

## March 22, 2023, GPAC Item IV.b Comments

These comments on an item on the Newport Beach [General Plan Advisory Committee](#) agenda are submitted by: Jim Mosher ( [jimmosher@yahoo.com](mailto:jimmosher@yahoo.com) ), 2210 Private Road, Newport Beach 92660 (949-548-6229)

### ***Item IV.b. Review of the Responses Received to the General Plan Update Consulting Services RFP***

It is, of course, disappointing there is only one response to review. Or any staff report explaining why this might be.

And it is disappointing the agenda has been written to suggest the GPAC will only to hear, passively, about it, not provide a collective recommendation to the Steering Committee about about it.

[The RFP](#) posted in February that the sole respondent, Dudek, is responding to can be reviewed on the PlanetBids site used by the City, as can the [previous version](#) posted in December.

The February posting shows 22 prospective “prime” bidders, so it seems a bit surprising Dudek was the only one to actually submit, especially since they did not list themselves as even a prospective bidder in December.

The broad task categories, and many of the subtasks, listed in the response generally reflect those listed in the RFP, with the primary exception of Dudek’s offer to perform “Task 4. OPTIONAL CEQA Clearance.”

As someone who volunteered for the GPAC Noise Element subcommittee, it is a bit confusing that the RFP did not ask this consultant to support that activity, leaving some uncertainty as to what support that subcommittee will receive and from whom (as could be said for the subcommittee reviewing the Land Use Element, as well).

The respondent’s reliance on Kearns & West for community outreach is troubling to me, since my recollection does not match the City statement found in the RFP [Q&A 1.7](#) that “*the City went through a remarkable outreach and branding effort in 2019.*”

I did not think the outreach provided by Kearns & West in 2019 was particularly innovative or effective. The reliance Dudek places on collecting feedback through surveys and activities placed on the Newport, Together website seems especially problematic if my recollection is correct that participation in them was extremely slight.

In fact, having a separate website, at all, does not seem a particularly good idea. At least to me, it creates the impression this is not something the City itself is really connected to. And, as happened with Newport, Together, it creates the possibility of the City losing control over it, entirely.

Integrating the General Plan Update into the existing City website structure, as was done on a smaller scale with [City Council Redistricting](#), seems the better approach to me.