg 42 thru 45 long records of successfully getting public projects approved and completed.		95
Problem solving and conflict resolution	Gary pg 42 para 1 and 3, JoAnn pg 43 para 1 thru 3, Scott pg 44 para 1, Michelle pg 45 para 1	the 4 principals have over 10 years working together on projects		89

Criteria 4: Familiarity with Tompkins County and local issues, initiatives, organizations, and individuals that relate to this project				Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
	team - pg 5 para 1 thru 3: Gary pg 42 para 1 & 3, JoAnn Pg 43 para 1 thru 3, Scott pg 44 para 1. Oral presentation of all 4 principals during interview	All 3 have over 2 decades each working in Tompkins county		95

Criteria 5: Thoroughness and clarity of the proposal				Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
	pg 12 thru 19 provide clearly how they intend to meet the required details of our comp plan update	Both Gary and JoAnn have spent 20 years or more each executing comp plan goals		95

Criteria 6: Project Timeline, Availability and flexibility in meeting Project Timetable and Deliverables.				Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
	pg 12 thru 19 provide clearly how they intend to meet the required details of our comp plan update	Both Gary and JoAnn have spent 20 years or more each executing comp plan goals		95

Presentation and Interview				Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Rate the quality of the consultant's presentation: substance, professionalism, engagement, energy, etc		All 4 have worked together for 15 years or more on a variety of public projects. All are enthusiastic to work on our comp plan.		100
How well did they respond to presented questions, did they fully answer each of the questions, were responses clear and concise etc.		All were eager to respond to questions. Gary managed the group to let the best qualified individual answer the question		100

EVALUATION WORKSHEET

RFQ# 2025-45 Comp Plan Consultant

Supplier/Contractor Name: MRB

Overall Rating Point **82**

Evaluator's Name: Karl Klankowski

Evaluation Rating Criteria: RFQ Pages 2-3

Scope of Work & Deliverables: RFQ Pages 6-22

Overall Greatest Strengths of the Consultant Team	Overall Greatest Concerns with the Consultant Team
Large company with in place back-ups for any one individual. Proven ability to complete comp plan updates (town of Ontario; Village of Hilton; Town of Bethlehem)	Lack of local planning experience with Tompkins county. Travel distance for any direct contact or public engagement.

Criteria 1: Expertise				Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Qualifications of the members of the proposed team	pg 24 to 30 individual resumes	MRB is a large firm with years of experience in support of community development.	They are Rochester based	89
Project team clearly understands project objectives and technical requirements	Page 3 - page 9	Their proposal addresses each of the objectives in our RFQ.		89
Familiarity with the Town's Comprehensive Plan and process	Pg 3 recognition of current comp plan - nothing in the interview regarding specific familiarity with the plan details	Has worked with the town before - mostly in an engineering support role		75

Criteria 2: Experience				Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Experience and demonstrated success in performing similar work	Page 14, 15, 18 Village of Hilton comp plan 2020; Town of Ontario comp plan 2021; Town of Bethlehem comp plan 2022	Recent successful completion of related comp plans		89
Ability to manage projects of a similar nature, size, and scope	above comp plans	Has done comp plans before		89
Experience completing projects on tight deadlines, within budget, and in a professional and thorough manner	Page 13 - 18	repeat employment by town of Ulysses for engineering work		89

Criteria 3: Interpersonal and Communication Skills				Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Working well with a wide variety of people possessing differing levels of understanding of complex topics	Presentation at town and cited recent projects on pgs 13 - 18	Matt Horn is comfortable in public presentation		89
Facilitating groups and assisting communities develop visions, goals, and policies	cited comp plan projects pgs 14, 15 & 18. Pg 24 para 2 thru 4	Yes		89
Giving presentations to varied audiences	Presentation at town	Yes		89
Preparing written materials in a clear, concise, and compelling manner	Proposal pgs 6 thru 9 addressing our RFQ requirements	Yes		89
Problem solving and conflict resolution	pg 24 thru 27 principals resumes including previous public work	extensive experience working with public groups		89

Criteria 4: Familiarity with Tompkins County and local issues, initiatives, organizations, and individuals that relate to this project	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
	from an engineering standpoint - pg 25 Bill Davis work for City of Ithaca, Trumansburg and Dryden. Pg 26 Matt McKenna - Dryden and trumansburg		No where near the experience level of CRRC with Tompkins county planning and other local issues.	70

Criteria 5: Thoroughness and clarity of the proposal	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
	Proposal pgs 3 thru 9 and interview presentation	Yes		89

Criteria 6: Project Timeline, Availability and flexibility in meeting Project Timetable and Deliverables.	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
	Page 10		Most team members will be commuting an hour or more to get to Town of Ulysses - direct contact is likely to be limited	75

Presentation and Interview				Total Points
Rate the quality of the consultant's presentation: substance, professionalism, engagement, energy, etc	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
	A solid presentation but came across as just another contract for MRB		80	
How well did they respond to presented questions, did they fully answer each of the questions, were responses clear and concise etc.	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
	Matt Horn readily answered all questions	Highland Planning is contracted by MRB to do their community outreach	75	

EVALUATION WORKSHEET
RFQ#

2025-45 Comp Plan Consultant

Supplier/Contractor Name: CRRC

Overall Rating Point 68.0857143

Evaluator's Name: Mo

Evaluation Rating Criteria: RFQ Pages 2-3

Scope of Work & Deliverables: RFQ Pages 6-22

Criteria 1: Expertise				Total Points
				90
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Qualifications of the members of the proposed team	Page 42-45	All members have experience on planning and development	The group has never done a Comp plan for a town	90
Project team clearly understands project objectives and technical requirements	Page 12-19	Group is local		90
Familiarity with the Town's Comprehensive Plan and process	Page 8-9	group is local	The group stresses planning and economic development	90

Criteria 2: Experience				Total Points
				1
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Experience and demonstrated success in performing similar work	No	They have worked locally on planning and development in the town of Ithaca	Has not done a Comp Plan	1
Ability to manage projects of a similar nature, size, and scope	Unknown			1
Experience completing projects on tight deadlines, within budget, and in a professional and thorough manner	Unknown			1

Criteria 3: Interpersonal and Communication Skills				Total Points
				35.6
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Working well with a wide variety of people possessing differing levels of understanding of complex topics	Unknown	They have worked locally on planning and development in the town of Ithaca	Not stated, no Comp plan to compare	1
Facilitating groups and assisting communities develop visions, goals, and policies	Unknown		Worked locally on planning	90
Giving presentations to varied audiences	Unknown			1
Preparing written materials in a clear, concise, and compelling manner	Proposal			85
Problem solving and conflict resolution	Unknown			1

Criteria 4: Familiarity with Tompkins County and local issues, initiatives, organizations, and individuals that relate to this project	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
	Proposal	All four members have worked locally		90

Criteria 5: Thoroughness and clarity of the proposal	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
	Proposal	Local	The proposal was not as detailed as MRB's	85

Criteria 6: Project Timeline, Availability and flexibility in meeting Project Timetable and Deliverables.	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
	Page 24-25			90

Presentation and Interview				Total Points
				85
Rate the quality of the consultant's presentation: substance, professionalism, engagement, energy, etc	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
	Worked locally	All four members spoke there was no lead member	85	
How well did they respond to presented questions, did they fully answer each of the questions, were responses clear and concise etc.	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
	Worked locally	Members had to decide on who would answer the question there was no lead member	85	

EVALUATION WORKSHEET

RFQ# 2025-45 Comp Plan Consultant

Supplier/Contractor Name: MRB

Overall Rating Point 89

Evaluator's Name: Mo

Evaluation Rating Criteria: RFQ Pages 2-3

Scope of Work & Deliverables: RFQ Pages 6-22

Criteria 1: Expertise				Total Points
				91.6666667
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Qualifications of the members of the proposed team	Page 12	All members have many years of experience. MRB Group is one of the longest established professional firms in the municipal services, engineering and architectural business.	Not local to the town of Ulysses	95
Project team clearly understands project objectives and technical requirements	Page 2 - page 9	MRB has a longstanding partnership with town of Ulysses. All items that need work are listed. From communications, public forums, community surveying, media, focus groups, ect.	Very large group could be good or bad	90
Familiarity with the Town's Comprehensive Plan and process	Page 7 plan update page 8	Has worked with the town before		90

Criteria 2: Experience				Total Points
				86.6666667
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Experience and demonstrated success in performing similar work	Page 13 - 17	Has done Comp plans for some surrounding towns		90
Ability to manage projects of a similar nature, size, and scope	Page 13 - 17	Has done comp plans before	Unknown unless we can contact one of the towns for their evaluation of the work that was done	85
Experience completing projects on tight deadlines, within budget, and in a professional and thorough manner	Page 13 - 17	Unknown	Unknown unless we can contact one of the towns for their evaluation of the work that was done	85

Criteria 3: Interpersonal and Communication Skills				Total Points
				73
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Working well with a wide variety of people possessing differing levels of understanding of complex topics	Presentation at town	Yes		90
Facilitating groups and assisting communities develop visions, goals, and policies	Presentation at town	Yes	Unknown unless we can contact one of the towns for their evaluation of the work that was done	85
Giving presentations to varied audiences	Presentation at town	Yes	Unknown	95
Preparing written materials in a clear, concise, and compelling manner	Proposal	Yes		95
Problem solving and conflict resolution	unknown	Unknown	Unknown unless we can contact one of the towns for their evaluation of the work that was done	0

Criteria 4: Familiarity with Tompkins County and local issues, initiatives, organizations, and individuals that relate to this project	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
	Proposal	Yes	Not a local group	90

Criteria 5: Thoroughness and clarity of the proposal	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
	Presentation at town	Yes		95

Criteria 6: Project Timeline, Availability and flexibility in meeting Project Timetable and Deliverables.	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
	Page 9		Unknown unless we can contact one of the towns for their evaluation of the work that was done	90

Presentation and Interview				Total Points
				95
Rate the quality of the consultant's presentation: substance, professionalism, engagement, energy, etc	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
	The presentation was well done there was 1 lead member Who presented the proposal		95	
How well did they respond to presented questions, did they fully answer each of the questions, were responses clear and concise etc.	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
	The lead member answered all questions		95	

EVALUATION WORKSHEET

RFQ#

2025-45 Comp Plan Consultant

Supplier/Contractor Name:

CRRC

Overall Rating Point

92.1904762

Evaluator's Name:

Roxanne Marino

Evaluation Rating Criteria:

RFQ Pages 2-3

Scope of Work & Deliverables:

RFQ Pages 6-22

Criteria 1: Expertise				Total Points
				95
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Qualifications of the members of the proposed team	p5, 9, 32-33, 41-47	the partner team are trained in landscape architecture, planning, and economic development. All 4 attended the interview; the firm associated with the team (Whitman Assoc) has a team (though smaller than MRB scale firm) of technical specialists for GIS	economic development experience very city focused	95
Project team clearly understands project objectives and technical requirements	same as above and examples in Scope of Work			95
Familiarity with the Town's Comprehensive Plan and process	p8, 12, in person interview	recognized regularly the 2009 Comp Plan and the context for updates in specific areas; stated they will utilize the 2009 plan as a baseline.		95

Criteria 2: Experience				Total Points
				92.3333333
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Experience and demonstrated success in performing similar work	throughout Scope of Work; qualification pgs listed above	principles have directly relevant experience in areas defined for analysis in RFQ - historic development, transportation, natural resource evaluation and protection, nopen space, parks, and recreation, housing	while they have all worked on different local projects with one or another over many years, they are a new entity working together to produce a full Comprehensive Plan	90
Ability to manage projects of a similar nature, size, and scope	p5, 9, 32-33, 41-47	Many years of collective experience and involvement with municipal / public projects related to comprehensive planning; one of the principles was a planner / director of planning locally, which oversaw all aspects of the components of crafting and implementing a Comp Plan	same as above	95

Experience completing projects on tight deadlines, within budget, and in a professional and thorough manner	need to infer from Relevant Experience section p36-40	no direct information on producing a Comp Plan update (new team for this); principles have extensive experience with municipal projects	no direct information	92
---	---	---	-----------------------	----

Criteria 3: Interpersonal and Communication Skills				Total Points
---	--	--	--	---------------------

				89
--	--	--	--	----

Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Working well with a wide variety of people possessing differing levels of understanding of complex topics	p5, Relevant Experience and Team resumes	same as already mentioned, lots of diverse experience in community planning and engagement across the team of principles		90
Facilitating groups and assisting communities develop visions, goals, and policies	as above; in-person interview	same as above; lots of emphasis on importance of community engagement and outreach strategies, open houses, etc	need good coordination among principles leading different focus groups	92
Giving presentations to varied audiences	in person interview; Relevant Experience	very enthusiastic on comprehensive planning and Town of Ulysses project; many years of experience working with varied audiences, based on the Relevant experience and Team resumes	Our only direct experience is the Ulysses presentation; was not well coordinated across the 4 principles, could have been smoother and more concise.	88
Preparing written materials in a clear, concise, and compelling manner	RFQ	Scope of Work descriptions followed sections of RFQ, helpful with evaluating specific responses and clarity on key tasks and principles leading them	Typeset and layout not the smoothest format for reading	90
Problem solving and conflict resolution	p9, Team Resumes	cited that they feel a specialty of their team is reaching disparate community segments and groups; experience and former positions of some principles (Cornish as director of planning, City of Ithaca) would require good problem-solving and ability to address conflict	no direct references	85

Criteria 4: Familiarity with Tompkins County and local issues, initiatives, organizations, and individuals that relate to this project	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
	throughout RFQ	many		100

Criteria 5: Thoroughness and clarity of the proposal	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
	RFQ, in person interview	Proposal addressed all of the requested Scope of Work and Deliverables areas topic by topic; helpful in evaluating thoroughness relative to requested information	typeset and layout not the smoothest format for reading	90

Criteria 6: Project Timeline, Availability and flexibility in meeting Project Timetable and Deliverables.	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
	p 23,24	Team came together for this project, so a strong commitment to it; all principles live locally and stressed their availability and ability to adapt to outreach and communication needs as they might evolve; timeline seems reasonable from final draft to adoption	coordination across the 4 principles will be important to keeping on timeline	90

Presentation and Interview				Total Points
				89
Rate the quality of the consultant's presentation: substance, professionalism, engagement, energy, etc		Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
		Lots of energy, engagement, enthusiasm from all 4 principles, relevant experience and expertise and value of that to Ulysses were apparent	presentation was not well coordinated / rehearsed with the 4 principles, not well timed	88
How well did they respond to presented questions, did they fully answer each of the questions, were responses clear and concise etc.		Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
		responses were on target to questions and clear		90

EVALUATION WORKSHEET
RFQ#

2025-45 Comp Plan Consultant

Supplier/Contractor Name: MRB

Overall Rating Point 83

Evaluator's Name: Roxanne

Evaluation Rating Criteria: RFQ Pages 2-3

Scope of Work & Deliverables: RFQ Pages 6-22

Criteria 1: Expertise				Total Points
				85
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Qualifications of the members of the proposed team	Page 12; Appendix A	All members have many years of experience. MRB Group is a well established firm in the region, focused on municipal services, engineering and architecture. They have worked with Ulysses on infrastructure projects.	All principles are located at least 1 hr away; the planner (Highland Planning) mentioned (in interview) for the public engagement portion of the project is in Albany. No planners attended the interview; Comprehensive Plan is a land use and planning document for a future vision and while it does need to be grounded in the specifics of a municipality, it is also conceptual and aspirational (their words). Overall team is heavily engineering-oriented, well suited to implementation of some of the likely goals, but I'd prefer more planner engagement and the different viewpoints that come with it.	85
Project team clearly understands project objectives and technical requirements	Page 3 - page 9; in person interview	Firm has familiarity with Ulysses infrastructure issues from several projects they have been engaged on. Approach is clearly laid out and easy to follow	In the interview we really only heard from one team member (director of local govt services) and so don't have much perspective on the full team other than what is written.	85
Familiarity with the Town's Comprehensive Plan and process	Page 7 (Environmental Analysis); update referred to on page 8; in person interview	Has worked with the town before on infrastructure and design projects; good familiarity with the Comp Planning process; good answer to the sustainability question on key issues to consider	Almost no recognition of the existing Comp Plan (and to work with it to update with a specific focus on sustainability); did not mention other relevant documents (p. 7 said they will work with town leadership to identify them)	85

Criteria 2: Experience				Total Points
				88.3333333
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points

Experience and demonstrated success in performing similar work	Page 13 - 18	Relevant experience listed: assisted with 2 Comp Plan updates within the last 3 yrs, as well as a review of marketing for economic investment and a housing market analyses for 2 Counties ; the planning subcontractor proposed assisted with the outreach component of one Comp Plan		90
Ability to manage projects of a similar nature, size, and scope	Page 13 - 17	Has done Comp Plans before, for larger communities; has a large team	Planning is not the primary focus of their firm; they are very strong on implementation of planning aspects (infrastructure, grant funding, facility design).	85
Experience completing projects on tight deadlines, within budget, and in a professional and thorough manner	could be inferred from pgs 13 - 17	no direct information on Comp Planning; Town has good experience with MRB on infrastructure and design related projects	no direct information	90

Criteria 3: Interpersonal and Communication Skills				Total Points
				69.4
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Working well with a wide variety of people possessing differing levels of understanding of complex topics	pg 6; in person interview	reasonable Public engagement and general outreach plan outlined; mentioned many tools to use	didn't recognize that we have 2 different school districts when using it as an example for outreach; not much emphasis on public forums and events (only 2)	82
Facilitating groups and assisting communities develop visions, goals, and policies	same as above	same as above	same as above (re: public forums and events); planning subcontractor that will do the public outreach not engaged in interview so little sense of their views	85
Giving presentations to varied audiences	in person interview	demonstrated skill with smooth presentations	very good interview presentation, perhaps need a different approach to engage varied audiences (rural residents and stakeholders), vs present to them; difficult to evaluate	90
Preparing written materials in a clear, concise, and compelling manner	RFQ response document	well laid out, concise		90
Problem solving and conflict resolution	no relevant response cited			0

Criteria 4: Familiarity with Tompkins County and local issues, initiatives, organizations, and individuals that relate to this project	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
		has worked with Ulysses on infrastructure and design projects	no specified experience with Tompkins County initiatives and organizations	80

Criteria 5: Thoroughness and clarity of the proposal	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
	RFQ response document, in person interview	covered the requested points concisely		90

Criteria 6: Project Timeline, Availability and flexibility in meeting Project Timetable and Deliverables.	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
	Page 10; I feel it is difficult to evaluate the availability and flexibility aspect beyond what is written	large firm so many resources to draw on	timeline seems a bit short / optimistic with regard to time from final draft to the Board to adoption (3 mo); all principles are located 1 hr or more away (planner sub is 3 hr); firm may have a lot of other competing projects / priorities since they are large and diverse in their services	80

Presentation and Interview				Total Points
				91
Rate the quality of the consultant's presentation: substance, professionalism, engagement, energy, etc		Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
		Very organized and well delivered powerpoint presentation	only one of the two principles present was really engaged (the municipal services lead), the other expertise was engineering infrastructure.	92
How well did they respond to presented questions, did they fully answer each of the questions, were responses clear and concise etc.		Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
		responses were on target and concise		90

Comprehensive Plan Consultant Evaluations -- additions to the evaluations xlsx sheet
R. Marino (worksheet already completed before this was added)

Consultant: MRB

Overall Greatest Strengths of the Consultant Team

They are a large and well-established firm in the region and so have diverse resources they manage, and can bring to bear; they are skilled at producing clearly laid out proposals and presentations; interview presentation was well-organized and well-timed (but also done by only one person). They have done 2 Comp Plan updates in the last 3 years, that we can look at to directly judge the type of product we would get.

Overall Greatest Concerns with the Consultant Team

Planning is not a primary focus, and no planners attended the interview, though those subcontractors (from Albany) will be the ones doing the public outreach and community engagement, which is crucial to success. Firm is strong on municipal service needs and is engineering-oriented (infrastructure, grant funding, facility design). As the engineer for the Town, they are engaged in several of the above type of projects; a more non-aligned and more planning-focused consultant is, in my view, better suited to ensure fresh ideas and breadth of perspective in the CP update process.

Consultant: CRRC

Overall Greatest Strengths of the Consultant Team

The team consists of 4 local principles, with very many years of collective and directly relevant experience with municipal / public projects and public engagement related to planning who came together for this project and demonstrates strong commitment and enthusiasm for it; all attended the interview, one is also a local farmer, which could be a strength in engaging that critical group in Ulysses. Team has strong familiarity with County-level resources and relevant planning documents, and regularly recognized the Ulysses 2009 plan as a baseline and context for an update.

Overall Greatest Concerns with the Consultant Team

While they have individually worked on Comprehensive Plans and components of one, the principles have never done a Comprehensive Plan as a team, so there is no product to evaluate relative to our needs. The interview presentation was not well organized across the 4 presenters to be smooth and concise; coordination will be important to keeping on a timeline and with leading different focus groups.

EVALUATION WORKSHEET

RFQ# 2025-45 Comp Plan Consultant

Supplier/Contractor Name: CRRC

Overall Rating Point 60.5238095

Evaluator's Name: Katelin

Evaluation Rating Criteria: RFQ Pages 2-3

Scope of Work & Deliverables: RFQ Pages 6-22

Criteria 1: Expertise				Total Points
				45
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Qualifications of the members of the proposed team		individually the subcontractors have a lot of experience	the primary consultants do not have experience putting comp plans together; will be fully dependent on additional subcontractors who do not appear to have worked together in this capacity before	20
Project team clearly understands project objectives and technical requirements		On paper (response), they seem to understand the goals	In person, they were not as focused on what the town wants/needs. Very confusing presentation.	55
Familiarity with the Town's Comprehensive Plan and process		On paper (response), they seem to understand the goals	In person, they were not as focused on what the town wants/needs. Very confusing presentation.	60

Criteria 2: Experience				Total Points
				41.6666667
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Experience and demonstrated success in performing similar work		individually the subcontractors have a lot of experience	the primary consultants do not have experience putting comp plans together; will be fully dependent on additional subcontractors who do not appear to have worked together in this capacity before	25

Ability to manage projects of a similar nature, size, and scope		Interesting professional backgrounds; could be very compelling if all were in the same firm.	The main contractor does not have this type of experience, and will be dependent on subcontractors.	40
Experience completing projects on tight deadlines, within budget, and in a professional and thorough manner		Each individual in the firm has a good reputation	This specific team does not have a long track record	60

Criteria 3: Interpersonal and Communication Skills				Total Points
				62
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Working well with a wide variety of people possessing differing levels of understanding of complex topics				75
Facilitating groups and assisting communities develop visions, goals, and policies		Varied professional backgrounds between different individuals, which helps suggest they will have good capacity to work with different audiences		80
Giving presentations to varied audiences			Poor presentation for experienced professionals; this skill would need to be worked on.	25
Preparing written materials in a clear, concise, and compelling manner		Written response was well put together		80
Problem solving and conflict resolution				50

Criteria 4: Familiarity with Tompkins County and local issues, initiatives, organizations, and individuals that relate to this project	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
--	--------------------------------	-------------------	---------------------------	--------

		All are from Tompkins County, so great local familiarity with the county generally	Clear urban focus in all of their backgrounds, particularly in the principles from the firm that submitted the RFQ.	75
--	--	--	---	----

Criteria 5: Thoroughness and clarity of the proposal	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				80

Criteria 6: Project Timeline, Availability and flexibility in meeting Project Timetable and Deliverables.	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				80

Presentation and Interview				Total Points
				40
Rate the quality of the consultant's presentation: substance, professionalism, engagement, energy, etc		Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				25
How well did they respond to presented questions, did they fully answer each of the questions, were responses clear and concise etc.		Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				55

EVALUATION WORKSHEET

RFQ# 2025-45 Comp Plan Consultant

Supplier/Contractor Name: MRB

Overall Rating Point 92

Evaluator's Name: Katelin

Evaluation Rating Criteria: RFQ Pages 2-3

Scope of Work & Deliverables: RFQ Pages 6-22

Criteria 1: Expertise				Total Points
				90
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Qualifications of the members of the proposed team		Large supporting team; leads are experienced and familiar with the Town.	Comp planning is a newer aspect of the firm, but their references/clients seem to be happy with their work.	85
Project team clearly understands project objectives and technical requirements		Very well organized presentation and the submission also appropriately followed the request of the RFQ		90
Familiarity with the Town's Comprehensive Plan and process		Demonstrated experience in this in both the RFQ and presentation		95

Criteria 2: Experience				Total Points
				91.6666667
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Experience and demonstrated success in performing similar work		Has experience with comp plans being prepared in similar communities	Newer to the firm, but other communities have provided good responses	90

Ability to manage projects of a similar nature, size, and scope		Town has successfully worked with them on many projects and they have demonstrated their follow through	Less experience in this specific type of project	90
Experience completing projects on tight deadlines, within budget, and in a professional and thorough manner		Town has successfully worked with them on many projects and they have demonstrated their follow through		95

Criteria 3: Interpersonal and Communication Skills				Total Points
				92
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Working well with a wide variety of people possessing differing levels of understanding of complex topics		Experience with the town in working on projects with engagement of a variety of groups; have demonstrated this with their projects.		90
Facilitating groups and assisting communities develop visions, goals, and policies		References were happy with their work		85
Giving presentations to varied audiences				95
Preparing written materials in a clear, concise, and compelling manner		Demonstrated experience in this in the RFQ		95

Problem solving and conflict resolution		My experience with this firm outside this application process suggests that they have strong capacity to do this		95
---	--	--	--	----

Criteria 4: Familiarity with Tompkins County and local issues, initiatives, organizations, and individuals that relate to this project	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
		Has extensive experience in Ulysses	Outside of Tompkins County	90

Criteria 5: Thoroughness and clarity of the proposal	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				95

Criteria 6: Project Timeline, Availability and flexibility in meeting Project Timetable and Deliverables.	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				90

Presentation and Interview				Total Points
				92.5
Rate the quality of the consultant's presentation: substance, professionalism, engagement, energy, etc		Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
		Great presentation and coordination		95
How well did they respond to presented questions, did they fully answer each of the questions, were responses clear and concise etc.		Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				90

Niels Tygesen

From: Rebecca L. Schneider <rls11@cornell.edu>
Sent: Thursday, May 9, 2024 4:01 PM
To: Niels Tygesen; alisonbecker006; Ann DiPetta; comp.plan.steering.chair; abdc4251; Elizabeth Weatherby; klankowskik; Katelin Olson; ulysestownsupervisor; moxie; rosemarienhanson; roxanne.m.marino; Tai Basilius
Cc: Mollie Duell; Rebecca L. Schneider
Subject: RE: CP Consultants Follow-up Info

Folks
Just listened to the two interviews. Won't have time to fill out the evaluation excel rubric prior to the meeting (happy to do so later) , but here is my feedback:
Overall, the two applicants have what I see as distinct strengths and weaknesses, but both would likely do a good job and neither do I consider unacceptable. Here is my feedback on the two groups:

I felt **MRB is the better candidate** for these reasons:

- they did a much better job at identifying the key features and strengths of Ulysses that should be considered, for example, highlighting environmental stewardship, unmatched rural setting and quality of life;
- although strongly an engineering firm, they partner with Highland Planning Company who are experienced at stakeholder engagement , and have considerable experience developing comprehensive plans, including the example from Ontario
- I like that they emphasize a good comprehensive plan should be intentional and help market who we want to be
- Very experienced with Ulysses and across the state
- Professional and polished presentation.

CRRC consists of all planners, have been doing this work for decades with lots of experience at economic development and revitalization, and have a strong history of focusing on urban settings (at least no examples of rural situations were discussed). However they spent most of their time talking about how well they work as a team, and although locally based, they didn't really list out the issues that are relevant to Ulysses. I thought it was a poor use of their allotted time, which may not bode well for the products we hope to get from them.

I will be happy to discuss in more detail this evening.
Rebecca

~~**From:** Niels Tygesen <Planner@townofulyssesny.gov>
Sent: Thursday, May 9, 2024 3:36 PM
To: alisonbecker006 <alisonbecker006@gmail.com>; Ann DiPetta <cpchair@townofulyssesny.gov>; comp.plan.steering.chair <comp.plan.steering.chair@gmail.com>; abdc4251 <abdc4251@gmail.com>; Elizabeth Weatherby <weatherby@townofulyssesny.gov>; klankowskik <klankowskik@gmail.com>; Katelin Olson <supervisor@townofulyssesny.gov>; ulysestownsupervisor <ulysestownsupervisor@gmail.com>; moxie <moxie@dr.com>; Rebecca L. Schneider <rls11@cornell.edu>; rosemarienhanson <rosemarienhanson@gmail.com>; roxanne.m.marino <roxanne.m.marino@gmail.com>; Tai Basilius <tbasili1@binghamton.edu>
Cc: Mollie Duell <mduell@townofulyssesny.gov>
Subject: CP Consultants Follow-up Info~~

Good Afternoon Committee Members,

Supplier/Contractor Name: CRRC

Overall Rating Point 71.2857143

Evaluator's Name: Liz Weatherby

Evaluation Rating Criteria: RFQ Pages 2-3
Scope of Work & Deliverables: RFQ Pages 6-22

Criteria 1: Expertise					Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
Qualifications of the members of the proposed team	6,	Team was put together with this project in mind, a lot of great reliable experience	Experience in rural areas like Ulysses is not specifically called out	70	76.666667
Project team clearly understands project objectives and technical requirements	11 through 18	Response addressed technical requirements of RFQ, with details on how the various technical study areas may be addressed		80	63.333333
Familiarity with the Town's Comprehensive Plan and process	11	Response addresses the steps outlined in the RFQ, discusses review of existing plan to use as baseline and using draft PIP prepared by CPSC	Response follows RFQ, what additional steps would they recommend?	80	

Criteria 2: Experience					Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
Experience and demonstrated success in performing similar work		Multiple projects of varying sizes from Comp Plans to Zoning updates	A lot of urban projects, limited rural projects	70	63.333333
Ability to manage projects of a similar nature, size, and scope		Multiple projects of varying sizes from Comp Plans to Zoning updates	A lot of urban projects, limited rural projects	70	
Experience completing projects on tight deadlines, within budget, and in a professional and thorough manner		No response	Could not confirm with references	50	

Criteria 3: Interpersonal and Communication Skills					Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
Working well with a wide variety of people possessing differing levels of understanding of complex topics		Response addressed the technical requirements outlined in the RFQ		70	49
Facilitating groups and assisting communities develop visions, goals, and policies		Discussed the various projects completed	Would be nice to see an example of how a specific public input was turned into a vision/goal/policy	65	
Giving presentations to varied audiences		Presentation skills were good during presentation, but response doesn't provide any indication	No direct response to this question, outside of supporting PIP and multiple ways of engagement	50	
Preparing written materials in a clear, concise, and compelling manner		RFQ was clear, well written		60	
Problem solving and conflict resolution				0	

Criteria 4: Familiarity with Tompkins County and local issues, initiatives, organizations, and individuals that relate to this project					Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
	Throughout	Response identified key local issues - Cayuga Lake health, development pressures, housing needs	Showed a lot of experience in urban areas, will that relate to rural?	80	

Criteria 5: Thoroughness and clarity of the proposal					Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
	Throughout	Proposal was clear, well written and thorough		80	

Criteria 6: Project Timeline, Availability and flexibility in meeting Project Timetable and Deliverables.					Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
	23	Schedule meets the steps outlined in the RFQ in a reasonable timeframe	Schedule is a little longer than RFQ, however is reasonable	80	

Presentation and Interview					Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
Rate the quality of the consultant's presentation: substance, professionalism, engagement, energy, etc.				70	
		Could tell they work as a team	A little scattered, were not able to complete presentation in the time allotted	70	
How well did they respond to presented questions, did they fully answer each of the questions, were responses clear and concise etc.		Answered the questions well, showed desire to learn about Town and its people	A little scattered, multiple questions were addressed by multiple people and almost to each other rather than committee	70	

Supplier/Contractor Name: MRB

Overall Rating Point 73

Evaluator's Name: Liz Weatherby

Evaluation Rating Criteria: RFQ Pages 2-3
Scope of Work & Deliverables: RFQ Pages 6-22

Criteria 1: Expertise					Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
Qualifications of the members of the proposed team	12-13	RFQ identifies a wide bench with various resources and specialties	References did not check out	75	
Project team clearly understands project objectives and technical requirements	9-May	Stresses community is key part of building plan, views the Comp Plan as a useful tool - not something to sit on the shelf with no follow through	MRB only includes FEAF, while it is expected an EIS will be required	75	
Familiarity with the Town's Comprehensive Plan and process	3	References to some key parts of 2009 Comp Plan	Does not indicate this will build on existing plan	75	

Criteria 2: Experience					Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
Experience and demonstrated success in performing similar work	14-15	Shows experience working with municipalities of similar size to Ulysses		80	
Ability to manage projects of a similar nature, size, and scope		Proposal lists out prior work efforts	Does not include size of municipalities	80	
Experience completing projects on tight deadlines, within budget, and in a professional and thorough manner		No response	Could not confirm with references	50	

Criteria 3: Interpersonal and Communication Skills					Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
Working well with a wide variety of people possessing differing levels of understanding of complex topics		Response addressed the technical requirements outlined in the RFQ	MRB did not go beyond technical requirements	80	
Facilitating groups and assisting communities develop visions, goals, and policies	4	Encouraged by variety of resources available to engage public (phone app); calls for authentic, meaningful engagement	Would be nice to see an example of how a specific public input was turned into a vision/goal/policy	80	
Giving presentations to varied audiences	6	Presentation skills were good during presentation, but response doesn't provide any indication	No direct response to this question, outside of supporting PIP and multiple ways of engagement	50	
Preparing written materials in a clear, concise, and compelling manner		RFQ was clear, well written		60	
Problem solving and conflict resolution				0	

Criteria 4: Familiarity with Tompkins County and local issues, initiatives, organizations, and individuals that relate to this project					Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
	3	Familiarity with engineering within Town	TC only mentioned once, how much interaction with public on Town issues?	70	

Criteria 5: Thoroughness and clarity of the proposal					Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
		Clear proposal,	No SEQRA EIS	85	

Criteria 6: Project Timeline, Availability and flexibility in meeting Project Timetable and Deliverables.					Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
	10	Schedule of milestones is clear	Concerned the schedule does not have wiggle room for EIS,	80	

Presentation and Interview					Total Points
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
Rate the quality of the consultant's presentation: substance, professionalism, engagement, energy, etc.		Professional, good presentation skills	There may be a feeling of being too formal for some of Town residents, need to ensure create a welcoming environment	80	
How well did they respond to presented questions, did they fully answer each of the questions, were responses clear and concise etc.		MRB directly answered questions, a lot of times with new information from presentation or added to information	Only responses from MRB, the planner and public engagement staff were not present	85	

EVALUATION WORKSHEET
RFQ#

2025-45 Comp Plan Consultant

Supplier/Contractor Name: CRRC

Overall Rating Point 88

Evaluator's Name: Alison Weaver

Evaluation Rating Criteria: RFQ Pages 2-3

Scope of Work & Deliverables: RFQ Pages 6-22

Overall Greatest Strengths of the Consultant Team	Overall Greatest Concerns with the Consultant Team
All members local and present to really want to be involved as this is their community as well. Years of diverse experience. Seem genuinely excited.	Group of 4 have not work all together on a project.

Criteria 1: Expertise				Total Points
				93
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Qualifications of the members of the proposed team			Have never cohesively done this type of project.	95
Project team clearly understands project objectives and technical requirements				90
Familiarity with the Town's Comprehensive Plan and process		Live locally and seem invested in the process.		95

Criteria 2: Experience				Total Points
				88
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Experience and demonstrated success in performing similar work				80
Ability to manage projects of a similar nature, size, and scope				90
Experience completing projects on tight deadlines, within budget, and in a professional and thorough manner				95

Criteria 3: Interpersonal and Communication Skills				Total Points
				71
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Working well with a wide variety of people possessing differing levels of understanding of complex topics				95
Facilitating groups and assisting communities develop visions, goals, and policies				95
Giving presentations to varied audiences				85
Preparing written materials in a clear, concise, and compelling manner				80
Problem solving and conflict resolution				

Criteria 4: Familiarity with Tompkins County and local issues, initiatives, organizations, and individuals that relate to this project	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				98

Criteria 5: Thoroughness and clarity of the proposal	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				85

Criteria 6: Project Timeline, Availability and flexibility in meeting Project Timetable and Deliverables.	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				95

Presentation and Interview				Total Points
				88
Rate the quality of the consultant's presentation: substance, professionalism, engagement, energy, etc	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
	Very energetic.	Did not seem totally polished or practiced.	85	
How well did they respond to presented questions, did they fully answer each of the questions, were responses clear and concise etc.	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
			90	

EVALUATION WORKSHEET
RFQ#

2025-45 Comp Plan Consultant

Supplier/Contractor Name: MRB

Overall Rating Point 86

Evaluator's Name: Alison Weaver

Evaluation Rating Criteria: RFQ Pages 2-3

Scope of Work & Deliverables: RFQ Pages 6-22

Overall Greatest Strengths of the Consultant Team	Overall Greatest Concerns with the Consultant Team
Very large group that has done this type of work a lot.	Is this just another project for them? Large group and we will develop a relationship with a lead point person or persons?

Criteria 1: Expertise				Total Points
				92
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Qualifications of the members of the proposed team				95
Project team clearly understands project objectives and technical requirements				95
Familiarity with the Town's Comprehensive Plan and process				85

Criteria 2: Experience				Total Points
				95
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Experience and demonstrated success in performing similar work				95
Ability to manage projects of a similar nature, size, and scope				95
Experience completing projects on tight deadlines, within budget, and in a professional and thorough manner				95

Criteria 3: Interpersonal and Communication Skills				Total Points
				71
Specific Criteria Items	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
Working well with a wide variety of people possessing differing levels of understanding of complex topics				90
Facilitating groups and assisting communities develop visions, goals, and policies				85
Giving presentations to varied audiences				90
Preparing written materials in a clear, concise, and compelling manner				90
Problem solving and conflict resolution				

Criteria 4: Familiarity with Tompkins County and local issues, initiatives, organizations, and individuals that relate to this project	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				70

Criteria 5: Thoroughness and clarity of the proposal	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				90

Criteria 6: Project Timeline, Availability and flexibility in meeting Project Timetable and Deliverables.	Proposal Page No and Paragraph	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points
				95

Presentation and Interview				Total Points
				90
Rate the quality of the consultant's presentation: substance, professionalism, engagement, energy, etc	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
				90
How well did they respond to presented questions, did they fully answer each of the questions, were responses clear and concise etc.	Strength/Benefits	Weaknesses / Deficiencies	Points	
				90



TOWN OF ULYSSES

10 Elm Street, Trumansburg, NY 14886
townofulyssesny.gov

Town Supervisor (607) 387-5767, Ext 232 • supervisor@townofulyssesny.gov
Town Clerk (607) 387-5767, Ext 221 • clerk@townofulyssesny.gov

To: The Ulysses Town Board and Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee
From: Michelle E. Wright, 2nd Deputy Supervisor and Budget Officer
Re: Administration and Contract Considerations for the Consultant Section for Services Related to the Comprehensive Plan Update
Date: 6/3/2024

Definitions

1. Master Contract: the contract the Town of Ulysses has with the NYSDEC for partial funding for the Comprehensive Plan update.
2. Contractor: within the Master Contract, the Town of Ulysses is referred to as the “Contractor.”
3. Subcontractor: within the Master Contract, any entity that the Town of Ulysses enters into contract for services to complete the Comprehensive Plan update is a “Subcontractor.”

The Town of Ulysses has entered into contract with the NYS Department of Conservation (NYSDEC) for partial funding for the Comprehensive Plan update.

The Master Contract outlines the required process and verbiage for any entity (i.e. any subcontractor) that the Town enters into contract with associated with the Comp Plan update.

It should be noted that the Master Contract specifies that, “If requested by the State, the Contractor agrees not to enter into any subcontracts, or revisions to subcontracts, that are in excess of \$100,000 for the performance of the obligations contained herein until it has received the prior written permission of the State...”

The Master Contract also states: “All such subcontracts shall contain provisions for specifying (1) that the work performed by the subcontractor must be in accordance with the terms of the Master Contract, (2) that nothing contained in the subcontract shall impair the rights of the State under the Master Contract, and (3) that nothing contained in the subcontract, nor under the Master Contract, shall be deemed to create any contractual relationship between the subcontractor and the State. In addition, subcontracts shall contain any other provisions which are required to be included in subcontracts pursuant to the terms herein.”

Contract making with the successful respondent will require the substantial administrative work referenced above, as well as the need to review all contracts between subcontractors to ensure adherence to program requirements: if the RFQ respondent proposes additional subcontractors, the Town is required



TOWN OF ULYSSES

10 Elm Street, Trumansburg, NY 14886

townofulyssesny.gov

to review those contracts to ensure complete adherence to both Town legal and insurance requirements as well as adherence to the Master Contract.

Beyond the contract making process, a critical aspect to consider when selecting a consultant is the related implications for Town employees. Beyond providing professional subject matter expertise, primary benefits of contracting for services include ensuring that Town staff have both a reasonable scope of work as well as consultant continuity when managing multi-year nuanced projects like the update to the Comprehensive Plan. To ensure that Town staff have adequate support from consultants, selecting an entity with organizational redundancy is the best fit for the Town's small staff paradigm.

With these considerations in mind, I believe it is in the Town's best interest to select MRB as the consultant to support the Town in the Comprehensive Plan update process.