



**Cherokee County, Georgia
Agenda Request**

Item#: 12.5.

SUBJECT:

**Selection of Architectural & Engineering Firm for Adult Detention
Center Expansion.**

MEETING DATE:

7/10/2018

SUBMITTED BY:

Dale Jordan, Director of Procurement and Risk Management

COMMISSION ACTION REQUESTED:

Consider approval of the County's standard professional services agreement to Studio 8 Design for architectural and engineering services associated with the renovation and expansion of the Adult Detention Center in the amount of \$1,590,000.

FACTS AND ISSUES:

The selection of Studio 8 was made following a two-step procurement process. First, a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) was issued in January 2018 to evaluate architectural and engineering firms based on their stability, experience, references, and project approach in designing jails. Seven (7) architectural firms responded. The top four (4) firms were selected for an interview and all were determined qualified to participate in the Request for Proposals (RFP) phase of the selection process. The total RFQ scoring is provided below:

Firm	Evaluation Score	Interview Score	RFQ Total Score
Studio 8 Design	90.7	48.2	138.9
Pieper O'Brien Herr	92.6	38.7	131.3
Jericho Design Group	86.7	41.3	128.1 (rounded)
Wakefield Beasley	80.6	41.4	122.0
Rosser International	77.1	N/A	
Clemons Rutherford	76.9	N/A	
McCall Architecture	65.1	N/A	

The second phase was the issuance of a Request for Proposals to the four qualifying firms on 01 May 2018. The requirements for the RFP were adjusted from those originally included in the RFQ. Evaluation scores were totaled and proposals were discussed on 19 June by the Committee and resulted in the selection of Studio 8 Design. Total scores from the RFQ and RFP processes are below:

Firm	RFP Score (out of 50)	Final Score (RFQ & RFP Combined)
Studio 8 Design	43.7	182.6
Pieper O'Brien Herr	39.0	170.3
Jericho Design Group	40.3	168.4
Wakefield Beasley	42.5	164.5

A fee discussion was initiated subsequent to the selection of Studio 8 Design. Fees ranged from \$1,500,335 to \$2,650,266 with Studio 8 Design being \$1,590,000 and the second lowest price.

Please see the attached procurement summary and all referenced documentation for a more comprehensive review of the steps taken during the procurement process.

BUDGET:

Budgeted Amount: \$16,997,880.00

Account Name: SPLOST - Jail Expansion

Amount Encumbered: \$5,120.00

Account #: 33261000-541300-66000

Amount Spent to Date: \$2,415.00

Remaining Budget: \$15,400,345.00

Amount Requested: \$1,590,000.00

ADMINISTRATIVE RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of the County's standard professional services agreement to Studio 8 Design for architectural and engineering services associated with the renovation and expansion of the Adult Detention Center in the amount of \$1,590,000.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type
D Procurement Summary	Backup Material
D Short List Determination	Backup Material
D Interviews	Backup Material
D Selection Meeting Results	Backup Material
D Reference Evaluation Process	Backup Material

- [PSA Signed by Studio 8](#)
- [Business License](#)
- [Insurance](#)

- Backup Material
- Backup Material
- Backup Material

Procurement Summary

Date Submitted: 6/28/2018
Submitted by: Dale Jordan
C/PSA or RFP Number: RFP 2018-021-1
Initial Term Value: \$ 1,590,000.00
Period of Performance: 11 July 2018 Through Dec 2020 (until complete)
Supplier Name: Studio 8 Design (with CROFT)
General Description: Architect and Engineering Services for ADC Expansion
Source of Funds: SPLOST

Contract Information

Proposed Contract Type

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Standard Professional Services Agreement
<input type="checkbox"/>	PSA with Exceptions Approved by Counsel
<input type="checkbox"/>	Supplier Agreement Approved by Counsel
<input type="checkbox"/>	Standard Purchase Order

Formal Advertised Procurement: Yes No*

Number of Bidders Contacted / Number of Bids Received: _____ | 7

Supplier Selection Based on:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Only One Bidder
<input type="checkbox"/>	Lowest Bidder
<input type="checkbox"/>	Lowest Evaluated Bidder
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Highest Proposal Scoring
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other*

Weight	Evaluation Criteria
25	Stability
65	Experience
30	Qualifications/References
30	Design Approach/Proj. Plan
50	Interview

If Award to Non-County Business:
(If Applicable)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <u>Cherokee County</u> Business submitted bid/proposal
<input type="checkbox"/>	CC Business bid/proposal was non-responsive/not-responsive
<input type="checkbox"/>	CC Business not within 5% of Low Bid (for consideration)
<input type="checkbox"/>	CC Business Total Evaluated Score Inadequate (for consideration)

Summary of Analysis / Scoring

Total Score*	Evaluated Price*	Bidder	Location	Rep Brand
182.6	\$ 1,590,000	Studio 8 Design (with CROFT)	Valdosta, GA / Kennesaw, GA	Self
170.3	\$ 2,650,266	Pieper O Brien Herr	Alpharetta, GA	Self
168.4	\$ 1,955,000	Jericho	Alpharetta, GA	Self
164.5	\$ 1,500,335	Wakefield Beasley	Alpharetta, GA	Self
**77.1	NA	**Rosser International		
**76.9	NA	**Clemons, Rutherford & Associates		
**65.1	NA	**McCall Architecture		

Fair Price Determination:

Method	Price Analysis Type
<input type="checkbox"/>	Lowest Bidder
<input type="checkbox"/>	Lowest Evaluated Bidder
<input type="checkbox"/>	Best Pricing Among Comparable Features / Suppliers
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Market Analysis or Market Pricing
<input type="checkbox"/>	State Contract Pricing
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other, see attached price analysis.

Important Price Evaluation Notes: This procurement consisted of three steps: Request for and Evaluation of Qualifications (1 below) , Interviews with the four selected "short list" candidates (2 below) and Request for and Evaluation of Proposals (3 below).

- 1) Memorandum regarding: Jail Expansion Architectural and Engineering Services Short List Determination
- 2) Memorandum regarding: Expansion Architectural and Engineering Services Interviews
- 3) Memorandum regarding: Jail Expansion Architectural and Engineering Services Selection Meeting Results

Why Other Than Low Bidder Selected: The evaluation of the pricing determined that the proposed pricing was fair and reasonable. This was based on the total pricing being less than the average pricing. Also, the price was about 4% of the total budget.

*Notes:

** These three firms submitted Qualifications that were evaluated and were not part of the short-list. These scores were earned based on 100 available RFQ points and were not considered beyond the initial review.

Please see Memorandums regarding: Reference Evaluation Process.

Pricing was considered only after sourcing decision was made by the Source Selection Committee.