

**A COMBINED PHONE MEETING OF THE BUSINESS AFFAIRS
AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Community College of Philadelphia
Thursday, December 21, 2017 at 10:00 A.M.**

Present from the Executive Committee: Mr. Jeremiah J. White, Jr., (Chair) (*via* Teleconference), Ms. Suzanne Biemiller (*via* Teleconference), and Ms. Lydia Hernández Vélez, Esq. (*via* Teleconference)

Present from the Business Affairs Committee: Ms. Suzanne Biemiller (Chair) (*via* Teleconference) and Mr. Joseph Martz (*via* Teleconference)

Serves on Both Business Affairs & Executive Committees: Ms. Suzanne Biemiller (*via* Teleconference)

Present from the Administration: Dr. Donald Guy Generals, Mr. Jacob Eapen, Mr. James P. Spiewak, and Victoria Zellers, Esq.

AGENDA – PUBLIC SESSION

(1) Architect Selection for the Library and Learning Commons Project (Action Item):

Discussion: Mr. Eapen briefly reviewed the history of the project planning for the Library and Learning Commons Project which started in 2012. The project will incorporate the entire footprint of the Library space which will be converted to be the center piece of the campus. As noted in the recently completed Facilities Master Plan the project will address the changes in demand for Library services and a central learning student destination and will realign the Library, Learning Laboratories, the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning, Tutoring space and will incorporate enhancements to the interior and exterior learning environments within common spaces, courtyards, and circulation spaces. He noted that during the FY 2017-18 Pennsylvania Department of Education Capital Process, the College designated this project as its carry-over project, and the project was approved by PDE for funding to a debt service level of \$9.0 million (the amount originally submitted to PDE in prior years). Mr. Eapen indicated that the cost of the project may be in the \$15 to \$20 million dollar range.

Mr. Eapen stated that the College developed an RFP for architectural, engineering and library services. The pre-bid meeting had more than 50 attendees from numerous firms. Nine quality architectural firms submitted bids which were reviewed by the Evaluation Committee. Please refer to Attachment A. The Committee was comprised of the VP for Business & Finance; the Dean of Education Support Services; the Assistant VP for Facilities & Construction Management; the Access Services Librarian/Asst. Prof. Library; Asst. Prof. & Chair, Learning Lab/Student Academic Computer Center; the Associate VP for Budgets & Business Services; the Associate VP, Division of Strategic Initiatives & Dean, Access & Community Engagement; and the Procurement Administrator. The committee selected five firms to do a presentation to the committee that also allowed for a question and answer period. These firms all had proposed

fees of less than 8.5% of the \$15 million project budget as described in the RFP. The Evaluation Committee used the criteria outlined in the Evaluation of Proposals in the selection process. Please refer to Attachment B. The Committee unanimously selected two firms as the finalists, HDR and Clarke Caton Hintz, and they presented to the President and Cabinet members who then offered comments to the Committee.

Mr. Eapen commented that all Committee members felt that the College received excellent proposals and that the two finalists put together excellent teams; had demonstrated experience in like projects; understood the College's project intentions, including the challenges and opportunities of the project; had appropriately defined project approaches; and believed in a collaborative approach. He noted that HDR, a large international architectural firm that recently opened an office in Philadelphia, had strong minority participation on their team. HDR partnered with Kelly/Maiello Architects (MBE 24%); Hunt Engineering (WBE 6%); and Metropolitan Acoustics (WBE 2%). In addition, Philadelphia-based firms totaled 88% of the total fees of the HDR proposal. Mr. Eapen mentioned that Kelly/Maiello was involved in the Philadelphia Library renovation project. In response to questions, Mr. Eapen stated that architectural fees for a project of this size are typically in the 7 to 10% of the estimated project cost. He answered that the project will most likely take fifteen months to complete with a construction starting in the summer of 2018.

The Evaluation Committee reviewed and considered all aspects of the required service and delivery of that service and unanimously recommends awarding an Architectural Service contract to HDR in the contract amount of \$1,264,378.

Action: Mr. White moved and Ms. Hernández Vélez seconded the motion that the Business Affairs and Executive Committees of the Board of Trustees approve the awarding of the Library/Learning Commons Architectural Service contract to HDR in the amount of \$1,264,378. The motion passed unanimously.

ATTACHMENT A

Responses of Architectural Firms and Bid Amount

Responses of Architectural Firms and Bid Amount (Revised)

Spiezle Architectural Group	USA Architects, Planners + Interior Designers, P.A.	BWA Architecture + Planning	Clarke Caton Hintz	HDR	KSS Architectures, LLP	Seiler+Drury Architecture	Ewing Cole	Wallace Roberts Todd, LLC
\$818,519	\$867,886	\$985,500	\$1,020,928	\$1,264,378	\$1,269,932	\$1,386,300	\$1,550,238	\$1,638,290

ATTACHMENT B

Evaluation of Proposals

A. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

Proposals will be evaluated for the most cost effective and responsive to the needs of the College. The College, at its sole discretion, will make final determination of the proposal responsiveness and reserves the right to award all, partial or none of the elements of the proposal. Proposals will be reviewed by the College Selection Committee consisting of representatives from Purchasing, Library, Education Support Services, Learning Lab/Student Academic Computer Center, Strategic Initiatives, Access & Community Engagement, Facilities and Finance. The award of the services associated with this RFP may or may not be made to the Vendor submitting the lowest price Cost Proposal. The award will be made to the Vendor whose Proposal is determined to be the most advantageous to the College, taking into consideration, without limitation the evaluation factors set forth below.

1. Quality of Team (35%):

- Composition of the team and alignment with project objectives
- The degree to which the personnel on the Project Team have held responsible project positions for similar projects;
- Demonstrated depth and higher education experience creating:
 - Libraries
 - student/study hubs
 - shared collaborative spaces
 - flexible spaces
- The degree to which the Project Team brings experience in the full range of skills and expertise needed to accomplish the scope of work in all task areas;
- The degree of project experience energizing and integrating internal and external common spaces and courtyards
- The specific commitments made in the Proposal for staffing the Project Team, including percent of time dedicated by Project Manager and senior members who are experienced and most aligned with project objectives.
- Contributions of Technology and Educational Specialists in support of project
- Experience within the local permitting region
- Experience planning projects in phased fully occupied and operational, spaces and functions
- Detailers efficient in AutoCAD, REVIT, and BIM.
- Any other experience and/or criteria the committee deems relevant.

2. Work Plan and Defined Approach to Project and Project Schedule (40%):

- Proposed organization of the work;
- Unique capabilities that may influence the Project;
- Understanding of the appropriate levels of effort required (hours) and approach for tasks required for:
 - *Information Collection*: Collaboration plan integrating faculty, staff, students, administration, outside consultants and other architectural firms
 - *Needs Assessment*: Develop a comprehensive understanding of the intent of the project, the infrastructures in-place or available

- *Program Development*: Providing Alternative Approaches to generate a minimum of three ideas for solutions
- *Schematic Design*: Designs that defines the general scope and conceptual design of the project
- *Design Development*: Detailed design development for a clear and coordinated description of all aspects of the design including Architectural, Mechanical, Plumbing, Electrical and Fire Protection Systems
- *Construction Documents*: Construction documents which consist of permitting, bid and conformed set of drawings, and specifications for a complete and comprehensive project manual.
- *Procurement*: Support of the college procurement practice of bidding, responding to Requests for Information, reviewing responses, making recommendations for multiple prime contracts and contractor negotiation through contract award and reconciling any cost differences and/or revising design drawings to bring the costs in line to the estimate or college budget.
- *Contract Administration*: Overseeing construction to ensure conformity to construction drawings, specifications, and standards. Weekly meetings, submittal review, requests for information, accurate tracking and management of pay applications, certified payroll, change order management, support to the General Trades Contractor and all other necessary efforts to oversee the project through successful close-out and completion.
- Identification of Project risks and methods to mitigate or eliminate such risks to complete the Project within the proposed schedule, estimated budget and with the quality and/or performance specifications identified herein

3. Financials and Alignment with College's Form of Agreement (15%)

- Price, Alternate Price and/or cost items deemed in the best interest of the College
- Costs and Fees
- Breakdown of hours and percentage of time allocated to senior members who are experienced and most aligned with project objectives throughout the project.
- Value added and cost savings achieved from previous projects
- Alignment with College AIA –B101 Form of Agreement

4. Quality of Overall Proposal (10%)

- Project Interpretation
- Collaborative Approach
- Team experience implementing projects in fully occupied and operational spaces.
- Understanding of programming the technological demands supporting emerging academic pedagogies to enhance the intellectual environments and backbone to incorporate new technologies and facilitate future initiatives
- Any other proposal qualities, features, and/or criteria the College deems relevant.