

**State College Area School District
Office of Physical Plant
Ed Poprik, Director**

To: Board of School Directors

From: Ed Poprik

RE: **Memorial Field, Design Professional**

Date: February 8, 2010

Recommend that the Board of School Directors identify the team of Palumbo Skibinski Crawford as the preferred choice for design professional of the Memorial Field Design Project. Further recommend that the Board authorize the Administration to negotiate a fee and a draft contract for Board consideration at a future meeting.

Background:

Based on previous Board discussion and direction, the CAC for Facilities has completed a public presentation and interview process with the following 4, previously short-listed, firms:

HKS, Inc.
Palumbo Skibinski Crawford
Agoos-Lovera
Hoffman/Populous

A previously documented process had identified the above firms to be short-listed as finalists and recommended that they receive a Request for Proposal (attached).

Interviews:

On January 28, 2010, each group participated in a 40-minute interview. These presentations were open to the public and taped for broadcast by C-Net. Present for these interviews were the following representatives:

Blair Malcom (Chair - CAC for Facilities)
Alan Popovich (CAC for Facilities)
Paul Heasley (CAC for Facilities)
Roy Schaeffer (CAC for Facilities)
Marc McMaster (CAC for Facilities)
Marianne Kuhns (CAC for Facilities)
Ron Pavlechko (Athletic Director)
Jeff Ammerman (Business Administrator)
Ed Poprik (Director of Physical Plant)

Also invited and present for the interviews was:

Mark Whitfield (State College Borough)

Each firm was asked to have the members of their team who will be mostly closely tied to the project deliver a 20 minute presentation, which included, at a minimum, one completed project that best illustrated their ability to successfully complete our project. Each presentation was followed by 5 questions from the interview team.

Deliberations:

Prior to the interviews, the committee reviewed and evaluated the RFQ and RFP responses from each firm. Utilizing the criteria established in these documents (listed below), and supplementing that with the information garnered at the interview, the team met to develop a recommendation.

- Strength of Project Team
- Similar Projects completed
- Approach to and knowledge of alternate funding
- Understanding of our Project
- Initial approach to our Project
- Proposed Calendar and fee

At the end of the discussion, the committee unanimously agreed to recommend the team of Palumbo Skibinski Crawford. The committee also recommended that, considering the potential variations in scope, the Board should authorize the Administration to further negotiate a fee. The committee felt that perhaps a reduced scope and fee could be established for an initial phase that would further define the project prior to the final design phase.

(Each of the Proposals is available for review on-line at the CAC for Facilities page and a summary is attached.)

During the discussion, the committee members offered the following as the perceived strengths for Palumbo Skibinski Crawford:

- The team had an excellent understanding of the difficult issues associated with the project.
- Through the Franklin Field example they demonstrated an excellent history of research on previous projects and had already begun to complete good initial research in preparation for our project.
- Their initial thoughts on the project showed sensitivity to the historic integrity of Memorial Field.
- The team had an excellent grasp of the phasing issues that would be involved with implementing this project.
- They showed experience and knowledge related to alternate funding sources.
- The team members were excellent communicators and demonstrated a plan that would involve all stakeholders in the development process.

Request for Proposals - Design Services

**State College Area School District
December 21, 2009**

Provide the information to the school district by responding to the following points, in the order stated below. Provide three (3) hard copies of the submitted materials, along with an electronic copy (as a single PDF file and limit the size of that file to 15 MB maximum). The deadline for submission is 4:00 PM on January 15, 2010.

A Program/Scope Statement is attached.

Request for Proposal:

1) Fee: All fees will be stated as “fixed fees” rather than percentages. The district plans on utilizing AIA document B141/Cma as a basis for the final, negotiated contract. Included with the fixed fees should be all costs associated with the necessary local, regional and state approval processes. All fees should include reimbursable expenses as needed for the base services specified.

Phase 1- Schematic Design

Develop a single, best, solution to the attached program/scope for Memorial Field. Included, as part of this phase, will be the following:

- Meetings with the Borough of State College (staff and elected officials as needed) to determine the feasibility of encroaching on, or shared use of, adjacent lands as part of the project
- Meetings with the State College Area School District Board of School Directors and CAC for Facilities to clarify project goals and provide interim guidance on early decision points
- At least one “at-large” community meeting to seek feedback on the project
- Evaluation of storm water issues and preliminary design solutions

RFP-State College Area School District, 12/21/09

-Completion of a traffic impact study and inclusion of any findings in the final design (as required by State College Borough)

Deliverables for this phase shall include at a minimum:

-Schematic Design site plan

-Identify location of restrooms, locker rooms and concession facilities and develop plans to a schematic design level

-Both elevations and renderings of the completed plan

-3-year phasing plan if project were to be completed in multiple phases

-Estimate of probable cost for each phase, as well as probable cost if the project were to be completed as a whole

Fee for Phase 1: _____.

Phase 2- Design Development through Project Execution

After completion of Phase 1, the Board may choose one of several options (reserving the right to not proceed, or proceed with an option not outlined below). If authorized to proceed with one of the suggested options below, please offer your additional fixed fee for each option. (Fees for 2A and 2B will be independent and exclusive of each other).

Phase 2A – Memorial Field Project

Provide a complete design and bid documents for the final Memorial Field project. This project will likely be a phased project. For the purpose of projecting a fee, assume 3 roughly equal phases; each 1 year apart. This price will also include project management and close out services (with the architect not acting as the construction manager).

Fee for Phase 2A:_____.

RFP-State College Area School District, 12/21/09

Phase 2B – West bleacher repair project

Within the scope of the final, approved schematic design, provide bid documents to complete the West Bleacher portion of the Memorial Field project. This price will also include project management and close out services (with the architect not acting as the construction manager).

Fee for Phase 2B:_____.

- 2) Please list the number of meetings included in the above price and the cost for any additional meetings.
- 3) List any additional services or costs that could be incurred, including reimbursable expenses and include a fee schedule. (all indirect costs will be billed 1X, that is, no mark-up).
- 4) Please demonstrate your understanding of the projects by restating the objectives, offering your proposed strategies for development, detailing your insights into the nature of any issues and potential solutions, including the integration of sustainability.
- 5) Please offer a projected timeline and development calendar. Include your preliminary thoughts on the stakeholders in the process and integrate appropriate meetings with those groups into the proposed calendar.
- 6) Identify the approximate percentage of responsibility each team member (or consultant) will have towards the final product (these percentages will total 100%). Additionally, the percentage of time each team member will devote to this project through the course of development (this number will range from 0 to 100% for each team member).

	Concept	Phase 1	Phase 2A	Phase 2B	Total	Reimbursable
HKS					\$507,000	extra
Hoffman (4,000 seats)	\$200,000	\$326,000	\$1,642,000	\$405,000		included
Hoffman (6,000 seats)	\$200,000	\$400,800	\$1,938,300	\$405,000		included
Skibinski (low)		\$140,250	\$565,000	\$191,250		extra
Skibinski (high)		\$173,250	\$701,000	\$242,250		extra
Agoos Lovera		\$438,810	\$574,670	\$167,000		3 - 5%

HKS- proposal was non-complaint with the requirements of the RFP

Hoffman did not include storm water design and traffic in their fees (would be extra).
Hoffman proposed a concept fee to better define scope, which would be refunded if employed through 2A.

Agoos Lovera fees include storm water design concept but not final engineering.

This analysis was prepared as an opinion by Ed Poprik, all reviewers are asked to study the RFP responses thoroughly.