

DEPARTMENT: Public Works

BY: James J. Petropulos

PHONE: 966-5356

RECOMMENDED ACTION AND JUSTIFICATION: (Policy Item: Yes ___ No X)

Resolution authorizing the Public Works Director to execute an agreement for preliminary design services for the New Human Services Facility.

Public Works is requesting that the Board of Supervisors authorize an Agreement, subject to final review and approval by the Administrative Officer and County Counsel, with LMA, an architectural firm, to provide preliminary design services for a new Human Services Facility. The Agreement will include an array of services as delineated in the attached memo from Fred Solomon. The cost for this portion of the project is \$53,215. The Human Services Department has the funds appropriated for this Agreement.

The Human Services Department needs a more suitable facility as previously discussed with the Board of Supervisors and the Space Needs Committee. The approach is to utilize an architectural firm to develop an extensive request for proposals to obtain a build-to-suit facility to be leased by the Human Services Department. The proposed lease would be long-term – possibly 20 or more years.

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF BOARD ACTIONS:

The Board of Supervisors has previously discussed this project, realizing that the Human Services Department needed a more suitable facility. A Personal Services Agreement with Fred Solomon was approved by the Board in October 2001 to assist staff in obtaining architectural services. An RFP was issued and several architectural firms were interviewed. Please refer to attached memo from Fred Solomon.

LIST ALTERNATIVES AND CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

Various alternatives were investigated, including that the County purchase or build its own facility. However, the nature of the available funding (Social Services Realignment) will not allow the purchase of a facility but will allow for a lease.

Negative action will delay obtaining a suitable facility for the Human Services Department.

COSTS: () Not Applicable

A. Budgeted current FY	\$ 50,000
B. Total anticipated costs	\$ 63,215
C. Required additional funding	\$ 13,215
D. Internal transfers	\$ _____

SOURCE: (X) 4/5ths Vote Required

A. Unanticipated revenues	\$ 13,215
B. Reserve for contingencies	\$ _____
C. Source description: <u>realignment, Federal allocation</u>	

Balance in Reserve for Contingencies, if approved: \$ _____

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS:
List the attachments and number the pages consecutively:

- Solomon to Petropulos memo dated January 18, 2002
- Budget Action Form

CLERK'S USE ONLY:

Res. No.: 02-06 Ord. No. _____
 Vote - Ayes: 5 Noes: _____
 Absent: _____ Abstained: _____
 Approved Denied
 Minute Order Attached No Action Necessary

COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION:
This item on agenda as:

Recommended
 Not Recommended
 For Policy Determination
 Submitted with Comment
 Returned for Further Action

Comment: _____
 C.A.O. Initials: [Signature]

The foregoing instrument is a correct copy of the original on file in this office.
 Date: _____
 ATTEST: MARGIE WILLIAMS, Clerk of the Board
 County of Mariposa, State of California
 By: _____
 Deputy

Memo

To: Jim Petropulos, Director of Public Works
From: Fred S. Solomon
CC: Cheryle Rutherford-Kelly, Director of Human Services
Date: January 18, 2002
Re: Human Services Building

On October 23, 2001. The County of Mariposa entered into a professional services agreement with me to develop a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and assist in the selection of an architectural firm to prepare a preliminary design services proposal for a new Human Services building.

An RFQ was prepared by me with input from Jim Petropulos, Director of Public Works, and Cheryle Rutherford-Kelly, Director of Human Services (the Team). The architectural firm is to prepare a spatial needs assessment, a floor plan, elevations, performance standards, and budget cost estimate.

The RFQ was advertised in the Fresno Bee and the Modesto Bee. Additionally, over 30 architectural firms listed in the Sierra Valley Chapter of the American Institute of Architects were contacted by mail. Finally, several firms, who I had previously worked with were contacted by phone.

Responses to the RFQ were received from eight firms. These responses were reviewed by the Team and ranked based on criteria we set for evaluation of the responding firms. Two firms, Leach Mounce Architects (LMA) and RRM Design Group, were selected for interview by the Team. Those interviews took place on December 20, 2001. At the conclusion of the interviews, each firm was requested to submit a proposal for services.

Proposals were received the first week in January, 2002 and evaluated. The proposals are generally compared below.

<u>Base Fees</u>	<u>LMA</u>	<u>RRM</u>
Needs Assessment/Concept Plans /		
Final Report	\$29,600	\$26,460
Project Cost Estimate	\$ 2,400	(1)
Performance Standards	<u>\$16,000</u>	<u>\$24,074</u>
Total	\$48,000	\$50,534

(1) RRM did not include this service. It was requested.

In addition to the base fees, each firm was requested to submit the cost for reimbursable expenses. LMA submitted reimbursable expenses of \$5,215 while RRM based their reimbursable expenses as an estimate calculated as a percentage of the professional fee or \$1,260.

LMA and RRM propose to accomplish the assignment within 28 weeks.

Recommendation

The Team unanimously recommends LMA to perform the requested services. LMA's presentation in the interview process and its proposal were the governing criteria for the Team's selection. The proposal of LMA was complete and the description of the tasks to be performed more encompassing. The fees were, in total, so close that they did not influence the Team's selection. Similarly the timeline for the work was the same. A copy of the LMA and RRM response to the RFQ and their proposals are attached.

The program which will be developed by the selected firm can be used in the development of a request for proposals from developers to build to lease to the County. Developers will retain their own architectural firm for the facility, but should be governed by the needs and standards prepared by the County. In this way the County can reasonably assure it will receive responsive proposals from Developers.

Her

