



Travis County Commissioners Court Agenda Request

Meeting Date: December 13, 2011

Prepared By/Phone Number: Jorge Talavera, CPPO, CPPB/854-9762;
Marvin Brice, CPPB/854-9765

Elected/Appointed Official/Dept. Head: Cyd Grimes, C.P.M.

Commissioners Court Sponsor: Judge Biscoe

Agenda Language: Receive briefing from Purchasing Agent on following:

A. Canadian Public Private Partnership (P3) Conference

B. Contract negotiations for Advisory Team for Feasibility Analysis of a P3 for new Civil and Family Courthouse (1) (This item may be taken in Executive Session pursuant to Local Government Code, Section 551.071)

Ø **Purchasing Recommendation and Comments:**

Ø Item A: The Purchasing Agent will provide a summary of the Canadian P3 Conference she attended on November 21-22, 2011.

Ø Item B: In December 2010, the County purchased the full city block located at 308 Guadalupe for a New Civil and Family Courthouse in Travis County. On April 22, 2011, Request for Information (RFI) No. I041311CG was issued, as directed by the Commissioners Court, to solicit information from developers and construction teams to explore the potential for a P3 in the development of the new Courthouse building. The intent of the P3 contracting approach would be to significantly reduce Travis County's cost and to deliver the project more quickly and with quality long-term design, construction, maintenance, and/or operations of the new facility.

Ø In response to the RFI, on June 30, 2011, twenty-one (21) responses were received from various companies and consortiums which provided information on their past experience with, and ideas on, the P3 contracting approach, and expressed an interest in participating in the County's P3 project in some capacity.

AGENDA REQUEST DEADLINE: All agenda requests and supporting materials must be submitted as a pdf to Cheryl Aker in the County Judge's office, Cheryl.Aker@co.travis.tx.us by Tuesdays at 5:00 p.m. for the next week's meeting.

- Ø On May 31, 2011, the Purchasing Agent was authorized to issue Request for Services (RFS) No. S110505-CG to procure the services of an Advisory Team to assist in determining the feasibility of utilizing a P3 contracting approach for the development of the new Courthouse building. Ten (10) responses were received in response to the RFS by the submission deadline of July 13, 2011, at 2:00 p.m., extended from the initial due date of June 30, 2011.
- Ø After the written proposals were scored by the Evaluation Committee (“Committee”), comprised of representatives from the Auditor’s, County Attorney’s, Planning and Budget, Purchasing, and Transportation and Natural Resources Offices, the four (4) highest ranked respondents were short-listed and invited for oral interviews. These four firms were: Cushman & Wakefield/Oxford Commercial; Ernst & Young LLP; Jones Lang LaSalle Americas, Inc.; and, KPMG Corporate Finance LLC. After oral interviews were conducted, the Committee completed another round of scoring based upon written responses to the RFS, oral interviews and additionally requested information received from short-listed respondents during the evaluation process.
- Ø The Committee then determined that negotiating concurrently with the top two ranked teams would allow for a more competitive final selection process. These teams were: Ernst & Young LLP and KPMG Corporate Finance, LLC. After numerous meetings and follow-up discussions with the two top ranked teams, a final vote was taken to select the successful Advisory Team. Ernst & Young LLP was selected by the Committee through a 4-2 vote.
- Ø The Purchasing Agent is currently supervising contract negotiations with Ernst & Young LLP. Upon completion of contract negotiations, the Purchasing Agent will present a contract for Commissioners Court approval to Ernst & Young LLP to act as the County’s Advisory Team. The Advisory Team will review and analyze the twenty-one (21) RFI responses received on June 30, 2011, and help develop concepts and objectives for Travis County’s P3 project. If the Commissioners Court decides to proceed with a P3 contracting approach for development of the new Courthouse building, the County will then need to procure an Owner’s Representative to act on behalf of the County in establishing a P3 for the new Civil and Family Courthouse.

AGENDA REQUEST DEADLINE: All agenda requests and supporting materials must be submitted as a pdf to Cheryl Aker in the County Judge’s office, Cheryl.Aker@co.travis.tx.us by **Tuesdays at 5:00 p.m.** for the next week’s meeting.

Written Proposals - Evaluation Matrix for Advisory Team for RFS No. S110505-CG, Feasibility Analysis of a Public Private Partnership for a New Civil and Family Courthouse at 308 Guadalupe Street in Austin, TX		Hawkins, Delafield & Wood LLP		Jones Lang LaSalle Americas, Inc.		Ernst & Young LLP		Kell Munoz, Inc.		Development Resolutions II LLC		KPMG Corporate Finance LLC		Basile Bauman Prost Cole & Associates, Inc.		CB Richard Ellis		Cushman & Wakefield/Oxford Commercial		Public Financial Management, Inc.		
Evaluator No. 1		Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Avg. Score
Criteria	Weighted Factor																					
1. CRITERION ONE: Demonstrated Expertise of Personnel																						
Demonstrated expertise and experience of key personnel proposed to provide the services proposed.	35%	0	0.00	1.5	0.53	2.5	0.88	0.2	0.07	1	0.35	4	1.40	1	0.35	1	0.35	1	0.35	0.2	0.07	0.43
2. CRITERION TWO: Demonstrated Experience of the Firm																						
Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.	25%	0	0.00	2	0.50	2	0.50	0.2	0.05	1	0.25	4.2	1.05	0.5	0.13	1.5	0.38	1	0.25	0.2	0.05	0.32
3. CRITERION THREE: Fee Proposal																						
Respondent shall provide a fee schedule giving a fixed rate for Basic Services and listing of Hourly Rates for any Additional Services.	20%	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	1.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.12
4. CRITERION FOUR: Proposed Approach to Providing Services																						
Respondent must have adequate current full-time staff, both registered professionals in an applicable field and technical and administrative support staff, to competently and efficiently perform the work. Respondent must submit a management plan to show how it proposes to efficiently accomplish the work for the Project under consideration. Each phase of the plan should have a well-defined scope, deliverables, and estimated timeframe for completion.	20%	0	0.00	0.5	0.10	2.5	0.50	0	0.00	0	0.00	4.5	0.90	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.20	0.3	0.06	0.18
TOTAL SCORE	100%	0	0.00	1.13	2.08	0.12	0.60	4.35	0.48	0.73	0.80	1.05	0.18	1.05								
Evaluator No. 2																						
Criteria	Weighted Factor																					
1. CRITERION ONE: Demonstrated Expertise of Personnel																						
Demonstrated expertise and experience of key personnel proposed to provide the services proposed.	35%	3	1.05	4	1.40	5	1.75	4	1.40	0	0.00	5	1.75	3	1.05	4	1.40	4	1.40	0	0.00	1.12
2. CRITERION TWO: Demonstrated Experience of the Firm																						
Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.	25%	3	0.75	5	1.25	4	1.00	3	0.75	0	0.00	4	1.00	3	0.75	4	1.00	4	1.00	0	0.00	0.75
3. CRITERION THREE: Fee Proposal																						
Respondent shall provide a fee schedule giving a fixed rate for Basic Services and listing of Hourly Rates for any Additional Services.	20%	4	0.80	4	0.80	5	1.00	3	0.60	0	0.00	4	0.80	4	0.80	2	0.40	3	0.60	0	0.00	0.58
4. CRITERION FOUR: Proposed Approach to Providing Services																						
Respondent must have adequate current full-time staff, both registered professionals in an applicable field and technical and administrative support staff, to competently and efficiently perform the work. Respondent must submit a management plan to show how it proposes to efficiently accomplish the work for the Project under consideration. Each phase of the plan should have a well-defined scope, deliverables, and estimated timeframe for completion.	20%	2	0.40	5	1.00	5	1.00	3	0.60	0	0.00	5	1.00	3	0.60	5	1.00	3	0.60	0	0.00	0.62
TOTAL SCORE	100%	3.00	4.45	4.75	3.35	0.00	4.55	3.20	3.80	3.60	0.00	3.07										
Evaluator No. 3																						
Criteria	Weighted Factor																					
1. CRITERION ONE: Demonstrated Expertise of Personnel																						
Demonstrated expertise and experience of key personnel proposed to provide the services proposed.	35%	2	0.70	4.5	1.58	4.2	1.47	2	0.70	2	0.70	4.5	1.58	2	0.70	1	0.35	4	1.40	4.5	1.58	1.07
2. CRITERION TWO: Demonstrated Experience of the Firm																						
Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.	25%	1	0.25	4.5	1.13	4.8	1.20	2	0.50	1	0.25	4.5	1.13	2	0.50	1	0.25	5	1.25	4.5	1.13	0.76
3. CRITERION THREE: Fee Proposal																						
Respondent shall provide a fee schedule giving a fixed rate for Basic Services and listing of Hourly Rates for any Additional Services.	20%	1	0.20	5	1.00	4	0.80	1	0.20	1	0.20	4	0.80	2	0.40	1	0.20	5	1.00	4.5	0.90	0.57
4. CRITERION FOUR: Proposed Approach to Providing Services																						
Respondent must have adequate current full-time staff, both registered professionals in an applicable field and technical and administrative support staff, to competently and efficiently perform the work. Respondent must submit a management plan to show how it proposes to efficiently accomplish the work for the Project under consideration. Each phase of the plan should have a well-defined scope, deliverables, and estimated timeframe for completion.	20%	1	0.20	5	1.00	4.8	0.96	1	0.20	1	0.20	4.5	0.90	2	0.40	1	0.20	4	0.80	4.5	0.90	0.58
TOTAL SCORE	100%	1.35	4.70	4.43	1.60	1.35	4.40	2.00	1.00	4.45	4.50	2.98										

		Hawkins, Delafield & Wood LLP		Jones Lang LaSalle Americas, Inc.		Ernst & Young LLP		Kell Munoz, Inc.		Development Resolutions II LLC		KPMG Corporate Finance LLC		Basile Bauman Prost Cole & Associates, Inc.		CB Richard Ellis		Cushman & Wakefield/Oxford Commercial		Public Financial Management, Inc.		
Evaluator No. 4																						
Criteria	Weighted Factor	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Avg. Score
1. CRITERION ONE: Demonstrated Expertise of Personnel Demonstrated expertise and experience of key personnel proposed to provide the services proposed.	35%	1	0.35	3.5	1.23	3.95	1.38	2	0.70	2	0.70	4.5	1.58	3.1	1.09	4.125	1.44	3.55	1.24	4.75	1.66	1.14
2. CRITERION TWO: Demonstrated Experience of the Firm Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.	25%	1	0.25	4.5	1.13	4	1.00	2	0.50	1.5	0.38	4.5	1.13	3.5	0.88	2.75	0.69	4.5	1.13	3.25	0.81	0.79
3. CRITERION THREE: Fee Proposal Respondent shall provide a fee schedule giving a fixed rate for Basic Services and listing of Hourly Rates for any Additional Services.	20%	3	0.60	3	0.60	3	0.60	2	0.40	3	0.60	3.5	0.70	3	0.60	2.5	0.50	3	0.60	3.5	0.70	0.59
4. CRITERION FOUR: Proposed Approach to Providing Services Respondent must have adequate current full-time staff, both registered professionals in an applicable field and technical and administrative support staff, to competently and efficiently perform the work. Respondent must submit a management plan to show how it proposes to efficiently accomplish the work for the Project under consideration. Each phase of the plan should have a well-defined scope, deliverables, and estimated timeframe for completion.	20%	2	0.40	2.5	0.50	3	0.60	1.5	0.30	1.5	0.30	4.5	0.90	2.5	0.50	3.5	0.70	2.5	0.50	5	1.00	0.57
TOTAL SCORE	100%		1.60		3.45		3.58		1.90		1.98		4.30		3.06		3.33		3.47		4.18	3.08
Evaluator No. 5																						
Criteria	Weighted Factor	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Avg. Score
1. CRITERION ONE: Demonstrated Expertise of Personnel Demonstrated expertise and experience of key personnel proposed to provide the services proposed.	35%	4	1.40	3	1.05	4	1.40	3	1.05	3	1.05	4	1.40	3	1.05	3	1.05	4	1.40	3	1.05	1.19
2. CRITERION TWO: Demonstrated Experience of the Firm Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.	25%	4	1.00	3	0.75	4	1.00	3	0.75	3	0.75	4	1.00	3	0.75	4	1.00	4	1.00	4	1.00	0.90
3. CRITERION THREE: Fee Proposal Respondent shall provide a fee schedule giving a fixed rate for Basic Services and listing of Hourly Rates for any Additional Services.	20%	1	0.20	3	0.60	3	0.60	4	0.80	2	0.40	3	0.60	4	0.80	4	0.80	4	0.80	1	0.20	0.58
4. CRITERION FOUR: Proposed Approach to Providing Services Respondent must have adequate current full-time staff, both registered professionals in an applicable field and technical and administrative support staff, to competently and efficiently perform the work. Respondent must submit a management plan to show how it proposes to efficiently accomplish the work for the Project under consideration. Each phase of the plan should have a well-defined scope, deliverables, and estimated timeframe for completion.	20%	4	0.80	3	0.60	4	0.80	2	0.40	2	0.40	4	0.80	3	0.60	4	0.80	4	0.80	4	0.80	0.68
TOTAL SCORE	100%		3.40		3.00		3.80		3.00		2.60		3.80		3.20		3.65		4.00		3.05	3.35
Evaluator No. 6																						
Criteria	Weighted Factor	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Avg. Score
1. CRITERION ONE: Demonstrated Expertise of Personnel Demonstrated expertise and experience of key personnel proposed to provide the services proposed.	35%	1	0.35	4	1.40	2	0.70	2	0.70	4	1.40	5	1.75	2	0.70	4	1.40	3	1.05	5	1.75	1.12
2. CRITERION TWO: Demonstrated Experience of the Firm Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.	25%	1	0.25	2	0.50	2	0.50	2	0.50	1	0.25	5	1.25	2	0.50	3	0.75	2	0.50	3	0.75	0.58
3. CRITERION THREE: Fee Proposal Respondent shall provide a fee schedule giving a fixed rate for Basic Services and listing of Hourly Rates for any Additional Services.	20%	3	0.60	1	0.20	1	0.20	5	1.00	1	0.20	1	0.20	5	1.00	1	0.20	1	0.20	1	0.20	0.40
4. CRITERION FOUR: Proposed Approach to Providing Services Respondent must have adequate current full-time staff, both registered professionals in an applicable field and technical and administrative support staff, to competently and efficiently perform the work. Respondent must submit a management plan to show how it proposes to efficiently accomplish the work for the Project under consideration. Each phase of the plan should have a well-defined scope, deliverables, and estimated timeframe for completion.	20%	1	0.20	3	0.60	2	0.40	2	0.40	3	0.60	5	1.00	2	0.40	3	0.60	3	0.60	5	1.00	0.58
TOTAL SCORE	100%		1.40		2.70		1.80		2.60		2.45		4.20		2.60		2.95		2.35		3.70	2.68
TOTAL SCORE AVERAGE			1.79		3.24		3.41		2.10		1.50		4.27		2.42		2.58		3.11		2.60	

Second Evaluation Matrix for Advisory Team for RFS No. S110505-CG, Feasibility Analysis of a Public Private Partnership for a New Civil and Family Courthouse at 308 Guadalupe Street in Austin, TX		Cushman & Wakefield/Oxford Commercial		Ernst & Young LLP		Jones Lang LaSalle Americas, Inc.		KPMG Corporate Finance LLC		
Evaluator No. 1										
Criteria	Weighted Factor	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Avg. Score
1. CRITERION ONE: Demonstrated Expertise of Personnel										
Demonstrated expertise and experience of key personnel proposed to provide the services proposed.	35%	1	0.35	2	0.70	2	0.70	5	1.75	0.88
2. CRITERION TWO: Demonstrated Experience of the Firm										
Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.	25%	1	0.25	2	0.50	2	0.50	5	1.25	0.63
3. CRITERION THREE: Proposed Approach to Providing Services										
Respondent must have adequate current full-time staff, both registered professionals in an applicable field and technical and administrative support staff, to competently and efficiently perform the work. Respondent must submit a management plan to show how it proposes to efficiently accomplish the work for the Project under consideration. Each phase of the plan should have a well-defined scope, deliverables, and estimated timeframe for completion.	20%	2	0.40	2	0.40	2	0.40	5	1.00	0.55
TOTAL SCORE	80%		1.00		1.60		1.60		4.00	2.05
Evaluator No. 2										
Criteria	Weighted Factor	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Avg. Score
1. CRITERION ONE: Demonstrated Expertise of Personnel										
Demonstrated expertise and experience of key personnel proposed to provide the services proposed.	35%	5	1.75	4	1.40	3	1.05	5	1.75	1.49
2. CRITERION TWO: Demonstrated Experience of the Firm										
Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.	25%	4	1.00	4	1.00	4	1.00	5	1.25	1.06
3. CRITERION THREE: Proposed Approach to Providing Services										
Respondent must have adequate current full-time staff, both registered professionals in an applicable field and technical and administrative support staff, to competently and efficiently perform the work. Respondent must submit a management plan to show how it proposes to efficiently accomplish the work for the Project under consideration. Each phase of the plan should have a well-defined scope, deliverables, and estimated timeframe for completion.	20%	4	0.80	4	0.80	3	0.60	5	1.00	0.80
TOTAL SCORE	80%		3.55		3.20		2.65		4.00	3.35
Evaluator No. 3										
Criteria	Weighted Factor	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Avg. Score
1. CRITERION ONE: Demonstrated Expertise of Personnel										
Demonstrated expertise and experience of key personnel proposed to provide the services proposed.	35%	5	1.75	5	1.75	4	1.40	4	1.40	1.58
2. CRITERION TWO: Demonstrated Experience of the Firm										
Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.	25%	5	1.25	5	1.25	4	1.00	4	1.00	1.13
3. CRITERION THREE: Proposed Approach to Providing Services										
Respondent must have adequate current full-time staff, both registered professionals in an applicable field and technical and administrative support staff, to competently and efficiently perform the work. Respondent must submit a management plan to show how it proposes to efficiently accomplish the work for the Project under consideration. Each phase of the plan should have a well-defined scope, deliverables, and estimated timeframe for completion.	20%	4	0.80	4	0.80	4	0.80	4	0.80	0.80
TOTAL SCORE	80%		3.80		3.80		3.20		3.20	3.50

		Cushman & Wakefield/Oxford Commercial		Ernst & Young LLP		Jones Lang LaSalle Americas, Inc.		KPMG Corporate Finance LLC		
Evaluator No. 4										
Criteria	Weighted Factor	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Avg. Score
1. CRITERION ONE: Demonstrated Expertise of Personnel										
Demonstrated expertise and experience of key personnel proposed to provide the services proposed.	35%	4	1.40	5	1.75	3	1.05	4	1.40	1.40
2. CRITERION TWO: Demonstrated Experience of the Firm										
Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.	25%	4	1.00	5	1.25	3	0.75	4	1.00	1.00
3. CRITERION THREE: Proposed Approach to Providing Services										
Respondent must have adequate current full-time staff, both registered professionals in an applicable field and technical and administrative support staff, to competently and efficiently perform the work. Respondent must submit a management plan to show how it proposes to efficiently accomplish the work for the Project under consideration. Each phase of the plan should have a well-defined scope, deliverables, and estimated timeframe for completion.	20%	3	0.60	4	0.80	3	0.60	3	0.60	0.65
TOTAL SCORE	80%		3.00		3.80		2.40		3.00	3.05
Evaluator No. 5										
Criteria	Weighted Factor	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Avg. Score
1. CRITERION ONE: Demonstrated Expertise of Personnel										
Demonstrated expertise and experience of key personnel proposed to provide the services proposed.	35%	3	1.05	4	1.40	3	1.05	4	1.40	1.23
2. CRITERION TWO: Demonstrated Experience of the Firm										
Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.	25%	3	0.75	3	0.75	3	0.75	4	1.00	0.81
3. CRITERION THREE: Proposed Approach to Providing Services										
Respondent must have adequate current full-time staff, both registered professionals in an applicable field and technical and administrative support staff, to competently and efficiently perform the work. Respondent must submit a management plan to show how it proposes to efficiently accomplish the work for the Project under consideration. Each phase of the plan should have a well-defined scope, deliverables, and estimated timeframe for completion.	20%	3	0.60	3	0.60	3	0.60	4	0.80	0.65
TOTAL SCORE	80%		2.40		2.75		2.40		3.20	2.69
Evaluator No. 6										
Criteria	Weighted Factor	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Avg. Score
1. CRITERION ONE: Demonstrated Expertise of Personnel										
Demonstrated expertise and experience of key personnel proposed to provide the services proposed.	35%	2	0.70	3	1.05	3	1.05	3	1.05	0.96
2. CRITERION TWO: Demonstrated Experience of the Firm										
Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.	25%	2	0.50	3	0.75	3	0.75	3	0.75	0.69
3. CRITERION THREE: Proposed Approach to Providing Services										
Respondent must have adequate current full-time staff, both registered professionals in an applicable field and technical and administrative support staff, to competently and efficiently perform the work. Respondent must submit a management plan to show how it proposes to efficiently accomplish the work for the Project under consideration. Each phase of the plan should have a well-defined scope, deliverables, and estimated timeframe for completion.	20%	2	0.40	2	0.40	3	0.60	3	0.60	0.50
TOTAL SCORE	80%		1.60		2.20		2.40		2.40	2.15
TOTAL SCORE AVERAGE			2.56		2.89		2.44		3.30	

Final Vote

	Ernst & Young LLP	KPMG Corporate Finance LLC
Evaluator #1	2	1
Evaluator #2	1	2
Evaluator #3	1	2
Evaluator #4	2	1
Evaluator #5	1	2
Evaluator #6	1	2
Total No. 1 Votes	4	2