

**PENNINGTON COUNTY
COURTHOUSE COMPLEX
EXPANSION**

Request for Qualifications

August 16, 2010

Pennington County Board of Commissioners

Ethan Schmidt, Chairperson

Nancy Trautman, Vice-Chairperson

Brenda Young

Gale Holbrook

De Glassgow

Table of Contents

I. Introduction..... Page 3

II. Background..... Page 3

III. Scope of Work..... Page 5

IV. Project Schedule..... Page 10

V. Consultant Selection..... Page 11

I. Introduction

Pennington County (Owner) is seeking Statements of Qualifications (SOQ) from Architecture/ Engineering (A/E) consulting firms interested, experienced and knowledgeable in working with public entities in the design and construction of public facilities.

The Pennington County Board of Commissioners (BOC) would like to engage a qualified A/E firm in the design and construction of the following projects:

<u>Facility</u>	<u>Approximate Size</u>
• New Relocated Evidence Building	22,433 SF
• Administration Building	93,243 SF
• Two Additional Floors to Existing Parking Structure	59,500 SF
• Renovation of Courthouse & Annex Building	26,500 SF

The Owner believes successful coordination between projects requires a single A/E contract for all projects located at the Courthouse Complex, so the selected firm must be capable of executing multiple projects at the same time. The A/E must be able to coordinate the work of multiple design disciplines on multiple projects while maintaining a critical schedule.

Bond program requirements are likely to drive a tight design and construction schedule. It is expected that multiple bid packages will be required so that several contractors can be engaged during the same time period. The combined capacity of individual contractors is thought to be necessary to meet bond program schedule requirements.

II. Background

Pennington County is located in western South Dakota and has a population of approximately 96,000 with approximately 62,000 people residing in its county seat, Rapid City. The county has experienced a great deal of growth and development in recent years. Therefore, the services that county government provides as required by law and those traditionally expected by the population are expanding. The expansion of services translates to increased facility needs.

To better understand the changing facility needs of the County, the BOC authorized the development of the Facilities Master Plan (FMP) in the fall of 2009. The plan was completed this past spring. The FMP is intended to be a “Living Document” that the county will update at regular intervals to reassess the needs of its departments and other agencies that use Pennington County facilities. The plan will allow the County to take a proactive approach to meeting facility needs in the future.

The Master Planning effort consisted of three primary parts – the Facility Inventory and Assessment, the Needs Assessment, and Master Plan Option Development. The Facility Assessment and Inventory, or Building Audit was a broad overview of the overall facility conditions. It identified life-cycle and maintenance costs that the County may need to invest into each facility. The Needs Assessment identified the individual spaces required for each department through the year 2025. The data collected for these two parts of the planning effort became the ground work for the third.

The Master Plan Option Development work created preliminary plan concepts which were studied and discussed. These concepts led to the final Master Plan which outlines how the County could consolidate its Rapid City facilities into a few sites and meet the growing needs of offices & departments.

Additional information about the planning process and the final Master Plan can be seen in the “Facilities Master Plan Executive Report” which is posted on the Buildings & Grounds page of the Pennington County website at the following address.

<http://www.co.pennington.sd.us/bldgrnd/bg.html>

On June 1, 2010 the BOC formally adopted the Facilities Master Plan. At that meeting the Master Planning Committee requested and received authorization to investigate the potential for projects based on the findings and recommendations of the FMP. The committee recognized that the amount of work that could be completed would be limited by how much funding might be available. So the committee investigated financing opportunities available to the County. It determined that a significant amount of project funding could be financed without affecting future tax levies through the use of some special federal bond programs.

The Master Planning Committee also recognized that an excellent bidding environment exists because of the down turn in the economy. Recent bids on other local projects have produced costs that are significantly under budget estimates. Given the excellent bidding environment and the availability of reduced cost bond programs, the committee members felt it would be fiscally irresponsible if this special financing were not used to the maximum extent possible to execute as much of the work outlined in the Facilities Master Plan as possible. To be more specific, the committee recommended that Pennington County move forward with the projects recommended in the FMP report and identified in this RFQ.

However, these projects and their scale are not yet a fixed part of any future design contract. The Evidence Building is still contingent on City of Rapid City participation in the project. (This issue is expected to be resolved before a contract for these services is signed.) And the scope of work for the Courthouse Renovation is expected to be revised from the original project recommended in the FMP. The intent of the revised scope will be to meet only the most immediate needs of the occupants of the

building. Remaining funding above what is required for these four project budgets will be designated for another project identified under the FMP.

The BOC has authorized bond financing up to the total estimated cost of the four original projects recommended in the FMP. However, the final amount financed will be limited to an amount that will not increase the tax levy. On August 3, 2010 the BOC approved a flexible bond resolution that will allow financial advisors to put together the best finance package and maximize project funding. It is anticipated that the final amount financed will be known before December 2010.

III. Scope of Work

As envisioned, the work of a design contract will include elements generally outlined in this Scope of Work. The work is not limited to the scope presented here. A/E firms are encouraged to expand on the scope and the approach they would take to develop the Pennington County Courthouse Complex Expansion Project.

A single professional services contract is expected for design and construction of the following four projects:

- New Relocated Evidence Building
- Administration Building
- Two Additional Floors to Existing Parking Structure
- Renovation of Courthouse & Annex Building

Additional information about these four projects can be found on the Buildings & Grounds page of the Pennington County website. All County information and documentation regarding these projects and other facilities will be made available to the selected A/E firm.

<http://www.co.pennington.sd.us/bldgrnd/bg.html>

Energy efficiency & conservation, and sustainability are important issues to Pennington County. Prior to finalizing the contract's scope of work the A/E will facilitate a discussion with Owner about how these issues should be addressed in the project.

As noted previously, the Owner believes a single A/E entity is necessary for successful coordination and completion of the four projects listed. Necessary because all four projects will be part of the same complex and their close proximity to each other means they will be connected in some way, be that visual, systematic or other. The Owner requires a holistic design approach to the expansion of the complex that results in a unified campus that can be identified by its specific characteristics.

The Owner recognizes that the planning, programming and recommendations presented in the FMP are preliminary in nature. The FMP has established a starting point for the work described in this RFQ, but this information must be reviewed,

refined and finalized. The Owner believes this creates unanswered questions when trying to finalize the overall scope of a contract and this is not in the Owners best interest. Therefore, the Owner would like to develop a contract that has fees based on individual scope elements.

In general terms, the contract will be broken into two phases of work with two lump sum fees. The first project phase will take the overall project through Schematic Design. This phase has been outlined below and the associated fee will be based on this Scope of Work. The second project phase will have a Scope of Work based on the outline below and what is learned in the first phase. Fees for the second phase will be negotiated at the completion of the first phase.

The following Scope of Work components are divided into the two described phases. Both phases are subject to overall project coordination and management.

1. Overall Project Coordination & Management

The Owner believes the successful execution of these projects is dependent on a clearly communicated project schedule and work plan based on input from all design team members and the County. The A/E shall develop and maintain these management tools as a requirement of the overall project.

- a. Schedule
 1. Develop schedule with clear milestones.
 2. Promptly communicate changes to schedule.
- b. Communications
 1. Define communication process
 2. Regular project meetings and status reports are expected to keep projects on schedule and to keep all identified stakeholders apprised of the progress of the design process.
 3. Quarterly progress updates to the BOC
- c. Coordination
 1. Coordinate the work of team members to assure the timely availability of required information.
 2. Assist the Owner in defining and securing additional contracts to support the work of this contract. (Surveys, geotechnical, special inspections, etc.)
- d. Project Work Plan
 1. Establish project objectives
 2. Define team members' roles and responsibilities
 3. Define how developing data will be shared and the approval process

2. Schematic Phase of Project

a. Existing Documentation Review

A/E shall review previous reports to develop a thorough understanding of project history and requirements. A working knowledge of findings and recommendations of previous work is expected so that the impact of design decisions is recognized in the evolution and implementation of the Facilities Master Plan. Documents to be studied include:

1. Facilities Master Plan Report and supporting documentation as necessary
2. Mechanical and Electrical Facility Audits and Recommendations
3. 1922 Pennington County Courthouse Preservation Plan

b. Energy Efficiency & Conservation, and Overall Sustainability

The Owner believes South Dakotans are a practical people that have a significant history in the practice of sustainable design going back to the Plains Indians and early Pioneers. South Dakotans have always tried to find the right balance between needs and resources. To us, good sustainable design must use commonsense thinking in meeting County needs, while being environmentally responsible. The County recognizes the value of sustainable design for the following reasons:

1. Enhanced building durability
2. Reduced maintenance and operating costs
3. Enhanced occupant comfort, safety, and productivity
4. Energy and water savings and conservation of natural resources
5. Minimization of waste and pollution
6. Prepares the County for future legislation and supports positive public relations

The “Mechanical and Electrical Facility Audits and Recommendations” document has identified energy conservation measures that shall be considered for implementation when associated with the four projects that have been identified. Return on investment calculations will be key to determining if measures should be implemented.

c. Program Refinement

Starting with the programs outlined in the FMP, the A/E will work with an advisory committee and office/ department personnel to refine and finalize the design criteria of the projects. This work will include:

1. Potential trips to case study facilities
2. Definition of design criteria
3. Definition of building performance criteria
4. Deliverable
 - Refined program report defining project criteria with and executive summary.
 - Revised budget numbers for projects.

d. Schematic Site and Facility Design

Following Owner approval of program report the A/E shall prepare schematic design documents. The Owner requires a holistic approach to the design of the overall campus must be utilized in order to maintain and reinforce the unifying characteristics of the Courthouse Complex. New facilities shall be respectful of the existing character of the complex. This work will include:

1. Site plan design
 - Unified campus design based on the master plan
 - Develop site standards based on existing elements and expected city infrastructure improvements.
 - Identify and reinforce connections between facilities and surrounding city.
 - Identify an overall “Way Finding” methodology that can be applied to separate projects.
 - Identify existing structures that must be demolished.
2. Individual facility designs
 - Design will meet the needs of user groups
3. Deliverables
 - Formal presentation of results to the BOC
 - Appropriate drawings and outline specifications
 - Overall Site Plan with supporting details
 - Plans for each level
 - Elevations
 - Key Sections
 - Renderings (If required by BOC or advisory committee.)
 - Comparison Summary of design area to program
 - Preliminary construction cost estimate

3. Development, Documentation & Construction Phase of Project

a. Design Development

Following Owner approval of schematic design documents the A/E shall break the overall project into appropriate subprojects that will become separate bid packages. Design development documents shall then be prepared on a timeline appropriate to the specific subproject.

1. Deliverables

- Formal presentation of results to advisory committee
- Appropriate drawings and specifications that fix and describe the size and character of the subprojects.
- Refined construction cost estimates

b. Construction Documents

Following Owner approval of design development documents the A/E shall prepare construction contract documents which set forth in detail the requirements for all design disciplines involved in the subprojects.

1. Deliverables

- Individual bid packages for subprojects
- 95% review documents with final construction cost estimate
- Final bid sets in a quantity appropriate to the bidding environment

c. Bidding/ Contract Negotiation

Following Owner approval of construction documents and the latest cost estimate the A/E shall assist the Owner in obtaining bids and assist in awarding and preparing contracts for construction of subprojects. This work will include:

1. Assisting Owner in the preparation of necessary bidding information
2. Distribution of bid documents
3. Responding to contractor inquiries
4. Issuing addendums as required
5. Review and recommendation of bids
6. Deliverables
7. Prepared Contracts (Standard AIA Contract)
8. Computer files of bid documents with addendums incorporated

d. Construction Administration

The A/E shall be a representative of and shall advise and consult with the Owner during construction until final payment to the contractor is due on each subproject. This work will include:

1. Project manager participation in bi-weekly or weekly progress meetings.
2. Site visits appropriate to the stage of construction
3. Preparation and distribution of observation reports
4. Preparation of change orders and directives
5. Review and approve or take other action on contractor submittals
6. Review and certify contractor applications for payment

e. Project Closeout

The A/E shall implement project closeout procedures in preparation for facility turnover and operation for each subproject. This work will include:

1. Develop closeout schedules
2. Produce "Punch" lists of outstanding items
3. Review "As-Built" drawings for accuracy and completeness.

IV. Project Schedule

The federal bond programs that will finance this project have specific time requirements which dictate elements of the schedule. Therefore, the ability to meet project schedules will be a critical factor in consultant selection. The following is a tentative project schedule.

MP Committee Recommendations to BOC	July 20, 2010
Bonding Recovery Zone Designation by BOC	August 3, 2010
BOC to Pass Bond Resolution	August 3, 2010
Design Contract Signing Date	October 5, 2010
Latest Construction Bid Opening Date	April 12, 2011
Latest Construction Contract Award Date	April 19, 2011
All Construction Complete	December 2013

V. Consultant Selection

1. Information Available to Interested A/E Firms

- a. The following will be available to firms interested in submitting Statements of Qualifications:
 1. The following will be posted on the Buildings & Grounds page of the Pennington County website - <http://www.co.pennington.sd.us/bldgrnd/bg.html>
 - Facilities Master Plan Executive Report
 - Mechanical and Electrical Recommendations for Facility Master Plan
 - 1922 Pennington County Courthouse Historic Preservation Plan
 2. Firms may tour the Public areas of the complex on their own, during regular business hours (Organized tours of the complex will not be conducted for this portion of the selection process.)
 3. Mike Peterson & Mike Kuhl of the Buildings & Grounds Department will respond to questions as their schedules permit.
 4. Selection Committee members are not to be contacted.
- b. The following will be made available to “Short Listed” firms:
 1. The full “Facilities Master Plan Report”
 2. Mechanical and Electrical Facility Audits and Recommendations
 3. 1922 Pennington County Courthouse Preservation Plan
 4. An organized tour of the complex and facilities
 5. Access to existing facility documents

2. Selection Schedule

The following is the expected schedule for selection of a consultant.

Request for Qualifications Issued	August 16, 2010
RFQ Advertisement Published	August 18 & 25, 2010
Statement of Qualifications Submittal	September 1, 2010
Consultants Notified of Short List Candidates	September 7, 2010
Complex & Facility Tour	September 14, 2010
Presentation / Interviews	September 21, 2010
Consultant Selection Notification	September 21, 2010
Contract Negotiation and Scope Refinement	September 21 – 29, 2010
Board of Commissioners Contract Approval	October 5, 2010

It is anticipated that design work will start immediately after commission contract approval.

3. Submittal Requirements

Interested firms shall submit a concise statement of the firm's qualifications including the following information. All materials should be bound in an 8 ½" x 11" format. Submit seven (7) copies.

- a. Cover letter signed by officer of firm, indicating a desire to be considered for this project and a summarized statement of why the firm should be selected for the project.
- b. General Firm Information:
 1. Name of firm, contact person, address, phone, fax and email address
 2. Brief history of firm, and number of employees
 3. Track record of on schedule & on budget projects (last 5 years)
- c. Project Approach- Management & Design Philosophy
 1. A brief statement of the A/E firm's philosophy toward project management and the firm's approach to be used in this project. Explain how the firm will ensure that the project is completed on schedule and on budget. Discuss the firm's quality assurance/ quality control procedures.
- d. The Project Team:
 1. An organizational chart indicating roles of all individuals and firms involved in this project.
 2. Brief resumes of proposed team members identifying their qualifications and experience.
 3. List current major assignments of all key team members, percentage of time committed to each assignment, anticipated end date of major assignments, and percentage of time to be committed to this project.
- e. Relevant Project Experience
 1. Similar work experience
 2. References from clients with similar projects
 3. Demonstrated ability to lead, facilitate and coordinate project involving committees and multiple departments.

Submittals shall be delivered by or before the close of business on dates indicated above to:

Pennington County Board of Commissioners
Suite 156, Pennington County Courthouse
Rapid City, South Dakota 57701

Submittals should be made in sealed envelopes or containers with the name of the project, the submitting firm's name, address and telephone number clearly indicated on the outside of the envelope or container.

4. Interviews

A selection committee will review and evaluate the submitted Statements of Qualifications. The committee will rank each SOQ to determine a short list of (3) qualified candidates for interviews. Short list candidates should plan to address the following topics in their interviews and provide written documentation of information shared during their presentation.

- a. Why firm should be selected for project.
- b. Firm's ability to meet schedule, including their own preliminary schedule.
- c. Firm's approach to project.
- d. Examples of similar projects.

5. Consultant Selection

A selection committee will evaluate submitted information and presentations/ interviews. It is expected that the selection committee will rank proposals based on the criteria stated below.

- a. Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of the scope of the project and a logical methodology for carrying out the tasks in the scope of work.
- b. Management approach to the project and design philosophy.
- c. Ability to successfully meet a project schedule.
- d. Qualifications of the team members assigned to the project.
- e. Experience and past record with similar projects.
- f. Strength of references.
- g. Innovative ideas & approaches.
- h. Approach to insuring quality data collection.
- i. Principal participation.
- j. Consultant's work load.
- k. Availability of firm's personnel for meetings.

Questions can be sent in writing to Mike Kuhl at the mailing or the email address below:

Mike Kuhl
Pennington County Buildings & Grounds Department
302 Kansas City Street
Rapid City, South Dakota 57701
Email: mikek@co.pennington.sd.us

Responses will be provided through email in order to expedite the process unless an objection is raised by a firm; in which case that firm may request to receive the information by fax or mail. Collected questions and the corresponding responses will be posted on the county website (<http://www.co.pennington.sd.us/>) on August 27, 2010.

Pennington County Courthouse Complex Expansion

Pennington County reserves the right to reject any and all SOQ or proposals received as a result of this RFQ. Pennington County is under no obligation to award a contract as a result of this RFQ.

All expenses involved with the preparation and submission of qualifications to Pennington County, or any work performed in connection with submittals, shall be borne by the submitting A/E firm. No payment will be made for any responses received, nor for any other effort required of or made by the submitting A/E firm, prior to commencement of work as defined by a contract approved by the Pennington County BOC.