City of San Angelo

Memo

Date:	
То:	Mayor and Councilmembers
From:	Robert F. Bluthardt
Subject:	Agenda Item for June 17, 2013
Contact:	Robert F. Bluthardt, Site Manager/Fort Concho 234-0316
Caption:	REGULAR
	Discussion and consideration of authorizing staff to begin negotiations with Antenora Architects of Austin, Texas for a contract and scope of services for the Fort Concho Visitor Center Project at Barracks 1 & 2
Summary:	Fort Concho let out a RFQ for professional services for this project under RFQ FC 01-13. By the deadline of 11-26-13 eighteen submissions were received and rated and ranked by a city staff/fort board committee. The top five were invited for an on-site interview. These five were rated and ranked again. Antenora Architects received the highest ranking
	Fort Concho's current visitor greeting area in Barracks 1 dates from 1995. While a great improvement over the Headquarters Building lobby, this space was quickly outgrown. Fort staff and board have been discussing expansion/improvement of this space for many years. Ultimately, this firm will help us with a feasibility study that integrates our needs for a larger greeting area, gift shop, admin offices & storage, a small theatre, and permanent and temporary display galleries within the best practices and examples in use today.
	This study will help staff with the future creation of actual construction documents that will guide the renovations and improvements. It will also help staff with documents and visual material to start the fundraising process among private donors and foundations.
History:	The improvement/expansion of the Fort Concho Visitor Center was approved by the voters in the election of 11-2-10. Fort staff and board received the authorization to start planning in 2012. A staff-board retreat in 2013 created the basis for the issued RFQ. The project is also listed in the city's Capital Improvement Program.
Financial Impact:	Up to \$90,000 is available in FY 2014 for planning; \$990,000 total funding is available.
Related Vision Item (if applicable):	Improvement of public facilities
Other Information/ Recommendation:	Staff recommends authorization to negotiate a contract with Antenora Architects for scope of services for the Fort Concho Visitor Center Project.

Attachments:	Preliminary Scores Final Scores Summary of scores and ranking of all eighteen firms who participated.
Presentation:	PowerPoint
Publication:	n/a
Reviewed by Director:	Carl White Parks & Recreation May 17, 2014
Approved by Legal:	

Proposals due 11-26-13 and reviewed by individual committee members by March-2014

Member 1							
Category	Max Pts	Antenora Architects	Architectural Planning	Architectural Plus	Atkin Olshin	Ford Powell	ForeSite
Design Team	30	29	25	26	26	26	25
Past Similar Projects	20	20	16	17	16	16	15
Best Practices at Historic Sites	20	19	17	17	17	18	15
Experience in visitor services	20	18	15	17	17	17	16
Experience in Projects with Public Input	10	9	7	9	8	9	7
Reserved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Score	100	95	80	86	84	86	78
	Rank	1	13	2	8	2	17

Member 2							
Category	Points	Antenora Architects	Architectural Planning	Architectural Plus	Atkin Olshin	Ford Powell	ForeSite
Design Team	30	20	20	20	19	29	25
Past Similar Projects	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Best Practices at Historic Sites	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Experience in visitor services	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Experience in Projects with Public Input	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Reserved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Score	100	90	90	90	89	99	95
•	Rank	6	6	6	14	3	4

Member 3							
Category	Points	Antenora Architects	Architectural Planning	Architectural Plus	Atkin Olshin	Ford Powell	ForeSite
Design Team	30	30	30	25	25	29	15
Past Similar Projects	20	20	10	15	15	20	5
Best Practices at Historic Sites	20	20	10	15	20	20	5
Experience in visitor services	20	20	15	20	15	20	10
Experience in Projects with Public Input	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Reserved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Score	100	100	75	85	85	99	45
	Rank	1	10	7	7	3	17

Date: November 26, 2013/2:00 PM

Member 5

Category	Points	Antenora Architects	Architectural Planning	Architectural Plus	Atkin Olshin	Ford Powell	ForeSite
Design Team	30	28	27	18	15	28	27
Past Similar Projects	20	20	15	10	8	18	15
Best Practices at Historic Sites	20	20	19	17	17	20	17
Experience in visitor services	20	19	15	8	8	20	18
Experience in Projects with Public Input	10	10	10	9	8	10	10
Reserved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Score		97	86	62	56	96	87
	Rank	1	8	15	16	3	7

		Antenora	Architectural	Architectural		Ford	
Category	Points	Architects	Planning	Plus	Atkin Olshin	Powell	ForeSite
Design Team	30	28	26	28	26	28	26
Past Similar Projects	20	18	16	16	20	18	16
Best Practices at Historic Sites	20	18	16	16	20	18	18
Experience in visitor services	20	20	16	18	14	20	18
Experience in Projects with Public Input	10	10	8	10	10	10	10
Reserved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Score	100	94	82	88	90	94	88
	Rank	1	14	9	7	1	9

Member 6											
Category	Points	Antenora Architects	Architectural Planning	Architectural Plus	Atkin Olshin	Ford Powell	ForeSite				
Design Team	30	30	26	26	30	28	25				
Past Similar Projects	20	18	10	16	26	18	14				
Best Practices at Historic Sites	20	18	15	18	16	18	10				
Experience in visitor services	20	18	5	14	12	20	20				
Experience in Projects with Public Input	10	10	2	8	8	10	8				
Reserved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Total Score		94	58	82	92	94	77				

Date: November 26, 2013/2:00 PM

Proposals due 11-26-13 and reviewed

by individual committee members by March-2014

Rank 1 17 8 3 1 9

Date: November 26, 2013/2:00 PM

Proposals due 11-26-13 and reviewed by individual committee members by March-2014

Member 7											
Category	Points	Antenora Architects	Architectural Planning	Architectural Plus	Atkin Olshin	Ford Powell	ForeSite				
Design Team	30	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Past Similar Projects	20	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Best Practices at Historic Sites	20	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Experience in visitor services	20	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Experience in Projects with Public Input	10	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Reserved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Total Score	100	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	Rank	1	1	1	1	1	1				

Committee Member Summary							
Category	Total Points	Antenora Architects	Architectural Planning	Architectural Plus	Atkin Olshin	Ford Powell	ForeSite
Design Team	210	165	154	143	141	168	143
Past Similar Projects	140	116	87	94	105	110	85
Best Practices at Historic Sites	140	115	97	103	110	114	85
Experience in visitor services	140	115	86	97	86	117	102
Experience in Projects with Public Input	70	59	47	56	54	59	55
Reserved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Score	700	570	471	493	496	568	470
	Rank	1	13	10	9	2	14

Attach a Written Justification for each company's ranking and forward to Purchasing

NOTE: Attached this form and the Written Justification to your Agenda Background Memo

Member 1							
Category	Max Pts	Gensler	Inter-Sec Group	Killis Almond	Komatsu	Lord Aeck Sargent	Museum Insights
Design Team	30	26	15	25	26	25	25
Past Similar Projects	20	18	10	18	17	17	16
Best Practices at Historic Sites	20	16	10	18	18	17	16
Experience in visitor services	20	17	10	17	17	17	16
Experience in Projects with Public Input	10	8	8	8	8	8	7
Reserved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Score	100	85	53	86	86	84	80
	Rank	7	18	2	2	8	13

Member 2							
Category	Points	Gensler	Inter-Sec Group	Killis Almond	Komatsu	Lord Aeck Sargent	Museum Insights
Design Team	30	30	20	20	20	15	20
Past Similar Projects	20	20	10	20	20	20	20
Best Practices at Historic Sites	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Experience in visitor services	20	20	10	20	20	20	20
Experience in Projects with Public Input	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Reserved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Score	100	100	70	90	90	85	90
	Rank	1	18	6	6	16	6

Member 3							
Category	Points	Gensler	Inter-Sec Group	Killis Almond	Komatsu	Lord Aeck Sargent	Museum Insights
Design Team	30	29	0	20	20	28	15
Past Similar Projects	20	19	0	15	15	19	15
Best Practices at Historic Sites	20	20	0	15	15	19	15
Experience in visitor services	20	20	0	10	15	19	20
Experience in Projects with Public Input	10	10	0	10	10	9	10
Reserved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Score	100	98	0	70	75	94	75
	Rank	4	18	13	10	5	10

Member 4							
Category	Points	Gensler	Inter-Sec Group	Killis Almond	Komatsu	Lord Aeck Sargent	Museum Insights
Design Team	30	27	15	28	26	19	20
Past Similar Projects	20	18	10	13	14	16	15
Best Practices at Historic Sites	20	17	10	19	19	20	18
Experience in visitor services	20	19	5	14	16	18	15
Experience in Projects with Public Input	10	9	5	10	10	9	9
Reserved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Scor	е	90	45	84	85	82	77
	Rank	6	18	10	9	11	12

Member 5							
Category	Points	Gensler	Inter-Sec Group	Killis Almond	Komatsu	Lord Aeck Sargent	Museum Insights
Design Team	30	28	14	26	28	26	22
Past Similar Projects	20	16	10	16	16	16	14
Best Practices at Historic Sites	20	20	10	18	18	20	20
Experience in visitor services	20	20	10	18	18	20	14
Experience in Projects with Public Input	10	10	8	8	8	8	10
Reserved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Score	100	94	52	86	88	90	80
	Rank	1	18	12	9	7	15

Member 6							
Category	Points	Gensler	Inter-Sec Group	Killis Almond	Komatsu	Lord Aeck Sargent	Museum Insights
Design Team	30	28	10	26	28	20	15
Past Similar Projects	20	14	0	12	18	10	10
Best Practices at Historic Sites	20	18	5	20	18	12	10
Experience in visitor services	20	20	0	5	18	14	20
Experience in Projects with Public Input	10	10	5	8	10	10	4
Reserved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Score		90	20	71	92	66	59

Kank 3 16 10 3 13 16	Rank	5	18	10	3	13	16
----------------------------------	------	---	----	----	---	----	----

Date: November 26, 2013/2:00 PM

Member 7							
Category	Points	Gensler	Inter-Sec Group	Killis Almond	Komatsu	Lord Aeck Sargent	Museum Insights
Design Team	30	0	0	0	0	0	0
Past Similar Projects	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
Best Practices at Historic Sites	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
Experience in visitor services	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
Experience in Projects with Public Input	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reserved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Score	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rank	1	1	1	1	1	1

Committee Member Summary							
Category	Total Points	Gensler	Inter-Sec Group	Killis Almond	Komatsu	Lord Aeck Sargent	Museum Insights
Design Team	210	168	74	145	148	133	117
Past Similar Projects	140	105	40	94	100	98	90
Best Practices at Historic Sites	140	111	55	110	108	108	99
Experience in visitor services	140	116	35	84	104	108	105
Experience in Projects with Public Input	70	57	36	54	56	54	50
Reserved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Score	700	557	240	487	516	501	461
	Rank	3	18	11	5	8	16

Attach a Written Justification for each company's ranki

NOTE: Attached this form and the Written Justification to your Aç

Member 1							
Category	Max Pts	Quimby McCoy	Rhodes Works	Southwest Museum Svc	Studio Tectonic	VOH Architects	Westlake Reed
Design Team	30	25	26	26	25	24	26
Past Similar Projects	20	17	15	15	16	18	17
Best Practices at Historic Sites	20	18	16	16	16	17	17
Experience in visitor services	20	18	15	15	16	17	16
Experience in Projects with Public Input	10	8	7	7	8	7	8
Reserved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Score	100	86	79	79	81	83	84
	Rank	2	15	15	12	11	8

Member 2							
Category	Points	Quimby McCoy	Rhodes Works	Southwest Museum Svc	Studio Tectonic	VOH Architects	Westlake Reed
Design Team	30	20	20	20	30	10	25
Past Similar Projects	20	20	20	19	20	20	20
Best Practices at Historic Sites	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Experience in visitor services	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Experience in Projects with Public Input	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Reserved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Score	100	90	90	89	100	80	95
	Rank	6	6	14	1	17	4

Member 3							
Category	Points	Quimby McCoy	Rhodes Works	Southwest Museum Svc	Studio Tectonic	VOH Architects	Westlake Reed
Design Team	30	20	20	20	20	25	30
Past Similar Projects	20	10	10	10	20	19	20
Best Practices at Historic Sites	20	10	10	15	10	19	20
Experience in visitor services	20	15	20	20	20	19	20
Experience in Projects with Public Input	10	5	10	5	10	10	10
Reserved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Score	100	60	70	70	80	92	100
	Rank	16	13	13	9	6	1

Member 4 Category	Points	Quimby McCoy	Rhodes Works	Southwest Museum Svc	Studio Tectonic	VOH Architects	Westlake Reed
Design Team	30	18	28	29	15	15	27
Past Similar Projects	20	12	19	19	8	15	18
Best Practices at Historic Sites	20	18	20	18	17	17	19
Experience in visitor services	20	15	20	17	8	18	17
Experience in Projects with Public Input	10	9	10	10	8	9	10
Reserved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Score		72	97	93	56	74	91
	Rank	14	1	4	16	13	5

Member 5							
Category	Points	Quimby McCoy	Rhodes Works	Southwest Museum Svc	Studio Tectonic	VOH Architects	Westlake Reed
Design Team	30	24	26	26	26	24	26
Past Similar Projects	20	14	16	20	16	14	16
Best Practices at Historic Sites	20	16	20	20	16	18	20
Experience in visitor services	20	14	20	20	16	16	20
Experience in Projects with Public Input	10	10	10	8	10	8	10
Reserved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Score	100	78	92	94	84	80	92
'	Rank	17	5	1	13	15	5

Member 6							
Category	Points	Quimby McCoy	Rhodes Works	Southwest Museum Svc	Studio Tectonic	VOH Architects	Westlake Reed
Design Team	30	24	28	26	25	20	27
Past Similar Projects	20	10	15	16	8	10	10
Best Practices at Historic Sites	20	10	15	16	10	15	10
Experience in visitor services	20	18	18	18	10	10	16
Experience in Projects with Public Input	10	8	10	8	10	8	8
Reserved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Score		70	86	84	63	63	71

Rank	12	6	7	14	14	10
------	----	---	---	----	----	----

Date: November 26, 2013/2:00 PM

Member 7			26				
0.4	Daimte.	Quimby	Rhodes	Southwest Museum	Studio	VOH	Westlake
Category	Points	McCoy	Works	Svc	Tectonic	Architects	Reed
Design Team	30	0	0	0	0	0	0
Past Similar Projects	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
Best Practices at Historic Sites	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
Experience in visitor services	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
Experience in Projects with Public Input	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reserved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Score	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rank	1	1	1	1	1	1

Committee Member Summary							
Category	Total Points	Quimby McCoy	Rhodes Works	Southwest Museum Svc	Studio Tectonic	VOH Architects	Westlake Reed
Design Team	210	131	148	147	141	118	161
Past Similar Projects	140	83	95	99	88	96	101
Best Practices at Historic Sites	140	92	101	105	89	106	106
Experience in visitor services	140	100	113	110	90	100	109
Experience in Projects with Public Input	70	50	57	48	56	52	56
Reserved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Score	700	456	514	509	464	472	533
	Rank	17	6	7	15	12	4

Attach a Written Justification for each company's ranki

NOTE: Attached this form and the Written Justification to your Aç