

**San Jacinto College District Board Workshop  
June 6, 2016  
District Administration Building, Suite 201**

**MINUTES**

	<b>Board Workshop Attendees:</b>	<b>Board Members:</b> Marie Flickinger, Brad Hance, Dan Mims, John Moon, Jr., Keith Sinor, Dr. Ruede Wheeler, Larry Wilson <b>Chancellor:</b> Brenda Hellyer <b>Others:</b> Allen Bourque, John Hopkins, Chet Lewis, Arturo Michel, Mandi Reiland, Rob Stanicic, Steve Trncak, Ben Wells
	<b>Agenda Item:</b>	<b>Discussion/Information</b>
<b>I.</b>	<b>Call the Meeting to Order</b>	<b>Workshop began at 5:01 p.m.</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>Roll Call of Board Members</b>	<b>Board Members:</b> Dan Mims, Marie Flickinger, Brad Hance, John Moon, Jr., Keith Sinor, Dr. Ruede Wheeler, Larry Wilson
<b>III.</b>	<b>Adjournment to closed or executive session pursuant to Texas Government Code Section 551.071, 551.072, 551.074, 551.076, &amp; 551.087 of the Texas Open Meetings Act</b>	Adjourned to closed session at 5:02 p.m.  a. For the purpose of a private consultation with the Board’s attorney on any or all subjects or matters authorized by law. Arturo Michel, John Hopkins, Ben Wells, Rob Stanicic, Allen Bourque, Chet Lewis, Steve Trncak, and Mandi Reiland were present for Item A of the executive session.  b. To consider the potential future adoption of tax abatement guidelines and criteria and tax abatement agreement regarding ship channel industries. Arturo Michel, Chet Lewis, Steve Trncak, and Mandi Reiland were present for Item B of the executive session.  c. For the purpose of discussing the purchase, exchange, lease or value of real property. Chet Lewis, Steve Trncak, and Mandi Reiland were present for Item C of the executive session.  d. 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. Steve Trncak and Mandi Reiland were present for Item D of the executive session.

		<p>e. To consider the deployment, or specific occasions for implementation, of security personnel or devices. Item E of the executive session was tabled.</p>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>Reconvene in Open Meeting</b>	<p>Reconvened in open meeting at 6:06 p.m.</p>
<b>V.</b>	<b>Discuss Proposed Fee Structure for Architectural Services</b>	<p>Steve Trncak, Chet Lewis, and Mandi Reiland were present for this portion of the agenda. A representative with Jacobs Project Management attended as a citizen.</p> <p>The action item on the agenda recommends the Board of Trustees approve the pool of architects for 2015 Bond Projects and grant the administration the authority to rank, select, and enter into negotiations with the most highly qualified firm(s) on a per project basis for the 2015 Bond Program new construction, renovation, and infrastructure projects.</p> <p>Brenda Hellyer explained that the Board book that was distributed contained a draft version of the rate structure. She gave an overview of the updated attachment for the action item that will be voted on at the Board Meeting.</p> <p><u>New construction and substantial new construction</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over \$15 million – 6.0%</li> <li>• \$10 million - \$15 million – 6.25%</li> <li>• \$3 million - \$10 million – 6.5%</li> <li>• \$500,000 - \$3 million – 7.0%</li> <li>• \$500,000 - Negotiable</li> </ul> <p><u>Renovations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over \$3 million – 7.0%</li> <li>• \$500,000 - \$3 million – 7.5%</li> <li>• Over \$500,000 – Negotiable</li> </ul> <p>These represent rates that cannot be exceeded or maximums.</p> <p>Marie Flickinger asked what projects the College has that will fall within these ranges.</p> <p>Brenda explained that the category of new construction and substantial new construction would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New classroom building replacing Frels – total project costs \$47 million</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Davison building renovation – total project costs \$15 million</li> <li>• McCollum building renovation – total project costs \$24.7 million</li> <li>• Brightwell building renovation – total project costs \$6.6 million</li> </ul> <p>Brenda noted that architectural fees are calculated based on construction costs not total project costs.</p> <p>Larry Wilson asked about the rate structure. He remembered the Board agreeing to set up the rates so that the College would save money on the fees. He asked why we would use standard rates if the College is trying to save money.</p> <p>Brenda explained that if the College had used this type of rate structure in the 2008 Bond, the savings would have been approximately \$1 million.</p> <p>Marie asked how much of the savings were on the 7 percent fee. Chet explained that it was not substantial. The rate is determined by if the project is classified as renovation, new construction, or substantial new construction. Some renovation projects can actually be classified as substantial new construction because of the amount of renovation needed.</p> <p>Dr. Wheeler asked how many architects the College plans on utilizing for the 2015 Bond.</p> <p>Brenda explained that there are seven that are included in the action item tonight to be approved by the Board as the pool of architects. She does not know for sure the actual number to be utilized, because they have to agree to the approved rates. The anticipated amount of architects is five.</p> <p>Brenda explained that this pool of architects is only for 2015 Bond Program projects. The plan is to have an additional request for qualifications (RFQ) to approve a pool of architects to work on the smaller projects.</p> <p>Larry inquired as to why the architects would not agree to these rates.</p> <p>Brenda explained that the recommended architect pool needs to be approved, and the College’s fee structure needs to be approved (two separate action items). Rates have not been discussed with the architectural firms yet. This will be done after the Board approves the rates and pool. The firms may not agree to our rates if they see the market paying higher.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Keith Sinor asked if the College has flexibility in the selection of the architects per project.</p> <p>Brenda explained that the College does have flexibility. We will select architects based on a qualification process by project.</p> <p>Chet explained that in negotiations you can say that you cannot exceed the percentages. State law also dictates our process. After an architect is selected, the College then can begin negotiations with the architects.</p> <p>Brenda referenced an article from Houston Business Journal regarding the largest architectural firms in the Houston area. All of the architects that are in the recommended pool were ranked in the list in the article.</p>
<p><b>VI.</b></p>	<p><b>Discuss Status of Request for Qualifications for Program Management</b></p>	<p>Steve Trncak, Chet Lewis, and Mandi Reiland were present for this portion of the agenda. A representative with Jacobs Project Management attended as a citizen.</p> <p>Brenda explained that the College went through an RFQ process for program managers for the 2015 Bond Program. This is a request for qualifications for program managers. There was a very specific list of qualifications that were involved in this process. This summary of qualifications was weighted at 70 percent of the total score of the evaluation. The required presentation was weighted at 30 percent. Eight firms responded to the RFQ.</p> <p>Brenda explained the handout that was distributed to the Board. The handout shows the top three firms rated were AECOM, Jacobs, and JLL. References were checked, and based on that, the final evaluation order was changed to – AECOM, JLL, and then Jacobs.</p> <p>Based on the RFQ process, after receiving the qualifications and selecting a project manager based on the evaluations, the College can then begin discussing pricing. AECOM was contacted for pricing. Included in the packet was the summary page which contains the company profile and qualifications of personnel.</p> <p>Brenda explained the preliminary negotiations of pricing options that were discussed with AECOM. The College staff, in consultation with AECOM, recommends option B on the pricing handout which is as follows.</p>

		<p>Schedule: August 2016 – July 2021  Total Staff Hours: 74,452  Total Project Expense: \$9,167,140  Percent of Project: 3.13%</p> <p>The options were reviewed internally, and it was agreed that this is the best option for the College. Brenda explained that our challenge will be meeting this time line internally.</p> <p>Brenda explained that an additional staff member needs to be added in Bryan Jones’ area. There have been discussions on what skills this person would need to have. This person would be charged to the Bond. There may need to be additional staff in the accounting and/or purchasing department charged to the Bond. Chet and Brenda are still analyzing the needs.</p> <p>Marie asked why the timeframe is the same for Option a, b, and c. She asked why it would not go faster with more staff. Brenda explained that the options are based on more resources from AECOM, and under all scenarios a lot of this would depend on the College. We need to ask ourselves if our teams can handle this timeline.</p> <p>The current rate is at 2.73 percent. Brenda wanted to make sure the Board understands that the current program manager is doing a very good job. As the group reviewed all the factors, sustainability was an issue with our current program manager.</p> <p>Brenda explained that AECOM needs a location on campus for offices. We are going to look at onsite space for the program manager.</p> <p>Brad Hance asked who the committee members were that evaluated the RFQ and if they were qualified to make decisions on program managers.</p> <p>Brenda explained that the committee consisted of six people and then five participated in the interviews. The majority were out of the Facilities services area, Steve Trncak, Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, and Ann Kokx-Templet, Director of Contracts &amp; Purchasing served on the committee. Jerusha Kasch participated in the RFQ review but was unable to be involved in the interviews due to a death in the family. Brenda felt that they were all qualified.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Dan Mims reiterated that we appreciate the work that our current program manager has done for us, and it has been great, but the concern is the sustainability of the company.</p> <p>Brad asked if AECOM will care about us like a smaller company would.  Marie said this is also a concern of hers.  Dan said that these companies do not get to be that way by not taking care of their customers. A larger firm can bring other experience to the table.  Dr. Wheeler said that a large company has a lot more resources to draw on.</p> <p>Brenda asked the Board for direction. The plan is to bring a recommendation for approval at the July Board meeting.  The Board is comfortable moving forward.</p>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>General Discussion of Meeting Items</b>	<p>Brenda Hellyer gave an overview of summer enrollment.</p> <p>Enrollment for summer is up 5.4 percent for unduplicated headcount, and contact hours are up 6.1 percent. Central Campus is down slightly, North Campus is up 16 percent, and South is up 9.5 percent. We are analyzing every area and utilizing the great reports we have to better understand the increase.</p>
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>Calendar</b>	Brenda reviewed the Board calendar.
<b>IX.</b>	<b>Adjournment</b>	Workshop adjourned at 6:53 p.m.