



City of Blanco

P.O. Box 750 Blanco, Texas 78606
Office 830-833-4525 Fax 830-833-4121

STAFF REPORT: 3/20/24

DESCRIPTION: Select Administrator from the RFP that was sent out for RCP grant.

ANALYSIS: The City of Blanco plans to apply for Regional Mitigation Program Council of Governments Method of Distribution (COG-MOD) Resilient Community Program (RCP) from the Texas General Land Office (GLO) and is soliciting proposals to provide administration and/or planning services for CDBG contract. We opened the RFQ process up at the end of January and the window for bids will close on February 26th.

There were four applicants that submitted for administration and application of the grant. Traylor, Public Management, Grant Works, and Langford Community Management. All four applicants are qualified, but based on a group that was put together to review the applicants Langford Community Management is the recommended choice. The group consisted of Bobby McClung of the CMP committee, Ken Welch of the Transportation Committee, and Brandon Carlson of P&Z.

FISCAL IMPACT: Up \$300,000

RECOMMENDATION: Committee recommends Langford Community Management.



RESILIENT COMMUNITIES PROGRAM

Texas General Land Office
Community Development & Revitalization

The Texas General Land Office (GLO) allocated up to \$100 million in Community Development Block Grant Mitigation (CDBG-MIT) funds for the Resilient Communities Program (RCP). The RCP will fund the development, adoption, and implementation of modern and resilient building codes and flood damage prevention ordinances to ensure that structures built within the community can withstand future hazards.

RCP launches June 1, 2022.

More information and the application are available at
recovery.texas.gov/rcp.

Communities are encouraged to also learn about RCP's companion program, the Local Hazard Mitigation Plans Program (LHMPP), which is actively accepting applications. Visit LHMPP's web page at recovery.texas.gov/mitigation/lhmpp.

Eligibility Criteria

Applications will have a maximum of \$300,000 per applicant, first-come first-served.

At least 50% must address mitigation needs in the CDBG-MIT most impacted and distressed (MID) areas identified by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

Eligible Applicants

Units of local government (e.g., cities, counties, federally recognized tribes, and councils of governments) located in a CDBG-MIT eligible area. Entity must have legal authority to adopt and enforce the building code, zoning ordinance, land use plan, and/or comprehensive plan proposed in the RCP application.

Planning Activities

Develop, update, adopt, and implement:

- **BUILDING CODES** that meet or exceed International Residential Code (IRC) edition 2012;
- **FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION ORDINANCES**
 - Must require new structures to be at least 2-feet above base flood elevation;
- **ZONING ORDINANCES**
 - based upon a land use plan or comprehensive plan; and
- Forward-looking **LAND USE PLANS** and/or **COMPREHENSIVE PLANS** that integrate hazard mitigation planning.

Public Service Activities

Activities leading to an increase in community knowledge and/or the National Flood Insurance Program's voluntary Community Rating System's (CRS) incentive program.

Examples include education and outreach campaigns that alert communities and beneficiaries to mitigation opportunities and best practices.

Public Service activities must meet a HUD national objective.

Technical Assistance

RCP staff is available to assist potential applicants with understanding how the program can best assist in meeting the needs of the community with regard to mitigation activities, such as modern building code adoption, that increase the resilience and reduce the likelihood of losses of life and property from future disasters.

 RCP Contact information: (512) 770-4900

 rcp.glo@recovery.texas.gov

Administration Professional Services Rating Sheet

CDBG-MIT

Grant Recipient _____ Name of Respondent Langston
 Evaluator's Name ESCON Date of Rating _____

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Proposal (RFP) by awarding points up to the maximum listed for each factor. Information necessary to assess the Respondent on these criteria may be gathered either from past experience with the Respondent and/or by contacting past/current clients of the Respondent. Respondents proposing to offer specific services (environmental or buyout only) will be scored only on those services.

Experience

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Related Experience / Background with federally funded projects	5	<u>4</u>
2. Related Experience / Background with specific project type (infrastructure, acquisition of property, coordination with regulatory agency, etc.)	5	<u>4</u>
3. Related experience/background with specific services:		
a. Administrative, construction management, and related acquisition	10	<u>8</u>
b. Environmental review	5	<u>4</u>
c. Buyout management (if not applicable score '0')	5	<u>0</u>
4. References from current/past clients	10	<u>8</u>
Subtotal, Experience	40	28

Work Performance

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Submits requests to client/GLO in a timely manner	5	<u>5</u>
2. Responds to client/GLO requests in a timely manner	5	<u>4</u>
3. Past client/GLO projects completed on schedule	5	<u>4</u>
4. Work product is consistently of high quality with low level of errors	5	<u>4</u>
5. Past client/GLO projects have low level of monitoring findings/concerns	5	<u>4</u>
6. Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	<u>5</u>
Subtotal, Performance	30	26

Capacity to Perform

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Qualifications / Experience of Staff		
a. Administrative, construction management, and related acquisition	5	<u>4</u>
b. Environmental review	5	<u>4</u>
c. Buyout management (if not applicable score '0')	5	<u>4</u>
2. Present and Projected Workloads	5	<u>4</u>
3. Demonstrated understanding of scope of the CDBG-MIT Project	5	<u>4</u>
Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	25	20

Proposed Cost

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
Proposed cost is in line with independent estimate and compared with all cost proposals received	5	<u>4</u>
	5	

TOTAL SCORE

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience	40	<u>28</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Performance	30	<u>26</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to Perform	25	<u>20</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Proposed Cost	5	<u>4</u>
Total Score	100	78

Administration Professional Services Rating Sheet

CDBG-MIT

Grant Recipient _____ Name of Respondent Public Man
 Evaluator's Name Esley Date of Rating _____

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Proposal (RFP) by awarding points up to the maximum listed for each factor. Information necessary to assess the Respondent on these criteria may be gathered either from past experience with the Respondent and/or by contacting past/current clients of the Respondent. Respondents proposing to offer specific services (environmental or buyout only) will be scored only on those services.

Experience

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Related Experience / Background with federally funded projects	5	4
2. Related Experience / Background with specific project type (infrastructure, acquisition of property, coordination with regulatory agency, etc.)	5	4
3. Related experience/background with specific services:		
a. Administrative, construction management, and related acquisition	10	7
b. Environmental review	5	5
c. Buyout management (if not applicable score '0')	5	0
4. References from current/past clients	10	9
Subtotal, Experience	40	29

Work Performance

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Submits requests to client/GLO in a timely manner	5	5
2. Responds to client/GLO requests in a timely manner	5	4
3. Past client/GLO projects completed on schedule	5	3
4. Work product is consistently of high quality with low level of errors	5	4
5. Past client/GLO projects have low level of monitoring findings/concerns	5	4
6. Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	4
Subtotal, Performance	30	24

Capacity to Perform

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Qualifications / Experience of Staff		
a. Administrative, construction management, and related acquisition	5	4
b. Environmental review	5	4
c. Buyout management (if not applicable score '0')	5	4
2. Present and Projected Workloads	5	4
3. Demonstrated understanding of scope of the CDBG-MIT Project	5	4
Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	25	20

Proposed Cost

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
Proposed cost is in line with independent estimate and compared with all cost proposals received	5	4
	5	2

TOTAL SCORE

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience	40	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Performance	30	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to Perform	25	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Proposed Cost	5	_____
Total Score	100	75

Administration Professional Services Rating Sheet

CDBG-MIT

Grant Recipient _____ Name of Respondent Traylor
 Evaluator's Name Es Long Date of Rating _____

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Proposal (RFP) by awarding points up to the maximum listed for each factor. Information necessary to assess the Respondent on these criteria may be gathered either from past experience with the Respondent and/or by contacting past/current clients of the Respondent. Respondents proposing to offer specific services (environmental or buyout only) will be scored only on those services.

Experience

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Related Experience / Background with federally funded projects	5	<u>4</u>
2. Related Experience / Background with specific project type (infrastructure, acquisition of property, coordination with regulatory agency, etc.)	5	<u>4</u>
3. Related experience/background with specific services:		
a. Administrative, construction management, and related acquisition	10	<u>7</u>
b. Environmental review	5	<u>5</u>
c. Buyout management (if not applicable score '0')	5	<u>0</u>
4. References from current/past clients	10	<u>8</u>
Subtotal, Experience	40	<u>28</u>

Work Performance

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Submits requests to client/GLO in a timely manner	5	<u>5</u>
2. Responds to client/GLO requests in a timely manner	5	<u>4</u>
3. Past client/GLO projects completed on schedule	5	<u>3</u>
4. Work product is consistently of high quality with low level of errors	5	<u>4</u>
5. Past client/GLO projects have low level of monitoring findings/concerns	5	<u>4</u>
6. Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	<u>3</u>
Subtotal, Performance	30	<u>23</u>

Capacity to Perform

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Qualifications / Experience of Staff		
a. Administrative, construction management, and related acquisition	5	<u>4</u>
b. Environmental review	5	<u>4</u>
c. Buyout management (if not applicable score '0')	5	<u>4</u>
2. Present and Projected Workloads	5	<u>4</u>
3. Demonstrated understanding of scope of the CDBG-MIT Project	5	<u>4</u>
Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	25	<u>20</u>

Proposed Cost

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
Proposed cost is in line with independent estimate and compared with all cost proposals received	5	<u>2</u>
	5	

TOTAL SCORE

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience	40	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Performance	30	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to Perform	25	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Proposed Cost	5	_____
Total Score	100	<u>73</u>

Administration Professional Services Rating Sheet

CDBG-MIT

Grant Recipient _____ Name of Respondent Grant work
 Evaluator's Name ESL Date of Rating _____

Rate the Respondent of the Request For Proposal (RFP) by awarding points up to the maximum listed for each factor. Information necessary to assess the Respondent on these criteria may be gathered either from past experience with the Respondent and/or by contacting past/current clients of the Respondent. Respondents proposing to offer specific services (**environmental or buyout only**) will be scored only on those services.

Experience

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Related Experience / Background with federally funded projects	5	<u>4</u>
2. Related Experience / Background with specific project type (infrastructure, acquisition of property, coordination with regulatory agency, etc.)	5	<u>3</u>
3. Related experience/background with specific services:		
a. Administrative, construction management, and related acquisition	10	<u>8</u>
b. Environmental review	5	<u>3</u>
c. Buyout management (if not applicable score '0')	5	<u>0</u>
4. References from current/past clients	10	<u>9</u>
Subtotal, Experience	40	<u>27</u>

Work Performance

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Submits requests to client/GLO in a timely manner	5	<u>4</u>
2. Responds to client/GLO requests in a timely manner	5	<u>4</u>
3. Past client/GLO projects completed on schedule	5	<u>4</u>
4. Work product is consistently of high quality with low level of errors	5	<u>4</u>
5. Past client/GLO projects have low level of monitoring findings/concerns	5	<u>1</u>
6. Manages projects within budgetary constraints	5	<u>4</u>
Subtotal, Performance	30	<u>21</u>

Capacity to Perform

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Qualifications / Experience of Staff		
a. Administrative, construction management, and related acquisition	5	<u>4</u>
b. Environmental review	5	<u>4</u>
c. Buyout management (if not applicable score '0')	5	<u>4</u>
2. Present and Projected Workloads	5	<u>4</u>
3. Demonstrated understanding of scope of the CDBG-MIT Project	5	<u>3</u>
Subtotal, Capacity to Perform	25	<u>19</u>

Proposed Cost

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
Proposed cost is in line with independent estimate and compared with all cost proposals received	5	<u>0</u>
	5	

TOTAL SCORE

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Max.Pts.</u>	<u>Score</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Experience	40	<u>27</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Performance	30	<u>21</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to Perform	25	<u>19</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Proposed Cost	5	<u>0</u>
Total Score	100	<u>67</u>



Warren Escovy <cityadmin@cityofblancotx.gov>

GLO CDBG-MIT RCP 2024

Kenneth Welch <krwelch@moment.net>
 To: City of Blanco Admin <cityadmin@cityofblancotx.gov>

Fri, Mar 15, 2024 at 3:17 PM

I have reviewed the proposals to do the administration for the 2024 CDBG resilient communities program. After reviewing all of the proposals and discussing them with Bobby, Brandon and yourself I believe Langford Grant Admin will be the best choice for Blanco.

All three companies have a long history of grant management and I judged their **Experience** factors virtually equal.

Without contacting the many references that each company submitted it is difficult to judge their work performance. However, after hearing your comments about the project managers of the three companies and Bobby's comments about Blanco's past history with Langford I feel that Langford should be given a leg up in the **Work Performance** area.

Although Public Management and GrantWorks appear to be much larger companies, I do not think size is a factor since Langford has a long history of grant management. As I mentioned in our meeting, I feel that a company's familiarity with Blanco and their ability to communicate effectively with Blanco citizens far outweighs the number of personnel available for the project. Presenting the project to the public and gathering input from members of the community will be essential to the success of the overall project. I believe Langford's **Capacity to Perform** may, in fact, be the best of the three companies because of their familiarity with Blanco and our residents.

I believe Langford should be chosen for the Administrative aspect of this program. If the grant is awarded to Blanco I trust that Langford will be able to lead the effort to choose the best company(s) to execute the various aspect of the project.

I look forward to working with you on the project as we move forward.

On Mar 8, 2024, at 5:49 PM, Warren Escovy <cityadmin@cityofblancotx.gov> wrote:

Brandon, Bobby, Kenneth,

About a month ago Council authorized staff to get proposals from grant writers to do the Administration for the 2024 CDBG resilient communities program. Langford brought us this grant and gave us the template we needed to advertise but I need to get a recommendation to council for the March 20th special meeting. As CMP chair, P&Z Chair and Transportation chair would you be willing to skim the proposals and review their qualifications? I will put together a score sheet for you to use next week and then we can meet later on in the week. I can even take you guys out to lunch for your troubles. The grant controls how much the admin receives in compensation so it's not about the cost but the qualifications.

Later, we would pick a land planner or professional services group that would actually do the work. If we get the whole requested \$300,000 we might do more projects than just the Comp plan. Council could look at a UDC re-write, transportation plan, and some types of drainage studies. Let me know and we'll get together next week. Thanks in advanced. W

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Laurie Cassidy <citysec@cityofblancotx.gov>
Date: Mon, Mar 4, 2024 at 9:42 AM
Subject: GLO CDBG-MIT RCP 2024
To: Warren Escovy <cityadmin@cityofblancotx.gov>

Warren,

Attached are copies of all the proposals we received (4 total including Langford, Grant Works, Public Management, and Traylor).

 City of Blanco - 2024 CDBG-MIT-RCP Proposal-
 Traylor.pdf



City of Blanco

P.O. Box 750 Blanco, Texas 78606
Office 830-833-4525 Fax 830-833-4121

STAFF REPORT: 3/20/24

DESCRIPTION: Consideration of a Police Department Retention program

ANALYSIS: There will probably be 6 open police position spots (4 which are paid by the city, two SRO positions paid by the school district within 6 weeks. A retention program is needed to help make sure we have sufficient staff to support the Blanco Police Department.

Concept Plan- To take a position that Chief Rubin and I had planned on eliminating and using some of that money to boost salaries of the employees. Plan would be paid for through savings. The plan is to boost City salaries (mainly for the patrol officers) up to the average of nearby communities (Bulverde, Blanco County, Burnet, Lampassas, and Marble Falls). About a \$3,000 increase.

FISCAL IMPACT: Cost of about \$30,000 for increase but paid for by decreasing PD by one position.

RECOMMENDATION: Authorize City Administrator to come up with a retention plan.

Salary Survey

Department/Position	Current Pay	City	Salary	City	Salary	City
Police Chief	\$ 101,682.62	Bulverde		Marble Falls	\$ 111,447.00	Blanco County
Police	\$ 56,324.57	Bulverde	\$ 59,000	Marble Falls	\$ 62,751.10	Blanco County
Police Admin	\$ 43,139.20	Bulverde		Marble Falls	\$ 40,670.00	Blanco County
Police Lieutenant	\$ 74,993.32	Bulverde		Marble Falls	\$ 85,012.00	Blanco County

Department/Position	Average per Position
Police Chief	\$ 102,956.13
Police	\$ 58,902.40
Police Admin	\$ 47,421.53
Police Lieutenant	\$ 82,587.80

Salary	City	Salary	City	Salary
\$ 83,453.00	Burnet	\$ 117,199.44	Lampapas	\$ 99,725.08
\$ 61,364.00	Burnet	\$ 59,894.01	Lampapas	\$ 51,502.88
\$ 57,353.00	Burnet	\$ 44,241.60	Lampapas	
\$ 76,750.00	Burnet	\$ 87,256.00	Lampapas	\$ 81,333.20

PD Budget Manpower

I want to see if I can explain the manpower chart well enough so I can forward to the rest of council. Placeholder are positions that will become open. Chief and I had already discussed eliminating one patrol officer position and then taking a third of that pay to distribute to other officers to help both the budget and retention of officers by providing higher salaries.

12 police department position, and three SROs (paid by the school district) are currently budgeted

We currently have **two SRO positions open and one police officer position open** that I was going to eliminate. Rice is one more patrol officer opening/placeholder, Robyn a Police admin opening, and Ruben a police chief opening. **(so three more vacancies will occur within 2 months with a total 6 place holders)**. Plus I have one more officer that keeps saying he wants to leave so that position is shaky.

Let me know if this makes sense. Warren

Compare

Employee Name	Department/Position	New Salary W/ Disbursement	2024/2025 Budget	Health	Dental	Vision	Life
Placeholder SRO	Police Officer - SRO	\$ 54,400.00	\$ 54,400.00				
Daniel	Police Officer	9/12/2022	\$ 57,079.27	\$ 10,808.18	\$ 546.47	\$ 120.02	\$ 131
DelaRosa	Police Officer	10/23/2023	\$ 57,079.27	\$ 10,808.18	\$ 546.47	\$ 120.02	\$ 131
Brandon	Police Officer	8/23/2018	\$ 68,521.67	\$ 10,808.18	\$ 546.47	\$ 120.02	\$ 131
Rivas	Police Officer		\$ 57,079.28	\$ 10,808.18	\$ 546.47	\$ 120.02	\$ 131
Victoria L	Police Officer		\$ 57,079.28	\$ 10,808.18	\$ 546.47	\$ 120.02	\$ 131
McMain	Police Detective		\$ 65,590.10	\$ 10,808.18	\$ 546.47	\$ 120.02	\$ 131

Kenneth Hopkins	Police Officer - SRO	2/29/23	\$	50,592.00	\$	50,592.00	\$	131
Place Holder	Police Admin	10/24/2017	\$	37,440.00	\$	37,440.00	\$	131
Ysidro T Rodriguez	Police Officer	2/11/2016	\$	71,231.96	\$	67,731.96	\$	131
Place Holder	Police Chief	7/24/2020	\$	105,749.92	\$	105,749.92	\$	131
Jazmine Salazar	Police Officer	2/1/2021	\$	65,439.40	\$	62,507.83	\$	131
Johnny Kendricks	Police Officer	10/23/2023	\$	59,601.99	\$	57,101.99	\$	131
Jerry Thornhill	Police Lieutenant	2/4/2012	\$	79,150.91	\$	77,993.05	\$	131
Brynn L Warrick	Police Officer	2/1/2021	\$	65,439.40	\$	62,507.83	\$	131
Placeholder SRO	Police Officer - SRO	-	\$	54,400.00	\$	54,400.00	\$	-
Zachary Rice	Police Officer	8/7/2023	\$	61,896.06	\$	59,396.06	\$	131
Placeholder Police	Remove position							

Total

\$ 733,629.85 \$ 710,177.29 \$ 118,889.97 \$ 7,142.02 \$ 1,506.36 \$ 1,43