

Committee Meeting
Review Proposals for Architect for Library Building Project
Thursday, March 21, 2024
6PM City Hall

Attendance: Mayor John Frieboes, Councilors Don McClure, Lindsey Thompson, & Jeff Nielsen, Library Board Chair Mike Schoeningh, Beth Wendt City Recorder.

Beth explained the scoring process then opened the proposals and handed out copies. There were two options for scoring process. One was to individually score each proposal and take an average, or to score the proposals as a collective group. The committee chose to score collectively. We received 3 proposals; Cole Architects, Pinnacle Architecture, and Straightline Architecture.

Each applicant was required to provide a cover letter describing their firm, a proposed schedule for the design and construction work, and proof of sufficient insurance. There is no score, other than pass or fail, for providing this information. They also receive a pass or fail mark for submitting proposals on time, which all three did. They were limited to 10 pages, not including cover sheet, resumes and insurance information, and at least one copy of the submitted proposal must have an original signature.

Cole Architects has offices in Bend, Boise and Gilbert, AZ. Pinnacle is from Bend, and Straightline is from Boise. John noted that he has worked with both Straightline and Pinnacle through the school. The Request for Proposal (RFP) was published around February 14th and proposals were due March 18th. The committee was given time to review the request criteria and read the proposals.

Pinnacle did the preliminary feasibility study for the new Library. Straightline did the new school and the cafeteria addition, as well as the new fire station. Each submission was scored on experience (40 pts), history (20 pts), available resources and team (30 pts), and references (10 pts). Experience was scored on similar projects comparable to North Powder's project, experience with CDBG project funding, and project timeline and completion. History was scored on how many years of experience the firm has working in small, rural communities designing public spaces and meeting ADA requirements. Consideration was given for previous work history in North Powder. Available resources and team was scored on the amount and type of resources available through the firm, as well as number of experienced staff, including sub-contractors used by the firm, and a short resume for each key team member. The submission required at least three references.

Straightline didn't appear to have experience working with CDBG funded projects. John noted that the North Powder School projects were finished below budget and on time. Lindsey asked what happens to the money if we come in under budget. Beth explained that it would either go back or we might be able to use it for additional construction needs, but we can't use it for supplies. CDBG is a reimbursement grant. We don't get paid in advance and cannot let the money sit in an account collecting interest.

Cole Architects worked on the Union School. Lindsey heard a lot of good things about it. Mike wondered about references. Beth said the Committee could check references and meet again before the next council meeting. Jeff like the idea of checking references. Mike felt that Coles had a broader scope of direction than the other two. They also mentioned building in a flood plain and possibly having to find an alternative location. John noted that we may have to adjust the size and shape of the building to accommodate the flood plain, but we don't have an alternate location option. Beth commented that CDBG requires an environmental review which will take into consideration, among other things, the floodplain, ditch and fuel tank next to the City shop. Mike noted that Cole was the only firm to suggest that as a possible obstacle. Beth noted that Pinnacle did the feasibility study so they were aware of the ditch and floodplain. She added that Cole seemed to be very familiar with CDBG and HUD requirements.

A CDBG representative will make on site visits from time to time. A lot of the paperwork falls to the grant administrator.

Jeff wondered if the committee needed to make a choice now. John thought we should make some preliminary scores and if their references check out, we can go with that. Jeff asked about checking with people we know. Beth felt we should check the references that were provided.

Mike noted that Pinnacle addressed the environmental issues as part of the CDBG process. Jeff wondered who did the ground/storm water for the school project. John said it was diverted to G Street to 2nd Street but it never got finished because of hang ups with ODOT and the ADA ramp. Mike thought Pinnacle had some good resumes. They seemed to have a lot of experience working with CDBG grants. John thought there would be several meetings between the City and the architect, and later with the contractor. Some may be via email, but some will have to be in person.

Lindsey wondered if there were ever any real issues with the ditch next to City Hall. Beth said she has seen water in the ditch quite often, especially in the spring, but never enough to cause a problem.

John thought the submissions should have included a bid cost. Beth pointed out that the request for proposal state that the grant budget allocated \$102,000 for the architectural and engineering services.

Pinnacle received the highest score. They have a lot of experience working with CDBG funds. Their time schedule was based on the schedule proposed in the RFP. Consideration was given for work in North Powder as they were the only firm interested in doing the feasibility study.

Beth will check 2 references for each firm. She will ask about time, budget, quality of work and how easy they are to work with. Jeff would like to do his own research. If Pinnacle has good reports, the committee will recommend them to the Council at the next meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Attest:

Beth Wendt
City Recorder