

The Indian River County District School Board met on Tuesday, February 26, 2013, at 9:00 a.m. The workshop was held in the Teacher Education Center located at the J.A. Thompson Administrative Center, 1990 25th Street, Vero Beach, Florida. School Board Members attending were: Chairman Carol Johnson, Vice Chairman Claudia Jiménez, and Board Members: Matthew McCain and Karen Disney-Brombach. Dr. Frances J. Adams, Superintendent of Schools, and School Board Attorney Suzanne D'Agresta were also present. Board Member, Jeff Pegler, was not present.

Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) Project Pathway Protocol and Request for Qualifications (RFQ) Update Workshop

- I. Called Workshop to Order – Chairman Johnson
- II. Purpose of the Workshop – Dr. Adams
Dr. Adams stated that Mr. Morrison and his Staff had a lot of information to present. The changes to be presented were for efficiency of operation.
- III. Presentation – Mr. Morrison
Mr. Morrison introduced his Staff. He stated that today's presentation was a culmination of efficiency standards prepared by the Support Services Council that was made up of the following Department leaders: Rick Chuma, Director of Purchasing; Scott Sanders, Director of Facilities; John Earman, Director of Maintenance; Pete Copeman, Code Compliance Inspector; and James Teague, Building Official. Mr. Morrison said that they were going to share with the Board the standard template changes for continuous process improvement for a clearer roadmap for the District's facilities projects.

CMAR/Hard Bid Processes

Mr. Chuma explained that the Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) was the selection process used to determine the best qualified firm. He also explained when the traditional hard bid process was used, based primarily on price. Mr. Chuma said that they were not changing the procurement process but were fine tuning the process. An example was given of when a hard bid and CMAR process was used in the past. They also reviewed the advantages and disadvantages. It was explained that change orders were not always bad. Occasionally issues came up due to unknown findings during construction or options for improvements of plans that were not apparent at the onset of the planning process.

Mr. Morrison reviewed the outside sources that they consulted while working on the proposed changes to the templates. He thanked Mrs. D'Agresta for her legal advice in reviewing the final drafts. Mr. Sanders stated that the original template was four pages and the new proposed template was 32 pages. He reviewed the changes that would now include items such as defined timelines, addendums,

contractors and architects responsibilities and rights, purchase rights to save sales taxes, breach of contract, and right to cancel.

Mr. Earman stated that the Committee planned to review the templates annually as things changed in the industry. He explained when it was necessary to hire a Construction Manager for complicated jobs and how they would maximize those services. Mr. Earman reviewed the CMAR Crosswalk that defined the when, who, what, where, how of the process. Mr. Morrison stated that the next step was to bring the new standard templates to the Board for approval. Board Members were provided an opportunity to ask questions. Dr. Adams stated that the proposed process was to design the plan and then to discuss with the schools or facility their needs; instead of the other way around.

Project Pathway Protocol Update

Mr. Morrison said that this was a continuous process for improvement based on self-assessment. Mr. Earman stated that this was a user manual to assist District Staff in determining flow for succession planning. Mr. Copeman and Mr. Sanders reviewed the steps. Mr. Morrison noted that project updates would continue to be provided to the Board and Superintendent as the projects moved towards completion. Dr. Adams suggested that other Departments be added to the beginning of the project phases; such as, Curriculum, Information Technology, and Support Services Council. Mr. Sanders gave an example of how and when change orders would be added.

Introduction to Performance Contracting (energy efficiency)

Mr. Morrison stated that they had been working on this internally and were now ready to move forward with energy efficiency plans. Mr. Copeman and Mr. Earman spoke to the Performance Contracting concept that could be handled by an energy services company. Mr. Earman talked about bundling of all energy savings plans and the Capital cost payback depicted in years. The driver of the plan was through the use of technology. Mr. Morrison said that the first step, with Board approval, would be to advertise for a Request for Qualifications (RFP) for an energy service company. Dr. Adams spoke of the dollars needed for training staff. Board Members were given an opportunity to ask questions.

Proposed Name Change for Maintenance Department

Mr. Earman proposed changing the name to Physical Plant. Chairman Johnson suggested that the Superintendent present the name change with the approval of the Organizational Chart.

IV. ADJOURNMENT – Chairman Johnson

With no further items, the workshop adjourned at approximately 11:02 a.m.