District School Board of Pasco County Bid Recommendation

| RFQ Title | Architectural Services for Remodeling Projects & Professional Services Contracts | Number of Vendors Notified | 801 |
|----------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| RFQ Number | 14-038-AZ | Number of Proposals Distributed | 126 |
| Date Solicited | January 30, 2014 | Number of Vendors Proposing | 19 |
| Date Opened | March 5, 2014 | Number of Formal "No Bid" Responses | 0 |
| Date Board Presentation | May 6, 2014 | Funding Source | Capital dollars |
| Total Savings | N/A | Grand Total of Proposal | Cost TBD based on notes below |

Recommendation: Recommend acceptance of Request for Qualifications per the attached tabulation. Per the terms of the RFQ and its Addenda, Holmes Hepner & Assoc., as the highest ranked firm, is recommended for Package #1 (Bayonet Point MS, Pine View MS and Professional Services contract); Rowe Architects Inc., as the second-ranked firm, is recommended for Package #2 (F.K. Marchman, Woodland Elem. and Professional Services contract); Renker, Eich, Parks, as the third-ranked firm, is recommended for Package #3 (R.B. Cox Elem. and Professional Services contract); and FleischmanGarcia Architecture, as the fourth-ranked firm, is recommended for Package #4 (Pasco Elementary and Mary Giella Elementary). Board approval will enable the Construction Services Dept. to negotiate umbrella terms and conditions with all firms in accordance with F.S. 287.055. The current AIA contract will be used as the template, and final negotiated contracts will be brought back to the Board for approval of terms, conditions and pricing.

<u>Term of Contract</u>: The AIA documents for the named school projects, as noted above, will include contract administration, design, and closeout. The Professional Services contracts in Packages #1 - #3 are for projects as needed, with construction budgets estimated under \$2 million; they will have terms of three (3) years, and will be renewable annually at the mutual agreement of the parties.

Notations and Exceptions: An average of the Evaluation Committee's scores (Phase I) produced the following company ranking, in order from highest to lowest: 1) Renker, Eich, Parks; 2) Ranon & Partners; 3) Long & Assoc.; 4) Holmes Hepner & Assoc.; 5) Rowe Architects; 6) Fleischman Garcia; 7) Canerday, Belfsky + Arroyo; 8) Harvard Jolly Inc.; 9) Williamson Dacar Assoc.; 10) RS &H Inc.; 11) Straughn Trout; 12) Wilderarchitecture; 13) Hoffman; 14) Holmes Architects; 15) Shumake; 16) Spring Engineering; 17) Robert P. Resch; 18) Rispoli & Assoc.; 19) Steven E. Hutchins.

Date/Time: April 30, 2014 09:04:00

Notations and Exceptions, continued:

Interviews (Phase II) with the seven (7) highest-ranked companies noted above were conducted on April 10 – 11, 2014. An average of the Evaluation Committee's scores produced the following company ranking, in order from highest to lowest: 1) Holmes Hepner; 2) Rowe Architects; 3) Renker, Eich, Parks; 4) FleischmanGarcia; 5) Ranon & Partners; 6) Cannerday, Belfsky + Arroyo; 7) Long and Associates.

Per the terms of the RFQ and F.S. 287.055, we recommend a firm for each Package, with two (2) firms short-listed. Negotiations for the named school projects will be held with the highest-ranked firm; we are requesting approval to negotiate, in turn, with firms ranked second and third, should negotiations with the highest-ranked firm fail to produce an acceptable contract on a timely basis.

Package #1: Holmes Hepner; Rowe Architects; Renker, Eich Parks Package #2: Rowe Architects; Renker, Eich, Parks; FleischmanGarcia Package #3: Renker, Eich, Parks; FleischmanGarcia; Holmes Hepner Package #4: FleischmanGarcia, Holmes Hepner, Rowe Architects

For the Professional Services contracts, the firms ranked 1^{st} , 2^{nd} and 3^{rd} in Phase II will be used in rotational order, beginning with the highest-ranked firm.

Offers from other vendors listed herein are the only offers received per the specified opening date and time. All other offers submitted in response to this solicitation, if any, are hereby rejected as late.

Proposals Evaluated By:

Alison Crumbley, Board Chair
Bill Hemphill, Project Coordinator, Construction Services
George Iwan, Penny for Pasco Committee
Carey Llazari, Project Coordinator, Construction Services
Joe Scudiero, Chief Building Official, Construction Services
Richard Tonello, Supervisor for Planning Services

John Petrashek, Director for Construction Services & Code Compliance, served as the non-voting Chair of the Committee.

Proposal Prepared By:

Arlene S. Zimney, CPPB, C.P.M., Buying Manager

Reviewed and Authorized By:

Nicole Westmoreland, MBA, Purchasing Agent Nicole Westmorland

DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD OF PASCO COUNTY RFQ TABULATION

| Date of Opening: March 5, 2014 @ 1:30 pm | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|--------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Proposal Title: Architectural Services for Remodeling Projects and Professional Services Contracts RFQ 14-038-AZ | 320 | Architecture 324 Hyde Park Ave., Ste 300 | Ste 515 | Hoffman Architects/Edward C. Hoffman, Jr. 29 West Orange St. | HolmesArchitects 18395 Gulf Blvd., Ste 103 | Holmes Hepner & Associates 601 S. Blvd., Suite 101 | Steven E. Hutchins Architects, Inc. 9143 Philips Hwy, Ste 140 |
| **BOARD MEETING MAY 6, 2014** | St. Petersburg, FL 33701 | Tampa, FL 33606 | Tampa, FL 33609 | Tarpon Springs, FL 34689 | 33785 | Tampa, FL 33606 | Jacksonville, FL 32256 |
| PHASE I SCORES: TO DETERMINE INTERVIEWS | 12 00701 | 00000 | 00000 | 04000 | 00700 | 00000 | 1 2 02200 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Federal Standard Form 330, with modifications (max. 45 pts.) | 38.00 | 35.60 | 34.60 | 33.00 | 34.80 | 35.80 | 19.60 |
| Answers to District quesitons (max. 30 pts.) | 24.80 | 24.00 | 23.00 | | | | 14.60 |
| References (max. 15 pts.) | 12.80 | 14.80 | 14.60 | | | | 14.80 |
| Office location (max. 5 pts.) | 3.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 3.00 | 5.00 | 0.00 |
| M/WBE certification status (max. 5 pts.) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5.00 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | | | |
| <u>TOTAL (max. 100 pts.)</u> | 78.60 | 79.40 | 77.20 | 73.00 | 72.20 | 84.00 | 49.00 |
| Banking to Batanging Internious | - | _ | | 40 | 44 | | 40 |
| Ranking to Determine Interviews | | 6 | 8 | 13 | 14 | 4 | 19 |
| PHASE II SCORES (INTERVIEWS): TO DETERMINE BOARD | | | | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Preparation for presentation (max. 10 pts.) | 8.60 | 9.00 | | | | 10.00 | |
| Philosophy and approach to planning (max. 10 pts.) | 8.80 | 9.00 | | | | 10.00 | |
| Key decision-makers (max. 10 pts.) | 9.00 | 9.60 | | | | 10.00 | |
| Clear and concise presentation (max. 10 pts.) | 8.60 | 9.20 | | | | 10.00 | |
| Thorough answers to questions (max. 10 pts.) | 8.80 | 9.40 | | _ | | 9.60 | |
| Personnel (max. 10 pts.) | 8.80 | 9.40 | | | | 9.80 | |
| Approach to budget issues (max. 10 pts.) | 9.00 | 8.80 | | | | 9.80 | |
| Contract administration (max. 10 pts.) | 8.80 | 8.80 | | | | 9.80 | |
| Experience on occupied campus (max. 10 pts.) | 8.60 | 9.40 | | | | 9.60 | |
| Overall impression of qualifications (max. 10 pts.) | 9.00 | 9.20 | | | | 9.70 | |
| TOTAL FOR INCIDENCE / | | 21.77 | | | | 22.22 | |
| TOTAL FOR INTERVIEWS (max. 100 pts.) | 88.00 | 91.80 | | | | 98.30 | |
| Ranking to Determine Board Recommendation | 6 | 4 | | | | 1 | |
| ranking to betermine board recommendation | U | 4 | | | | | |

DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD OF PASCO COUNTY RFQ TABULATION

| Date of Opening: March 5, 2014 @ 1:30 pm | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|
| Proposal Title: Architectural Services for Remodeling Projects and Professional Services Contracts | Long & Associates Architects/ Engineers, Inc. 4525 S. | Ranon & Partners, Inc., Architects | Renker Eich Parks Architects | Robert P. Resch, III, Architect | Rispoli & Associates Architecture, Inc. | Rowe Architects Incorporated | R S & H, Inc. 1715 N. |
| RFQ 14-038-AZ | Manhattan Ave. | 515 West Bay St., Ste 200 | | 647 Douglas Ave. | 114 S. Magnolia Ave. | 100 Madison St., Ste 200 | Westshore Blvd., Ste 500 |
| **BOARD MEETING MAY 6, 2014** | Tampa, FL 33611 | Tampa, FL 33606 | St. Petersburg, FL 33704 | Dunedin, FL 34698 | Ocala, FL 34471 | Tampa, FL 33602 | Tampa, FL 33607 |
| PHASE I SCORES: TO DETERMINE INTERVIEWS | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Federal Standard Form 330, with modifications (max. 45 pts.) | 38.60 | + | 41.40 | 26.60 | | | 34.60 |
| Answers to District quesitons (max. 30 pts.) | 26.00 | + | 25.20 | 14.20 | | | 21.60 |
| References (max. 15 pts.) | 14.60 | 14.20 | 14.40 | 14.80 | | | 14.70 |
| Office location (max. 5 pts.) | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | | | 5.00 |
| M/WBE certification status (max. 5 pts.) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| <u>TOTAL (max. 100 pts.)</u> | 84.20 | 85.00 | 86.00 | 60.60 | 56.80 | 81.60 | 75.90 |
| Ranking to Determine Interviews | 3 | 2 | 1 | 17 | 18 | 5 | 10 |
| | | | | | | | |
| PHASE II SCORES (INTERVIEWS): TO DETERMINE BOARD RECOMMENDATION | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Preparation for presentation (max. 10 pts.) | 8 60 | 9.00 | 9.00 | | | 9.20 | |
| Preparation for presentation (max. 10 pts.) Philosophy and approach to planning (max. 10 pts.) | 8.60 8.70 | | | | | 9.20 9.40 | |
| Philosophy and approach to planning (max. 10 pts.) | 8.70 | 8.80 | 9.40 | | | 9.40 | |
| Philosophy and approach to planning (max. 10 pts.) Key decision-makers (max. 10 pts.) | 8.70 8.60 | 8.80 8.70 | 9.40 9.40 | | | 9.40 9.60 | |
| Philosophy and approach to planning (max. 10 pts.) Key decision-makers (max. 10 pts.) Clear and concise presentation (max. 10 pts.) | 8.70 | 8.80 8.70 9.00 | 9.40 9.40 9.40 | | | 9.40 | |
| Philosophy and approach to planning (max. 10 pts.) Key decision-makers (max. 10 pts.) Clear and concise presentation (max. 10 pts.) Thorough answers to questions (max. 10 pts.) | 8.70 8.60 8.40 8.80 | 8.80 8.70 9.00 9.00 | 9.40 9.40 9.40 9.40 | | | 9.40 9.60 9.40 8.60 | |
| Philosophy and approach to planning (max. 10 pts.) Key decision-makers (max. 10 pts.) Clear and concise presentation (max. 10 pts.) Thorough answers to questions (max. 10 pts.) Personnel (max. 10 pts.) | 8.70 8.60 8.40 | 8.80 8.70 9.00 9.00 9.00 | 9.40 9.40 9.40 9.40 9.00 | | | 9.40 9.60 9.40 | |
| Philosophy and approach to planning (max. 10 pts.) Key decision-makers (max. 10 pts.) Clear and concise presentation (max. 10 pts.) Thorough answers to questions (max. 10 pts.) | 8.70 8.60 8.40 8.80 8.60 | 8.80 8.70 9.00 9.00 9.00 8.60 | 9.40 9.40 9.40 9.40 9.00 | | | 9.40 9.60 9.40 8.60 9.60 | |
| Philosophy and approach to planning (max. 10 pts.) Key decision-makers (max. 10 pts.) Clear and concise presentation (max. 10 pts.) Thorough answers to questions (max. 10 pts.) Personnel (max. 10 pts.) Approach to budget issues (max. 10 pts.) | 8.70 8.60 8.40 8.80 8.60 8.80 | 8.80 8.70 9.00 9.00 9.00 8.60 8.60 | 9.40 9.40 9.40 9.40 9.00 9.00 | | | 9.40 9.60 9.40 8.60 9.60 9.40 | |
| Philosophy and approach to planning (max. 10 pts.) Key decision-makers (max. 10 pts.) Clear and concise presentation (max. 10 pts.) Thorough answers to questions (max. 10 pts.) Personnel (max. 10 pts.) Approach to budget issues (max. 10 pts.) Contract administration (max. 10 pts.) | 8.70 8.60 8.40 8.80 8.60 8.80 | 8.80 8.70 9.00 9.00 9.00 8.60 8.60 | 9.40 9.40 9.40 9.40 9.00 9.00 9.20 9.20 | | | 9.40 9.60 9.40 8.60 9.60 9.40 | |
| Philosophy and approach to planning (max. 10 pts.) Key decision-makers (max. 10 pts.) Clear and concise presentation (max. 10 pts.) Thorough answers to questions (max. 10 pts.) Personnel (max. 10 pts.) Approach to budget issues (max. 10 pts.) Contract administration (max. 10 pts.) Experience on occupied campus (max. 10 pts.) | 8.70 8.60 8.40 8.80 8.60 8.60 9.00 | 8.80 8.70 9.00 9.00 9.00 8.60 8.80 9.00 | 9.40 9.40 9.40 9.40 9.00 9.00 9.20 9.20 9.00 | | | 9.40 9.60 9.40 8.60 9.60 9.40 9.60 9.40 | |
| Philosophy and approach to planning (max. 10 pts.) Key decision-makers (max. 10 pts.) Clear and concise presentation (max. 10 pts.) Thorough answers to questions (max. 10 pts.) Personnel (max. 10 pts.) Approach to budget issues (max. 10 pts.) Contract administration (max. 10 pts.) Experience on occupied campus (max. 10 pts.) Overall impression of qualifications (max. 10 pts.) | 8.70 8.60 8.40 8.80 8.60 8.60 9.00 8.60 | 8.80 8.70 9.00 9.00 9.00 8.60 8.80 9.00 | 9.40 9.40 9.40 9.40 9.00 9.00 9.20 9.20 9.20 | | | 9.40 9.60 9.40 8.60 9.60 9.40 9.40 9.40 | |

DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD OF PASCO COUNTY RFQ TABULATION

| Date of Opening: March 5, 2014 @ 1:30 pm | T | | 1 | | |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Proposal Title: Architectural Services for Remodeling Projects | Shumake Architecture. | Spring Engineering, | Stroughn Trout | Wilderarchitecture, | Williamson Dacar Associates. |
| and Professional Services Contracts | PA | Inc. | Architects, LLC | | Inc. |
| RFQ 14-038-AZ | 2907 W. Bay to Bay Blvd. | 3014 U.S. Hwy 19 | 2005 East Edgewood Dr. | 1517 E. Seventh Ave., Ste C | 1535 Dale Mabry Hwy., Ste 201 |
| **BOARD MEETING MAY 6, 2014** | Tampa, FL 33629 | Holiday, FL 34691 | Lakeland, FL 33803 | Tampa, FL 33605 | Lutz, FL 33548 |
| PHASE I SCORES: TO DETERMINE INTERVIEWS | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Federal Standard Form 330, with modifications (max. 45 pts.) | 29.80 | 29.20 | 36.20 | 31.80 | 34.00 |
| Answers to District quesitons (max. 30 pts.) | 20.60 | 18.80 | 24.40 | 21.80 | 22.20 |
| References (max. 15 pts.) | 15.00 | | 14.00 | | |
| Office location (max. 5 pts.) | 5.00 | 5.00 | 0.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 |
| M/WBE certification status (max. 5 pts.) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | |
| <u>TOTAL (max. 100 pts.)</u> | 70.40 | 68.00 | 74.60 | 73.20 | 76.00 |
| Ranking to Determine Interviews | 15 | 16 | 11 | 12 | 9 |
| PHASE II SCORES (INTERVIEWS): TO DETERMINE BOARD | | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | · | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION | | | | | |
| Preparation for presentation (max. 10 pts.) | | | | | |
| Philosophy and approach to planning (max. 10 pts.) | | | | | |
| Key decision-makers (max. 10 pts.) | | | | | |
| Clear and concise presentation (max. 10 pts.) | | | | | |
| Thorough answers to questions (max. 10 pts.) | | | | | |
| Personnel (max. 10 pts.) | | | | | |
| Approach to budget issues (max. 10 pts.) | | | | | |
| Contract administration (max. 10 pts.) | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Experience on occupied campus (max. 10 pts.) | | | | | |
| Experience on occupied campus (max. 10 pts.) Overall impression of qualifications (max. 10 pts.) | | | | | |
| Overall impression of qualifications (max. 10 pts.) | • | | | | |
| <u> </u> | | | | | |