



EC-19-428
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

Albuquerque, New Mexico
Office of the Mayor

Timothy M. Keller, Mayor

INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 29, 2019

TO: Klarissa J. Peña, President, City Council
FROM: Timothy M. Keller, Mayor *TMK*
SUBJECT: Mayor's Recommendation of Cherry/See/Reames Architects PC for Architectural Consultant for City Wide On-Call Architectural Services

The Selection Advisory Committee (SAC) met on May 20, 2019 to consider the following project:

Project: Project No: 7964.95 Architectural Consultant for City Wide On-Call Architectural Services

Agency: Department of Municipal Development

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

Project Description: This project will provide on-call architectural design services for the projects at the ABQ Bio Park and other projects on a City-wide basis. ABQ Bio Park projects will primarily be related to improvements to address on-going capital maintenance issues. Projects may include studies, analyses, site planning, pre-design, design and/or construction phase services.

The Committee made the following recommendation of the three highest ranked respondents:

Cherry/See/Reames Architects PC Lee Gamelsky Architects P.C. VHGArchitects

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:

Cherry/See/Reames Architects PC

Mayor's Recommendation of Cherry/See/Reames Architects PC for Project No. 7964.95 Architectural Consultant for City Wide On-Call Architectural Services.

This recommendation is being forwarded for Council consideration and action.


Approved:



Sarita Nair, JD, MCRP Date
Chief Administrative Officer 6/13/19



Approved as to Legal Form:



Esteban A. Aguilar, Jr. Date
City Attorney 6-4-2019

Recommended:



Patrick Montoya, Director Date
Department of Municipal Development 5-29-19 (or 5/28/19)

MIM

Attachments:

- Cover Analysis
- Composite SAC Evaluation Form
- Minutes of the SAC Meeting

Cover Analysis

1. What is it?

This Executive Communication is the Mayor's recommendation of Cherry/See/Reames Architects PC for City Wide On-Call Architectural Services for Project No: 7964.95

2. What will this piece of legislation do?

This project will create an On-Call contract for architectural services that can be used for ABQ Bio Park for studies, analysis, design and implementation of small City projects.

3. Why is this project needed?

The project is necessary to provide architectural services for ABQ Bio Park on an On-Call basis.

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

The amount of the contract is \$500,000.00 from various sources depending upon the scope of services.

5. Is there a revenue source associated with this contract? If so, what level of income is projected?

There is no revenue source associated with this contract.

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

If the agreement is not approved, architectural services available to the City will be limited.

7. Is this service already provided by another entity?

Other On-Call agreements are available; however, the existing Bio Park On-Call architectural contract is expiring.

Composite Selection Advisory Committee Evaluation Form

Project No: 7964.95 Architectural Consultant for City Wide On-Call Architectural Services

DATE: 5/20/2019

Evaluation Criteria	Total Committee Points	Firm Name	Firm Name	Firm Name
		Cherry/See/Reames Architects PC	VHGArchitects	Lee Gamelsky Architects P.C.
I. General Information (points available: 5) 1. Provide Name and Address of Respondent and, if firm, when firm was established. 2. Provide number of employees, technical discipline and registration. 3. Indicate where the services are to be performed.	25	25	25	25
II. Project Team Members (points available: 20) 1. Provide organization plan for management of the project. 2. Identify all consultants to be used on the project. 3. Provide qualifications of project team members shown in organization plan, including registration and membership in professional organizations. 4. Provide any unique knowledge of key team members relevant to the project.	100	83	86	81
III. Respondent Experience (points available: 30) 1. 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. 2. 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.	150	130	133	124
IV. Technical Approach (points available: 30) 1. Describe respondent's understanding of the project scope. 2. Describe how respondent plans to perform the services required by the project scope. 3. Describe specialized problem solving required in any phase of the project.	150	121	120	123
V. Cost Control (points available: 5) 1. Describe cost control and cost estimating techniques to be used for this project. 2. 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 justification for any discrepancies that may exist with this information.	25	22	19	21
VI. Quality and Content of Proposal (points available: 10) 1. Evaluator's rating of overall quality of proposal.	50	44	42	44
Total Possible Points	500	500	500	0
Total Points (Before Point Deductions)		425	425	418
Minus High and Low Scores Total		171	170	166
Total Points (Minus High and Low Scores)		254	255	252
Minus Point Deductions (If Applicable)		0	1	1
Sub-Total (All Applicable Deductions Applied)		254	254	251
Plus Tie Breaker Points (If Applicable)		1	0	0
SAC TOTAL SCORES		255	254	251
Plus Interview Scores		0	0	0
FINAL SCORES		255	254	251

Minutes of the Meeting
of the
Selection Advisory Committee
May 20, 2019

Room 7096, City County Government Center

Architectural Consultant for City Wide On-Call Architectural Services

Project # 7964.95

Present:

Mark Motsko, PM, Department of Municipal Development
Jerry Francis, RA, Department of Municipal Development
Hartwell Briggs, RA, Department of Municipal Development
Mark Eshelman, RA, Department of Municipal Development
Baird Fleming, Cultural Services

Others:

Dyron Murphy Architects
Lee Gamelsky Architects
VHGArchitects
Cherry/See/Reames Architects

Staff:

Myrna Marquez, Administrator, Selection Advisory Committee
Betty Greenbaum, Recording Secretary
Jesse Valdez, PM

Six proposals were received in response to the Notice of Request for Proposals but one proposal was eliminated due to an incomplete Pay Equity Form submitted in the RFP.

Project Description:

This project will provide on-call architectural design services for the projects at the ABQ Bio Park and other projects on a city wide basis. ABQ Bio Park projects will primarily be related to improvements to address on-going capital maintenance issues. Projects may include studies, analyses, site planning, pre-design, design and/or construction phase services.

Estimated Compensation: \$500,000.00

The Administrator called the meeting to order at 9:30a.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 five proposals were good overall. Committee members said that some larger projects were included in some proposals which made comparing the proposals difficult; one particular proposal, however, included a project that was quite large and did not have proper relevance to this RFP. Committee members said they carefully reviewed the team members proposed and their experience and that weighed on their scoring. Committee members reminded respondents to check for proper formatting and scale when submitting proposals so that their proposals always display the utmost professionalism.

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. Ties did not result but because the two highest scores were within 5% of each other, point deductions were applied. At this point, a tie in fact resulted in the highest score. Because a tie did not result after the highest and lowest scores were dropped but after the point deductions were applied, the Administrator stated that she felt more comfortable consulting with the SAC Rules and Regulations before proceeding with any point additions in order to break the tie.

The SAC Administrator, however, continued with her meeting agenda and, as required, asked if any Committee member wanted to make a motion to conduct interviews. Baird Fleming made a motion to conduct interviews pending the results of breaking the tie and it was seconded by Jerry Francis. The Administrator reminded the Committee and the respondents that the proposal scores would need to be verified prior to submitting the Committee's recommendation to the Mayor.

Final scores reported at the meeting were as follows:

Cherry/See/Reames Architects PC	254
Lee Gamelsky Architects P.C.	251
Dyron Murphy Architects, P.C.	237
NCA Architects	243
VHGArchitects	254

After the conclusion of the SAC Meeting, the SAC Administrator consulted with the SAC Rules and Regulations and according to the SAC Rules and Regulations, one point is added to the firm involved in the tie whose highest score was dropped. The two firms involved in the tie, however, happened to have identical high scores dropped which then leads to adding one point to the firm whose highest low score was dropped. This finally brought the total scores to a break in the tie and the Administrator advised the Committee of the final scores via email.

Final scores after the tie was broken:

Cherry/See/Reames Architects PC	255
Lee Gamelsky Architects P.C.	251
Dyron Murphy Architects, P.C.	237
NCA Architects	243
VHGArchitects	254

The Administrator emailed the entire Committee and asked Baird Fleming and Jerry Francis specifically, if they wanted to conduct interviews after the results of breaking the tie at the conclusion of the SAC Meeting. Both Mr. Fleming and Mr. Francis declined conducting interviews.

In accordance with the Rules and Regulations, subject to verification of the scores, the following firms are the Committee's recommendation.

Cherry/See/Reames Architects PC Lee Gamelsky Architects P.C. VHGArchitects

There being no further business before the Committee, the Administrator adjourned the meeting at 9:50a.m.



Myrna Marquez, Administrator
Selection Advisory Committee

cc: City Clerk