GBKB

COPY

GBKB Associates

Architecture
Engineering
Interior Design

220 W. Washington Street
P.O. Box 789
Marquette, Michigan
49855
906/228-7720

Principals

Bill J. Graheck
Architect

Norman A. Kline
Architect

Robert C. Stow
Architect

William R. Sirrine
Architect

Duane E. Travis
Engineer

October 9, 1984

Dr. Robert Berube, DDS
City Commissioner
City of Marquette
300 W. Baraga Avenue
Marquette, Michigan 49855

Re: Proposal Public Works Facility
Design/Build Proposal
City of Marquette

Dear Buzz:

As I mentioned in our phone conversation today, I am concerned about the reported direction that the City appears to be taking regarding the construction of a new public works facility--both as a taxpayer and as a design professional. Because I may not be able to attend the Commission Meeting today due to previous commitments, this letter is written to reflect some of my thoughts on the subject.

If a design/build concept with leaseback is desired, I believe the City should request proposals for such a concept. There are many competent architects/engineers in the Marquette area as well as extremely qualified contractors all of whom could put together a "design/build team", if desired. To select a single proposal at this time would be anti-competitive and unfair--particularly because media exposure last night indicated that the primary purpose of the meeting tonight was to select a site.

As a design professional, my firm has participated in a number of design/building programs, and I believe that they are reasonable approaches for private business. (It should be noted, however, that in at least one of the examples listed by Northern Developers the team consisted of an owner, (who owned the land, was the eventual occupant of the project, and paid the other two members of the team) the independently hired architect and the independently hired contractor. There was not a developer be-

tween the owner/user and the designers and builders.) We believe that a more conventional procedure is better for a government project where the government agency hires the design firm to design a facility that the government will have to operate and maintain over its useful life (not just for 5 - 10 years of a leaseback agreement). The project then would be bid by all qualified contractors. Should the City wish to finance it privately, the project could be bid with a leaseback provision over the period of time specified by the City and this would provide the cashflow benefits outlined under the so called "team approach".

We can not find any creditable reason for the schedule differentiation outlined in your proposal between "team" and "conventional" approaches, and can state categorically that any qualified design firm selected for the project by November 1, 1984 could complete working drawings in time for an April 1 bid date and a May 1 construction start. Under no circumstances can we imagine a situation (that would not also effect the team approach time schedule such as unusual delays in decisions by the Owner) that would extend a project for the additional year outlined in Northern Developers' proposal.

We urge that, at the very least, the City Commission not consider the proposal of Northern Developers without also considering other proposals, and we suggest that the City and the people of the City could be better served by following a more conventional approach whereby the City would select its design firm on the basis of qualifications for this type of facility. That firm would then prepare documents for bidding by qualified contractors.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

GBKB ASSOCIATES

Robert C. Stow, AIA
Upper Peninsula Office Manager

RCS:rms

cc: Mayor Robert Stow
David Svanda, City Manager
Mike Etelamaki, Public Works Director