



City Council Agenda Report

Meeting Date: May 3, 2016

Department: Management Services

SUBJECT:

CONTRACT AWARD FOR CIVIC CENTER TECHNOLOGY DESIGN AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT SERVICES

RECOMMENDED ACTION(S):

1. Approve the Agreement with P2S Engineering, for Civic Center Technology Design and Project Management Services.
 2. Authorize the Mayor to sign, and the City Clerk to attest, the Agreement with P2S Engineering.
-

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The design of the Civic Center's technology infrastructure will be critical to the functionality, flexibility, and usability of the Lake Forest Civic Center. This infrastructure includes physical infrastructure, hardware, communications systems, security systems, and audio-visual systems. Based upon the City's recent design and construction experience with the Sports Park and Recreation Center, staff recognized the value in retaining a technology design-focused consultant to assist with design, bid, and project management activities for the Lake Forest Civic Center project. In February 2016, the City Manager approved the issuance of a competitive Request for Proposals for Civic Center Technology Design and Project Management Services. The City received a total of four (4) proposals. After evaluating technical submittals, cost proposals, and interviewing the firms, staff recommends awarding a three-year contract to P2S Engineering with a total not-to-exceed compensation amount of \$348,500. There are sufficient funds in the 2-Year CIP Budget for Civic Center Design for the activities in the proposed agreement. The City Attorney's Office reviewed and approved the attached agreement as to form.

BACKGROUND:

In December 2015, the City executed an agreement with Carrier Johnson + CULTURE for general architectural and design services related to the Lake Forest Civic Center project. Shortly thereafter, City staff began the process to

procure the services of a firm to provide technology design, in order to achieve the City's goals related to technology in the Civic Center. Since these services were outside the scope of work of the City's existing agreement with SIGMAnet for IT support services, staff recognized an RFP would need to be issued.

In February 2016, the City Manager approved the issuance of a Request for Proposals ("RFP") to solicit firms to design the technology elements of the Civic Center project, specifically: IT infrastructure; telecommunication networks; audio-visual components and integration; and security systems. The Scope of Work included schematic design, design development, construction drawings, bidding, and construction administration of these technology components. The services will be in cooperation with, and not duplicate, the activities of the City's design firm and construction management firm.

DISCUSSION:

Staff posted the Civic Center Technology Design and Project Management draft Scope of Work ("SOW") on the City's website on February 24, 2016, for the mandatory seven (7) day review and comment period. Two firms provided comments which were incorporated into the final SOW. The City released the final RFP on March 2 with a due date of March 23, 2016, to meet the mandatory 21-day posting period. The RFP was posted to the City's website and emailed separately to five firms. During the RFP's open period, staff received questions/requests for clarification from proposing firms, which were compiled and posted to the bid section of the City's website to ensure availability to all potential proposers. In response to the RFP, four firms submitted proposals:

- PlanNet Consulting (Brea, CA)
- P2S Engineering (Long Beach, CA)
- Syska Hennessy Group (Culver City, CA)
- Vantage Technology Consulting (El Segundo, CA)

To evaluate the proposals and interview potential candidate firms, the City Manager approved the following Selection Committee: the Director of Management Services, the Information Technology Manager (Management Services), and the Principal Civil Engineer (Public Works). The City's Purchasing Coordinator monitored the purchasing process.

The City's evaluation and selection process involved a qualitative evaluation (technical review) of the written proposals, in-person qualification interviews, and client reference checks. The selection panel scored written proposals based upon the firm's expertise and experience, response to the scope of work, and allocation of resources. In accordance with RFP guidelines, firms must score an

average of 70 points on the qualitative evaluation in order to advance to the interview portion of the process. Each of the four (4) firms received at least the minimum score and the selection committee invited all firms to the oral presentation/interview on March 31, 2016.

Interviews were held at City Hall and each firm brought those team members who would be working directly with City staff on the project. Interview scores considered the following factors:

- Experience on similar projects
- Effective communication
- Approach and methodology
- Understanding of the technology needs of local government
- Proposed personnel and allocation of resources

The results of the qualitative evaluation and qualifications interview are displayed in Table 1. From a possible 600 points, P2S received the highest score of 529, followed by PlanNet with 499, Syska Hennessey with 476, and Vantage with 461.

Table 1. Qualitative Evaluation and Interview Scores

Firm	Technical Review			Technical Review Subtotal	Qualifications Interview			Interview Subtotal	Total
	Rater				Rater				
	1	2	3		1	2	3		
P2S									
	82	85	89	256	95	90	88	273	529
PlanNet									
	89	85	76	250	85	90	74	249	499
Syska Hennessey									
	86	80	75	241	90	70	75	235	476
Vantage									
	73	75	79	227	70	80	84	234	461

All firms were given five (5) days to submit a Best and Final Cost Proposal. Only Syska Hennessey elected to submit a revised cost proposal. Cost proposals for all firms were then opened, and are listed in Table 2.

Table 2: Cost Proposals with Total Score

Firm	Cost Proposal	Total Score
P2S	\$ 435,900	529
PlanNet	\$ 475,691	499
Syska Hennessey	\$ 135,200	476
Vantage	\$ 322,480	461

As documented in the City's Purchasing and Contract Guidelines, the cost proposal of the top ranked firm is evaluated to determine if it is reasonable. The tests of reasonableness include comparison of the cost proposal to the City's estimated project cost and the City's project budget, prior experience, comparative project costs in neighboring or relevant communities, professional judgement, and comparison to costs submitted by qualified vendors for the proposed project. First staff compared overall project cost. The cost proposal of the top-ranked firm, P2S, was second-highest at \$435,900, or 8.4% less than the highest cost proposal of \$475,691, submitted by PlanNet.

Next staff compared hours allocated to the project and average hourly cost as shown in Table 3. P2S and PlanNet each allocated over 2,400 hours at an average hourly cost of \$172 and \$176 per hour, respectively. Syska Hennessey and Vantage each allocated less than 1,700 hours (much less in the case of Syska Hennessey) at an average hourly cost over \$190. When queried about the significantly lower allocated hours in their proposal, Syska Hennessey stated that the hours listed only represented the billable hours of staff based in the United States. Syska Hennessey stated that the additional hours necessary to complete the project would be provided by staff in Shanghai, China, at local hourly rates not documented in the proposal. This verbal disclosure outside of the formal, written proposal led to staff doubts about the thoroughness and completeness of the submitted proposal. Based on these findings, staff concluded the P2S proposal met the criterion of reasonableness.

Table 3: Total Hours and Cost per Hour

Firm	Cost	Total Hours	Average Cost per Hour
P2S	\$ 435,900	2,477	\$176
PlanNet	\$ 475,691	2,763	\$172
Syska Hennessey	\$ 135,200	692	\$195
Vantage	\$ 322,480	1,664	\$193

Reference checks conducted for P2S included projects involving IT infrastructure, telecommunication networks, security and surveillance systems, and audio-visual projects. References were provided by a combination of project owners (CSU Long Beach, Golden West College, Long Beach Community

College District) as well as engineering firms (Psomas, DLR Group). All references communicated their satisfaction with the high quality of work produced by P2S and the firm's professionalism, as illustrated in the attached References form.

Based on the proposal evaluations, interviews, cost analyses, and reference checks, staff believes P2S to be the best qualified firm for this project. Staff initiated negotiations with P2S to clarify some sections of the Scope of Work, resulting in P2S adjusting its allocation of resources to more efficiently meet the project requirements. For example: (1) P2S originally planned to perform its own technology equipment inventory for relocation planning, however, the City already keeps an equipment inventory and can provide that to P2S; (2) P2S planned to evaluate all City IT systems for potential bids, including data storage, but, in 2015 the City enhanced data storage capacity and does not need to procure additional storage for the Civic Center. Consequently, the initial proposal of 2,477 hours was reduced by 16% to 2,089, and the cost proposal was subsequently modified accordingly from the initial \$435,900 to \$348,500, a 20% reduction.

Staff recommends the City enter into a three (3) year agreement with P2S Engineering for Civic Center Technology Design and Project Management Services for a total not-to-exceed cost of \$348,500. The Agreement includes two optional one-year renewal options. The City Attorney's Office reviewed and approved the attached Agreement as to form.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The agreement's total compensation is for a not-to-exceed amount of \$348,500. There are sufficient funds in the 2 Year CIP Budget for Civic Center Design for the activities in the proposed agreement.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Agreement with P2S Engineering for Civic Center Technology Design and Project Management Services
2. Reference Check

Initiated By: Douglas McBratney, Information Technology Manager
Submitted By: Hannah Shin-Heydorn, Director of Management Services
Approved By: Robert C. Dunek, City Manager