

1 **Providence City Planning Commission Meeting**

2 **15 South Main, Providence UT 84332**

3 **December 8, 2016**                      **5:30 p.m.**

4  
5 Attendance

---

6 Chair: Mike Harbin  
7 Commissioners: Rowan Cecil, Andrea Diamond, Brent Fresz (alternate), John Parker  
8 Excused: Robert James  
9 Absent: None

10  
11 Skarlet Bankhead, Administrative Services Director

12  
13 **Action Item(s):**

14 **Item No. 1. General Plan Consultant RFP review:** The Providence City Planning Commission will consider for  
15 recommendation to the City Council, one of the firms that submitted a response to the City's request for  
16 proposals from qualified consultants for the 2016 General Plan Update.

17  
18 **Discussion and comments**

- 19 • R James submitted comments in email.
  - 20 ○ KLJ pros –very detailed, indexed all charts and pictures in introduction.
  - 21 ○ KLJ cons – sometimes almost too much detail, the number of full-page maps dominated the end
  - 22 product and were excessive resulting in a watered down end product. There was not enough
  - 23 interpretation of what was shown to make the amount of them useful.
  - 24 ○ CRSA pros – provided results of public meetings in terms of what percent agreed, disagreed or did
  - 25 not care. This would be a good way to identify that the city is following public opinion. There was
  - 26 plenty of graphical representation, sometimes too much although it can be easier to interpret
  - 27 graphical data than text especially if it is presented correctly. There was good data backup for each
  - 28 section. He liked the hand sketches on various parts of the vision plans for the city.
  - 29 ○ CRSA cons –sometimes the graphics were too much and perhaps too simplified. There were areas
  - 30 that felt like an entire page was used when three or four sentences would have been sufficient.
  - 31 ○ In summary, overall he leans strongly towards CRSA. He liked the level of community involvement it
  - 32 would bring. Their general plan examples included all the necessary data to ensure a firm
  - 33 foundation for the plan. The New York Company has a strong transportation section. In
  - 34 comparison, with KLJ there would be additional costs added for traffic studies. In one example plan,
  - 35 KLJ simply quoted the Montana Transportation Data that either firm can do. He felt that KLJ did not
  - 36 bring anything more to the table than CRSA. CRSA is local and has a reputation for providing an
  - 37 onsite presence on a monthly basis. Considering that this is the first time the city will have the
  - 38 opportunity to work with a professional third- party, greater accessibility and in-person access
  - 39 would be another advantage CRSA offers in this process. Public input and community buy-in is key
  - 40 to the successful implementation of a general plan. He felt that KLJ charging \$10,000 for additional
  - 41 meetings seemed excessive.
- 42 • S Bankhead agreed that she was also disappointed with the costs that KJL would charge for additional
- 43 public meetings.
- 44 • B Fresz commented that the cost difference was not worth it; his preference would be CRSA.
- 45 • M Harbin compared costs, identifying that CRSA was \$38,300 and KLJ was \$56,250. This was close to a
- 46 \$15,000 cost difference.
- 47 • J Parker agreed that KLJ leaned toward the technical side. He did prefer CRSA's presentation to KLJ's and,
- 48 taking that into consideration with the difference in price; he would go with CRSA. He also suggested
- 49 requesting the images of the city plan layouts be larger to make them easier to see and read.
- 50 • A Diamond commented on the importance of community input and the ability of the community to help
- 51 guide the city as it develops its general plan.
- 52 • R Cecil commented that he was leaning toward KLJ because they are an engineering firm but he preferred
- 53 the way CRSA proposed handling the public meeting.
- 54 • M Harbin commented that the city would need to look at ways to reduce some of this \$38,300 from CRSA
- 55 because we are working with a budget of \$37,000.

- S Bankhead responded that City Council may suggest ways of reducing costs. She also added that CRSA is using Cache Landmark for their Transportation Plan. Cache Landmark is a local firm. We know them and we have worked with them. In response to R. Cecil’s question, yes, CRSA will contract out with another consultant but it is a consultant that we know and we know that they do really good work. In fact, they were very much in the running when we hired a city engineer. This is a firm the city holds in high esteem.
- M Harbin added that although he missed the first presentation with KLJ but he did like what he saw from CRSA. Taking into account everything that was discussed, he thought CRSA would be more flexible and this would be the type of firm the city would be better able to work with.

**Motion made to make the recommendation to City Council to approve CRSA as the city’s consultants for the 2017 General Plan Update. -Rowan Cecil, seconded J Parker.**

**Vote:    Yea:                    R Cecil, Brent Fresz, A Diamond, M Harbin, J Parker**  
**Nay:                      None**  
**Abstained:            None**  
**Excused:                R James**

**Note:** Reminder that there will be a Planning Commission Meeting on Wednesday, December 14, 2016 and the City Council Meeting is December 13, 2016 at 6:00 pm. R James will present the Planning Commission’s recommendations at the City Council Meeting identifying the reasons the Planning Commission is recommending CRSA as the consulting firm chosen to update the General Plan.

**Motion made to adjourn Planning Commission Meeting of November 17, 2016. – R Cecil, seconded by A Diamond.**

**Vote:    Yea:                    R Cecil, Brent Fresz, A Diamond, M Harbin, J Parker**  
**Nay:                      None**  
**Abstained:            None**  
**Excused:                R James**

Agenda posted by Skarlet Bankhead on December 6, 2016.

Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Minutes prepared by K Merrill.

---

Mike Harbin, Chairman, Pro Tem

---

Kristine Merrill, Office Specialist