

## A G E N D A



## Recommendation for Council Action (CMD)

Austin City Council	Item ID:	23498	Agenda Number	4.
Meeting Date:	April 11, 2013			
Department:	Contract Management			
Subject				
Authorize negotiation and execution of professional services agreements with the following eight staff recommended firms (or one of the other qualified responders) and correct calculation of ranking order under Council action taken on Item 19 on January 17, 2013: LIMBACHER AND GODFREY ARCHITECTS, INC. (WBE /FW); THE LAWRENCE GROUP, INC.; MCKINNEY YORK ARCHITECTS (WBE /FW); AUSTIN ARCHITECTURE PLUS, INC. dba ARCHITECTURE + PLUS (WBE /FW); STANLEY-SALAIZ JOINT VENTURE; JACKSON AND MCELHANEY ARCHITECTS, INC.; HPA LLP dba HATCH+ ULLAND OWEN ARCHITECTS; and MWM DESIGN GROUP, INC. dba MWM DESIGN GROUP (WBE /FH) for the 2013 General Architectural Services Rotation List for an estimated period of two years or until financial authorization is expended, with the total amount not to exceed \$4,000,000 divided among the eight firms.				
Amount and Source of Funding				
Funding is available in the Capital and/or Operating and Maintenance Budgets of the various departments requiring services.				
Fiscal Note				
There is no unanticipated fiscal impact. A fiscal note is not required.				
Purchasing Language:	Staff recommendations are the most qualified firms out of thirty firms evaluated through the City's qualification-based selection process.			
Prior Council Action:				
For More Information:	Scott Hilton 974-7054; Rolando Fernandez 974-7749; Felecia Shaw 974-6017.			
Boards and Commission Action:				
Related Items:				

**MBE / WBE:**

This contract will be awarded in compliance with Chapter 2-9B of the City Code (Minority Owned and Women Owned Business Enterprise Procurement Program) by meeting the goals with 15.80% MBE and 15.80% WBE subconsultant participation.

**Additional Backup Information**

The City of Austin maintains a rotation list of professional architectural firms to provide architectural services for small to medium sized projects of a general or routine scope, and for projects having a critical or emergency schedule which would preclude going through the normal individual project Request for Qualifications (RFQ) selection process.

On January 17, 2013, Council authorized the selection of eight (8) consulting firms for the General Architectural Services Rotation List for 2013. The total funding authority for the 2013 General Architectural Services Rotation List is \$4,000,000 with the authority for each of 8 firms to be approximately \$500,000. The 2013 General Architectural Services Rotation List replaces the existing 2009-2011 rotation list which has exhausted its authorization.

After Council approved award of the 2013 General Architectural Services Rotation List, Contract Management staff discovered an error in the evaluation matrix component that scores the Key Personnel. The total points advertised in the RFQ for the 2013 General Architectural Services Rotation List, key personnel (Project Professional and Project Principal) were 25 points. The point allocation range for the key personnel was:

- 18 points Project Professional
- 7 points for Project Principal

The evaluation panelist scored 25 points overall for the key personnel. However, 3 of the evaluation panelists (Evaluator 2, Evaluator 4 and Evaluator 5) allocated the following point ranges for the key personnel:

- 15 points Project Professional
- 10 points for Project Principal

In reviewing the matrix and evaluator notes, we determined that there were NO errors in the criteria or justification for scoring by the evaluators. However, there was an error in the scoring range that Evaluators 2, 4 and 5 used to allocate to the firms based on their evaluations.

To correct the values within the matrix for Evaluator 2, Evaluator 4 and Evaluator 5 the Project Professional scores was multiplied by a factor of 1.2 and the Project Principal scores were multiplied by a factor of .7:

- 1.2 for the Project Professional which was determined by  $[18/15]=1.2$
- .7 for the Project Principal which was determined by  $[7/10]=.7$

As a result, there were no changes to the firms selected for the 2013 Architectural Services Rotation List

when implementing the recommended corrections to the panelist scores.

The Contract Management Department has taken the following actions to mitigate this matrix miscalculation from recurring:

1. Automation of the matrix used to calculate scores. A threshold will be set to eliminate erroneous scores from being entered when the project matrix is initially developed for the project. The threshold will be set at the lowest column level.
2. Additional verification from the Contract Procurement Division Manager and team (Contract Relations Consultant and Buyer) that item scores are consistent with the evaluation notes, matrix, and RFQ documents both at the time of the kick-off evaluation panel meeting, and final evaluation meeting.
3. Additional verification from the Contract Procurement Division Manager that evaluation scores are consistent with RFQ documents prior to RCA launch.

This request allows for the development of a professional services agreement with staff's recommendation of the 8 recommended firms for an estimated period of 2 years or until financial authorization is expended. Initial project assignments will be based on the firm's final ranking as determined during the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) evaluation (highest to lowest), the maximum cumulative contracted amount in comparison to the estimated task budget for that firm, and the firm's qualifications and availability of expertise at time of project need. If the City is unsuccessful in negotiating a satisfactory agreement with a recommended firm(s), if a selected firm ceases practice during the contract period, or if the City elects to terminate its agreement with one of the selected firms, the remaining assignments will be assigned to the remaining firm(s) for the duration of the contract period.

Participation subgoals stated in the solicitation were 1.90% African American; 9.00% Hispanic; 4.90% Native/Asian American and; 15.80% WBE subconsultant participation. The recommended firm(s) provided a MBE/WBE Compliance Plan that met the goals of the solicitation or demonstrated a Good Faith Effort and was approved by the Small and Minority Business Resources Department.

Notification of issuance of a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for the subject services was sent to 670 firms on August 3, 2012. The RFQ was obtained by 189 firms, and 32 firms submitted qualification statements. Twelve (12) of the firms were certified M/WBE firms.

**RECOMMENDED FIRMS:**

Limbacher & Godfrey Architects, Inc. (WBE /FW)

The Lawrence Group, Inc.

McKinney York Architects, Inc. (WBE /FW)

Architecture Plus, Inc. (WBE /FW)

Stanley-Salaiz Joint Ventrue

Jackson & McElhaney Architects

HPA, LLP dba Hatch+ Ulland Owen Architects

MWM Design Group, Inc dba MWM Design Group. (WBE /FH)

Limbacher & Godfrey Architects Incorporated is located in Austin, TX  
The Lawrence Group Incorporated is located in Austin, TX  
McKinney Architects Incorporated is located in Austin, TX  
Architecture Plus Incorporated is located in Austin, TX  
Stanley-Salaiz Joint Venture is located in Austin, TX  
Jackson & McElhaney Architects is located in Austin, TX  
HPA, LLP dba Hatch+ Ulland Owen Architects is located in Austin, TX  
MWM Design Group Incorporated dba MWM Design Group is located in Austin, TX.