



## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Memo for File

**FROM:** Phillip A. Zavadil, City Manager

**DATE:** May 5, 2023

**RE:** Review and Selection of Proposals Received for the City of Saint Paul, Alaska Architectural, Engineering and Project Inspection Services for Small Boat Harbor Utility Expansion Project

---

On January 16, 2023, the City of Saint Paul (City) issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for City of Saint Paul, Alaska Architectural, Engineering and Project Inspection Services for Small Boat Harbor Utility Expansion Project (*see attached*). Proposals were due on February 10, 2023. The RFP was advertised in Anchorage Daily News once a week for four weeks. The RFP was also emailed to over a dozen engineering firms in Alaska.

On February 10, 2023, the City received only one proposal in response to the RFP from Kuna Engineering (*see attached*).

After consultation with EDA regarding only receiving one proposal for the project, we had three options:

1. Elect an Architect/Engineer and move forward without EDA participation in funding this contract.
2. Re-advertise the solicitation in hopes of receipt of 3 or more proposals.
3. Request EDA approval of the sole-source selection of Kuna Engineering for the design of the project. This alternative will require:
  - A formal, signed request from the City asking for EDA consideration based on the applicable procurement regulations.
  - Submittal of all documentation of the solicitation action to EDA.
  - Review of such documentation by EDA Regional Counsel. Unfortunately, EDA Regional Counsel is backed-up some 3 to 6 months with other reviews.

To avoid risk to the City, we opted to reissue the RFP.

On March 17, 2023 the City reissued the Request for Proposals for Architectural, Engineering and Project Inspection Services for the Saint Paul Small Boat Harbor Utility Expansion Project (*see attached*). In the reissued RFP we took out the budget and clarified what the City was asking the



contractor to perform for inspection services. The RFP was advertised in Anchorage Daily News and Seattle Daily Journal of Commerce once a week for four weeks. The RFP was also emailed to over a dozen engineering firms in Alaska.

On April 17, 2023, the City received three proposals in response to the RFP. Proposals were received via email on time from Kuna Engineering, PTS and REPEC (*see attached*).

Copies of the proposals were made or distributed via email to the City review team. The review team consisted of Phillip Zavadil, City Manager; Stephanie Mandregan, Finance Director; Aubrey Wegeleben, City Clerk; Lynn Sterbenz, Grant/Projects Specialist; and Caitlin Bourdukofsky, Public Works Administrative Assistant.

On April 18, 2023, the review team met to review and rank the proposals using the attached RFP Review Instructions and Evaluation Scoring Sheet.

Below are the summary of the scores from the review of the proposals by each evaluator:

<b>Firm Name</b>	<b>Bid Fee</b>	<b>Evaluator 1</b>	<b>Evaluator 2</b>	<b>Evaluator 3</b>	<b>Evaluator 4</b>	<b>Evaluator 5</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
Kuna	\$392,649	83	72	92	88	90	425
PTS	\$469,038	96	85	94	63	90	428
RESPEC	\$457,952	72	82	82	80	80	396

Attached are the individual Evaluation Scoring Sheets for each evaluator. The review team also had some follow up questions for PTS and Kuna regarding their proposals:

- For PTS: How could the assumptions listed in proposal drive up the overall cost/fee? What additional costs do you expect that are not included in the proposal? More details needed on hiring local staff?
- More details on electrical experience. How would you avoid timeline delays (proposed a short timeline).

On April 24, 2023, I met with Dean Karcz with PTS virtually to follow up on the questions the review team had. Below is a summary of the follow up:

- EPS did not propose travel and it was not needed.
- Staking was for construction and would not be included in this proposal.
- Additional fees may apply if we need PTS to assist with easement issues.
- A PTS inspector would come up to perform two inspections for sewer, and one each for water and electrical during the construction phase.
- There would be daily involvement on construction management and the contractor, but this would be done remotely and/or through City staff.

On April 25, 2023, I met with Daniel Nichols and Suzanne Taylor with Kuna virtually to follow up on the questions the review team had. Below is a summary of the follow up:

- Kuna will send additional information on their electrical experience. Carl Olson their electrical engineer has many years of electrical experience, especially with high voltage. On

April 25, 2023, I received additional information from Suzanne regarding Kuna's electrical experience.

- Kuna proposed an onsite inspector for 60 days. The inspector would come out at critical junctures during the construction phase.
- Kuna project schedule is aggressive. Daniel stated that they have time for this project and think that it can be completed in the timeframe they proposed.

Over the next week or so I performed reference checks on Kuna and PTS. The following questions were emailed to references provided by Kuna and PTS:

1. What was the scope of work that the firm performed for you?
2. When was the work done?
3. Would you hire them again to do a project like ours?
4. Was the project completed in a timely basis?
5. What stumbling blocks did you hit and how were they overcome?
6. What role did you play in the project?
7. What was the length of the project?
8. Was the firm communicative and responsive?
9. How flexible was the firm with the timeline?
10. Were you satisfied with how the billing was handled? Were there any disputes?
11. How satisfied were you with the final product?
12. Did you institute the firm's recommendations, why or why not?
13. Do you have a feel for the level of technical expertise that the firm possesses?

The responses to the reference check questions are attached.

I emailed the additional information received from Kuna and the reference check responses to the evaluation team. The evaluation team met again on May 4, 2023 to review the responses and discuss pros and cons of each proposal and to select a firm. Myself, Stephanie, Aubrey and Lynn were present at the meeting. Below is a summary of the team discussion:

- Concerns about potential additional costs that may be incurred by the firms, especially with PTS and the list of assumptions they listed.
- The reference checks did not provide any meaningful information that distinguished one firm from the other.
- Kuna would have one inspector onsite for many more days than PTS. The team thought this was more beneficial given City staffing issues.
- Kuna seemed to have more relevant rural Alaska experience over PTS.
- Kuna and PTS seemed equally capable of performing the work.
- Given the potential that construction could go over budget, cost of engineering services is a factor. Kuna bid fee was significantly lower than PTS's bid fee to the tune of \$76,389.

Given that the evaluation scores were so close between Kuna and PTS and considering the factors mentioned above, the team selected Kuna Engineering as the winning bidder.