



Meeting Date: February 18, 2021

Submitted By: Bill Atkins
Title: Chief Financial Officer

Agenda Item: Consider and take action regarding approving the ranking of the architectural firms for services related to RFQ 16-07 Architectural Services - Various Small Projects.

CONSENT ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the ranking of the architectural firms to provide services for the design and construction for various small projects. It is further recommended that the Board of Trustees delegate the authority to the superintendent or her designee to execute contracts upon successful negotiations.

IMPACT/RATIONALE:

Allows the district to procure professional services in accordance with §2254.004 of the Texas Government Code and comply with Board Policy CV (LOCAL).

Expenditures will be paid from 2016 Bond Funds.

The contracts will be for a specific projects and will expire upon their completion.

BOARD ACTION REQUESTED:

Approval/Disapproval



MEMORANDUM

February 10, 2021

To: Bill Atkins, Chief Financial Officer

From: J.J. McQuade, Director of Purchasing

RE: RFQ 16-07 Architectural Services – Various Small Projects

A Request for Qualifications for architectural services was completed earlier in 2016 in order to develop a pool of highly qualified architects that would be available as specific projects become necessary. A pool of 28 firms responded with statements of qualifications. For this engagement, five (5) of these firms have been identified as equally qualified to provide the required services needed by the District. A thorough review has been conducted and each firm has been selected according to their qualifications. Approval of this ranking will allow the superintendent or her designee to attempt to negotiate a contract for a fair and reasonable price with the top-ranked provider. In the event an agreement cannot be reached, all negotiations will cease with that vendor. At that point, an attempt will be made to negotiate with the next highest ranked vendor and so on until an agreement is reached.

Selected Firms:

1. Pluger Architects
2. PBK Architects
3. RVK/NextGen
4. Alamo Architects
5. LPA Architects

Expenditures will be made from 2016 bond fund proceeds. Expenditures are estimated to be \$470,000.

The contract will be for a specific project and will expire upon completion.

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the ranking as presented in the attachment.

All board members, employees and agents involved in the planning, recommending, selecting or contracting of a vendor are reminded of the conflict of interest reporting requirements as mandated in Chapter 176 of the Local Government Code. A copy of Form CIS has been included as an additional attachment. In the event that a conflict exists, the form should be completed and submitted to the Purchasing Department not later than the 7th day after the conflict is identified.

Once a recommendation to make the purchase was established, the prospective vendor was requested to complete a Texas Ethics Commission Form 1295. This requirement became effective on January 1, 2016 and is related to the passage of House Bill 1295 which is now incorporated into the Texas Government Code 2252.908. The form is attached and identifies all interested parties associated with the vendor as it relates to this procurement. Upon approval by the Board of Trustees and issuance of a district purchase order, the form will be posted on the Texas Ethics Commission's website as required by statute.



MEMORANDUM

Date: February 9, 2021

To: James McQuade
Director of Purchasing

Thru: Helen Keaton *H. Keaton*
Executive Director of Facilities Planning

From: Ruben Moreno *RMA*
Director of Facilities Planning

Project: Various Small Projects

Re: RFQ 16-07 – Architectural Consultant Services – Ranking

Below are the rankings for Architectural Consultant Services for various small projects in the 2016 Bond. Projects included are as follows: security vestibule, life skills areas, and mechanical work. These projects are at Metzger MS, Judson MS, Woodlake Hills MS and Hopkins ES. Project consultants are from the RFQ 16-07. Also included is the supporting documentation. The office of Facilities Planning found Pluger Architects to be the highest ranked firm. The budgeted cost for the work is approximately \$470,000.00. The architectural cost would be a stipulated sum or a percentage of the budget.

Rankings are as follows:

1. Pluger Architects
2. PBK Architects
3. RVK/NextGen Architects
4. Alamo Architects
5. LPA Architects

CC: Dr. Milton (Rob) Fields, Deputy Superintendent of Administration and Operations

LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICER CONFLICTS DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM CIS

(Instructions for completing and filing this form are provided on the next page.)

This questionnaire reflects changes made to the law by H.B. 23, 84th Leg., Regular Session.

This is the notice to the appropriate local governmental entity that the following local government officer has become aware of facts that require the officer to file this statement in accordance with Chapter 176, Local Government Code.

OFFICE USE ONLY

Date Received

1 Name of Local Government Officer

2 Office Held

3 Name of vendor described by Sections 176.001(7) and 176.003(a), Local Government Code

4 Description of the nature and extent of employment or other business relationship with vendor named in item 3

5 List gifts accepted by the local government officer and any family member, if aggregate value of the gifts accepted from vendor named in item 3 exceeds \$100 during the 12-month period described by Section 176.003(a)(2)(B).

Date Gift Accepted _____ Description of Gift _____

Date Gift Accepted _____ Description of Gift _____

Date Gift Accepted _____ Description of Gift _____

(attach additional forms as necessary)

6 AFFIDAVIT

I swear under penalty of perjury that the above statement is true and correct. I acknowledge that the disclosure applies to each family member (as defined by Section 176.001(2), Local Government Code) of this local government officer. I also acknowledge that this statement covers the 12-month period described by Section 176.003(a)(2)(B), Local Government Code.

Signature of Local Government Officer

AFFIX NOTARY STAMP / SEAL ABOVE

Sworn to and subscribed before me, by the said _____, this the _____ day
of _____, 20 _____, to certify which, witness my hand and seal of office.

Signature of officer administering oath

Printed name of officer administering oath

Title of officer administering oath

LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICER CONFLICTS DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Section 176.003 of the Local Government Code requires certain local government officers to file this form. A "local government officer" is defined as a member of the governing body of a local governmental entity; a director, superintendent, administrator, president, or other person designated as the executive officer of a local governmental entity; or an agent of a local governmental entity who exercises discretion in the planning, recommending, selecting, or contracting of a vendor. This form is required to be filed with the records administrator of the local governmental entity not later than 5 p.m. on the seventh business day after the date on which the officer becomes aware of the facts that require the filing of this statement.

A local government officer commits an offense if the officer knowingly violates Section 176.003, Local Government Code. An offense under this section is a misdemeanor.

Please refer to chapter 176 of the Local Government Code for detailed information regarding the requirement to file this form.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THIS FORM

The following numbers correspond to the numbered boxes on the other side.

- 1. Name of Local Government Officer.** Enter the name of the local government officer filing this statement.
- 2. Office Held.** Enter the name of the office held by the local government officer filing this statement.
- 3. Name of vendor described by Sections 176.001(7) and 176.003(a), Local Government Code.** Enter the name of the vendor described by Section 176.001(7), Local Government Code, with whom the officer has an employment or other business relationship as described by Section 176.003(a)(2)(A), Local Government Code.
- 4. Description of the nature and extent of employment or business relationship with vendor named in item 3.** Describe the nature and extent of the employment or other business relationship with the vendor in item 3 as described by Section 176.003(a)(2)(A), Local Government Code.
- 5. List gifts accepted, if the aggregate value of the gifts accepted from vendor named in item 3 exceeds \$100.** List gifts accepted during the 12-month period (described by Section 176.003(a)(2)(B), Local Government Code) by the local government officer or family member of the officer from the vendor named in item 3 that in the aggregate exceed \$100 in value.
- 6. Affidavit.** Signature of local government officer.

February 09, 2021 JUDSON ISD RFQ EVALUATION FORM RFQ 16-07 ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES Professional Services for Various Small Projects		Alamo	Corgan / DHR	Dockery	Ero Architects	Garza	Garza Bomberger	Gignac	Harrison Kornberg	Huckabee	Kai Alliance	Shawn Kaarlsen	Lopez Salas	LPA	Marron Mok	Munoz	Noonan Rittiman	O'Connell Robertson	PBK	Pfuger	Piwonka Sturrock	RVK / Next Gen	Stantec	VLK Robey	WPA
--	--	-------	--------------	---------	----------------	-------	-----------------	--------	-------------------	----------	--------------	----------------	-------------	-----	------------	-------	-----------------	---------------------	-----	--------	------------------	----------------	---------	-----------	-----

1) Firm Background and Staff																										
Years present firm established:		5	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	2	5	5	5	5
Subtotal		5	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	2	5	5	5	5

2) Firm Background and Staff																										
i	Number of employees in firm locally:	10	8	4	0	4	8	4	0	4	2	8	4	8	10	10	4	6	10	10	2	10	6	4	0	
ii	Total of employees in firm all locations	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	
a.	Number of Registered Architects	11	10	10	0	10	10	10	0	10	10	10	10	11	11	10	10	10	10	11	10	10	10	10	0	
b.	Number of Draftsmen/CAD/Designers/EITs/Interns/Inspectors	5	2	1	0	1	3	1	0	1	0	3	1	2	4	5	1	3	5	3	0	5	0	3	0	
c.	Others certified or licensed professionals	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	
d.	Administrators	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	
Subtotal		27	23	16	1	17	23	16	1	18	13	22	16	24	26	27	17	21	28	26	12	26	18	20	1	

3) Personnel Qualifications																										
Designated Representative		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
Subtotal		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	

4) Insurance Claims																										
Claims asserted against your firm within the past five years? (Y = Yes) (N = No)		N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	

5) Basic Services Provided by Firm																										
Summarized Services provided as part of Basic Services		3	3	3	3	4	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	5	5	2	3	3	4	3	
Subtotal		3	3	3	3	4	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	5	5	2	3	3	4	3	

6) Organizational Chart (No Points Assigned)																										
Was an Organizational Chart included? (Y = Yes, N = No)		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	

7) Completed Similar Renovation Construction Projects																										
Projects Of Similar Scope, Complexity And/or Dollar Value:		4	0	2	0	2	2	0	4	6	4	2	2	10	4	2	2	8	6	10	8	6	10	2	0	
Subtotal		4	0	2	0	2	2	0	4	6	4	2	2	10	4	2	2	8	6	10	8	6	10	2	0	

8) Errors & Omissions																										
Firm's approach to E&O		4	5	1	0	5	1	1	1	5	1	0	1	0	0	1	5	5	5	1	1	4	5	1	1	
Subtotal		4	5	1	0	5	1	1	1	5	1	0	1	0	0	1	5	5	5	1	1	4	5	1	1	

9) Building Information Modeling (10 Points)																										
Firm has in-house BIM capabilities		10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	
Subtotal		10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	

10) Sustainable Design																										
Firm has certified professional staff with Green certifications		5	5	5	0	0	5	5	5	5	0	0	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	5	
Subtotal		5	5	5	0	0	5	5	5	5	0	0	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	5	

11) Past Relationship with the District																										
Prior Experience with Judson ISD		10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	6	10	10	10	10	10	10	
Subtotal		10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	6	10	10	10	10	10	10	

12) Technology/Electronic Expertise																										
Ability to Meet Requirements (Y = Yes, N = No)		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	

13) Added Value to JISD (20 points)																										
Benefit to JISD in means of additional value or savings																										
Subtotal		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

TOTAL		71	64	55	31	55	64	53	41	65	49	53	55	71	66	66	45	70	73	75	48	72	69	60	38
RANK		4	11	14	24	14	11	17	22	10	19	17	14	4	8	8	21	6	2	1	20	3	7	13	23