
The Collaborative Inc Questions / Answers

1. *Including but not limited to all drawings, blueprints, CADD files, project visuals, and any other materials developed in relation to all projects worked on with Blissfield Community Schools: Will the items be considered the ownership of Blissfield Schools or will ownership be retained by your company? If there are any items listed above that will not be owned by Blissfield Community Schools, please be specific in describing them.*

The standard of the industry is for the architect to retain ownership of all original documents (instruments of service) and that Blissfield Community Schools is entitled to copies of all documents provided on their behalf. The only instances where we have had clients insist on ownership of documents were industrial clients who have a unique process or product and confidentiality was an issue, and retail clients who had a prototype design and were duplicating their building design at multiple locations. TCI would prefer to maintain ownership of all original documents, but is open to the idea of Blissfield Community Schools taking ownership. We would like to discuss what limited rights we would be interested in maintaining and what potential liabilities we would seek to limit.

2. *Your submitted proposal includes references to planning, developing, and other services that you recommend prior to any potential request of support from the public for a new bond levy. There is indication that you would not charge a direct fee for many of these services. You further indicated that fees for the preliminary planning and development process could be deferred or included in a later construction project once a bond levy was passed. If a bond levy is ultimately not requested of the public, or does not receive a favorable vote, what fees (if any) would you seek to recover for the earlier planning and development phases for the project?*

Please see attached Scope / Fee Clarification Statement.

3. *Assuming a public bond levy for construction receives a favorable vote of the public, please clearly outline the amount (if any) of fees/charges that you would seek to recover for the pre-bond processes. Are the pre-bond expense amounts you seek to recover absorbed in your overall project fee schedule going forward, or will you bill directly to recover those costs?*

Please see attached Scope / Fee Clarification Statement.

4. *Please clearly outline and clarify your fee schedules for any specific projects you could work on with Blissfield Community Schools. Is there more than one fee schedule based on whether or not a bond levy proposal is supported by the public? What would the specific fee schedule be if the Board of Education decides not to request support from the public for a new bond levy?*

TCI's fee schedule would be the same for projects moving forward without public approval or for projects requiring public approval. The fee ranges are as shown in the Fee Clarification Statement. The intent would be to establish a lump sum fee for each project (within the fee ranges) after final scope is determined. The scope of projects and the range of potential services vary widely as does the degree to which Blissfield Community Schools may self-manage projects. TCI is willing to customize its services to match the needs of Blissfield Community Schools from project to project.

The Collaborative Inc Questions / Answers

5. Knowing what you do currently about Blissfield Community Schools and the feedback from our public, if you are selected as a finalist to present a proposal in person to the Board of Education, how would you answer the following questions:

a. What amount (if any) would you recommend that the Board of Education ask for support of the public in a new bond levy? What is the time frame in which the bond levy proposal should be made to the public from today's date?

Although it is important for the process to take its course- we can share some preliminary thoughts based on what we know to-date: Your Epic MRA survey demonstrated that the public is not supportive of an \$18M project, and may or may not be comfortable at \$12M. So indicators are suggesting we should be thinking below \$12M, and the farther we can get below this threshold and still address BCS's issues, the better chance we have of getting the public on-board. We would recommend that some of the more costly initiatives (like wholesale mechanical system replacement) and visible projects (like window replacements, sloped roofs, drop-off loop, etc.) or projects for which there is demonstrated public support (like air conditioning at the Middle School) be promoted to the public in a bond campaign. Projects done with sinking funds or stimulus dollars should be the less-glamorous maintenance items that would be less-likely to catch the public's interest. Additionally, new playground equipment may be a good candidate for private fundraising.

The concept of beginning with an 'Interim' Master Plan is to develop these larger strategies early and then break the Master Plan into pieces. The Master Plan will be broken down into a series of individual projects, and then assigned both a priority and a strategy. As shown in our process graphic, projects can move forward if identified as not needing public support, or for those requiring public support be delayed until successful bond passage.

Addressing the issue of timing- we think that starting a public process in the fall when school is back in session and the community is excited about their Royals may be advantageous. The process should allow a full public vetting, carefully listening for signals while continuously trying to build momentum. A February 2010 bond issue may be reasonable, or later depending on community feedback.

b. What projects and scope would you potentially see being completed from this new bond levy if the public is favorable? (attach amounts to projects)

We would recommend that some of the more costly initiatives (like wholesale mechanical system replacement) and visible projects (like window replacements, sloped roofs, drop-off loop, etc.) or projects for which there is demonstrated public support (like air conditioning at the Middle School) be promoted to the public in a bond campaign.

c. What projects and scope would you potentially see being completed if a new bond levy is not supported by the public? (attach amounts to projects)

If the public will not support additional funding, Blissfield Community Schools should use what money is available to handle issues of basic utility and safety. The mechanical systems at the high school are probably getting beyond the point of being remedied with temporary patches, and the lack of AC at the middle school is resulting in some security concerns. It is important that these investments be made within the vision of the Master Plan because one must assume that the community will eventually support a more comprehensive project.

d. As a finalist in this Architect firm selection process, what level of detail would you include regarding your potential recommended project(s) above in making a formal presentation to the Board of Education?

In our interview we would focus on our team, our process and our qualifications. Additionally, we would typically develop some site planning, building layouts, budgeting and schedule options as a means of demonstrating our processes, our ability to think creatively and to initiate dialogue with the committee. We look at this opportunity as a first-step in establishing a long-term relationship built on trust and the consistent delivery of high value services- the project interview should demonstrate a sense of that.

The Collaborative Inc **Scope / Fee Clarification Statement**

Data Gathering / Planning Phase:

Fee: **\$5,000**

This cost will be absorbed into (not in addition to) the stated fee ranges for future projects, either bond supported or otherwise.

Key Deliverable: Interim Master Plan including:

1. A basic facilities conditions summary
2. Conceptual site plans (bus-drop & potential new addition space set-asides)
3. Conceptual floor plan variations
4. Mechanical, Electrical & Plumbing strategy narratives
5. Opinion of probable costs
6. Strategy for bond campaign developed with District representatives

Key Goals:

We would work directly with Blissfield's Facilities Subcommittee and key stakeholders (not formalized public meetings). Data would be gathered from basic site observations, previously-developed facilities studies, the community opinion poll, etc. Estimating would be done using basic area costing techniques based on historical data and limited subcontractor input. The key idea of this exercise is to put a working plan in-place sufficient to:

1. Help the District make a sound decision as to whether to pursue a bond-issue.
2. If the District elects to pursue a bond- develop a strategy for getting the bond passed.
3. Give the District enough confidence in which assets will be retained to move forward with improvements that do not require bond passage.

Pre-Bond Planning, Refine Master Plan, Public Process:

Fee: **\$15,000 - \$20,000** (depends on scope, # of meetings, etc.)

This cost will be absorbed into (not in addition to) the stated fee ranges for future projects, either bond supported or otherwise.

Key Deliverable: Master Plan / Public Process includes:

1. Conceptual site plans (bus-drop & potential new addition space set-asides)
2. Conceptual floor plans
3. More refined estimating (refined for final Master Plan)
4. Mechanical, Electrical & Plumbing strategy narratives (refined for final Master Plan)
5. 3-dimensional visualization graphics
6. Public-relations materials support

Key Goals:

The value of Master Planning is as much about process as it is about product. Although a fairly-reliable 'interim' master plan can be developed with input from select individuals within the district, the plan can be enhanced and tested through a broader public-input process. This process has the added benefit of communicating directly with the community and making the general public feel a part of the process (key in shaping public opinion). These services are more time-consuming but are key to successful passage of the bond-issue.

The Collaborative Inc
Scope / Fee Clarification Statement

Risk-Sharing:

Our team believes in the concept of risk-sharing with the school districts we represent. The base fees we are representing reflect only a portion of the cost of the services we are proposing to provide. In addition to the risk of not seeing any projects roll out of this process, we also will spend significant fee beyond the ranges of those shown in this proposal.

Building Projects:

Fees will be established on a lump sum basis, based on each project's scope and complexity for a fee range of 5.0 - 7.0%.



Dan J. Tabor, AIA
Architect / Partner



Ray D. Micham, AIA, LEED®AP
Architect / Partner