



## CITY COUNCIL ACTION REPORT

December 6, 2007

TO: Phillip L. Nelson, City Manager

FROM: John M. Lamerato, Assistant City Manager/Finance & Administration  
Susan A. Leirstein, Purchasing Director  
Cathleen Russ, Library Director  
Loraine Campbell, Museum Manager

SUBJECT: Standard Purchasing Resolution 8: Best Value Award —  
Architectural Services for the Troy Museum & Historic Village

### **Background**

- On January 23, 2006, City Council approved Resolution #2006-01-022-E6, an agreement with the Troy Historical Society that delineated the process for the City of Troy and the Troy Historical Society to work together during a five-year capital fund raising campaign to expand the Troy Museum and Historic Village.
- Covenant 5 of the agreement stated that the Troy Historical Society would select an architect/site planner guided by The City of Troy's guidelines for best value selection procedures, from respondents to their Requests for Qualifications/Proposals.
- On September 25, 2007, twenty-two (22) firms attended a pre-bid meeting at the Troy Museum and were provided access to the Niles-Barnard House.
- On October 8, 2007, Requests for Qualifications/Proposals were received and opened to provide site plan and architectural services for the expansion of the Troy Museum & Historic Village.
- 207 vendors were notified via the MITN system, with eleven (11) bidders responding, five (5) of which did not meet the minimum pass/fail requirements.
- Five (5) committee members, consisting of Mark Stimac, Building and Zoning Director, Loraine Campbell, Museum Manager, Ward Randol and John Lavender, co-chairs of the Troy Historical Society Heritage Campaign, and Terry Navratil, Historical Commission, reviewed and evaluated the remaining six (6) RFQ/RFPs.
- The top three (3) firms were interviewed by the full committee on Friday, November 9, 2007.
- Based on the scoring criteria of 40% Proposal Score, 40% Price Score and 20% Interview Score, the committee recommends awarding the contract to the highest rated bidder, Hopkins Burns Design Studio.

December 6, 2007

To: Phillip L. Nelson, City Manager

Re: Best Value Award – Architectural Services for the Troy Museum & Historic Village

### **Financial Considerations**

- Funds are available through the Troy Historical Society Heritage Campaign to pay for the site plan and architectural services and will be transferred to the City of Troy Capital Projects Fund to cover the costs in the Museum Capital Account for Land Improvements - #401804.7971.010.

### **Legal Considerations**

- RFQ / RFP 07-27, Architectural Services for the Troy Museum & Historic Village was competitively bid and opened with eleven (11) bidders responding.
- All bidders were given the opportunity to respond with their level of interest to provide architectural services for the Troy Museum & Historic Village expansion.
- The contract award is contingent on the recommended bidder's submission of proper contract and supplemental documents, including insurance certificates, and all other specified requirements.

### **Policy Considerations**

- Enhance the livability and safety of the community (Goal I)
- Minimize the cost and increase the efficiency and effectiveness of City government (Goal II)
- Maintain relevance of public infrastructure to meet changing public needs (Goal V)

### **Options**

- City management recommends awarding a contract to perform the Architectural Services for the Troy Museum & Historic Village to the highest rated bidder, Hopkins Burns Design Studio, of Ann Arbor, Michigan, as a result of a best value process, for an estimated total cost of \$219,265.00



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Architectural Services for the Troy Museum and Historic Village

#### STATISTICS:

- ◆ **Two-hundred and seven (207) firms were notified via the MITN e-procurement website**
- ◆ **Eleven (11) proposals were received**
- ◆ **Six (6) firms met the pass/fail criteria**
- ◆ **Three (3) firms were interviewed**
- ◆ **Hopkins Burns Design Studio received the highest score as a result of a best value process**

The following three firms received the indicated final scores as a result of the interview, proposal and pricing selection criteria. Only these three top rated firms were invited to participate in an interview.

Firm	SCORE
Hopkins Burns Design Studio	87
Ekocite Architecture	73
John Dziurman Architects LTD	62

#### REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS - FIRMS ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION (BASED ON PASS/FAIL MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS AND INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS)

- George J. Hartman Architects, PC
- Hobbs & Black Architects
- Moody Nolan, Inc.
- Frank McCormick & Khalaf, LLC Architects
- Luckenback/Ziegelman Architects PLLC

#### Attachments:

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



WEIGHTED FINAL SCORING

Architectural Services for the Troy Museum and Historic Village

Final Score Calculation:

$$\begin{array}{r}
 20\% \times \text{Interview Score} \\
 40\% \times \text{Proposal Score} \\
 40\% \times \text{Price Score} \\
 \hline
 100\% \qquad \qquad \qquad = \text{Final Weighted Score}
 \end{array}$$

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 100. **NOTE:** For the proposal and price evaluations, vendors are listed in the order of their cost proposal from lowest to highest. For the summary and final scores the vendors are listed in order of rating from highest to lowest. For the interview evaluation the vendors are listed in the order they were interviewed.

Weighted Average Score for Proposals: 40%

Raters:	1	2	3	4	5	Average	Final Weighted Score (x .40)
Vendors:							
Ekocite Architecture	41	30	76	42	61	50	50 x .40 = 20
Hopkins Burns Design Studio	100	89	89	97	94	94	94 x .40 = <b>38</b>
Ehresman Associates Inc.	38	56	78	64	65	60	60 x .40 = 24
John Dziurman Architects LTD	62	70	92	77	60	72	72 x .40 = 29
Hamilton Anderson	37	53	88	64	53	59	59 x .40 = 24
THA Architects Engineers	85	88	85	83	94	87	87 x .40 = 35

Weighted Average Score for Price: 40%

RATERS	Weighted Criteria - Difference in Costs {1-(Proposal price - lowest price)/low price} x available points	Final Weighted Score (x .40)
Vendors:		
Ekocite Architecture	{1-(177,000.00-177,000.00)/177,000.00} x 100 = 100	100 x .40 = <b>40</b>
Hopkins Burns Design Studio	{1-(219,265.00-177,000.00)/177,000.00} x 100 = 76	76 x .40 = 30
Ehresman Associates Inc.	{1-(253,600.00-177,000.00)/177,000.00} x 100 = 57	57 x .40 = 23
John Dziurman Architects LTD	{1-(265,500.00-177,000.00)/177,000.00} x 100 = 50	50 x .40 = 20
Hamilton Anderson	{1-(282,815.00-177,000.00)/177,000.00} x 100 = 40	40 x .40 = 16
THA Architects Engineers	{1-(422,000.00-177,000.00)/177,000.00} x 100 = 0	0 x .40 = 0

Summary: Proposal and Price Scores

VENDORS:	Hopkins Burns Design Studio	Ekocite Architecture	John Dziurman Architects LTD	Ehresman Associates Inc	Hamilton Anderson	THA Architects Engineers
Proposal Score	38	20	29	24	24	35
Price Score	30	40	20	23	16	0
SCORE	68	60	49	47	40	35

Only the top three rated firms were invited to participate in an interview.  
(Maximum # of points - 20 -)



Weighted Average Score for Interview: 20%

RATERS	1	2	3	4	5	Average	Final Weighted Score (x .20)
Vendors:							
John Dziurman Architects LTD	66	74	84	50	63	67	67 x .20 = 13
Ekocite Architecture	76	67	87	30	72	66	66 x .20 = 13
Hopkins Burns Design Studio	94	91	93	96	93	93	93 x .20 = <b>19</b>

FINAL SCORE:

VENDORS:	Hopkins Burns Design Studio	Ekocite Architecture	John Dziurman Architects LTD	Ehresman Associates Inc	Hamilton Anderson	THA Architects Engineers
Proposal Score	38	20	29	24	24	35
Price Score	30	40	20	23	16	0
Interview Score	19	13	13	N/A	N/A	N/A
FINAL SCORE	87	73	62	47	40	35

\*\*HIGHEST RATED VENDOR - RECOMMENDED AWARD



## SELECTION PROCESS

### **CRITERIA FOR SELECTION**

The identified Committee will review the proposals. The City of Troy and Troy Historical Society reserve the right to award this proposal to the firm considered the most qualified based upon a combination of factors including but not limited to the following:

- A. Compliance with qualifications criteria
- B. Completeness of the proposal
- C. Financial strength and capacity of the firm
- D. Correlation of the proposals 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**

Firms will be required to meet minimum established criteria in order to go to the second phase of the process.

#### **Phase 2: Evaluation of Proposals**

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

#### **Phase 3: Interview Score – Optional-**

The City and the Historical Society, at their option, will invite at least the top three (3) rated firms to participate in an interview. If less than three (3) candidates remain in the process, all will be interviewed. 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 firm for this phase of the process. Those being interviewed may be supplied with further instructions and requests prior to the interview. Persons representing the firm at the interview must be the personnel who will be assigned to this project.

#### **Phase 4: Price**

Points for price will be calculated as follows:

$$\text{FORMULA: } \{1 - (\text{Proposal Price} - \text{Low Price}) / \text{low price}\} \times \text{available points}$$

#### **Phase 5: Final Scoring and Selection**

The firm with the highest final weighted score will be recommended to the Troy City Council for Award.

40% Proposal Score (100 point base)  
40% Price Score (100 point base)  
20% Interview Score (100 point base)  
100%

**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.**

FIRM NAME:		Ekocite Architecture	Hopkins Burns Design Studio	Ehresman Associates Inc.
<b>PROPOSAL: TO PROVIDE ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES TO CONDUCT DESIGN SERVICES FOR THE TROY MUSEUM AND HISTORIC VILLAGE EXPANSION PROJECT.</b>				
<b>VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE:</b>	(Yes or No)	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>SEVEN (7) COPIES</b>	(Yes or No)	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>INSURANCE:</b>	Can Meet	XX	XX	XX
	Cannot Meet			
	Signed Y or N	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>PROPOSAL: Schedule of Values</b>		<b>NOT TO EXCEED</b>	<b>NOT TO EXCEED</b>	<b>NOT TO EXCEED</b>
Cost for Scope of Work as Stated:				
Phase I	Not to Exceed:	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 31,370.00	\$ 8,400.00
Phase II	Not to Exceed:	\$ 14,000.00	\$ 11,275.00	\$ 8,400.00
Phase III	Not to Exceed:	\$ 16,000.00	\$ 11,275.00	\$ 7,000.00
Phase IV	Not to Exceed:	\$ 13,000.00	\$ 11,275.00	\$ 9,800.00
Phase V	Not to Exceed:	\$ 112,000.00	\$ 134,070.00	\$ 218,000.00
Project Total	Not to Exceed:	\$ 175,000.00	\$ 199,265.00	\$ 251,600.00
Reimb Estd Exps	Not to Exceed:	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 2,000.00
<b>COMPLETE FOR THE SUM OF:</b>		\$ 177,000.00	\$ 219,265.00	\$ 253,600.00
<b>SCHEDULE OF VALUES:</b>	(Hourly Rates)	<b>UNIT PRICE</b>	<b>UNIT PRICE</b>	<b>UNIT PRICE</b>
<b>SERVICES:</b>		A - 100 Hr	SHA - 150 Hr	Planning & Design
		S & MEP E - 165 Hr	SA - 120 - 140 Hr	16,800 to 33,600
		C E - 146 Hr	A & LA - 75 - 100 Hr	TA - 48 Hr
		LEED - 110 Hr	IA & ILA - 50 - 75 Hr	AD - 62 Hr
			SEE & SLP - 140 Hr	LAD - 72 hr
<b>ADDITIONAL SERVICES:</b>		Soil Boring by owner	IEE - 65 - 85Hr	PA - 79 Hr
			SSE - 165 Hr / EE 85-110 Hr	SA - 84 Hr
			ME 90-110 Hr/CE 100-120/Hr	Const. Docs - 5%
			IME 70-90 Hr/Clerical 40-50/Hr	Constr.Phase - 1.25%
<b>REIMBURSEABLES:</b>		Cost plus 10%	Est Amount \$20,000	Photos - \$1.00 /picture
				Mileage - .40/mile
				Delivery - Cost + 50%
			Attached to Bid	Copies - .15 cent ea
<b>SITE INSPECTION</b>	Y or N	Yes	No	Yes
	DATE	9/25/2007	Unable to make site visit	9/25/2007
			however visited prior to	
<b>AIA DOCUMENT B431-1993</b>	Y or N	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>CONTRACT FORMS:</b>	Y or N	Yes	Yes	Yes
Legal Status & Non-Collusion				
<b>COMPLETION DATE:</b>	Can meet	XX	XX	XX
	Cannot meet			
<b>TERMS:</b>		Blank	Blank	Blank
<b>EXCEPTIONS:</b>		Blank	Letter from Carrier re:	None
			areas of uninsurability	
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:</b>	Y or N	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>ADDENDUM #1</b>	Y or N	Yes	Yes	Yes

**DMS:**

- George J. Hartman Architects, PC - Did not include Insurance Certificate (\$300,000.00)
- Hobbs & Black Architects - Did not meet insurance requirements (\$375,525.00)
- Moody Nolan, Inc. - Did not meet Insurance Requirements (\$283,450.00)
- Frank McCormick & Khalaf, LLC Architects - Did not meet pass/fail requirements (\$260,000.00)
- Luckenbach/Ziegelman Architects PLLC - Did not meet pass/fail requirements (\$261,000.00)

**NO BIDS:**

- Quinn Evans Architects
- Fishbeck, Thompson, Carr & Huber, Inc.
- Lorri D. Sipes
- Yamasaki Associates, Inc.

Susan Leirstein CPPB  
Purchasing Director

**ATTEST:**

William Boardman  
Yvonne Ranzinger  
Linda Bockstanz

FIRM NAME:		John Dziurman Architects LTD	Hamilton Anderson	THA Architects Engineers
<b>PROPOSAL: TO PROVIDE ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES TO CONDUCT DESIGN SERVICES FOR THE TROY MUSEUM AND HISTORIC VILLAGE EXPANSION PROJECT.</b>				
<b>VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE:</b>	(Yes or No)	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>SEVEN (7) COPIES</b>	(Yes or No)	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>INSURANCE:</b>	Can Meet	XX	XX	XX
	Cannot Meet			
	Signed Y or N	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>PROPOSAL: Schedule of Values</b>		<b>NOT TO EXCEED</b>	<b>NOT TO EXCEED</b>	<b>NOT TO EXCEED</b>
Cost for Scope of Work as Stated:				
Phase I	Not to Exceed:	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 53,655.00	\$ 26,250.00
Phase II	Not to Exceed:	\$ 22,500.00	\$ 36,398.00	\$ 28,000.00
Phase III	Not to Exceed:	\$ 24,000.00	\$ 27,598.00	\$ 24,500.00
Phase IV	Not to Exceed:	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 30,298.00	\$ 26,250.00
Phase V	Not to Exceed:	\$ 150,000.00	\$ 126,366.00	\$ 315,000.00
Project Total	Not to Exceed:	\$ 241,500.00	\$ 274,315.00	\$ 420,000.00
Reimb Estd Exps	Not to Exceed:	\$ 24,000.00	\$ 8,500.00	\$ 2,000.00
<b>COMPLETE FOR THE SUM OF:</b>		\$ 265,500.00	\$ 282,815.00	\$ 422,000.00
<b>SCHEDULE OF VALUES:</b>	(Hourly Rates)	<b>UNIT PRICE</b>	<b>UNIT PRICE</b>	<b>UNIT PRICE</b>
SERVICES:		P - 130 Hr	P - 165 - 185 Hr	PM - 111.05 Hr
		T1 - 90 Hr	ASP - 135 - 155 Hr	PA - 95.76 Hr
		T2 - 80 Hr	PM - 120 - 130 Hr	E - 119.54 Hr
		T3 - 70 Hr	ALD-105-130 Hr/ALAD 75-105/Hr	A CAD - 72.94 Hr
		T4 - 60 Hr C -50 Hr	JLDL - 65 - 75 Hr	E CAD - 62.40 Hr
ADDITIONAL SERVICES:		Blank	SID - 100 - 120 Hr	CA - 94.64 Hr
			I D - 75 - 100 Hr	PMA - 49.05 Hr
			JID - 65 - 75 Hr	
			SP - 80 - 105 Hr	
REMIBURSEABLES:		Expense of Postage	PI - 65 - 85 Hr	Postage for mailings
		Copies, Drawings, etc	SGD - 90-05 Hr/GRD 70-90 Hr	No charge for Mileage
		Travel - .45 per mile	SAS - 90 - 125 Hr	and Phone
		Expenses - 15%	Ad Sp - 55 - 65 Hr	
<b>SITE INSPECTION</b>	Y or N	Yes	Attached to Bid Yes	Yes
	DATE	9/25/2007	9/25/2007	9/25/2007
<b>AIA DOCUMENT B431-1993</b>	Y or N	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>CONTRACT FORMS:</b>	Y or N	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Legal Status & Non-Collusion			
<b>COMPLETION DATE:</b>	Can meet	XX	XX	XX
	Cannot meet			
<b>TERMS:</b>		As stated in RFP	Net 30 Days	Lump Sum
<b>EXCEPTIONS:</b>		Idemnif provision as stated is a potential problem-see attached	None	As noted on Fee
				Clarification
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:</b>	Y or N	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>ADDENDUM #1</b>	Y or N	Yes	No	Yes