



**GOVERNING BOARD AGENDA ITEM
AMPHITHEATER UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 10**

DATE OF MEETING: December 4, 2012

TITLE: Approval of Bond-Related Projects

- 1) Award of Contract for Architectural Services for a Professional Development Center Based on Responses to Request for Qualifications 12-0021**
-

BACKGROUND:

A notice of Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for Professional Architectural Services was posted to the District's web site pursuant to the requirements of Arizona Administrative Code R 7-2-1118. Architectural services vendors registered with the Purchasing Department were also notified of the posting via email correspondence.

This RFQ asked for statements of qualifications from interested architectural firms to provide professional architectural services for design, drawings, specifications, code & ADA compliance review, budget and scheduling for facility improvements at Wetmore Center as identified in the May 2007 Blue Ribbon Budget Analysis and Facilities Needs Committee Report. The scope of work included construction of a professional development learning center and renovation of existing office facilities to support the demolition of portable buildings.

Ten vendors responded. The evaluation team ranked each vendor based on the evaluation criteria listed in the request for qualifications. The four highest ranked vendors were scheduled to meet with the evaluation team for discussions. The top ranked vendor after discussions was asked to provide certified cost and pricing data for the proposed work.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Administration recommends that the Governing Board make the determination that the vendor's compensation for the services provided is both fair and reasonable and award a contract to Burns Wald-Hopkins Shambach Architect (BWS) based on their response to RFQ 12-0021.

INITIATED BY:

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Scott Little".

Scott Little, Chief Financial Officer

Date: November 26, 2012

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Patrick Nelson".

Patrick Nelson, Superintendent

Evaluation Phase #1:

The evaluation team, Chris Louth, Bond Projects Manager, Monica Nelson, Associate Superintendent, Roseanne Lopez, Executive Director Elementary Education, Cathy Eiting, Executive Director Student Services & Special Education & Mike Bejarano, Executive Director Secondary Education reviewed each vendor's response. The evaluation criteria in order of importance were:

1. Professional background & caliber of previous experience of each professional staff person with a focus on the design and renovation of existing office facilities to include new construction, LEED Green Building Certification, etc.
2. The firm's demonstrated record of performance, design and renovation of office facilities to include new construction on occupied sites utilizing a CM at-R alternate construction project delivery method.
3. Control of costs, ability to meet schedules, quality of work, etc. The District reserves the right to conduct independent vendor evaluations based on site visits, reference checks and user acceptance.
4. Creativity of the firm in their design solutions.
5. Other criteria, excluding cost, desired by the District to include responsiveness of the vendor in meeting the requirements of the RFQ.

The ten (10) vendors evaluated were William Ford Architect, Breckenridge Group, Lizard Rock Designs, L2 Architecture, EMC2, WSM, BWS, Krebs Carhuff, Sakellar Associates and Scott Rumel.

The four highest ranked vendors selected for discussions were the Breckenridge Group, BWS, WSM and EMC2. Each vendor was provided a meeting agenda with discussion points covering different aspects of the scope of work at Wetmore Center.

Evaluation Phase #2, Meeting Agenda Discussion Points:

1. Show recent similar examples of designs your firm has worked on, remodels and/or additions to educational office/administration spaces. Demonstrate how your present day designs of these facilities aesthetically are tied into existing architectural settings.
2. Provide examples of designs your firm has developed for multi use or flexible use office/administration space.
3. In an educational setting, 21st Century Technology is critical for use as a teaching tool for students as well as for staff members. Show recent similar examples of sites your firm has designed that provide 21st Century Technology and its application as a teaching tool and for professional development.
4. Using recent similar examples show how your firm develops designs of facilities which are not only attractive but are functional for end users and sustainable.

Evaluation Team Questions:

The evaluation team ranked each vendor based on their response to the discussion points. BWS was rated first followed by EMC2, WSM and the Breckenridge Group.

Robin Shambach, the designated Project Architect, Frank Slingerland, the Design Architect and Marty Klell, Architect covered two BWS projects, renovation of the Pima College Integrated Learning Center and the Northern Arizona University Extended Campus Center, a LEED Gold facility.

At Pima College they researched student learning techniques for integration into the former library only space to include library stacks, a computer commons, moveable furniture, quiet rooms, public space, dual front classrooms and natural lighting. The Northern Arizona University facility houses an Emergency Readiness Center requiring 24/7 operation during construction. The center successfully remained operational.

The BWS Team stated, "we work around costly problems, something we do all the time". They provided many examples, designing flexible office and administrative spaces for both the Sahuarita & Marana Municipal Centers, the Coolidge Civic Complex, the Herbert K. Abrams Public Health Administration Building and the San Xavier Mission Office Complex. All flexible work spaces easily reformatted as occupancy requirements change. For each project BWS completes a post occupancy evaluation to assess their design functionality once construction is complete.

Evaluation Point #3

The Arizona Administrative Code Title 7 Chapter 2 governs the procurement process for specified professional services which includes Architects. R7-2-1122 defines the final evaluation criteria, Fee Negotiation, in the selection of a professional service provider. The Code requires the fee charged to be both fair and reasonable to the school district taking into account the estimated value, scope, complexity and nature of the required services. R7-2-1079 requires an analysis of the fee proposed to determine if the fee is reasonable and fair.

BWS provided the evaluation team with a State of Arizona School Facilities Board Architectural Fee Schedule adopted January 7, 1999 and modified September 2, 1999 covering four categories (groups) of school construction and the associated architectural fees, ('Attachment A').

The BWS fee will be a percentage of the guaranteed maximum price using the Arizona School Facilities Board (SFB) Architectural Fee Guidelines referenced above. The BWS fee schedule is based on Group A, (More Than Average Complexity Projects) to include libraries, special purpose classrooms, etc. Please see 'Attachment B' the BWS fee proposal for the new construction and major renovations to Wetmore Center.

Chris Louth, Amphitheater Bond Projects Department Manager, has reviewed the fee schedule provided by BWS and has determined it to be fair and reasonable. A notarized BWS (certified) fee schedule signed by an officer of the company is on file in the Purchasing Department.

'Attachment A'

SCHOOL FACILITIES BOARD

Adopted: January 7, 1999

Modified: September 2, 1999
Certified Correct: November 13, 2000

ARCHITECTURAL FEE GUIDELINES

These guidelines are to be used to determine the Lump Sum Architectural & Engineering (A&E) fees for "Basic Services" for all SFB projects, including both New Construction and Deficiency Correction projects. **** These are guidelines, not a schedule ****.

The A&E fee for an individual project should be determined by both the difficulty and the estimated cost of the project. In New Construction projects, the fee should be determined by the square foot times the formula cost of the planned facility or project (Construction Cost) multiplied by a factor determined by the size and complexity of the scope of the project. See below both "Project Types" (to determine the difficulty of the project) and the "Fee Guidelines Multiplier" (for the percentage multiplier) to determine the project's fee.

Basic Services: The architectural contract should identify and include all of the services necessary to design and construct the project under "Basic Services" without any hidden or unknown cost. The services to be included as part of the contract as "Basic Services" shall consist of architectural, structural, mechanical, electrical, civil, and landscape design. The descriptions of these services are described in the American Institute of Architect (A.I.A). Document B141, "Standard Form of Agreement Between Owner and Architect (1987 Edition)", Article 2, and Add, Modified and/or Delete paragraphs 2.6.5, 2.6.5.1, 2.6.15.1, 3.2, 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.3.1.2, 3.3.1.3, 3.3.3, 3.3.4, 3.3.6, 3.3.9, 3.4.1, 3.4.4, 3.4.9, 4.6.1, 4.6.1.1, 5.2.2, 5.2.3, 8.6, 8.7.1, 8.7.2, 8.7.3, 10.2.1.1, 10.2.1.2, 10.2.1.4, 10.2.1.6

(Please REFER TO the SFB provided ENCLOSED SAMPLE DOCUMENT).

Lump Sum Fee: This is a fixed A&E fee that is based on a percentage of the estimated cost of construction for the approved project specified for a defined scope of work.

Construction Cost: The cost of construction includes the cost of the construction of the building, site improvements, and all fixed and installed equipment. It does not include Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment (FF&E), testing, surveys, permits, land cost, studies, contingencies, or A&E fees.

PROJECT TYPES:

Group A - MORE THAN AVERAGE COMPLEXITY PROJECTS: New complex stand-alone facilities such as special purpose classrooms, laboratory classrooms, libraries, auditoriums, and food service facilities.

Group B - AVERAGE COMPLEXITY PROJECTS: Total facilities such as new elementary schools, middle schools, high schools, or large additions to existing facilities.

Group C - LESS THAN AVERAGE COMPLEXITY PROJECTS: New less complex stand-alone facilities such as warehouses, maintenance facilities, bus barns, offices, and storage facilities or any repetitive design use of a facility.

Group D - REPAIRS AND RENOVATIONS: Miscellaneous repairs and renovations, alterations to facilities, code corrective work or upgrades, system replacements, etc.

ARCHITECTURAL FEE GUIDELINES
Page 2

Fee Guideline Multiplier:

Construction Cost:	Group A	Group B	Group C	Group D
\$ 0 to \$ 100,000	8.8%	7.9%	7.2%	8.9%
\$ 100,000 to \$ 400,000	7.8% - 8.8%	7.2% - 7.9%	6.6% - 7.2%	8.3% - 8.9%
\$ 400,000 to \$ 1,000,000	7.2% - 7.8%	6.7% - 7.2%	6.2% - 6.6%	7.8% - 8.3%
\$ 1,000,000 to \$ 4,000,000	6.3% - 7.2%	6.0% - 6.7%	5.7% - 6.2%	7.2% - 7.8%
\$ 4,000,000 to \$10,000,000	6.0% - 6.3%	5.5% - 6.0%	5.3% - 5.7%	6.8% - 7.2%
\$10,000,000 to \$20,000,000	5.5% - 6.0%	5.5% - 6.0%	5.0% - 5.3%	5.7% - 6.8%
\$20,000,000 and above	5.5% - 6.0%	5.5% - 6.0%	4.3% to 5.0%	Up to 6.0%

FEE FORMULA:

Estimated Construction Cost _____ x Multiplier _____ % = Fee

Notes:

The higher the Construction Cost in each range, the multiplier percentage should be proportionally lower.

Districts in remote areas and/or with high cost per square foot should not use a higher multiplier percentage than normal. The increased cost per square foot difference automatically increases the fee to cover the additional cost of travel. Since most of the architects' offices and their consultants are in urban areas, the cost to design and produce the contract documents would be the same as if the project were in the same city. See example below for a 750 student elementary school.

<p>City:</p> <p>750 x 95 S.F/ student. = 71,250 S.F.</p> <p>71,250 S.F. x \$85 / S.F. = \$6,056,250</p> <p>\$6,056,250 x 5.7% = \$345,206 = Fee</p>	<p>Rural:</p> <p>750 x 95 S.F/ student. = 71,250 S.F.</p> <p>71,250 S.F. x \$125 / S.F. = \$8,906,250</p> <p>\$8,906,250 x 5.6% = \$498,750 = Fee</p>
---	---

'Attachment B'

November 21, 2012

Pete Burgard, Purchasing Manager
Amphitheater Public Schools
1001 W. Roger Road
Tucson, AZ 85705

RE: Architectural Services - Facility Improvement Wetmore Administrative Center
Architectural Services RFQ #12-0021

Dear Pete,

BWS Architects is pleased to submit this fee proposal for architectural services for the above noted project.

Scope:

We understand the proposed scope of this project to be new construction and renovations at Wetmore Administrative Center as described in the RFQ and as follows:

The work required at the district's administrative center will include major renovation to professional staff office facilities, restroom upgrades and new construction; a Professional Development Center for the inner courtyard of the former school. The project will be phased.

The first phase is the renovation of current work areas, the professional staff offices with the second phase to follow within six to eighteen months; the construction of the Professional Development Building. We understand the actual scope will be determined or confirmed in the programming phase and during site investigation phase. We also understand this will be a phased construction project due to the need to maintain the operation of the existing campus during construction. As such the construction period may be extended beyond what is typical for a project of this magnitude. We understand the construction budget for the project has been established as \$2 million.

Services:

Basic services will consist of architectural, structural, mechanical, plumbing and electrical design and engineering for all phases of document preparation and construction as defined by the Amphitheater Unified School District No. 10 Owner – Architect Agreement Paragraph 5, as distributed with the RFQ. Our fee includes regular meetings during the design, document prep at your office or the project site and weekly meetings during the construction administration phase at the site.

Fee:

Our fee for the work outlined above will be a percentage of the guaranteed maximum price and /or final estimate of probable cost using the Arizona School Facility Boards Architectural Fee Guidelines. BWS Architects is agreeable to working on fixed lump sum fee when the budget and scope are correctly identified at the beginning of the project.

Fee for Amphitheater Public Schools:	
\$2,000,000 X 0.070 (Group A) =	\$140,000
Site electrical service	\$ 12,200
Telecommunications Design	\$ 15,240
Site Survey Update	\$ 5,000
Total	\$ 172,440

Additional Services:

Our basic services do not include the following which, if required, will be considered additional services:

1. Offsite civil design or engineering
2. Full Site Survey. We understand a full survey was completed approximately three years ago. We have included additional localized survey work to provide additional detail which may be required for siting the new construction. This will be used on as as-needed basis.
3. Preparation of easements, dedications, or civil reports.
4. Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans
5. Design services caused by scope changes or extensive value engineering changes after the completion of documents
6. Emergency Generator Design and Documentation
7. Preparation of code variances
8. Preparation of Record Drawings

Additional Services will be proposed on a per task basis and submitted for approval prior to performing the services. Where applicable they will be performed on an hourly basis at our standard 2012 billing rate.

Reimbursable Costs:

Our basic services do not include the following services which typically are the responsibility of the Owner to provide or procure. These services, if provided through BWS Architects will be considered reimbursable at cost plus 10%:

1. Printing and reproduction of Owner review sets, bid sets, presentation and submittal sets.
2. Plan review or permit fees
3. Special Inspections
4. Materials Testing
5. Geotechnical Report
6. Environmental Reports
7. Topographical and ALTA Surveys
8. Localized Underground Potholing

All work will be billed monthly based on the percentage of completion. We will begin work immediately upon receipt of a purchase order or a signed contract. BWS Architects carries \$2,000,000 E&O Insurance Policy. A Certificate of Insurance will be forwarded showing standard coverage.

We look forward to working with you on this important project. Please feel free to call if there are any comments or concerns regarding our proposal. I would be happy to discuss this proposal further.
Sincerely,

BWS Architects



Robin Shambach AIA
Principal/Project Manager

Cc: Chris Louth, APS

November 26, 2012

Pete Burgard, Purchasing Manager
Amphitheater Public Schools
1001 W. Roger Road
Tucson, AZ 85705

RE: Architectural Services - Facility Improvement Wetmore Administrative Center
Architectural Services RFQ #12-0021
Hourly Rates

BWS Architects:	
Principal	\$130/hour
Project Designer	\$110/hour
Project Architect	\$90/hour
Spec writer/LEED	\$85/hour
Architectural Drafter	\$60/hour
Administrative support	\$55/hour

Sincerely,
BWS Architects

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robin Shambach". The signature is fluid and cursive, written over a white background.

Robin Shambach AIA LEED AP
Principal