

EC-19-370

DATE: March 5, 2019

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

Albuquerque, New Mexico Office of the Mayor

Timothy M. Keller, Mayor

INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

Klarissa J. Peña, President, City Council

FROM: Timothy M. Keller, Mayor

SUBJECT: Mayor's Recommendation of DWL Architects & Planners Inc. of NM for

Architectural Consultants for West Side Vehicle Maintenance/Office Building at

Cerro Colorado Rd.

The Selection Advisory Committee (SAC) met on March 4, 2019 to consider the following project:

Project:

TO:

Project No. 6554.96 Architectural Consultants For West Side Vehicle

Maintenance/Office Building at Cerro Colorado Rd.

Agency:

Department of Municipal Development

Seven proposals were received in response to the Request for Proposals.

Project Description: An Architectural firm to perform a feasibility study of the existing building and vacant land for a new vehicle maintenance/office building. Upon completion of the feasibility study, the Architectural firm will either design a new vehicle maintenance/office building or design the renovation of the existing building to facilitate the vehicle maintenance/office.

The Committee made the following recommendation:

DWL Architects & Planners Inc. of NM

Huitt-Zollars, Inc.

SMPC Architects

The Cover Analysis, Score-Sheet Compilation and Minutes of the SAC Meeting are attached.

Therefore, in accordance with Section 14-7-2-1 et seq, ROA 1994, the following is my consultant selection recommendation concerning the procurement of professional services for the above listed project:

DWL Architects & Planners Inc. of NM

Mayor's Recommendation of DWL Architects & Planners Inc. of NM for Project No. 6554.96 Architectural Consultants For West Side Vehicle Maintenance/Office Building at Cerro Colorado Rd.

This recommendation is being forwarded for Council consideration and action.

Approved:

Approved as to Legal Form:

Sarita Nair, JD, MCRP Chief Administrative Officer

Date

Esteban A. Aguilar, Jr.

Date

City Attorney

Recommended:

Patrick Montoya, Directo Date

Department of Municipal Development

MIM

Attachments:

Cover Analysis Composite SAC Evaluation Form Minutes of the SAC Meeting

Cover Analysis

1. What is it?

This project is for a feasibility study of the existing building and vacant land for a new Vehicle Maintenance/Office building. Upon completion of the feasibility study, the Architectural firm will either design a new Vehicle Maintenance/Office Building or design the renovation of the existing building to facilitate the Vehicle Maintenance/Office.

2. What will this piece of legislation do?

This piece of legislation will hire a design firm to evaluate and design a facility, either by renovating the existing vacant building which had previously housed the Intermediate Processing Facility, or by designing a new building.

3. Why is this project needed?

This project is a commonsense solution for collections operations to prepare for Westside growth. This facility will help decentralize the Solid Waste Management Department's (SWMD) collection operations, reducing the City's carbon footprint by reducing fuel use of trucks on the highway, and providing accommodations for drivers and trucks serving the Westside. The maintenance facility will have two bays and landfill mechanics will service the trucks for routine maintenance and minor repairs. Decentralizing operations by expanding the Westside facility will help prepare for future growth on the Westside and restructure the collection routes to maximize service capacity.

4. How much will it cost and what is the funding source?

The design cost is estimated at \$150,000. The construction cost is estimated at \$1,400,000. The design cost will be funded by the Solid Waste Enterprise Fund. The construction cost will be funded through Revenue Bonds.

5. Is there a revenue source associated with this contract? If so, what level of income is projected? This is not a revenue source.

No.

6. What will happen if the project is not approved?

The vehicle maintenance and office functions will continue to be housed at the Edith Yards (4600 Edith Boulevard NE).

7. Is this service already provided by another entity?

SWMD currently provides these services at the Edith Yards (4600 Edith Boulevard NE).

Composite Selection Advisory Committee Evaluation Form

DATE: 3/4/2019

Project No: 6554.96 Architectural Consultant for West Side Vehicle Maintenance/Office Building at Cerro Colorado Rd.

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum	Firm Name DWL Architects &	Firm Name	Firm Name
	Paints	Planners Inc. of NM	SMPC Architects	Huitt-Zollars, Inc.
General Information Provide Name and Address of Respondent and, if firm, when firm was established. Provide number of employees, technical discipline and registration. Indicate where the services are to be performed.	25	24.5	24.75	24.5
I. Project Team Members				
Provide organization plan for management of the project.				
Identify all consultants to be used on the project.				
Provide qualifications of project team members shown in organization plan, including registration and membership in professional organizations. Provide any unique knowledge of key team members relevant to the project.	125	98.5	98.5	102.25
II. Respondent Experience				
Describe previous projects of a similar nature, including client contact (with phone numbers), year services provided, construction cost (if applicable), and a narrative description of how they relate to this project. Provide examples of the Project Manager's City experience within the past five (5) years that serve to demonstrate the the Project Manager's knowledge of City procedures.	125	103	114	107
V. Technical Approach				
Describe respondent's understanding of the project scope. Describe how respondent plans to perform the services required by the project scope. Describe specialized problem solving required in any phase of the project.	125	108.5	108	104.5
/. Cost Control				
Describe cost control and cost estimating techniques to be used for this project. Provide comparisons of bid award amount to final cost estimate for projects designed by the respondent during the past two (2) years. The consultant may provide	75	62.25	64	62
justification for any discrepancies that may exist with				
this information. /I. Quality and Content of Proposal				
Evaluator's rating of overall quality of proposal.	25	23.25	24.75	24.75
Total Possible Points	500	500	500	C
Total Points (Before Point Deductions)		420	434	425
Minus High and Low Scores Total		161	170	169
Total Points (Minus High and Low Scores)		259		250
Minus Point Deductions (If Applicable)		0	8	erretetetetetetetetetetetete e
Sub-Total (All Applicable Deductions Applied)		259	256	255
Plus Tie Breaker Points (If Applicable)		0	230	/// /
SAC TOTAL SCORES		259	256	258
Plus Interview Scores	Ï	0	Ol	(
FINAL SCORES		259		25

Minutes of the Meeting of the Selection Advisory Committee March 4, 2019

Room 7096, City County Government Center

Architectural Consultants For West Side Vehicle Maintenance/Office Building at Cerro Colorado Rd.

Project # 6554.96

Present:

Stacy Herrera, PM, Department of Municipal Development Jerry Francis, RA, Department of Municipal Development Hartwell Briggs, RA, Aviation Department Mark Eshelman, RA, Transit Department Jill Holbert, Solid Waste Department

Others:

Huitt-Zollars, Inc.
DWL Architects & Planners Inc. of NM
Cherry/See/Reames
SMPC Architects
Sam Sterling Architecture, Ilc.
VHGArchitects

Staff:

Myrna Marquez, Administrator, Selection Advisory Committee Betty Greenbaum, Recording Secretary Juanito Serna, Senior Project Coordinator

Seven proposals were received in response to the Notice of Request for Proposals.

Project Description:

An Architectural firm to perform a feasibility study of the existing building and vacant land for a new vehicle maintenance/office building. Upon completion of the feasibility study, the Architectural firm will either design a new vehicle maintenance/office building or design the renovation of the existing building to facilitate the vehicle maintenance/office.

Estimated Construction: \$1,400,000.00

The Administrator called the meeting to order at 9:00a.m. to review responses to the project. She reminded the Committee members of the section of the Rules and Regulations regarding lobbying and asked if anyone would like to make a motion to discuss the issue further. No motion was forthcoming.

The Administrator asked each Committee member to comment on the proposal, but to withhold giving their scores until all discussions ended. Members thanked the respondents for their interest in the project and said all proposals were good overall. Committee members noted that it was evident that some respondents just cut and paste from other projects because there was not always specific or relevant work experience included in the proposals. Committee members also stated that oftentimes there were many or what seemed excessive, sub-consultants listed.

The Administrator asked the Committee members to report their scores and she deleted the high scores and low scores and then totaled the proposal scores. There were no ties to be broken. The Administrator stated that the proposal scores would be verified prior to submitting the Committee's recommendation to the Mayor.

After verification, it was apparent that an error was made during the SAC Committee meeting noting that the top two highest firms were not within 5% of each other when indeed they were. Point deductions were not applied during the SAC Committee meeting and the top three firms were announced. After review, point deductions should have been applied because the top two ranked firms were actually within 5% of each other. This error resulted in a different ranking of the top three firms that will be recommended to the Mayor.

Final scores upon verification are as follows:

Cherry/See/Reames	247
DWL Architects & Planners Inc. of NM	259
Huitt-Zollars, Inc.	255
NCA Architects	239
Sam Sterling Architecture, Ilc.	233
SMPC Architects	256
VHGArchitects	243

The Administrator asked if any Committee member wanted to make a motion to conduct interviews. No motion was made to do so.

In accordance with the Rules and Regulations, after verification of the scores, the following firms is the Committee's recommendation:

DWL Architects & Planners Inc. of NM Huitt-Zollars, Inc. SMPC Architects

There being no further business before the Committee, the Administrator adjourned the meeting at 9:15a.m.

Myrna Marquez Administrator Selection Advisory Committee

cc: City Clerk