TO: HONORABLE CITY COUNCIL
FROM: CITY MANAGER
DEPARTMENT: PUBLIC WORKS
DATE: AUGUST 9, 2004
CMR:377:04

SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF CONTRACT WITH TMAD ENGINEERS, INC. IN THE AMOUNT OF $100,000 FOR DESIGN SERVICES FOR CUBBERLEY MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL UPGRADES - CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PROJECT PF-04010

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that Council approve and authorize the Mayor to execute the attached contract (Attachment A) with TMAD Engineers, Inc. in the amount of $100,000 for Design Services for Cubberley Mechanical and Electrical Upgrades - Capital Improvement Program Project PF-04010.

DISCUSSION
Scope of Services
The Theater, Pavilion, Auditorium and Gymnasiums ‘A’ and ‘B’ have mechanical and electrical equipment that are original equipment installed in the early 1950’s and are now ready for replacement. The equipment has exceeded its useful life, failures are occurring and many repair parts are no longer available.

The scope of work to be performed under the contract is consulting engineering services to design mechanical and electrical upgrades to the Theater, Pavilion, Auditorium, and Gymnasiums ‘A’ and ‘B’ at the Cubberley Community Center, 4000 Middlefield Rd., Palo Alto. This project provides for identifying the major pieces of equipment to be replaced and the design of energy efficient systems including boilers, domestic hot water heating system, piping, lighting and electrical systems.

Summary of Solicitation Process
A notice inviting formal proposals for Design Services for Cubberley Mechanical and Electrical Upgrades – RFP Number 105780, was sent to nineteen consultants and posted at City Hall and Purchasing’s website on April 14, 2004. The proposal period was 27 days. A pre-proposal meeting was held on April 28, 2004; eight consultant firms’ representatives attended the meeting.
Summary of Solicitation Process
A notice inviting formal proposals for Design Services for Cubberley Mechanical and Electrical Upgrades – RFP Number 105780, was sent to nineteen consultants and posted at City Hall and Purchasing’s website on April 14, 2004. The proposal period was 27 days. A pre-proposal meeting was held on April 28, 2004; eight consultant firms’ representatives attended the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Description/Number</th>
<th>Design Services for Cubberley Mechanical and Electrical Upgrades – RFP No. 105780</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Length of Project</td>
<td>4 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Proposals Mailed</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Days to Respond to Proposal</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-proposal Meeting Date</td>
<td>April 28, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Company Attendees at Pre-proposal Meeting</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Proposals Received:</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Location (City, State)</th>
<th>Selected for oral interview?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. TMAD Engineers, Inc</td>
<td>Oakland, California</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ackerman Practicon Engineers</td>
<td>Palo Alto, California</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Advanced Design Consultants, Inc.</td>
<td>San Jose, California</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Salas O’Brien Engineers, Inc.</td>
<td>San Jose, California</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ATI</td>
<td>Danville, California</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Flack &amp; Kurtz, Engineers, Inc.</td>
<td>San Francisco, California</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mazetti Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>San Jose, California</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ray I. Juachon &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Burlingame, California</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of Proposal Amounts Submitted: $79,000 to $200,000

An evaluation committee consisting of staff from Utilities, Administrative Services; Public Works, Facilities Management reviewed the proposals. Four firms were invited to participate in oral interviews on May 26, 2004. The committee carefully reviewed each firm's qualifications and submittal in response to the criteria identified in the RFP. The following criteria were used to evaluate the firms.

1. Qualifications and experience of proposed project manager and key staff.
2. Similar experience, methodology and expertise in the type of work required.
3. Demonstrated experience and methodology used in performing work/service.
4. The response to this RFP, including consultant’s approach and methodology proposed.
5. The proposed fee relative to the services to be provided.
TMAD Engineers, Inc. was selected for its innovative proposed solution to the air movement issues at the Pavilion Building and other design challenges at the site. Its design team has extensive experience with similar projects, and is prepared to address the design issues, including energy efficiency improvements that the Utilities Department is targeting. It shows enthusiasm and a genuine interest in solving problems at Cubberley.

Staff, with the concurrence of the City Attorney, has determined that the consultant is exempt from complying with the financial disclosure provisions of the City's conflict of interest code, because the consultant's range of duties and services to be provided under the contract are limited in scope.

**RESOURCE IMPACT**
Funds are available in the FY 2004-2005 Cubberley Mechanical and Electrical Upgrades Project - Capital Improvement Program Project PF-04010

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**
This recommendation does not represent any change to existing City policies

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**
This project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

**ATTACHMENTS**
Attachment A: Contract

PREPARED BY: 
______________________________
PALANIAPPA CHOKKALINGAM
Engineer, Facilities Management

DEPARTMENT HEAD: 
______________________________
GLENN S. ROBERTS,
Director of Public Works

CITY MANAGER APPROVAL: 
______________________________
EMILY HARRISON
Assistant City Manager