



A Community of Learners

Informational Item: Architect RFQ Process

TO: School Board

FROM: Facility Subcommittee
Trisha Kocanda, Superintendent
Brad Goldstein, CFO

November 12, 2018

Overview & Background

The Facilities Subcommittee has been analyzing various selection processes to identify the best architect to partner with on the Educational Master Facility Plan. This analysis included contemplating the benefits and challenges of a design competition. For instance, should the District consider a competition for the entire project? Only Crow Island? Etc. Architectural design competitions are sometimes utilized. It would allow us to invite architects to submit design proposals as part of the RFQ process. The District would pay a stipend for this work, ranging from \$15,000-\$50,000 per firm. This stipend does not cover all expenses for the architectural firms. Those familiar with the process indicated that architects incur expenses that far outweigh the stipend. The preferred firm can be chosen by an independent panel of design professionals and stakeholders, community input, or a combination.

The Administration conferred with school districts with design competition experience and/or recent major capital projects. Administration also consulted with community members who are in the architectural field, including a member of the Crow Island Stewardship group. In addition, the Facility Subcommittee conferred directly with Peter Brown, a referral from the Crow Island Stewardship group and a consultant on local capital projects involving competitions and historically significant structures. As a result of these consultations, the Facility Subcommittee was able to learn the benefits and challenges of various processes and form a recommendation for full board consideration. A summary of benefits/challenges to a design competition are highlighted in the table below:

<u>Design Competition Benefits</u>	<u>Design Competition Challenges</u>
Early community involvement in process	Designs created in competition evolve tremendously over the actual design phase often bearing little resemblance to original concept
May trigger more design creativity	Questionable if financial output is worth the payoff; some firms do not participate in design competitions due to this
	Designs often maximize cost with little incentive for value engineering; risks maintaining integrity to what community valued in competition
	Often extends the timeline and process

The majority of the feedback was lukewarm on the benefits of a full design competition for the District’s current EMFP. Although isolating Crow Island could garner attention in a competition, the scope of the work is somewhat limited offsetting benefits associated with attracting a wider array of architects. In addition, it was encouraged to select a single architectural firm versus multiple during the EMFP. Not only does this help manage costs, it better manages time and project accountability.

Facility Subcommittee Recommendation:

- Pursue a traditional RFQ process for the entire EMFP. Continue to collaborate with the select group of community architects on writing the RFQ.
- Collect RFQ responses and analyze to short list 3 firms with facility subcommittee.
- Ask the short-listed firms to draft conceptual ideas (lower level design) for our EMFP for interview phase of selection process. This was recommended by architect on Crow Island stewardship committee.
- Full School Board evaluates presentations and join site visits to inform final selection.

Timeline:

November 2018 - Finalize a draft of the RFQ, and seek input from community architects. The RFQ will include a design piece that won’t be on the scale of a full design competition, but will embed some design piece within the RFQ. An advertisement will go out in late November and allow three weeks for submittal.

December 2018 - Facility subcommittee meets prior to winter break to review the submittals, and narrow the field to three architects. These firms will then have four weeks to work on the design piece, as well as their presentation to the Board.

January 2019 - Board and Administration will conduct site visits at buildings constructed by the three finalists prior to the Board interviews. The finalists will be

interviewed in late January, and the Board will rank order their finalists.

February 2019 - The state regulated RFQ process for architects does not allow for pricing to play a role until the School Board rank orders the finalists. After the Board has ranked their three finalists, the Administration will begin negotiating pricing with the top choice. If an agreement cannot be reached, the District would then move onto the second choice. Once an agreement is reached, a master agreement is then drafted by the attorneys and approved by the Board.

Attachments

None