## Santaguin City Resolution 04-04-2015

## A RESOLUTION OF SANTAQUIN CITY AUTHORIZING A SERVICE AGREEMENT WITH WPA ARCHITECTURE FOR ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES RELATED TO THE NEW PUBLIC WORKS FACILITY

**WHEREAS**, the City of Santaguin is a fifth class city of the State of Utah; and

WHEREAS, the City desires to construct a new Public Works building and related facilities which will require architectural services; and

WHEREAS, cities in the state of Utah are authorized to enter into contracts for professional services after appropriate notice and procurement procedures; and

WHEREAS, the bids for structural architectural services were sought and WPA Architecture was found to be the preferred service provider out of those firms who submitted proposals.

**NOW THEREFORE,** be it resolved by the City Council of Santaguin City to authorize the Mayor to enter into a service contract with WPA Architecture for architectural services related to the new Public Works building and related facilities as provided in the attached proposal for architectural services. The amount of the contract is to not exceed \$66,500 without prior council approval.

ADOPTED AND PASSED by the City Council of Santaguin City, Utah, this 1st day of

April, 2015.

SANTAQUIN CITY

Attest

Larowaniak Susar B. Farnsworth, City Recorder

## **Norm Beagley**

Kirk Hunsaker; Matt Carr; Amanda Jeffs; Keith Broadhead (external); David Hathaway

(External); Nick Miller (External)

Cc: Ben Reeves; Dennis Marker; Susan Farnsworth

**Subject:** Architectural Services Proposals for the New Public Works Building and Facilities

Attachments: 2 - Review\_Committee\_Evaluation\_(Architectural\_Services).pdf

Good afternoon Mayor and Council Members,

As we discussed last week during City Council meeting, we were waiting for RFP responses for architectural services for the new public works building and related facilities. We received 8 proposals by the submittal deadline (last Thursday).

We have completed an evaluation of the submitted proposals. A summary of the scoring and rankings is attached for your review. The review committee consisted of Ben Reeves, Dennis Marker, Norm Beagley, Wade Eva, Randy Spadafora and Nick Miller (Dave Hathaway was invited to help with the evaluations but was unable to attend).

The scoring and ranking of submitted proposals shows that WPA Architecture scored the highest and therefore is ranked 1<sup>st</sup> in the overall rankings. Incidentally, WPA Architecture did not provide the lowest proposed cost. They provided the 3<sup>rd</sup> lowest proposed cost.

It is the review committee's recommendation that the Council approve awarding the contract for architectural services for the new public works building to WPA Architecture. This item will be on the next City Council Agenda (April 1st ) for your consideration and possible action.

we have placed all of the proposals received in Drop Box and you are welcome to review them. Please keep in mind that, until a contract with an architectural firm is approved to be awarded by the Council, the submitted proposals are considered confidential and should not be shared. Once the award is approved, and a contract with a firm is executed, the winning proposal will be available for 4 years and the remaining proposals will be available for 2 years as a matter of public record.

If you have questions about the evaluation results or other questions, please feel free to let myself of Dennis know.

Thank you for your time

## Norm Beagley, P.E.

Santaquin City Engineer 275 West Main Street Santaquin, Utah 84655 nbeagley@santaquin.org (801) 754-1011 x 225 Office (801) 754-3526 Fax (801) 636-6899 Cell Santaquin City Corporation New Public Works Building and Related Facilities Evaluation of Architectural Services Proposals

Overall Ranking Company		2 Archiplex	3 Sandstrom	JRCA	5 MWA	6 Cartwright	<b>7</b> Thalmann	8 Entelen
Project 1 (possible 10pts)	8.50	9.00	8.00	7.50	6.83	8.08	7.33	4.5
Project 2 (possible 10pts)	7.50	7.50	7.33	6.33	7.33	6.67	7.50	4.0
Project 3 (possible 10pts)	9.67	8.00	6.17	6.67	7.33	6.17	8.00	4.5
Project 4 (possible 10pts)	9.67	7.67	5.00	7.50	6.50	3.00	7.50	2.8
Total Points possible = 40	35.33	32.17	26.50	28.00	28.00	23.92	30.33	15.8
Methodology								
Total Points possible = 35	33.17	25.00	25.83	30.33	16.33	23.50	22.50	23.1
Completeness of Proposed Cost Sheet (5 pts possible)	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00			1 ,	
			5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	1.00	5.0
Bid Amount	\$ 66,500.00	\$ 73,500.00		\$ 108,800.00		5.00 \$ 96,200.00		5.00 \$ 75,100.00
	\$ 66,500.00 14.69		\$ 53,500.00	\$ 108,800.00		\$ 96,200.00	\$ 122,400.00	\$ 75,100.00
Bid Amount  Bid Cost Points Value (20 pts possible)  Summary of Evaluation		13.29	\$ 53,500.00 18.26	\$ 108,800.00 8.98	\$ 48,850.00	\$ 96,200.00 10.16	\$ 122,400.00 7.98	\$ 75,100.00 13.0
Bid Cost Points Value (20 pts possible)	14.69	13.29 75.46	\$ 53,500.00 18.26	\$ 108,800.00 8.98 72.31	\$ 48,850.00 20.00 69.33	\$ 96,200.00 10.16 62.57	\$ 122,400.00 7.98 61.82	\$ 75,100.00 13.0 57.0
Bid Cost Points Value (20 pts possible) Summary of Evaluation	14.69 88.19	13.29 75.46	\$ 53,500.00 18.26 75.60	\$ 108,800.00 8.98 72.31	\$ 48,850.00 20.00 69.33	\$ 96,200.00 10.16 62.57	\$ 122,400.00 7.98 61.82	\$ 75,100.00 13.0 57.0