

**ITEMS REQUIRING BOCC APPROVAL**  
**April 4, 2024**  
**(1 Item)**

**1. ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR JUVENILE SERVICES BUILDING -- PROJECT SERVICES**

**FUNDING -- JUVENILE SERVICES COMMUNITY - BASED BUILDI**

(Request sent to 109 vendors)

RFP #24-0008 S/C #8000232650

	<b>Hanney &amp; Associates Architects</b>	LK Architecture, Inc.	S2 Architects, LLC dba Elevatus Architecture
	<b>Cost</b>	Cost	Cost
Phase 1: Renovation/Expansion and New Building	<b>\$22,000.00</b>	\$45,000.00	\$59,000.00
Phase 2: Renovation/Expansion	<b>\$780,000.00</b>	\$497,000.00	\$1,575,000.00
Phase 2: New Building	<b>\$780,000.00</b>	\$562,000.00	\$1,625,000.00
	Schaefer Architecture, Inc.	TESSERE formerly GLMV Architecture	TreanorHL, Inc.
	Cost	Cost	Cost
Phase 1: Renovation/Expansion and New Building	\$30,000.00	\$130,000.00	\$49,147.00
Phase 2: Renovation/Expansion	\$960,000.00	\$1,093,582.00	\$2,225,138.00
Phase 2: New Building	\$950,000.00	\$1,159,736.00	\$2,460,371.00
	WDM Architects P.A.		
	Cost		
Phase 1: Renovation/Expansion and New Building	align="right">\$145,500.00		
Phase 2: Renovation/Expansion	align="right">\$676,900.00		
Phase 2: New Building	align="right">\$612,900.00		
No Submission	Alloy Architecture	Cathcart Architects LLC	Clarkitecture LLC
	Dubois Consultants, Inc.	Evans Building Co., Inc.	Folger & Associates, Inc.
	Incite Design Studio LLC	Krehbiel Architecture	Landmark Architects
	MKEC Engineering, Inc.	Moody Nolan, Inc.	P1 Service, LLC
	Pulse Design Group	Randal Steiner Architect, P.A.	Wildcat Construction Co., Inc.

On the recommendation of Lee Barrier, on behalf of Project Services, Anna Meyerhoff-Cole moved to **accept the proposal for architectural and engineering services from Hanney & Associates Architects**. Tim Myers seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

A committee comprised of Sandy Anguelov - Project Services; Steven Stonehouse and Mario Salinas - Department of Corrections; Russell Leeds - Manager's Office; and Lee Barrier - Purchasing evaluated the proposal responses based on the criteria set forth in the RFP. The committee unanimously agreed to accept the proposal from Hanney & Associates Architects.

This request for proposal is for selection of an Architectural and Engineering firm to provide professional design services and construction administration to construct a facility for the Department of Corrections. It will combine multiple functions and services conducive to rehabilitation under one roof.

Two (2) design options are requested:

Keep the existing Juvenile Residential Facility and expand the campus incorporating the square footage needed to support multiple combined services or demolish the existing Juvenile Residential Facility and build new in its place.

The two (2) options will combine: Juvenile Residential Facility (JRF), Juvenile Field Services (JFS), Evening Reporting Center (ERC), Home Based Services (HBS), and a projected facility capacity of 24 beds. These services will share resources, such as, conference rooms, work spaces, restrooms, and lobby space. It will include a secure outdoor play area, an indoor gym, a new dormitory design, outdoor family space, conference rooms, lab, common storage spaces, shared school space, and office space for 56 administrative staff.

Department for Children and Families, Kansas Laws and Regulations for Licensing Residential Centers and Group Boarding Homes for Children and Youth requirements will be addressed. Attention to all areas within the project site will meet full ADA compliance standards and any other applicable federal or state requirements. Controlled public access for security of the residents and staff will be addressed including video surveillance and audio acoustics, and the design(s) will allow the department the ability to expand in the future.

I would like to start by saying this is a proposal not a bid. Proposals are scored based on criteria set forth in the RFP. There are five (5) components to this RFP.

Component	Points
A. Ability to meet or exceed all Request for Proposal conditions and instructions as outlined herein.	20
B. Competence to perform the specified and mandatory services as reflected by technical training and education, experience in providing required services, and the qualifications and competence of persons who would be assigned to perform the services. Prior work experience, job sizes and history of proven performance.	20
C. Capacity to perform the services in the required time as reflected by workload, availability of adequate personnel, equipment and facilities. The ability to manage projects simultaneously and expeditiously, approach to problem/task resolution, methodology/data gathering techniques and procedures and teamwork.	20
D. Past performance with respect to cost control, quality of work, value engineering and ability to meet deadlines. This shall be determined in part by a check of references for similar projects and/or services provided for governmental entities or organizations of similar size and scope.	20
E. Proposing the services described herein with the most advantageous and prudent methodology and costs to the county.	20
<b>Total Points</b>	<b>100</b>

### Questions and Answers

Tim Kaufman: Could you talk about the rationale behind the two (2) project proposals, one for a remodel of the existing facilities and the other for a new build?

Sandy Anguelov: It was requested that we attempt to try to save the Juvenile Residential Facility that we currently have. The reason we requested the two (2) options is because we need to have someone look at whether or not we can get the square footage needed for all these functions. If we can't, for some reason, to the existing building, we also requested a design for a new building that would incorporate the square footage again that's needed and provide the layout the Department of Corrections is looking for.

Tim Kaufman: I'm going to ask Purchasing one more time to talk about the difference in pricing with this not being the most expensive bid but is also not the least expensive. Could you talk a little bit more to how that played into the overall decision?

Steve Stonehouse: The cost component, as you can see, in the initial plan is significantly less than the other proposals and that's primarily due to Hanney & Associates being involved as the on-call vendor for our architectural drawings in 2018 when we started this process. That really helped them in the other areas as far as their familiarity with the project and their ability to see how we progressed from doing a remodel to now either a new building or a complete consolidation of programs. They demonstrated their ability to work with us, listen to our needs, and were very responsive during that process. That really helped them in other areas of the scoring. All the bids did come in within the timeline requested but obviously they're going to be much quicker in the beginning part. This just felt like this gave them the edge as far as that goes. The price is not the lowest but we felt the formula we used still had them above the others with everything in mind.