



CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

February 16, 2011

To: John Szerlag, City Manager

From: Mark F. Miller, Acting Assistant City Manager/Economic Development Services
Susan A. Leirstein, Purchasing Director
R. Brent Savidant, Acting Planning Director

Subject: Standard Purchasing Resolution 8: Best Value Award – Community Planning Services

Background

On December 20, 2010, Statements of Qualifications (SOQ) were received at the City's request from firms interested in providing Community Planning Services for the City of Troy. Two hundred fifty-seven (257) companies were notified via the Michigan Intergovernmental Trade Network (MITN) website with three (3) proposals received. All three firms met the pass/fail criteria and were interviewed.

A committee consisting of Mark Miller, Acting Assistant City Manager/Economic Development Services; R. Brent Savidant, Acting Planning Director; and Charlotte Burckhardt, Principal Planner, Oakland County Planning & Economic Development Services, were the raters for the entire best value process.

After the interviews, a Detailed Pricing Proposal was requested and received from the three firms on January 25, 2011. Based on the scoring criteria for the statement of qualifications, interview, detailed proposal and pricing analysis, the committee recommends awarding the contract to the highest rated respondent, Carlisle/Wortman Associates, Inc. (CWA) of Ann Arbor, Michigan. (see Executive Summary attached) CWA had the lowest hourly rates of the three firms. Additionally, the hourly rates proposed by CWA were lowered from current levels. The hourly rate of the Principal Planner was lowered from \$95 to \$90 per hour; the hourly rate of the Senior Planner was lowered from \$80 to \$75 per hour.

Fund Availability

Contractual Services funds are available in the Planning Department Budget.

Recommendation

City Management recommends awarding a contract to Carlisle/Wortman Associates, Inc. of Ann Arbor, as a result of a best value process to determine the successful Community Planning firm.

The award is contingent upon the recommended bidder's submission of properly executed contract and proposal documents, including insurance certificates and all other specified requirements.

Attachments:

1. Executive Summary, Community Planning Services.
2. Agreement for Community Planning Services.

Approved As To Form and Legality:

Lori Grigg Bluhm, City Attorney

Date



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

COMMUNITY PLANNING SERVICES

STATISTICS:

- ◆ **Two-hundred fifty-seven (257) firms were notified via the MITN e-procurement website**
- ◆ **Three (3) proposals were received**
- ◆ **All three (3) firms met the pass/fail criteria**
- ◆ **All three (3) firms were interviewed**
- ◆ **Carlisle / Wortman Associates, Inc. received the highest score as a result of a best value process**

The following three (3) firms received the indicated final scores as a result of the SOQ evaluation, interview, detailed proposal and pricing selection criteria.

Firm	SCORE
Carlisle / Wortman Associates, Inc.	195
Birchler Arroyo Associates, Inc.	150
McKenna Associates	119

Attachments:

- ✓ Weighted Final Scoring Including SOQ Evaluation, Interview and Detailed Proposal Scoring
- ✓ Evaluation Process
- ✓ Original Tabulation



WEIGHTED FINAL SCORING
Community Planning Services

Final Score Calculation:

$$\frac{30\% \times \text{SOQ Evaluation Score (Phase 2)} + 40\% \times \text{Interview Score (Phase 3)} + 30\% \times \text{Detailed Proposal Score (Phase 4)}}{100\%} = \text{Final Weighted Score}$$

In order to equate the price to the weighted evaluation process scoring, the prices had to be converted into a score with the base of 200. **NOTE:** In all sections, vendors are listed in the order of their final score ratings, from highest to lowest.

Phase 2 - Weighted Average Score for SOQ Evaluation: 30%

RATERS	1	2	3	Average	Final Weighted Score (x .30)
Vendors:					
Carlisle / Wortman Associates, Inc.	200	200	195	198	59
Birchler Arroyo Associates, Inc.	80	100	195	125	38
McKenna Associates	85	120	200	135	41

Phase 3 - Weighted Average Score for Interview: 40%

RATERS	1	2	3	Average	Final Weighted Score (x .40)
Vendors:					
Carlisle / Wortman Associates, Inc.	197	200	182	193	77
Birchler Arroyo Associates, Inc.	150	113	154	139	56
McKenna Associates	58	95	134	96	38

Phase 4 - Weighted Average Score for Detailed Proposal A (Price Score):

RATERS	Weighted Criteria - Difference in Costs
	$\{1 - (\text{Proposal Price} - \text{low price}) / \text{low price}\} \times \text{Available Points}$
Vendors:	
Carlisle / Wortman Associates, Inc.	Proposal A: Principal Planner: $\{1 - (91.67 - 89.00) / 89.00\} \times 50 = 49$ Senior Planner: $\{1 - (76.67 - 76.67) / 76.67\} \times 50 = 50$ Landscape Architect: $\{1 - (71.67 - 71.67) / 71.67\} \times 50 = 50$ TOTAL: 149
Birchler Arroyo Associates, Inc.	Proposal A: Principal Planner: $\{1 - (89.00 - 89.00) / 89.00\} \times 50 = 50$ Senior Planner: $\{1 - (81.00 - 76.67) / 76.67\} \times 50 = 47$ Landscape Architect: $\{1 - (81.00 - 71.67) / 71.67\} \times 50 = 44$ TOTAL: 141
McKenna Associates	Proposal A: Principal Planner: $\{1 - (113.50 - 89.00) / 89.00\} \times 50 = 36$ Senior Planner: $\{1 - (87.50 - 76.67) / 76.67\} \times 50 = 43$ Landscape Architect: $\{1 - (108.50 - 71.67) / 71.67\} \times 50 = 24$ TOTAL: 103



Phase 4 - Weighted Average Score for Detailed Proposal B (Project Team):

RATERS	1	2	3	Average
Vendors:				
Carlisle / Wortman Associates, Inc.	50	50	46	49
Birchler Arroyo Associates, Inc.	50	38	43	44
McKenna Associates	20	34	32	29

Phase 4 - Weighted Average Score for Detailed Proposal A & B Totals: 30%

Vendors:	Proposal A	Proposal B	Total Points	Final Weighted Score (x .30)
Carlisle / Wortman Associates, Inc.	149	49	198	59
Birchler Arroyo Associates, Inc.	141	44	185	56
McKenna Associates	103	29	132	40

FINAL SCORE:

VENDORS:	Carlisle / Wortman Associates, Inc.	Birchler Arroyo Associates, Inc.	McKenna Associates
SOQ Evaluation Score	59	38	41
Interview Score	77	56	38
Detailed Proposal Score	59	56	40
FINAL SCORE	195	150	119

**HIGHEST RATED VENDOR - RECOMMENDED AWARD



SELECTION PROCESS

SECTION 4: CRITERIA FOR SELECTION

Community Planning and Related Services

A Committee of three (3) individuals will review the proposals. The City of Troy reserves the right to negotiate a final contract (pending City Council approval) with the most qualified organization based upon a combination of factors including but not limited to the following:

- A. Compliance with qualifications criteria
- B. Completeness of the SOQ
- C. Financial strength of the organization
- D. Correlation of the SOQ submitted to the needs of the City of Troy
- E. Any other factors which may be deemed to be in the City's best interest
- F. Evaluation Process

Phase 1: Minimum Qualifications Evaluation (Pass/Fail)

Organizations will be required to meet minimum established criteria in order to go to the second phase of the process. (Evaluation Sheet Proposal)

Phase 2: Statement of Qualifications Evaluation (30%)

Each Committee member will independently use a weighted score sheet to evaluate the Statement of Qualifications; each Committee Member will calculate a weighted score. The scores of the Committee Members will be averaged into one score for each organization for this phase of the process.

Phase 3: Interview Score (40%)

The top rated firms will be invited to participate in an interview. Each Committee member will independently use a weighted score sheet to evaluate the Interview; each Committee Member will calculate a weighted score. The scores of the Committee Members will be averaged into one score for each organization for this phase of the process. Those being interviewed may be supplied with further instructions and requests prior to the interview. Persons representing the organization at the interview must be the personnel who will be assigned to this project.

Phase 4: Detailed Proposal (30%)

The separately sealed envelopes containing the detailed proposal pages for each firm will be opened only upon completion of phases 1 – 3 and only after all final evaluation forms / rating sheets have been submitted to the Purchasing Department. Purchasing will compile all scores to determine the highest rated firm.

Phase 5: Final Scoring and Selection – based on scoring from Phase 2, Phase 3 and Phase 4

The organization with the highest final weighted score will be recommended to the Troy City Council for Award. The final weighted score shall be based on:

$$\begin{aligned} &30\% \times \text{SOQ Evaluation Score} \\ &40\% \times \text{Interview Score} \\ &\underline{30\% \times \text{Detailed Proposal Score}} \\ &100\% = \text{Final Weighted Score} \\ &\qquad\qquad\text{Base points} = 200 \end{aligned}$$

Note:

The City of Troy reserves the right to change the order or eliminate an evaluation phase if deemed in the City's best interest to do so.

Opening Date -- 1/25/11
Date Reviewed -- 1/28/11

PRICE ONLY - COMMUNITY PLANNING SERVICES

FIRM NAME:

Carlisle Wortman	Birchler Arroyo	McKenna
Associates, Inc	Associates, Inc	Associates, Inc

PROPOSAL A: HOURLY RATES-VARIOUS CLASSIFICATIONS

Services:	HOURLY RATES	HOURLY RATES	HOURLY RATES
Principal Planner	\$95.00 (2013-2014) \$ 90.00	\$ 89.00	\$97.00- \$130.00
Senior Planner	\$80.00 (2013-2014) \$ 75.00	\$ 81.00	\$78.00 - \$97.00
Landscape Architect	\$75.00 (2013-2014) \$ 70.00	\$ 81.00	\$97.00 - \$120.00

PROPOSAL B: PROJECT TEAM AND REIMBURSABLES

Principal Planner	Name:	Richard Carlisle	Rod Arroyo	John Jackson (or) Amy Chesnut
	Years of Experience:	35	28	21 / 13
	Certifications:			
	ACIP (Y/N)	Y	Y	Y / Y
	PCP (Y/N)	Y	N	N / N
	RLA (Y/N)	N	N	N / N
	LEED ND (Y/N)	N	N	(LEED GA Certified) N / N
Senior Planner	Name:	Zach Branigan or D. Scurto	Jill Bahm	James Breukman
	Years of Experience:	10 / 25	15	12
	Certifications:			
	ACIP (Y/N)	Y / Y	Y	Y
	PCP (Y/N)	N / Y	N	N
	RLA (Y/N)	N / N	N	N
	LEED ND (Y/N)	Y / N	N	N
Landscape Architect	Name:	L. Fortin or S. Elmiger	Mike Franklin	Courtney Piotrowski (or) Stacey Tobar
	Years of Experience:	25 / 15	15	20 / 17
	Certifications:			
	ACIP (Y/N)	N / Y	N	N / N
	PCP (Y/N)	N / N	N	N / N
	RLA (Y/N)	Y / N	Y	Y / Y
	LEED ND (Y/N)	N / N	Y	(LEED GA & AP Certified) N / N

FEE SCHEDULE ATTACHED Labeled:	Rate Schedule	Schedule of Professional Fees	Professional Fee Schedule
---------------------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------

ATTEST:

 Paul Evans

 Diane Fisher

 Julie Hamilton

 Susan Leirstein CPPO CPPB
 Purchasing Director

Opening Date -- 12/20/10
 Date Reviewed -- 1/28/11

CITY OF TROY
 TABULATION
 COMMUNITY PLANNING AND RELATED SERVICES

ORGANIZATION NAME: sl

Birchler Arroyo	Carlisle/Wortman	McKenna	
Associates, Inc.	Associates, Inc.	Associates	

PROPOSAL: COMMUNITY PLANNING AND RELATED SERVICES

FOUR (4) COPIES	(Yes or No)	Y	Y	Y	
QUESTIONNAIRE:	(Yes or No)	Y	Y	Y	
INSURANCE:	Can Meet	XX	XX	XX	
	Cannot Meet				
	Signed Y or N				

PRICING:					
<i>SEPARATELY IN SEALED ENVELOPE</i>		Y	Y	Y	
Y or N					

PAYMENT TERMS:		Monthly Invoice Net 30 Days	Negotiable	Net 30 Days	
EXCEPTIONS:		Blank	None	No Exceptions	
		Indemnification			
		Language chngs			
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:	Y or N	Y	Y	Y	
THREE FORMS:	Y or N				
Non-Collusion		Y	Y	Y	
Legal Status		Y	Y	Y	
Indemnification Clause		Y	Y	Y	
ADDENDUM #1:	Y or N	Y	Y	Y	

NO BIDS:
Wade Trim Associates, Inc.
ROWE Professional Services Company
LSL Planning Inc

ATTEST:
 Paul Evans
 Irene Newman
 Julie Hamilton

 Susan Leirstein CPPO CPPB
 Purchasing Director

**CITY OF TROY
AGREEMENT FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING
AND RELATED SERVICES**

CONSULTING SERVICES

THIS AGREEMENT is entered into between the CITY OF TROY, 500 W. Big Beaver Road, Troy, Michigan 48084, hereinafter referred to as the CITY, and Carlisle/Wortman Associates, Inc, 605 South Main Street, Suite 1, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104, hereinafter referred to as CONSULTANT.

WITNESSETH:

RECITALS

- A. WHEREAS, CITY finds it necessary to utilize the services of CONSULTANT to assist the CITY on an as needed bases to aide staff with regard to periodic zoning and planning investigations and reports, review of development projects and / or consultation with City staff regarding planning and development programs and policies.

Now, therefore, in consideration of the covenants and agreements contained herein, CITY and CONTRACTOR agree as follows:

1. SCOPE. During the term of the Agreement, CONSULTANT shall provide services as defined in CITY'S Statement of Qualifications (SOQ-COT 10-24), Addendum 1, and CONSULTANT'S response to Statement of Qualifications. All three documents are incorporated and made a part of this Agreement to the extent that their terms do not conflict with the terms herein. The CONSULTANT shall furnish all labor, materials, and equipment necessary and perform all of the work as set forth in the Proposal and this Agreement in strict accordance with the scope of services and other documents which

have been made a part of this contract in the manner, time, and place as therein set forth. The required services are generally described as follows:

A. Keep regular office hours in the Planning Department. Presently one day per week but may vary, as determined by the City.

B. Meet with prospective applicant(s) and/or their consultant team to discuss potential project(s). Discuss viability of the proposed project(s). Viability issues will include, but not be limited to, Zoning Ordinance compliance, site constraints, access, Master Plan designation, compatibility of land uses, density, urban design and site plan layout.

C. Review and prepare reports on development applications, including but not limited to site plans, special use applications, Planned Unit Development applications, rezoning applications, subdivision applications and site condominium applications. Review and findings shall be based on the City's Zoning Ordinance, Master Plan, and other ordinances and standards that may apply.

D. Conduct field reconnaissance and verification regarding various aspects of site plan approval including, but not limited to, adjacent activities and existing conditions.

E. Attend Planning Commission, City Council and other meetings, on an as needed basis to present summary reports and answer questions as requested by the Planning Department.

F. Conduct research and analysis on an as needed basis as requested by the City administration for various issues including but not limited to planning and zoning.

G. Assist the City administration in developing reports and supporting presentation graphics for, but not limited to, the Planning Commission, City Council and Zoning Board of Appeals.

H. Assist the City administration in interpreting and applying the standards contained within the City's Zoning Ordinance and other ordinances related to land use.

I. Assist the Planning Department in day to day tasks, including but not limited to processing applications, assisting residents and applicants at the counter, assisting residents and applicants on the telephone, and other tasks assigned by the Planning Director.

J. Additional related community planning and zoning services such as economic development, recreation planning or landscape architecture as assigned by City administration.

K. Provide expertise in areas of sustainability, low impact development techniques, and L.E.E.D.

L. Periodically the CONSULTANT may be requested by the CITY to perform a project which is beyond the scope of a minor investigation. If necessary, the CITY may request the CONSULTANT to provide a cost estimate for services which may be provided on a cost not-to-exceed or lump sum basis.

Project assignments will be on an as-needed basis. Not each project submitted to the CITY for review and approval will necessarily require any or all of the professional services of the CONSULTANT. The CITY reserves the right to perform work in-house or to assign specific projects on a separate competitive or negotiated basis to the selected CONSULTANT or to other CONSULTANTS currently working on existing City projects.

To assist the CONSULTANT, the CITY will provide the CONSULTANT with an electronic copy of the Zoning Ordinance, Master Plan and other ordinances and documents necessary to perform the assigned task(s).

2. COMPENSATION. CONSULTANT shall be paid by CITY for services render at the hourly rates stated in Attachment 1 of this Agreement.

3. PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO CITY ACCOUNT During the term of the Agreement, CONSULTANT shall provide qualified personnel to the CITY on an as needed basis. The personnel assigned to the CITY will be the individuals listed in the CONSULTANTS proposal and shall consist of a Principal Planner, Senior Planner, Landscape Architect or equivalent classification. During the course of this agreement, if a personnel change is required, the CONSULTANT will provide the CITY with all resumes, copies of certifications, registrations, qualifications, degrees, or any additional information to establish the proposed individual meets the CITY'S minimum qualifications. The CITY shall have the right to accept or reject any personnel assigned to the CITY'S account.

4. TERM OF AGREEMENT. This contract shall commence on the date of execution of this Agreement and terminate March 31, 2014. The Agreement may be renewed for an additional two-year period based upon mutual consent of both parties within 90 days of contract expiration and upon approval of City Council.

5. SUB-CONTRACTORS. No portion of the Proposal may be sub-contracted without the prior written approval of the City.

6. CONTRACT TERMINATION. The CITY reserves the right to terminate the contract without penalty upon 7 days written notice due to poor performance or for any reason deemed to be in its best interest. The CITY'S designated representative will be solely responsible for determining acceptable performance levels. His/her decision will be deemed in the City of Troy's best interest and will be final.

7. TERMINATION FOR CONVENIENCE. The CITY may cancel the contract for its convenience, in whole or in part, by giving the consultant written notice 30-days prior to the date of cancellation. If the CITY chooses to cancel this contract in part, the charges payable under this contract shall be equitably adjusted to reflect those services that are canceled.

8. INSURANCE. Consultant shall carry general liability insurance, automobile liability insurance, professional liability insurance and workers compensation for any actions, claims, liability or damages caused to others arising out of the performance of this Agreement in the amounts approved by City. The insurance shall name the City of Troy, its elected and appointed officials, employees and volunteers, as additional insured and shall contain the following cancellation notice:

“Should any of the above described policies be cancelled before the expiration date thereof, the issuing insurer will mail 30 days written notice to the certificate holder.”

A certificate of insurance demonstrating the required insurance coverage shall be provided to City’s Risk Manager immediately upon execution of this Agreement. Cancellation or lapse of the insurance shall be considered a material breach of this Contract, and the Agreement shall become null and void unless CONSULTANT immediately provides proof of renewal of continuous coverage to City’s Risk Manager. All of CONSULTANT’S insurance carriers shall be licensed and admitted to do business in the State of Michigan and acceptable to CITY. An updated certificate of insurance shall be provided to the City’s Risk Manager each year at the time of policy renewal.

9. INDEMNIFICATION.

A. Indemnification except for professional liability: To the fullest extent permitted by law, the CONSULTANT agrees to defend, pay on behalf of, indemnify, and hold harmless the City of Troy, its elected and appointed officials, employees and volunteers and others working on behalf of the City of Troy against any and all claims, demands, suits, or loss, including all costs connected therewith, and for any damages which may be asserted, claimed or recovered against or from the City of Troy, its elected and appointed officials, employees, volunteers or others working on behalf of the City of Troy, by reason of personal injury, including bodily injury or death and/or property damage, including loss of use thereof, which arises out of or is in any way connected or associated with this contract/agreement.

B. Indemnification for Professional Liability:

1. The Consultant expressly agrees to indemnify and hold the CITY harmless against all losses and liabilities arising out of personal injury, bodily injury or property damages to the extent of any negligent act, grossly negligent act, error or omission of the CONSULTANT or anyone acting on the CONSULTANT'S behalf, in connection with, or incidental to, the contract or work to be performed, except that the CONSULTANT shall not be responsible to indemnify the CITY for any losses or damages to the extent that same are caused by or result from the gross negligence of the CITY or any other person or entity.

2. To the extent of the CONSULTANT'S actual degree of fault, the CONSULTANT'S obligation to indemnify and hold the CITY harmless shall include:

- a) The obligation to defend the CITY from any such suit, action or proceeding, and;
- b) The obligation to pay any and all judgments which may be recovered in any such suit, action or proceeding and/or any reasonable expenses including, but not limited to costs, attorney fees and settlement expenses which may be incurred, but only to the extent that such judgments and expenses are attributable to the CONSULTANT'S actual fault.

For the purpose of the indemnifications clauses set out above, "CITY" shall mean City of Troy, its elected and appointed officials, employees and volunteers working on behalf of the CITY; losses and liabilities shall mean loss, cost, expense, damage, liability or claims, whether groundless or not; personal injury shall mean false arrest, erroneous service of civil papers, false imprisonment, malicious prosecution, assault and battery, libel, slander, defamation of character, discrimination, mental anguish, wrongful entry or eviction, violation of property, or deprivation of any rights, privileges or immunities secured by the constitution and laws of the United States of America or the State of Michigan, for which the CONSULTANT may be held liable to its injured party in an action-at-law or a suit in equity or other proceedings for redress; bodily injury shall mean death, bodily injury, sickness or disease and mental injury which may be sustained or claimed by any person or persons; and property damage shall mean the damage and destruction of any property including the loss of use thereof.

10. SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS. The CONSULTANT agrees that it will not settle or resolve any claim or action against the CONSULTANT based upon its acts which includes, or may include, a claim or count against the CITY or its employees without obtaining a full and complete release in favor of the CITY with respect to any and all claims or counts against the CITY except those based upon the gross negligence or willful or wanton misconduct of the CITY or its employees.

11. NO POWER OF ASSIGNMENT. The CONSULTANT shall have no authority, power to assign, sublet, or transfer any rights, privileges, or interest under this Agreement without prior written consent from the CITY.

12. INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR. The CONSULTANT acknowledges that he/she is an independent contractor with no authority to bind the CITY to any contracts or agreements, written or oral.

13. ARBITRATION. The CONSULTANT and the CITY may agree to arbitrate any disputes with respect to the application of this indemnification clause.

14. NOTICE: All written notices to be given under this Agreement shall be mailed by first class mail to the other party at its last known address.

15. GOVERNING LAW AND JURISDICTION: This Agreement is made in and shall be governed by the laws of the State of Michigan. Any lawsuits under this Agreement shall be filed in the Oakland County Circuit Court, Michigan.

16. HEADINGS. Pronouns and relative words herein used shall be read interchangeably in the masculine, feminine or neuter, singular or plural as the respective case may be.

17. ENTIRE AGREEMENT. The foregoing constitutes the entire Agreement between the parties and may be modified only by a written instrument signed by both parties.

18. AUTHORITY TO EXECUTE: By execution of this Agreement, the respective parties acknowledge that each has executed this Agreement with full and complete authority to do so.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the City and Consultant have executed this Agreement on this _____ day of April 2011.

WITNESSES:

Richard K. Carlisle, AICP, PCP

R. Donald Wortman, RLA, AICP, PCP

CITY OF TROY

BY: _____
Mayor Louise E. Schilling

John Szerlag, City Manager

RESOLUTION NUMBER: _____

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY:

BY: _____

Lori Grigg Bluhm, City Attorney

ATTEST: _____
Tonni Bartholomew, City Clerk

Proposed Hourly Rate Schedule:

Personnel	Time Avail. Average Annual %	Rate		
		2011	2012	2013-2014
Principal Planner (R. Carlisle, Principal)	10 -15	\$90	\$90	\$95
Senior Planner (Z. Branigan, Associate)	50 - 60	\$75	\$75	\$80
Senior Planner (D. Scurto, Associate)	10	\$75	\$75	\$80
Landscape Architect (L. Fortin, Landscape Architect)	25	\$70	\$70	\$75
Landscape Architect (S. Elmiger, Environmental Planner)	25	\$70	\$70	\$75
Graphics (GIS) Technician	25	\$50	\$50	\$50
Support Staff	25	\$50	\$50	\$50

1. All rates for calendar year although contract begins April 1, 2011 and ends March 31, 2014.

**Rate Schedule
Troy Consultation**

Personnel	Hourly Rate			
	2011	2012	2013	2014
Principal	\$90	\$90	\$95	\$95
Senior Associate	\$80	\$80	\$90	\$90
Associate	\$75	\$75	\$80	\$80
Community Planner / Environmental Planner / Landscape Architect	\$70	\$70	\$75	\$75
Graphics (GIS) Technician	\$50	\$50	\$50	\$50
Support Staff	\$50	\$50	\$50	\$50

Schedule Effective: 4-1-2011 through 3-31-2014