

**McKean County Housing Authority
McKean County Redevelopment Authority
A Partnership In Housing, Inc.**

*REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS (RFQ)
ARCHITECTURAL AND/OR
ENGINEERING SERVICES
Solicitation 2022-006*

ALL INQUIRES SHOULD BE DIRECTED TO:

McKean County Housing Authority Alcherrie Williams, Executive Director 415 W. Main Street Smethport, PA 16749	McKean County Redevelopment Authority Alcherrie Williams, Executive Director 415 W. Main Street Smethport, PA 16749	A Partnership in Housing, Inc. Alcherrie Williams 415 W. Main Street Smethport, PA 16749
--	--	--

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Request For Qualifications
- Description of Agency Functions
- Statement of Work
- Submission Requirements
- Evaluation Factors
- PHA 5-Year Capital Fund Program Action Plan
- Architect/Engineering Service Checklist
- Non-Collusive Affidavit
- PHA and APIH Property Listing
- Form HUD-5369-B Instructions to Offerors – Non-Construction
- Form HUD-5369-C Certifications and Representations of Offerors, Non-Construction Contract
- Form HUD-5370-C General Conditions for Non-Construction Contracts
- Form HUD-51915, Model Form of Agreement Between Owner and Design Professional

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

**ARCHITECTURAL AND/OR ENGINEERING SERVICES
FOR THE MCKEAN COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY (MCHA),
MCKEAN COUNTY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (MCRA) AND
A PARTNERSHIP IN HOUSING, INC. (APIH)**

July 25, 2022

SOLICITATION 2022-006

You are hereby invited to submit information concerning your professional services and qualifications to perform work as presented in this Request for Qualifications (RFQ).

The McKean County Housing Authority (**MCHA**), McKean County Redevelopment Authority (**MCRA**) and A Partnership in Housing, Inc. (**APIH**), are seeking qualifications from architectural and/or engineering providers for services found to be necessary for the above three agencies. These services may include consultation, planning, project development, permitting, environmental services, project design, construction services, etc.

Each agency is seeking a 3-year contract with an option to extend on an annual basis for a total contract period not to exceed 5 years.

The Architect/Engineer selected through qualifications-based selection (QBS), a form of competitive proposals procurement, must be experienced with undertaking a variety of different types of construction projects, and be familiar and experienced with federal, state and local requirements, including ADA and UFAS requirements, UCC requirements, PennDOT & DEP requirements, M/WBE, Federal & State Wage Rates, bidding and procurement regulations, permitting, environmental requirements, etc.

The firm receiving the highest ranking will be asked to submit a proposed fee schedule with a detailed breakdown in, mileage rates, direct labor costs and overhead costs.

Qualifications are to be submitted to each of the following:

McKean County Housing Authority (MCHA) Alcherrie Williams, Executive Director 415 W. Main Street Smethport, PA 16749	McKean County Redevelopment Authority (MCRA) Alcherrie Williams, Executive Director 415 W. Main Street Smethport, PA 16749	A Partnership in Housing, Inc. (APIH) Alcherrie Williams 415 W. Main Street Smethport, PA 16749
---	---	---

A separate RFQ must be submitted to MCHA, MCRA, and/or APIH. In a sealed envelope, marked: “**2022 A/E Qualifications – Do Not Open**” by no later than **3:00PM Monday, August 15, 2022**. Make sure to indicate which entity the qualifications are for, i.e. MCHA, MCRA, or APIH. Proposals received after this time and date will not be considered.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF AGENCY FUNCTIONS AND STATEMENT OF WORK:

The **MCHA** is annually allocated funding under the U.S. Department of Housing And Urban Development's (HUD) Capital Fund Program to modernize its structures and grounds. The MCHA owns and manages housing development sites in the City of Bradford, Foster Township, Eldred Borough, Port Allegany Borough, Smethport Borough, Lewis Run Borough, Mt. Jewett Borough and Kane Borough (full property listing attached).

Please refer to MCHA's attached 5-Year Capital Fund Program (CFP) Action Plan for a detailed description of work. In brief, this work includes but is not limited to:

- Generator replacement PHA wide
- Energy efficient improvements PHA wide
- Extensive interior façade improvements PHA wide
- Exterior and interior improvements PHA wide
- Blacktop/concrete replacements and/or repairs PHA wide
- Project feasibility studies
- Independent Cost Estimates

Construction plans and specifications produced for and in conjunction with the Housing Authority's Capital Fund Program, must comply with procedures and responsibilities according to HUD requirements under 24 CFR Part 85.36 and HUD Procurement Handbook (REV-2).

The **MCRA** annually administers the McKean County Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and other types of miscellaneous grants. The MCRA undertakes various types of project located throughout the County except in the City of Bradford.

MCRA description of work includes but is not limited to:

- Water/sewer extension projects
- Handicap accessibility renovations
- Building rehabs
- Preparation of Existing Conditions Reports residential and commercial
- Independent Cost Estimates
- Project feasibility studies

Construction Plans and Specifications produced for and in conjunction with the Redevelopment Authority's CDBG Program, must comply with procedures and responsibilities as contained in 24 CFR Part 570.

APIH is a non-profit agency that was formed to provide decent, safe and affordable housing to low income households. A Partnership in Housing, Inc. owns properties in Bradford, Smethport, Mt. Jewett and Kane (full property listing attached) that are managed by the McKean County Housing Authority.

APIH description of work includes but is not limited to:

- Generator Replacement

- Black Top/Concrete Replacement
 - Roof Repair/Replacement
 - Boiler Replacement
 - Independent Cost Analysis
 - Project feasibility studies
-

The Architect/Engineer is requested to respond to this invitation by submitting the following:

- 1. Letter of Interest that states clearly what type of services you are proposing (ARCHITECTURAL, ENGINEERING OR BOTH)**
- 2. Evidence that the Architect and/or Engineer are registered or licensed to perform the required design services in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.**
- 3. A certified statement that the Architect and/or Engineer or the firm is not debarred, suspended or otherwise prohibited from professional practice by any federal, state or local agency.**
- 4. Evidence of the firm's ability to perform the work, including a profile of the firm's principals, staff and facilities and a list of the principals and staff to be assigned to the project.**
- 5. Evidence of firm's knowledge of local building codes. They should show their familiarity with local approval processes in obtaining permits and variances, and obtaining approvals of plans.**
- 6. Evidence of firm's knowledge of HUD 504, Uniform Federal Accessibility Standard (UFAS) and with the American's with Disabilities Act.**
- 7. A listing of at least three business client references preferably Housing and Redevelopment Authorities. This listing is to include a contact name and telephone number.**
- 8. Evidence of professional liability insurance (errors and omissions) in the amount of at least \$500,000 for Architect and/or Engineer.**
- 9. Demonstration of understanding of comprehensive modernization Capital Fund program and CDBG program.**
- 10. Non-Collusion Affidavit.**
- 11. HUD-5369-C**

****Underlined/bolded items above are required documents.** If any of them are missing at time of submission, the proposals will be declared non-responsive.

One (1) original and three (3) copies of the proposal and other requested material must be submitted.

Each agency, MCHA, MCRA and APIH, require a separate RFQ proposal and all responses to the request for qualifications will be evaluated separately.

MCHA, MCRA, and APIH, at their sole discretion, may award one or more contracts to perform the services. MCHA, MCRA, and, APIH reserves the right not to award a contract pursuant to this RFQ and issue a subsequent RFQ if it's in the best interest of each entity.

The firm receiving the highest ranking will be asked to submit a proposed fee schedule breakdown for each professional discipline including direct and indirect labor costs, overhead costs, and profit for agency analysis and negotiation.

If contract terms cannot be agreed to, negotiations will be opened with the other firms by ranking order until a mutual agreement is reached.

Once an agreement has been met and a contract signed between the awarded A/E firm(s) and one of the agencies, specific work from the scope of work will be assigned by task order by the agency to the contracted A/E firm(s). The A/E firm(s) will in-turn submit a fixed price, i.e., lump sum, proposal in response to the task order based upon the overall A/E contract's agreed upon fee schedule. This fixed price proposal must also contain a cost breakdown insofar as to detail variable cost drivers such as required hours per discipline, mileage, and reimbursable such as printing costs, etc. Upon receipt of the fixed price task order proposal, the agency will analyze the proposal and negotiate with the A/E firm(s) to arrive at an agreed upon price, and a separate task order contract will be signed.

MCHA, MCRA, APIH reserves the right to:

1. Request additional information from any or all firms submitting information;
2. Reject any or all submissions, and waive any information;
3. Submissions will not be returned

Qualifications that **do not** contain the following will be declared non-responsive and rejected:

1. A certified statement that the Architect/Engineer or the firm is not debarred, suspended, or otherwise prohibited from professional practice by any Federal, State and/or local agency;
2. Evidence that the Architect/Engineer is registered or licensed to perform the required design services in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;
3. Non Collusive Affidavit;
4. Evidence of professional liability insurance
5. A completed and signed HUD-5369-C.

The responsibilities of the Architect/Engineering firm(s) include, but are not limited to, the items listed below and as detailed in the contract, HUD-51915.

1. Development of design concept.
2. Preparation of design and construction documents, bid packets, work write-ups, cost estimates, advertising documents and compliance with local, state and federal procurement procedures.
3. Evaluation and review of construction bids for completeness, accuracy and compliance. Verifying that low bidder is reputable and not on any suspension or debarment list.
4. Weekly or as specified in the contract, monitor and inspect quality and progress of work and furnish an associated field report during construction. Inspections will be coordinated with the Maintenance Superintendent or other staff member who will be responsible for accepting the work on a daily basis.
5. Review of any contract modifications and preparation of change orders after such orders are approved by the Executive Director.
6. Certification that construction is being performed in accordance with the construction contract.
7. Notifying the Authority and the contractor of any problems observed and recommend remedies thereto.
8. Attend all pre-construction meetings and construction conferences and prepare transcripts for distribution to and approval by the Executive Director and contractors.
9. Perform certain Clerk of the Works duties such as:
 - a. Assurance of compliance with prevailing wage rates and Davis-Bacon requirements;
 - b. Review all documents and paperwork submitted by the contractors for compliance with HUD regulations pertaining to the work;
 - c. Coordinate contractor activities for proper notifications to tenants prior to the contractor entering the building/units;
 - d. Review all contractor submission to the Authority for completeness and accuracy as well as compliance;
 - e. Review all warranties and completion documents for accuracy and compliance and prepare necessary paperwork for submission to HUD.
 - f. Other services which are found to be necessary for the complete performance of the construction contracts.
10. Prepare revised as-built drawings for submission to and approval by the Executive Director.

The scope of work items presented are not intended to delineate or describe every detail and feature of work. Work items specified in the RFQ include all items necessary for proper execution of the project. No additions to the fee negotiated for these items will be approved unless it can be clearly demonstrated that the Architect/Engineer has been requested to perform work, which is beyond the original scope, and intent of the work presented is absolutely essential to the proper execution of the work.

EVALUATION FACTORS

The following evaluation factors will be used to evaluate the qualifications submitted in response to RFQ for Architectural/Engineering Services. Please note that evaluation factors #1 through #5 have equal scoring weights. Evaluation Factor #6, consisting of two points, will be used as a tie-breaker.

1. Demonstrate ability to effectively and efficiently undertake the work described in the RFQ.
2. Firm's ownership, size and qualification of all staff assigned to project(s). Proof and references of professional architects and/or engineers for design of projects whether in-house or subcontracted.
3. Capability to provide professional services in a timely manner.
4. Proof shown of past performances in terms of cost control, quality of work, compliance with performance schedules, and references of similar projects.
5. Demonstrate knowledge of federal, state and local statutes and codes and knowledge of HUD Section 504 and with the American's with Disabilities Act by use of Uniform Federal Accessibility Standard (UFAS).
6. Minority Business Enterprise and/or Women's Business Enterprise.*

*Must show proof of certification that firm is certified with the State of Pennsylvania.

The MCHA, MCRA and APIH reserve the right to contact any party directly or indirectly knowledgeable, with respect to the firm's past performance. Should there be any objections or exceptions to this right, the Agencies should be informed prior to submission.

The firm receiving the highest ranking will be called in for contract and price negotiations. If price negotiations with the highest ranked firm fail to reach an agreed upon price, the Authority will end negotiations with the highest ranked firm and begin negotiations with the next highest ranked firm and so on until a price determined to be fair and reasonable to both parties is achieved.

FACTOR 1: Demonstrated ability to effectively and efficiently undertake the work described in the RFQ.

Rating Criterion: Offeror’s proposal provides a clear, logical plan for organizing the tasks, and describes lines of authority and responsibility of key personnel and management. Staffing plan reflects the proposed approach, and all labor is described in number of hours and type required per task. The offeror’s internal controls provide for thorough, but efficient, quality control of the offeror’s work. All subcontracted work is identified, and either a subcontractor is proposed or the method of selecting a subcontractor is described.

Rating (check one)	Points	Rating Specifications
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	5	Proposal clearly addresses staffing, management and quality controls in detail. The proposed staffing, management and quality controls correspond to, and are consistent with, the offeror’s proposed approach. All subcontractors selected to perform the work are identified.
<input type="checkbox"/> Good	4	Proposal addresses staffing, management and quality controls adequately. The proposed staffing, management and quality controls correspond to, and are consistent with, the offeror’s proposed approach. All subcontract work is identified, as are most of the subcontractors selected to perform the work. The proposal describes the method the offeror will use to select the remaining subcontractors.
<input type="checkbox"/> Fair	3	Proposal addresses staffing, management and quality controls. The staffing plan provides total hours for each position, but does not provide a detailed breakdown of hours and labor type by task. The proposed management and quality controls are somewhat inconsistent with the offeror’s proposed approach. All subcontract work is identified, but proposed subcontractors are not identified. The proposal described the method the offeror will use to select subcontractors.
<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	2	Proposal addresses staffing, management and quality controls in generic terms. The staffing plan provides total hours for the contract, but does not provide a breakdown of hours by labor type or task. The proposed staffing plan, management and quality controls are inconsistent with the offeror’s proposed approach. All subcontract work is identified, but proposed subcontractors are not identified. The proposal does not describe the method the offeror will use to select subcontractors.

Rating (check one)	Points	Rating Specifications (continued)
<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	1	Proposal addresses staffing, management, and quality controls in vague terms or not at all. It is unclear what, if any, work will be subcontracted. The proposal does not describe the method the offeror will use to select subcontractors.

FACTOR #1 SCORE: _____

Narrative statement supporting rating on Factor #1:

FACTOR 2: Firm’s ownership, size and qualification of all staff assigned to project(s), and proof and references of professional architects and/or engineers for design of projects whether in-house or subcontracted.

Ranking Criterion: Proposed qualification of staff, engineer’s references, and a proof of size to identify that the firm can perform multiple projects.

Rating (check one)	Points	Rating Specifications
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	5	All key personnel are identified in the proposal, and meet or exceed all qualification requirements. All engineering reference were addressed, and the firm has identified ownership and size by listing all staff employed by the firm and perform multiple projects.
<input type="checkbox"/> Good	4	Most key personnel and engineering references are identified in the proposal, and meet or exceed the qualification requirements. For the positions where no key personnel are identified, the offeror has submitted detailed position descriptions and provided a list of potential candidates, and did submit a list of the firm’s size and can perform multiple projects.
<input type="checkbox"/> Fair	3	Some key personnel and engineering references are identified in the proposal, and do meet some of the qualification requirements. Some engineering references are identified. Submitted a list of the firm’s size.
<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	2	Few key personnel and engineering references are identified in the proposal. Of those listed, do not meet qualification requirements. Firm’s ownership and size was vaguely addressed.
<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	1	Proposal did not identify and key personnel, engineer references, and firm’s ownership and size were not listed.

FACTOR #2 SCORE: _____

Narrative statement supporting rating on Factor #2:

FACTOR 3: Capability to provide professional services in a timely manner.

Ranking Criterion: Proposal provides a clear list of staffing of personnel to address workloads, shows possible present and future workloads, and how staff is assigned projects.

Rating (check one)	Points	Rating Specifications
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	5	Proposal provides a clear list of all personnel and how they are assigned to projects. Also provides a list of present projects
<input type="checkbox"/> Good	4	Proposal provides an adequate list of personnel and who is working on present projects and a list of some future projects, and personnel who will be assigned to this project.
<input type="checkbox"/> Fair	3	Proposal provides a list of personnel who is working on present projects, and personnel who will be assigned to this project.
<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	2	Proposal briefly addresses a list of personnel who will possibly be working on this project.
<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	1	Proposal did not address this factor.

FACTOR #3 SCORE: _____

Narrative statement supporting rating on Factor #3:

FACTOR 4: Proof shown of past performances in terms of cost control, quality of work, compliance with performance schedules, and references of similar projects.

Ranking Criterion: Proposals lists references of past performances of similar projects that came within budget compared to preliminary estimates, on time schedules, and acceptable work.

Rating (check one)	Points	Rating Specifications
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	5	Proposal clearly listed references of cost control of similar projects that came within budget, examples of quality of work related to design, and always met bidding deadlines on projects including accelerated deadlines on projects that required finishing before expiration of funding.
<input type="checkbox"/> Good	4	Proposal adequately listed references of cost control of similar projects that came within budget, quality of work to design, and met deadlines on projects.
<input type="checkbox"/> Fair	3	Proposal listed some references on cost control measures on similar projects, some information addressed on budget control and quality of work related to design, with some information relating to deadlines on similar projects.
<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	2	Proposal poorly addressed references of similar projects cost control measures, quality of work, insufficient information on similar projects related to deadlines.
<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	1	Proposal did not list references of similar projects identified in the proposal, nor did it list any information related to this factor.

FACTOR #4 SCORE: _____

Narrative statement supporting rating on Factor #4:

FACTOR 5: Demonstrated knowledge of federal, state and local statutes and codes and knowledge of HUD Section 504 and with the American’s with Disabilities Act by use of Uniform Federal Accessibility Standard (UFAS).

Ranking Criterion: Proposal specifically addresses years of experience of all state and local code issues and references of similar HUD Section 504, American’s with Disabilities Act by use of UFAS.

Rating (check one)	Points	Rating Specifications
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	5	Proposal clearly addresses experience of all state and local code issues, updated education and training of current codes and regulations, and clearly identifies knowledge and lists references similar HUD Section 504 and American’s with Disabilities Act projects with the use of UFAS.
<input type="checkbox"/> Good	4	Proposal addresses experience of state and local codes, education and training of some staff, lists some references and sufficient knowledge of HUD Section 504 and with American’s with Disabilities Act by use of UFAS.
<input type="checkbox"/> Fair	3	Proposal addresses state and local codes, brief list of references to ADA compliance. Briefly familiar with HUD Section 504 and American’s with Disabilities Act by use of UFAS.
<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	2	Proposal addresses knowledge of state and local codes, not familiar with HUD Section 504 and American’s with Disabilities Act by use of UFAS.
<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	1	Proposal addresses knowledge of state and local codes, does not address or make reference to HUD Section 504 and American’s with Disabilities Act by use of UFAS.

FACTOR #5 SCORE: _____

Narrative statement supporting rating on Factor #5:

FACTOR 6: Minority Business Enterprise and/or Women’s Business Enterprise.

Ranking Criterion: Must show proof of certification that firm is certified with the State of Pennsylvania.

Proof **MUST** be submitted with qualifications. Two (2) points will be given to this factor, and will be used only as a tie-breaker as defined as:

If the top two or more firms tie in total score, the M/WBE firm will be ranked as the top-ranked firm and will be contacted for contract and price negotiations. In the event that a non-M/WBE firm scores the highest score and a M/WBE firm trails by one (1) or two (2) points, two (2) points will be given to the M/WBE firm, and the M/WBE firm will be contacted for contract and price negotiations.

FACTOR #6 SCORE: _____

Narrative statement supporting rating on Factor #6:

QUALIFICATION EVALUATION

Architectural and/or Engineering Qualification Ranking Summary

Check one of the following to show the type of proposal being submitted:

_____ **Architect** _____ **Engineer** _____ **Architect/Engineer**

Firm Name: _____

Address: _____

Telephone: _____

Date: _____

Ranking Range: **Excellent = 5, Good = 4, Average = 3**
 Fair = 2, Poor = 1, Not Addressed = 0

NO.	RANKING CRITERIA	POINTS
1	Demonstrated ability to effectively and efficiently undertake the work described in the RFQ. Maximum Points - 5	
2	Firm’s ownership, size and qualification of all staff assigned to project(s), and proof and references of professional architects and/or engineers for design of projects whether in-house or subcontracted. Maximum Points - 5	
3	Capability to provide professional services in a timely manner. Maximum Points - 5	
4	Proof shown of past performances in terms of cost control, quality of work, compliance with performance schedules, and references of similar projects. Maximum Points - 5	
5	Demonstrated knowledge of federal, state and local statutes and codes and knowledge of HUD Section 504 and with the American’s with Disabilities Act by use of Uniform Federal Accessibility Standard (UFAS). Maximum Points - 5	
6	Minority Business Enterprise and/or Women’s Business Enterprise Maximum Points – 2	
TOTAL NUMBER OF POINTS (27 points maximum)		

Evaluated By (name & title): _____

Date: _____