



A PROUD TRADITION | A BRIGHT FUTURE

LAMAR CONSOLIDATED INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

Special Board Meeting

Tuesday, May 5, 2015

6:30 PM

Julie Thompson, President • Rhonda Zacharias, Vice President • Kay Danziger, Secretary
Anna Gonzales • Dar Hakimzadeh • Kathryn Kaminski • Frank Torres

**LAMAR CISD BOARD OF TRUSTEES
SPECIAL BOARD MEETING
BRAZOS CROSSING ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
3911 AVENUE I, ROSENBERG, TEXAS
MAY 5, 2015
6:30 PM**

AGENDA

1. Call to order and establishment of a quorum
2. **ACTION ITEMS**
 - A. **Goal: Planning**
 1. Consider approval of ranking of Construction Manager-Agent (CMA) 4
3. **CLOSED SESSION**
 - A. Adjournment to closed session pursuant to Texas Government Code Sections 551.071, 551.072, 551.074, and 551.082, the Open Meetings Act, for the following purposes: (Time _____)
 1. Section 551.074 - For the purpose of considering the appointment, employment, evaluation, reassignment, duties, discipline or dismissal of a public officer or employee or to hear complaints or charges against a public officer or employee.
 - a. Approval of personnel recommendations or employment of professional personnel
 - b. Employment of professional personnel (Information)
 - c. Employee resignations and retirements (Information)
 2. Section 551.072 - For the purpose of discussing the purchase, exchange, lease or value of real property
 3. Section 551.071 - To meet with the District's attorney to discuss matters in which the duty of the attorney to the District under the Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct of the State Bar of Texas clearly conflicts with the Open Meetings Act, including the grievance/complaint hearing.

RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION

**Action on Closed Session Items
Future Agenda Items**

ADJOURNMENT: (Time _____)

If during the course of the meeting covered by this notice, the Board should determine that a closed session of the Board should be held or is required in relation to an item noticed in this meeting, then such closed session as authorized by Section 551.001 et seq. of the Texas Government Code (the Open Meetings Act) will be held by the Board at that date, hour or place given in this notice or as soon after the commencement of the meeting covered by this notice as the Board may conveniently meet in such closed session concerning any and all subjects and for any and all purposes permitted by Section 551.071-551.084, inclusive, of the Open Meetings Act, including, but not limited to:

Section 551.084 - For the purpose of excluding witness or witnesses from a hearing during examination of another witness.

Section 551.071 - For the purpose of a private consultation with the Board's attorney on any or all subjects or matters authorized by law.

Section 551.072 - For the purpose of discussing the purchase, exchange, lease or value of real property.

Section 551.073 - For the purpose of considering a negotiated contract for a prospective gift or donation.

Section 551.074 - For the purpose of considering the appointment, employment, evaluation, reassignment, duties, discipline or dismissal of a public officer or employee or to hear complaints or charges against a public officer or employee.

Section 551.082 - For the purpose of considering discipline of a public school child or children or to hear a complaint by an employee against another employee if the complaint or charge directly results in a need for a hearing.

Section 551.076 - To consider the deployment, or specific occasions for implementation, of security personnel or devices.

Section 551.083 - For the purpose of considering the standards, guidelines, terms or conditions the Board will follow, or instruct its representatives to follow, in consultation with representatives of employee groups in connection with consultation agreements provided for by Section 13.901 of the Texas Education Code.

Section 551.0821 – For the purpose of deliberating a matter regarding a public school student if personally identifiable information about the student will necessarily be revealed by the deliberation.

Should any final action, final decision or final vote be required in the opinion of the Board with regard to any matter considered in such closed session, then such final action, final decision or final vote shall be at either:

- a. the open meeting covered by this notice upon the reconvening of this public meeting, or
- b. at a subsequent public meeting of the Board upon notice thereof, as the Board may determine.

CERTIFICATE AS TO POSTING OR GIVING OF NOTICE

On this 1st day of May 2015 at 3:00 p.m., this notice was posted on a bulletin board located at a place convenient to the public in the central administrative offices of the Lamar Consolidated Independent School District, 3911 Avenue I, Rosenberg, Texas 77471, and in a place readily accessible to the general public at all times.

Karen Vacek
Secretary to Superintendent

**CONSIDER APPROVAL OF RANKING OF
CONSTRUCTION MANAGER – AGENT (CMA)**

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Board of Trustees approve the ranking of Construction Manager-Agent (CMA) firms and authorize the Superintendent to begin contract negotiations for construction manager agent services for the 2014 bond program.

IMPACT/RATIONALE:

In March, the Purchasing Department released a Request for Qualifications, RFQ 10-2015ML, for Construction Manager-Agent (CMA).

Procured in the same manner as an Architect or Engineer, an RFQ for Construction Manager Agent (CMA) is prescribed by law in Texas Government Code 2269. The code, specifically 2269.052(b), requires all submissions be selected on the basis of demonstrated competence and qualifications.

The RFQ, as per the code, was advertised in the Fort Bend Herald. The Purchasing Department extended marketing of this solicitation by contacting fifteen (15) firms who previously indicated an interest or performed these services for other entities. Additionally, twenty five (25) firms who registered on the Lamar CISD Interested Vendor database were also contacted directly regarding this solicitation.

The RFQ required responsive firms to provide detailed information providing evidence of demonstrated competence and qualifications. A rubric (Exhibit 1) was provided in the RFQ offering a two-step approach of specific facts which would allow staff to quantify and reduce the submissions to three (3) top firms.

This rubric, while not required by statute, allowed the evaluation team to successfully and without subjectivity review seven (7) submitted responses using a consistent methodology.

Upon completion of the initial evaluation (Exhibit 2), the Department of Operations provided a list of three (3) firms. All seven (7) firms responding were notified of the three (3) firms that would receive an invitation for interview.

The top three (3) firms were provided with a list of twelve (12) identical questions. During their interview, each firm was asked to address the twelve (12) questions before a committee made up of the Board Facilities Committee, the Superintendent, and the Administrator for Operations. The Committee heard presentations from the three firms on April 28th. Following the presentations, a scoring rubric was provided to determine the quality of response to each of the twelve (12) questions. Scores from the interviews were tabulated by the Purchasing Department (Exhibit 3). In addition, a scoring rubric was prepared by Business Office staff to evaluate the financial strength of the three firms (Exhibit 4). Financial statement information was reviewed for the firms assuming financial responsibility for the engagement. The combined results of the interview tabulation and financial strength evaluation offer the final ranking of firms as follows:

1. Gilbane/IDC
2. Vanir/Rice Gardner, A Joint Venture
3. AECOM/Skanska

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

Upon approval of the ranked list, the Superintendent will begin negotiations with the top ranked firm. Should negotiations fail, the firm will be notified in writing and negotiations may begin with the next firm in rank.

Submitted by: Kevin McKeever, Administrator for Operations
Jill Ludwig, CPA, RTSBA, Chief Financial Officer
Michele Leach, RTSBA Purchasing & Materials Manager

Recommended for approval:



Dr. Thomas Randle
Superintendent

Exhibit 1

	Evaluation Criteria	Point System
1	Response to RFQ – Adequacy of response to the RFQ or presentation of Statement of Qualifications as it relates to the needs of Lamar Consolidated ISD 2014 Bond Program.	5
2	Past relevant performance of the CMA methodology – Review of past positive performance acting as a CMA for other school districts (preferred) or government entities. Review should include past work, detailed information on application of this methodology in past contracts.	20
3	Firm’s proposed personnel/team certifications and qualifications – Relevant qualifications and experience of the firm and personnel assigned for the performance of Program Management services on an educational facility capital improvement program. A review of resumes, credentials and other qualifications supporting the accomplishment of program standards will be assessed.	15
4	Components of CMA Program Management Approach – Program Management approach as it relates to the needs of the district.	20
5	Financial Strength – Review of current and past 5 years of financial information. Information to include size and scope of all current contracted work, listing current clients being served. STEP TWO ONLY	20
6	References – Adequacy of response and information provided by relevant references. References must be provided from the list of past projects requested within this RFQ.	15
7	Ability to service our accounts with proper staff and insurance requirements – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide proof of proper insurance as defined in this solicitation. 	5
	TOTAL	100 POINTS

Vendor	Response to RFQ 5 Points Max	Past relevant performance of the CMA methodology 20 Points Max	Firm's proposed personnel/team certifications and qualifications 15 Points Max	Components of a CMA Program Approach 20 Points Max	Total Score	Firm's Ranking Order
AECOM	4.25	17.00	13.00	16.50	50.75	2
Gilbane/IDC	4.25	17.50	13.75	16.50	52.00	1
Heery International	4.25	15.00	13.00	15.00	47.25	4
Jacobs	4.25	16.00	13.00	16.25	49.50	3
Jones, Lang, LaSalle	3.75	13.50	10.00	13.50	40.75	6
Project Control	3.75	14.25	11.50	14.75	44.25	5
Vanir/Rice Garder	4.25	16.50	13.75	16.25	50.75	2

Exhibit 3

Vendor	Total Score	Firm's Ranking Order
AECOM/Skanska	147	3
Gilbane/IDC	234	1
Vanir/Rice Garder	152	2

Exhibit 4

<u>Indicator and Maximum Point Allocation (20 points)</u>	<u>Maximum Point Allocation</u>	<u>AECOM</u>	<u>Gilbane</u>	<u>Rice Gardner and Vanir</u>
Submission of Financial Information:	7	6	7	5
Operational Health/Ratio Analysis:	5	4	3	4
Other Criteria Relative to Strengths/Weaknesses	8	3	7	7
Total Points Awarded	20	13	17	16