

METROPOLITAN EXPOSITION-RECREATION COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. 99-16


Authorization for staff to issue Request for Proposal for Architectural Services for the reconstruction of Hall D at the Expo Center.

The Metropolitan Exposition-Recreation Commission finds:

1. That the existing Hall D at the Expo Center is sub-standard, and at the February 26th Commission meeting, the Commission approved with Resolution 99-08 the replacement of Hall D with a new structure.
2. That implementation of the project requires architectural and design services.
3. That the formal competitive request for proposal process required for the project can begin immediately to allow adequate time for architectural and design services and permit processes to be completed which will allow an April, 2000 construction date.

Be it therefore resolved that the Metropolitan Exposition-Recreation Commission authorizes staff to issue a request for proposal, pursuant to Commission policies and procedures, for services required to contract for architectural and design services for the replacement of Hall D at the Expo Center.

Passed by the Commission on April 7, 1999.


Chairman


Secretary/Treasurer

Approved As to Form:
Daniel B. Cooper, General Counsel

By: 
Kathleen A. Pool
Senior Assistant Counsel

MERC STAFF REPORT

Agenda Item/Issue: Authorizing staff to issue Request for Proposal for architectural and design services for Reconstruction of Hall D at Expo Center

Resolution No: 99-16

Date: April 7, 1999

Presented by: Chris Bailey and Mark Hunter

Background:

Part of the long-term capital plan for the Expo Center is the replacement of the aging Halls A, B, C, and D. Recently the Commission approved the project, and on April 1, 1999, the Metro Council approved both the construction and instructed staff to proceed with the financing.

Fiscal Impact:

Funding is available in both the FY99 and FY00 budgets to proceed with architectural and design services for the new Hall D. When funds are received from the sale of bonds, any expenses incurred by the Expo Center to begin the architectural and design services will be charged to the project costs.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that they be authorized to proceed with Request for Proposal to identify a contractor architectural firm design the project; the selection of qualified bidder and authorization for contract will be subject to approval by the Commission.

REQUEST FOR PORPOSALS
For
ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES
For the
PORTLAND EXPOSITION CENTER – HALL “D”

INTRODUCTION

Metro, the regional government, and the Metropolitan Exposition-Recreation Commission (MERC), a commission of Metro, (collectively “Owner”) are soliciting written proposals from qualified design firms to provide full Architectural Services for a new building at the Portland Exposition Center (EXPO). It is the intent of the Owner to enter into a contract with the selected design consultant for full design services for Hall “D” of the EXPO located in north Portland, Oregon.

The expansion project includes approximately 112,000 square feet of building. The project will replace the existing Hall “D” or South Hall. Present plans call for all of the additional square footage to be constructed on the EXPO site adjacent to the new Hall “E”. The addition will include exhibition hall, conference and lounge facilities, lobby, restrooms, commercial kitchen, food service, administrative offices, loading dock, connection corridors, and appropriate support space.

A schedule for the project has been established with a project completion date set for no later than March 17, 2001. The construction will occur during on-going operations of the EXPO and will therefore require complex phasing and/or highly coordinated scheduling. A significant objective of the project is to maintaining on-going EXPO operations with the least amount of disruption possible and realizing cost savings due to value engineering and building systems analysis so that the final product is the best building give the established budget.

Given the above stated objective, the Owner has determined that a Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC) procurement method is best suited for the project. This method is intended to provide a cooperative atmosphere whereby the Owner and CM/GC combine to deliver the best building within the established budget and schedule. The Owner intends to select the Design Consultant and commence design work approximately two months in advance of commencement of the CM/GC’s selection. The Owner intends to establish the Project’s Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) upon completion of the Design Development Documents.

GENERAL PROPOSAL INFORMATION

Written proposals, in English, are due at the Metropolitan Exposition-Recreation Commissions offices at the Oregon Convention Center, 777 NE MLK Jr. Blvd., Portland, OR, 97232, to the attention of Mark Hunter, by no later than 3:00PM, May 6, 1999. Proposals are to be clearly marked “Proposal – Architectural Services – Portland Exposition Center – Hall “D”. Each proposal must be submitted in the format described in this RFP.

All information submitted by Proposers shall be public record and subject to disclosure pursuant to the Oregon Public Records Act, except such portions of the proposals for which Proposers request exception from disclosure to the extent permitted by Oregon law.

Owner and its Contractors will not discriminate against any person based on race, color, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, age, religion, physical disability, political affiliation or marital status.

A pre-proposal conference and site visit has been scheduled for **April 15, 1999, at 10:00AM**. Those attending should check in at the EXPO Administrative Office at 2060 North Marine Drive, Portland, OR 97217.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

A. PROJECT WORK SCOPE

The project site is located at 2060 North Marine Drive, Portland, OR 97217. See Preliminary Drawings attached as Appendix 1. The initial project components are described below:

Replaces existing Hall "D" with a new building approximately 112,000 square feet which includes:

- 72,000 square feet of divisible column free exhibit hall.
- 10,000 square feet of 2-story lobby with large atrium skylight, ticket office, and meeting rooms.
- 4,000 square feet of upper level administrative offices.
- 5,000 square feet of central commercial kitchen.
- 6,000 square feet of conference and lounge facilities.
- 10,000 square feet of storage, service, and loading dock area.
- 5,000 square feet of connection corridor.
- Landscape Court in visitor parking area.
- Exhibitor and service parking facilities.
- Stabilization of wetlands area complete with nature walk.

The building exterior and landscaping are intended to match the existing Hall "E" facility. The finishes included in the addition should be the same quality and type as the original facility, including wall coverings, furniture, fixtures. An art program will be included in the project by way of Metro's One Percent for Art Program whereby 1% of the construction budget will be set aside to purchase public art. Selection of the artwork will be handled through a competition similar to that, which was employed in the Hall "E" project. This program attempts to integrate art into the design and construction process to enhance lobby spaces, public restroom and other public areas of the project.

B. PROJECT ORGANIZATION

Owner will retain a Construction Manager/General Contractor to lead the pre-construction and construction phases of the project. Specifically, the CM/GC will participate in project planning, constructability review, value engineering and cost estimating.

The Owner's contact for the project is the Project Manager who will be appointed in writing by MERC's General Manager.

C. PROJECT SCHEDULE

The current project schedule includes the following dates or milestones:

<u>ACTIVITY</u>	<u>DATE</u>
Issue RFP for Architect	April, 1999
Pre-Proposal Conference-Architect	April, 1999
Architect Proposals Due	May, 1999
Interviews-Architect	May, 1999
Execute Contract/Commence Work-Architect	May, 1999
Issue RFP for CM/GC	June, 1999
CM/GC proposal due	June, 1999
CM contract executed	July, 1999
Establish GMP	August, 1999
GC contract executed	August, 1999
Begin construction	April, 2000
Complete Construction	March, 2001

D. CONSTRUCTION BUDGET

The estimated construction budget is \$15,800,000. The goal is to build the best building for the set budget.

E. SCOPE OF SERVICES – SEE ATTACHMENT “A”

PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS

A. Deadline and Submission of Proposals

10 copies of the submittal shall be furnished to Owner addressed to:

MERC
777 NE MLK Jr. Blvd.
Portland, OR 97232
ATTN: Mark Hunter

And clearly marked “Proposal – Architectural Services – Portland Exhibition Center – Hall “D.” Submittals will be returned and not considered if received after 3:00PM, May 6, 1999. Postmarks are not acceptable.

Proposers may withdraw their Proposal in person, or by written or telegraphic request prior to the scheduled closing time for submitting Proposals.

B. Basis for Proposals

This RFP represents the most definitive statement Owner will make concerning the information upon which the submittals are to be based, Owner will not consider any information, which is not addressed in the RFP, in evaluating the submittals. All questions relating to the RFP should be addressed to Mark Hunter. Any questions, which in the opinion of Owner warrant a written reply or RFP amendment, will be furnished to all parties receiving the RFP. Owner will respond to questions received up until seven days in advance of the proposal due date.

C. Selection Committee

Owner will appoint a Selection Committee to review the submittals received and conduct interviews. The Selection Committee will evaluate information provided in the written proposals and interviews and rank the candidates in order of suitability to meet Owner's needs. Criteria to be used for evaluation are listed in Section entitled **Evaluation of Proposals**.

D. Award of Contract

Owner intends to award a Contract for Architectural Services to the Proposer who, after considering the recommendation of the Selection Committee, Owner finds best fits the needs of Owner to perform the work in accordance with the requirements set out in this RFP.

PROPOSAL CONTENTS

The submittal should contain not more than the equivalent of forty single-sided pages of written material (excluding resumes, which should be included in an appendix), describing the ability of the Proposer to perform the work requested. Proposals should be concise and direct. They should be submitted on recyclable, double-sided recycled paper (post-consumer content.) No waxed page dividers or non-recyclable materials should be included in the proposal. The submittal should include the following information:

A. Firm Description

For each firm participating in the proposal, provide a brief narrative description of the firm's history and capabilities. Include complex public project and CM/GC project experience, annual volume figures for the last five years, and current firm commitments.

B. Experience

Describe relevant experience of both key firms and key individuals on the proposed project team.

C. Staffing

1. Provide a project organization chart showing your proposed staff for this job, including all professional staff involved in project management, corporate administration, design and specification, drafting, and supervision. Clearly identify the approximate percentage each individual will be working on the project. Include resumes for all individuals on the chart, listing their relevant past experience.
2. Describe the duties and responsibilities for all key staff positions.

D. Project Approach and Management of the Work

In detail, describe your firms' overall plan to complete the project. At a minimum, include the following:

1. Discuss your plan for providing services in the design, construction, and commissioning phases of the project.
2. Explain how you will ensure the timely delivery of high quality documents as required by the project team to complete the work effectively. Discuss your internal quality control program.
3. Explain how you will approach the cost estimating and value engineering work.
4. Discuss your experience with promoting participation on the part of minority, women-owned and emerging small business enterprises as contractors, subcontractors, and suppliers. Explain your approach to obtain maximum participation on this project.
5. Explain how you intend to establish and maintain good relations and foster open and productive communications with Owner, their Project and Construction Manager, the CM/GC, and MERC Staff.
6. Identify key issues and constraints you foresee in the project. Propose means of resolution of such.
7. Describe the role you foresee for the design consultant during the establishment of the projects GMP.

E. Fee Proposal

1. **Base Bid** – Submit a fee proposal for the Architectural Services. The fee should be a lump sum for all basic Services required, broken into project components. Provide details regarding estimated hours, rates, and consultants to be utilized. In addition, provide hourly rates for all proposed staff, which may be used to determine compensation for Extra Services.
2. **Alternate Bid** – Submit separate fees for each of the Extra Services described below. The fee should be a lump sum. Provide details regarding estimated hours, rates, and consultants utilized.
 - Telecommunications Design
 - Audio/Visual Design
 - Interior and Exterior Signage Design
 - Food Service Design
 - Security Design

The Owner shall determine which if any of the above Extra Services to include in the Services to be performed by the Architect. The Owner may select none or any combination of the above Extra Services.

GENERAL PROPOSAL AND CONTRACT CONDITIONS

A. Limitation and Award

This RFP does not commit Owner to the award of a contract, nor to pay any costs incurred in the preparation and submission of Proposals in anticipation of a contract. Owner reserves the right to reject or accept any or all Proposals received as the result of this request, to negotiate with all qualified sources, or to cancel all or part of this RFP.

B. Contract Type

Owner intends to award an Architectural Services Contract with the selected firm. A copy of the sample contract is attached hereto. Any concerns or recommendations for changes should be included in the Proposal submittal, including an explanation why it is in the best interests of Owner to accept recommended changes. Requests for changes in contract language submitted after selection of the successful Proposer may be treated as a withdrawal of the Proposal. In the event Owner and the successful Proposer do not agree on the terms of a contract, Owner may, at its option, begin negotiations with the Proposer ranked next highest by the Selection Committee.

C. Validity Period and Authority

The Proposal shall be considered valid for a period of 90 days and shall contain a statement to that effect. The submittal shall contain the name, title, address,

and telephone number of an individual or individuals with authority to bind the proposing firm during the period in which Owner is evaluating the submittals.

D. Conflict of Interest

A Proposer submitting a Proposal thereby certifies that no officer, agent, or employee of Metro or MERC has a pecuniary interest in the submittal; that the submittal is made in good faith without fraud, collusion, or connection of any kind with any other Proposer; the Proposer is competing solely in its own behalf without connection with, or obligation to, any undisclosed person or firm.

E. Appeals

Appeals of the Award of the Contracts should be addressed to the Metro Contracts Administrator, Risk and Contracts Division, 600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97232. Appeals shall be submitted in writing within five working days of the postmarked Notice of Award or disqualification. Appeals must describe the specific citation of law, rule, regulation, or practice upon which protest is based. The judgment used in the evaluation by individual members of the Selection Committee is not grounds for appeal.

EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

A. Evaluation Procedure

Only submittals received that conform to the requirements of this RFP will be evaluated. The evaluation will be based on the criteria identified in the following section and performed by a Selection Committee appointed by Owner. After review of the written submittals, the Selection Committee will rank the Proposers. The three highest-ranking Proposers will be interviewed. Upon completion of the interviews, the Selection Committee will rank the three candidates based both on their written proposal and their interview. The Selection Committee may request clarifying information of any Proposer during the evaluation process which should be provided in a timely manner.

B. Evaluation Criteria

The Selection Committee will evaluate information provided in the written Proposals and the interviews to rank the candidates in order of suitability to meet Owner's needs. Criteria to be used for evaluation are as follows, listed in order of importance with the most important criteria listed first.

1. Project Approach and Management Plan	35 points
2. Staffing	30 points
3. Fee Proposal	20 points
4. Past Relevant Experience	<u>15 points</u>
Total	100 points