



Agenda Item Number: 10-3-13.6D

**SANDOVAL COUNTY  
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS**

---

**Date of Commission**

**Meeting:** October 3, 2013

**Division / Elected**

**Office:** Public Works

**Staff Contact:** Tommy Mora, Jr., Director

**Title of Item:** Judicial Complex Addition and Public Safety Facility

**Action Requested:** Motion to Award Bid for Architectural Design Services for the Planning and Schematic Design Phase for the Judicial Complex and Public Safety Facility to RMKM Architects and Approval to Authorize the County Manager to Negotiate and Enter into a Contract

**Summary:**

On August 15, 2013 Sandoval County advertised in the Albuquerque Journal requesting written proposals for Architectural Design Services for the Judicial Complex Addition and Public Safety Facility (Fire Administration Building, 911 Call Center, and Sheriff's Offices). The bids were received and evaluated according to the New Mexico State Procurement Code for professional services. According to the selection criteria, RMKM was the most qualified architect for this phase of the project.

The following is a description of the Architect's scope of work: Using projected 2035-2040 population studies, conduct space and parking analysis for future needs of the Sandoval County Judicial Complex and Public Safety Facility to include schematic design phase and design development phase. From the studies, provide three (3) conceptual designs with renderings and floor plan layouts for the expansion of the Judicial Complex. Work directly with the Sandoval County Public Safety / Judicial Complex Committee to gather information related to the Judicial Complex expansion. Staff recommends approval.



Agenda Item Number: 10-3-13.6D

**FISCAL IMPACT**

The dollar amount of the contract will be negotiated but will not exceed \$47,000.

**STAFF ANALYSIS SUMMARY**

**County Manager:**

In moving forward with looking at the judicial complex expansion and space needs the task force recommend that architectural assistance was needed to plan and design a conceptual plan. Staff went out for consultant services to help in developing a plan for funding. Recommend Board of County Commission approval. PPR 09/26/2013

**Initiating Elected Official /  
Division Director:**

Recommend Approval-TMJ 9/23/13

**Legal:**

After award the CM will need to negotiate a contract with the architect. PFT 9/26/2013

**Finance:**

Funding is in place-Recommend Approval- CCH 9/25/13

Procurement process has been followed.  
Recommend Approval of Award – LO 9/25/13



**ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN SERVICES:  
PRELIMINARY JUDICIAL COMPLEX ADDITION RFP# FY14-PW-05**

STUDIO SOUTHWEST	27	This firm provided over 9 examples of experience working on projects related to Judicial Facilities, Fire Administrative Centers, and Call Centers including the Sandoval County Judicial Complex. SW Studio also included proof of ample experience and capability to meet the requirements of the Scope of Work for this RFP.		
		Individual Scores:	25	27
VIGIL & ASSOCIATES	26	This firm included examples of several detailed examples of experience working on Judicial Facilities. Many of the projects listed were outside of New Mexico or were completed by "Team Members" or Affiliates of the Vigil & Associates.		
		Individual Scores:	20	30

**2. Registration, Licensing, and Conflict of Interest (20 points possible):**

Offeror	Score	Justification for Points Awarded		
DYRON MURPHY	20	All requested documentation was provided in the proposal.		
		Individual Scores:	20	20
FBT	15	The Conflict of Interest Form was included and signed. Registration and Licensing were listed, but copies of the documents were not included.		
		Individual Scores:	10	10
JAMES LYNCH	19	The Conflict of Interest Form was included and signed. Mr. Lynch's Architect License was included in the proposal; however no other documentation of Registration or Licensure were provided.		
		Individual Scores:	15	20
NCA	20	All requested documentation was provided in the proposal.		
		Individual Scores:	20	20
RMKM	20	All requested documentation was provided in the proposal.		
		Individual Scores:	15	20
SOLEIL WEST	20	All requested documentation was provided in the proposal.		
		Individual Scores:	20	20
STUDIO SOUTHWEST	20	All requested documentation was provided in the proposal.		
		Individual Scores:	20	20
VIGIL & ASSOCIATES	20	All requested documentation was provided in the proposal.		
		Individual Scores:	20	20

**ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN SERVICES:  
PRELIMINARY JUDICIAL COMPLEX ADDITION RFP# FY14-PW-05**

**3. General Qualifications and Knowledge (Education, Related Experience, Knowledge of County Environment) (20 points possible):**

<b>Offeror</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Justification for Points Awarded</b>			
DYRON MURPHY	18	Offeror's proposal was complete and professional. Evidence was provided of extensive experience with government, primarily county, projects. The most recent project was 5 years ago.			
		Individual Scores:	20	18	15
FBT	15	Offeror's proposal is brief, listing limited experience primarily related to Ports of Entry.			
		Individual Scores:	15	15	15
JAMES LYNCH	17	Offeror provided examples of experience and knowledge of County projects; however these projects are not related to Judicial Complexes.			
		Individual Scores:	16	14	20
NCA	18	Offeror's proposal was comprehensive, listing examples of a wide variety of experience. Proposal was well organized and easy to read.			
		Individual Scores:	20	18	17
RMKM	19	This firm's proposal provided exemplary evidence of knowledge and experience in the field of Architectural Design. Proof of education, related experience, and knowledge of the county environment was detailed and abundant.			
		Individual Scores:	18	18	20
SOLEIL WEST	18	Offeror provided evidence of experience with Sandoval County projects and knowledge of the county environment; however the projects were not related to Judicial and Public Safety Complexes.			
		Individual Scores:	20	17	17
STUDIO SOUTHWEST	17	Offeror provided limited examples of experience and knowledge related to the county environment.			
		Individual Scores:	15	18	19
VIGIL & ASSOCIATES	16	Offeror provided very limited examples of experience with government related projects.			
		Individual Scores:	18	16	15

**4. Communications and Reporting, Attendance, and Availability (Accessibility, Willingness to Meet Reporting Requirements): (10 points possible):**

<b>Offeror</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Justification for Points Awarded</b>			
DYRON MURPHY	9	This offeror's response was sufficient related to accessibility, availability, attendance, and willingness to meet reporting requirements. Evaluation Committee members stated that the response was standard to the industry.			
		Individual Scores:	10	8	9
FBT	5	Little detail was provided by this offeror in relation to availability and willingness to meet reporting requirements. Statements were too brief and generalized.			
		Individual Scores:	5	5	3

**ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN SERVICES:  
PRELIMINARY JUDICIAL COMPLEX ADDITION RFP# FY14-PW-05**

JAMES LYNCH	0	Offeror did not address availability, accessibility, and willingness to meet reporting requirements.			
		Individual Scores:	0	5	5
NCA	8	The communication plan provided by the Offeror was broad and generalized.			
		Individual Scores:	10	9	7
RMKM	9	Offeror provided a detailed plan for availability, accessibility, and willingness to meet reporting requirements.			
		Individual Scores:	8	9	10
SOLEIL WEST	9	Offeror provided a detailed plan for availability, accessibility, and willingness to meet reporting requirements.			
		Individual Scores:	9	8	10
STUDIO SOUTHWEST	9	Offeror provided a detailed plan for availability, accessibility, and willingness to meet reporting requirements.			
		Individual Scores:	10	9	8
VIGIL & ASSOCIATES	7	Not enough detail was provided related to how this Offeror would meet reporting requirements or address communication and accessibility.			
		Individual Scores:	9	5	8

5. Cost: Will not be a scoring factor/will be a point of discussion only.

**Preliminary Scores: Selection of Top 4 Finalists**

VENDOR	Q #1	Q #2	Q #3	Q #4	Q #5	RES. PREF	TOTAL
DYRON	26	20	18	9	0	0	73
FBT	20	15	15	5	0	0	55
LYNCH	15	19	17	0	0	0	51
NCA	28	20	18	8	0	0	74
RMKM	29	20	19	9	0	0	77
SOLEIL	16	20	18	9	0	0	63
STUDIO SW	27	20	17	9	0	0	73
VIGIL	26	20	16	7	0	0	69

**ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN SERVICES:  
PRELIMINARY JUDICIAL COMPLEX ADDITION RFP# FY14-PW-05**

6. Resident or Resident Veteran's Preference:

Offeror	Score	Justification for Points Awarded
DYRON MURPHY	5	RESIDENT VENDOR CERTIFICATE PROVIDED - VALID
NCA	5	RESIDENT VENDOR CERTIFICATE PROVIDED - VALID
RMKM	5	RESIDENT VENDOR CERTIFICATE PROVIDED - VALID
STUDIO SOUTHWEST	0	DOCUMENTATION NOT PROVIDED

**Scores of Top 4 Finalists Including Preference**

VENDOR	Q #1	Q #2	Q #3	Q #4	Q #5	RES. PREF	TOTAL
DYRON	26	20	18	9	0	5	78
NCA	28	20	18	8	0	5	79
RMKM	29	20	19	9	0	5	82
STUDIO SW	27	20	17	9	0	0	73

**Section 2**

**1. Financial Stability**

Offeror	Pass/Fail
DYRON MURPHY	PASS
NCA	PASS
RMKM	PASS
STUDIO SOUTHWEST	PASS

**2. Letter of Transmittal**

Offeror	Pass/Fail
DYRON MURPHY	PASS
NCA	PASS
RMKM	PASS
STUDIO SOUTHWEST	PASS

**3. Campaign Contribution Disclosure Form**

Offeror	Pass/Fail
DYRON MURPHY	PASS
NCA	PASS
RMKM	PASS
STUDIO SOUTHWEST	PASS

<b>EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEETING</b>		
<i>Reason for Meeting</i>	<i>Date of Meeting</i>	<i>Summary of Meeting</i>
Evaluation of Proposals submitted for the Architectural Design Services RFP# FY14-PW-05.	9/9/13	Evaluation Committee members reviewed and scored proposals submitted in response to the RFP

**ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN SERVICES:  
PRELIMINARY JUDICIAL COMPLEX ADDITION RFP# FY14-PW-05**

**SUMMARY OF AWARD RECOMMENDATION**

*The proposal submitted by RMKM ARCHITECTURE, P.C. received the highest total score and is therefore recommended as the finalist to be awarded the contract for Architectural Design Services. The proposal submitted by RMKM ARCHITECTURE, P.C. was the most comprehensive including documentation of extensive experience, knowledge, and understanding of the Architectural Design Services needs of Sandoval County. RMKM ARCHITECTURE, P.C. also provided all of the documentation requested in the Request for Proposals.*

**Names of Evaluation Committee Members:**

**JASON CLARK  
FRED MARQUEZ  
PETE NIETO**

<b>FINALIST INTERVIEWS</b>		
<i>Reason for Meeting</i>	<i>Date of Meeting</i>	<i>Summary of Meeting</i>
Interviews of the top four (4) finalist respondents to the Architectural Design Services RFP# FY14-PW-05.	9/19/13	The top four (4) finalists were interviewed by panel members. Recommendations were made based on the finalists' responses to the following interview questions.
1.) What is your understanding of the scope of this project?		
2.) What will be your approach to gathering information for the project?		
3.) Who from your firm will be the lead / project manager? Is this the same person we will be dealing with directly?		
4.) Of all your on-going projects, what priority will this project have with your firm?		
5.) Based on the scope of the project, what do you anticipate the timeline to be for deliverables?		
6.) Do you have an estimated cost for the completion of this phase of the project?		
7.) Why is your firm the best firm for this project?		
8.) Which projects are more difficult remodel or new construction?		

**Names of Interview Panel Members:**

**PHILLIP RIOS  
PETE NIETO  
FRED MARQUEZ  
RUTH DYGERT  
CRYSTAL HYER  
JASON CLARK**

**Recommended Offeror: RMKM ARCHITECTURE, P.C.**

**Liz Otten**



**9/19/13**

**Printed Name and Signature of Procurement Officer**

**Date**