



LINCOLN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

BUCKNER M. CREEL
ADMINISTRATOR FOR BUSINESS AND FINANCE

August 17, 2017

To: School Committee
Becky McFall, Superintendent
From: Buckner Creel

Subject: Award of Designer Contract – Lincoln School Project

Background In March 2017, the Town Meeting authorized the School Committee to use funds appropriated by a prior Town Meeting to acquire the services of a design consultant to study the Lincoln School and assist the School Committee in presenting options to address the facilities issues. The School Committee appointed a subcommittee, the School Building Committee (SBC), to conduct a study of the Lincoln School and authorized it to select a consultant to provide assistance. Massachusetts procurement laws require the municipality to follow the Designer Selection Law and that the design consultant be selected through a qualifications-based process.

Process In accordance with the procedures outlined in M.G.L. 7C §§44-57, qualifications from firms interested in providing design services for the Lincoln School Feasibility Study were solicited from potential consultants using the following process:

- Construction announcements in the *Central Register* were published announcing the availability of Request for Services (RFS) documents on June 28, 2017.
- Legal notices were published in the Lincoln Journal on June 30, 2017.
- The RFS document contained the terms of the RFS, the required certifications and the 2016 SOI submitted to the MSBA.
- Forty-three (43) potential responders requested the electronic version of the RFS packet.
- Fifteen (15) potential responders attended the non-mandatory briefing session held July 6, 2017 at 10:00 AM in the Hartwell Building.
- One addendum was added to the RFS packet after the briefing: Addendum #1 dated July 7, 2017 answered questions from the briefing session and provided the representative contract document. No additional questions were received subsequently, but before the cut-off date.
- Eight (8) qualification & interest statements (responses) were received by July 20, 2017 at 2:00 pm. Four of the ten firms responding had not attended the briefing session.

Response results The respondents were (alphabetically):

- Dore & Whittier Architects
- DRA Drummey Rosane Anderson
- Flansburgh Architects
- HMFH Architects
- JLA Jonathan Levi Architects
- LLB Lerner Ladds Bartels
- SMMA Symmes Maini & McKee Associates
- Tappe'

All eight responses were received prior to the official response receipt time. The materials submitted by all firms met the requirements of the RFS instructions, and I initially found that all eight are responsive.

Evaluation The responses were evaluated by a Designer Selection Panel (DSP) with eight members appointed by the SBC:

- Douglas Adams, Architect
- Ken Bassett, Architect
- Jennifer Glass, Selectman
- Craig Nicholson, OPM
- Peter Sugar, Architect
- Rebecca McFall, Superintendent
- Michael Haines, Town Facilities Manager
- Buckner Creel, Administrator for Business and Finance (recorder)

The RFS contained the following criteria, which were used by the panel for response evaluation:

- a. Prior similar experience best illustrating current qualifications for the specific project.
- b. Past performance of the firm, if any with regard to public, private, DOE-funded, and MSBA-funded projects across the Commonwealth and elsewhere, with respect to:
 - 1) Quality of project design.
 - 2) Quality, clarity, completeness and accuracy of plans, contract documents and BIM models .
 - 3) Ability to meet established program requirements on time and within allotted budget.
 - 4) Ability to meet schedules including submission of design and contract documents, processing of shop drawings, contractor requisitions and change orders.
 - 5) Coordination and management of consultants.
 - 6) Working relationship with contractors, subcontractors, local awarding authority and local officials.
- c. Current workload and ability to undertake the contract based on the number and scope of projects for which the firm is currently under contract.
- d. The identity and qualifications of the consultants who will work on the project.
- e. The financial stability of the firm.
- f. The qualifications of the personnel to be assigned to the project.
- g. Geographical proximity of the firm to the project site or willingness of the firm to make site visits and attend local meetings as required by the client.
- h. Participation of minority and women-owned business enterprises in the design team.

- i. Additional criteria that the Owner considers relevant to the project.

The DSP re-grouped the criteria into four categories, as follows:

1. (40%) **Prior experience** specifically demonstrating commitment to the objectives of the Lincoln school project, including:
 - 21st-century education;
 - sustainable, energy-efficient design;
 - sensitivity to community priorities and the need for consensus-building; and
 - the development of a unified campus plan.
2. (25%) **Quality of design**, including the specific items enumerated under item b in the list of criteria.
3. (25%) **Quality of the team**, including the criteria d, f and h.
4. (10%) **Basic qualifications**, including the criteria c, e and g

Panel members reviewed and ranked the responses separately, then met to vote.

Initial review and interviews After discussion, the panel unanimously decided to advance Dore & Whittier Architects, Flansburgh Architects, HMFH Architects, JLA Jonathan Levi Architects and SMMA Symmes Maini & McKee Associates to the finalist phase, eliminating DRA Drummey Rosane Anderson, LLB Lerner Ladds Bartels and Tappe' from further consideration. The five finalist firms were interviewed on August 15 and 16 by the entire School Building Committee (SBC), appointed members and liaisons.

Reference checks Daedalus Projects staff conducted reference checks; at least three references for each firm were contacted, and a series of questions were asked. All firms received a mix of excellent and good references for their work. Nothing in the reference checks led me to believe that any firm would not successfully perform the desired scope in support of the Lincoln School Feasibility Study. Therefore, I find all of these five finalists to be responsible.

Final ranking In a meeting on August 16, 2017, the SBC discussed the results of the reference checks, reviewed the proposals and interview results and discussed the relative merits of the finalist firms.

Dore & Whittier Architects and Symmes Maini & McKee Associates (SMMA) were both considered strong, and the SBC initially had difficulty determining a clear front-runner. After additional discussion, however, consensus emerged and the SBC members proposed ranking the firm of SMMA first by a vote of eight to two. The SBC subsequently approved the following ranking:

1. Symmes Maini & McKee Associates (SMMA)
2. Dore & Whittier Architects
3. Flansburgh Architects
4. HMFH Architects
5. JLA Jonathan Levi Architects

Findings and Recommendation I find that SMMA is a responsive, responsible proposer who is likely to offer a reasonable price. The SBC voted to recommend to the School Committee that SMMA be awarded the contract for designer services for the Revitalization of the Lincoln School, contingent upon agreement over the fee and the contract document language. The SBC authorized me to request a fee proposal from SMMA.

Suggested motion MOVE, That the School Committee VOTE to authorize the Administrator for Business & Finance to enter into negotiations with Symmes Maini & McKee Associates (SMMA), and authorize the School Committee Chairperson to award the contract to provide designer services for the Revitalization of the Lincoln School, subject to agreement upon the fee and the language of the contract document.