



CITY COUNCIL ACTION REPORT

April 14, 2008

TO: Phillip L. Nelson, City Manager

FROM: John M. Lamerato, Assistant City Manager/Finance & Administration
Susan A. Leirstein, Purchasing Director
Steven A. Pallotta, Building Operations Director

SUBJECT: Standard Purchasing Resolution 8: Best Value Award —
Architectural Services for HVAC Design for the Troy Hall of Justice

Background

- On January 14, 2008, the City of Troy Purchasing Department solicited Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and Request for Proposal (RFP) documents to provide heating, ventilation, and air conditioning services for the design related to upgrading the major mechanical systems and controls for the Troy Hall of Justice Building.
- On January 22, 2008, twelve (12) firms attended a non-mandatory walk through at City Hall. The site visit consisted of a review of the written specifications and scope of work, with an opportunity to view the existing mechanical systems.
- On February 14, 2008, Requests for Qualifications/Proposals were received and opened to provide architectural and design services for upgrading the major mechanical systems and controls for the Troy Hall of Justice Building.
- 106 firms were notified via the MITN system, with eleven (11) bidders responding, and three (3) statements of no bid received.
- All eleven (11) firms were able to meet the minimum pass/fail requirements.
- Three (3) committee members consisting of Mark Stimac, Building and Zoning Director, Mark Riley, Building Department Inspector Supervisor, and Steven Pallotta, Director of Building Operations reviewed, evaluated and rated all eleven (11) RFQ/RFPs.
- In order to fairly evaluate and score the pricing phase, the estimated number of hours for each proposal was normalized for each phase of the project.
- The top six (6) firms were interviewed by the full committee on Friday, April 4, 2008.
- Based on the final scoring and selection criteria of 40% Proposal Score, 40% Price Score, and 20% Interview Score, the committee recommends awarding the contract based on a best value process to DiClemente Siegel Design Inc of Southfield, MI.

April 14, 2008

To: Phillip L. Nelson, City Manager

Re: Best Value Award – Architectural Services for HVAC Design for the Troy Hall of Justice

Financial Considerations

- Funds are available through the City Hall Capital Outlay Account for City Hall HVAC - #401265.7975.040.

Legal Considerations

- RFQ / RFP-COT 07-46, HVAC Engineering Design Services for the Troy Hall of Justice 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 HVAC design services for the Troy Hall of Justice mechanical systems upgrade.
- 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

- Provides the public with up to date energy savings equipment and a healthier environment, in accordance with the City's high standards. (Goal V).
- Provides long term solutions to building equipment deficiencies. (Goal V).
- Maintain relevance of City building infrastructure to meet changing public needs (Goal V)

Options

- City management recommends awarding a contract to perform the HVAC Engineering Design Services for the Troy Hall of Justice, to DiClemente Siegel Design Inc., of Southfield, Michigan, as a result of a best value process, for an estimated total cost of \$69,074.09, plus reimbursable expenses not to exceed \$2,000.00.



LEVEL, CLASSIFICATION & FLAT RATE SCHEDULE - 2008

<u>LEVEL</u>	<u>CLASSIFICATIONS</u>	<u>RATE</u>
1.0	Drafter I/Clerical I.....	\$ 40.00
1.5	Drafter II/Clerical II.....	\$ 42.50
2.0	Drafter III/Typist.....	\$ 45.00
2.5	CAD Designer I/Secretary I.....	\$ 47.50
3.0	CAD Designer II/Secretary II.....	\$ 50.00
3.5	CAD Designer III/Admin. Secretary.....	\$ 52.50
4.0	Designer I/Draftsperson IV.....	\$ 55.00
4.5	Designer II/Technician I.....	\$ 60.00
5.0	Designer III/Architect I.....	\$ 65.00
5.5	Engineer I/Architect II.....	\$ 70.00
6.0	Engineer II/Architect III.....	\$ 75.00
6.5	Engineer III/Architect IV.....	\$ 80.00
7.0	Engineer IV/Architect V.....	\$ 85.00
7.5	Engineer V/Sr. Architect I.....	\$ 90.00
8.0	Senior Engineer I/Sr. Architect II.....	\$ 95.00
8.5	Senior Engineer II/Sr. Architect III.....	\$100.00
9.0	Associate (Engineer/Architect).....	\$115.00
9.5	Senior Associate (Engineer/Architect).....	\$120.00
10.0	Staff Consultant I.....	\$125.00
11.0	Senior Staff Consultant.....	\$130.00
12.0	Department Head - Project Executive.....	\$140.00

Classification Billing Rates to be applied for Professional Services from January 1, 2008, through December 31, 2008.

Form FRS1000 – 2008



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

HVAC ENGINEERING DESIGN SERVICES FOR THE TROY HALL OF JUSTICE HVAC SYSTEM

STATISTICS:

- ◆ **One-Hundred Six (106) firms were notified via the MITN e-procurement website**
- ◆ **Eleven (11) proposals were received, as well as three (3) statements of no bid**
- ◆ **Eleven (11) firms met the pass/fail criteria**
- ◆ **Top Six (6) firms were interviewed**
- ◆ **DiClemente Siegel Design Inc received the highest score as a result of a best value process**

The following Six (6) firms received the indicated final scores as a result of the interview, proposal and normalized pricing selection criteria. Only these six top rated firms were invited to participate in an interview.

Firm	SCORE
DiClemente Siegel Design Inc.	81
Wolf Wineman, Inc	76
MEP Engineers LLC	74
Engineering Systems Group LLC	72
MA Engineering	72
Peter Basso Associates, Inc	66

Attachments:

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



WEIGHTED FINAL SCORING
HVAC Design Services for the Troy Hall of Justice HVAC System

Final Score Calculation:

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

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:** Vendors are listed in the order of their summary score for both the proposal and price, from highest to lowest. For the final score the vendors are listed in the order of rating from highest to lowest.

Weighted Average Score for Proposals: 40%

Raters:	1	2	3	Average	Final Weighted Score (x .40)
Vendors:					
DiClemente Siegel Design Inc.	100	85	79	88	35
Engineering Systems Group LLC	50	60	57	56	22
MEP Engineers LLC	65	85	85	78	31
Wolf Wineman, Inc.	80	90	79	83	33
Peter Basso Associates, Inc	75	80	76	77	31
MA Engineering	80	90	62	77	31
JE Jacobs/Carter Burgess Consultant	100	90	65	85	34
EAM Engineers, Inc.	100	85	88	91	36
Sellinger Associates, Inc.	85	85	88	86	34
Berbiglia Associates, Inc.	70	65	56	64	25
Wilcox Professional Services LLC	75	80	94	83	33

Weighted Average Score for Normalized Price: 40%

	Weighted Criteria - Difference in Costs {1-(Proposal price - low price)/low price} x available points	Final Weighted Score (x .40)
Vendors:		
DiClemente Siegel Design Inc.	{1-(69,074.09-52,848.52)/52,848.52} x 100 = 69	69 x .40= 28
Engineering Systems Group LLC	{1-(52,848.52-52,848.52)/52,848.52} x 100 = 100	100 x .40= 40
MEP Engineers LLC	{1-(67,008.00-52,848.52)/52,848.52} x 100 = 73	73 x .40= 29
Wolf Wineman, Inc.	{1-(72,909.41-52,848.52)/52,848.52} x 100 = 62	62 x .40= 25
Peter Basso Associates, Inc	{1-(71,033.11-52,848.52)/52,848.52} x 100 = 66	66 x .40 = 26
MA Engineering	{1-(74,357.72-52,848.52)/52,848.52} x 100 = 59	59 x .40= 24
JE Jacobs/Carter Burgess Consultant	{1-(80,156.59-52,848.52)/52,848.52} x 100 = 48	48 x .40= 19
EAM Engineers, Inc.	{1-(82,881.00-52,848.52)/52,848.52} x 100 = 43	43 x .40= 17
Sellinger Associates, Inc.	{1-(83,010.00-52,848.52)/52,848.52} x 100 = 43	43 x .40= 17
Berbiglia Associates, Inc.	{1-(79,350.11-52,848.52)/52,848.52} x 100 = 50	50 x .40 =20
Wilcox Professional Services LLC	{1-(91,832.83-52,848.52)/52,848.52} x 100 = 26	26 x .40= 10



Summary: Proposal and Price Scores

	Proposal Score	Price Score	Score
Vendors:			
DiClemente Siegel Design Inc.	35	28	63
Engineering Systems Group LLC	22	40	62
MEP Engineers LLC	31	29	60
Wolf Wineman, Inc.	33	25	58
Peter Basso Associates, Inc	31	26	57
MA Engineering	31	24	55
JE Jacobs/Carter Burgess Consultant	34	19	53
EAM Engineers, Inc.	36	17	53
Sellinger Associates, Inc.	34	17	51
Berbiglia Associates, Inc.	25	20	45
Wilcox Professional Services LLC	33	10	43

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

Weighted Average Score for Interview: 20%

RATERS	1	2	3	Average	Final Weighted Score (x .20)
Vendors:					
DiClemente Siegel Design Inc	100	89	87	92	18
Engineering Systems Group LLC	41	41	70	51	10
MEP Engineers LLC	76	54	86	72	14
Wolf Wineman, Inc	97	95	79	90	18
Peter Basso Associates, Inc	20	44	75	46	9
MA Engineering	95	76	82	84	17

FINAL SCORE:

VENDORS:	DiClemente Siegel Design Inc	Wolf Wineman, Inc	MEP Engineers LLC	Engineering Systems Group LLC	MA Engineering	Peter Basso Associates, Inc
Proposal Score	35	33	31	22	31	31
Price Score	28	25	29	40	24	26
Interview Score	18	18	14	10	17	9
FINAL SCORE	81	76	74	72	72	66

**HIGHEST RATED VENDOR - RECOMMENDED AWARD



SELECTION PROCESS

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION

The identified Committee will review the proposals. The City of Troy reserves 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, 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.

Normalizing Estimated Hours

	Pre-Design	Schematic Design	Design Development	Construction Doc/Meeting Attendance
Peter Basso Associates, Inc	24.0	24.0	80.0	20.0
EAM Engineers, Inc.	40.0	250.0	600.0	80.0
DiClemente Siegel Design Inc.	58.0	115.0	286.0	688.0
JE Jacobs/Carter Burgess Consultant	120.0	170.0	230.0	790.0
Sellinger Associates, Inc.	100.0	150.0	150.0	350.0
Wolf Wineman, Inc.	40.0	80.0	560.0	180.0
Wilcox Professional Services LLC	70.0	70.0	140.0	565.0
MA Engineering	12.0	100.0	200.0	425.0
MEP Engineers LLC	40.0	180.0	700.0	120.0
Berbiglia Associates, Inc.	160.0	220.0	120.0	140.0
Engineering Systems Group LLC	30.0	115.4	310.0	36.1
	694.0	1474.4	3376.0	3394.1
	63.1	134.0	306.9	308.6
Average	63.1	134.0	306.9	308.6

PROPOSAL SCHEDULE OF VALUES	Pre-Design	Schematic Design	Design Development	Construction Doc/Meeting Attendance	Reimbursables	
Peter Basso Associates, Inc	\$ 2,184.00	\$ 2,184.00	\$ 6,312.00	\$ 1,820.00	\$ 800.00	\$ 13,300.00
EAM Engineers, Inc.	\$ 4,200.00	\$ 29,400.00	\$ 50,400.00	\$ 9,000.00	\$ -	\$ 93,000.00
DiClemente Siegel Design Inc.	\$ 4,930.00	\$ 9,775.00	\$ 24,310.00	\$ 58,485.00	\$ -	\$ 97,500.00
JE Jacobs/Carter Burgess Consultant	\$ 11,033.00	\$ 16,090.00	\$ 21,606.00	\$ 71,272.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 125,001.00
Sellinger Associates, Inc.	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 35,000.00	\$ 1,750.00	\$ 76,750.00
Wolf Wineman, Inc.	\$ 3,750.00	\$ 7,500.00	\$ 48,750.00	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 77,000.00
Wilcox Professional Services LLC	\$ 9,344.00	\$ 8,250.00	\$ 15,235.00	\$ 60,938.00	\$ 937.00	\$ 94,704.00
MA Engineering	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 9,000.00	\$ 18,000.00	\$ 37,000.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 66,700.00
MEP Engineers LLC	\$ 3,200.00	\$ 14,400.00	\$ 56,000.00	\$ 9,600.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 85,200.00
Berbiglia Associates, Inc.	\$ 16,000.00	\$ 22,000.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 64,500.00
Engineering Systems Group LLC	\$ 1,950.00	\$ 7,500.00	\$ 20,150.00	\$ 2,350.00	\$ -	\$ 31,950.00

RATE PER PHASE: Calculated using proposal lump sum amount divided by proposal estimated hours

	Pre-Design	Schematic Design	Design Development	Construction Doc/Meeting Attendance
Peter Basso Associates, Inc	\$ 91.00	\$ 91.00	\$ 78.90	\$ 91.00
EAM Engineers, Inc.	\$ 105.00	\$ 117.60	\$ 84.00	\$ 112.50
DiClemente Siegel Design Inc.	\$ 85.00	\$ 85.00	\$ 85.00	\$ 85.01
JE Jacobs/Carter Burgess Consultant	\$ 91.94	\$ 94.65	\$ 93.94	\$ 90.22
Sellinger Associates, Inc.	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00
Wolf Wineman, Inc.	\$ 93.75	\$ 93.75	\$ 87.05	\$ 83.33
Wilcox Professional Services LLC	\$ 133.49	\$ 117.86	\$ 108.82	\$ 107.85
MA Engineering	\$ 100.00	\$ 90.00	\$ 90.00	\$ 87.06
MEP Engineers LLC	\$ 80.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 80.00
Berbiglia Associates, Inc.	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 85.71
Engineering Systems Group LLC	\$ 65.00	\$ 64.99	\$ 65.00	\$ 65.10

Normalized Values: Calculated using rate per phase multiplied by normalized estimated total hours

	Pre-Design	Schematic Design	Design Development	Construction Doc/Meeting Attendance	Reimbursables	Normalized Values
Peter Basso Associates, Inc	\$ 5,742.10	\$ 12,194.00	\$ 24,214.41	\$ 28,082.60	\$ 800.00	\$ 71,033.11
EAM Engineers, Inc.	\$ 6,625.50	\$ 15,758.40	\$ 25,779.60	\$ 34,717.50	\$ -	\$ 82,881.00
DiClemente Siegel Design Inc.	\$ 5,363.50	\$ 11,390.00	\$ 26,086.50	\$ 26,234.09	\$ -	\$ 69,074.09
JE Jacobs/Carter Burgess Consultant	\$ 5,801.41	\$ 12,683.10	\$ 28,830.19	\$ 27,841.89	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 80,156.59
Sellinger Associates, Inc.	\$ 6,310.00	\$ 13,400.00	\$ 30,690.00	\$ 30,860.00	\$ 1,750.00	\$ 83,010.00
Wolf Wineman, Inc.	\$ 5,915.63	\$ 12,562.50	\$ 26,715.65	\$ 25,715.64	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 72,909.41
Wilcox Professional Services LLC	\$ 8,423.22	\$ 15,793.24	\$ 33,396.86	\$ 33,282.51	\$ 937.00	\$ 91,832.83
MA Engineering	\$ 6,310.00	\$ 12,060.00	\$ 27,621.00	\$ 26,866.72	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 74,357.72
MEP Engineers LLC	\$ 5,048.00	\$ 10,720.00	\$ 24,552.00	\$ 24,688.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 67,008.00
Berbiglia Associates, Inc.	\$ 6,310.00	\$ 13,400.00	\$ 30,690.00	\$ 26,450.11	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 79,350.11
Engineering Systems Group LLC	\$ 4,101.50	\$ 8,708.66	\$ 19,948.50	\$ 20,089.86	\$ -	\$ 52,848.52

		Proposal Price- Low Price/Low Price	Final Price Score	Final Weighted Price Score (x .40)	Proposal Score	Total Score
{1-(Proposal price-low price/low price) x 100 =						
Peter Basso Associates, Inc	1-(71,033.11-52,848.52)/52,848.52 x 100 =	0.34	65.59	26	31	57
EAM Engineers, Inc.	1-(82,881.00-52,848.52)/52,848.52 x 100 =	0.57	43.17	17	36	53
DiClemente Siegel Design Inc.	1-(69,074.09-52,848.52)/52,848.52 x 100 =	0.31	69.30	28	35	63
JE Jacobs/Carter Burgess Consultant	1-(80,156.59-52,848.52)/52,848.52 x 100 =	0.52	48.33	19	34	53
Sellinger Associates, Inc.	1-(83,010.00-52,848.52)/52,848.52 x 100 =	0.57	42.93	17	34	51
Wolf Wineman, Inc.	1-(72,909.41-52,848.52)/52,848.52 x 100 =	0.38	62.04	25	33	58
Wilcox Professional Services LLC	1-(91,832.83-52,848.52)/52,848.52 x 100 =	0.74	26.23	10	33	43
MA Engineering	1-(74,357.72-52,848.52)/52,848.52 x 100 =	0.41	59.30	24	31	55
MEP Engineers LLC	1-(67,008.00-52,848.52)/52,848.52 x 100 =	0.27	73.21	29	31	60
Berbiglia Associates, Inc.	1-(79,350.11-52,848.52)/52,848.52 x 100 =	0.50	49.85	20	25	45
Engineering Systems Group LLC	1-(52,848.52-52,848.52)/52,848.52 x 100 =	0.00	100.00	40	22	62

SUMMARY

	Proposal Score	Price Score	Total Score
DiClemente Siegel Design Inc.	35	28	63
Engineering Systems Group LLC	22	40	62
MEP Engineers LLC	31	29	60
Wolf Wineman, Inc.	33	25	58
Peter Basso Associates, Inc	31	26	57
MA Engineering	31	24	55
JE Jacobs/Carter Burgess Consultant	34	19	53
EAM Engineers, Inc.	36	17	53
Sellinger Associates, Inc.	34	17	51
Berbiglia Associates, Inc.	25	20	45
Wilcox Professional Services LLC	33	10	43