

**MINUTES OF THE  
PRELIMINARY SCREENING OF APPLICANTS**

**Learning Lab  
University of Louisiana Lafayette - South Campus  
Lafayette, Louisiana  
Project No. 19-640-23-04, F.19002506**

A meeting of the selection committee for the scoring and ranking of Proposers for the project referenced above was held in the Claiborne Building, 1201 N. Third Street, North Dakota Room 1-155, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70802 on Thursday, February 19, 2026.

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 AM by Bryan Andries FPC Assistant Director and RFQ Coordinator. Those committee members present were: Robert Mayard, Amy Petersen, Scott Hebert, Gene Sellers, and Thomas K. Bulliard II.

The first item of business was to ask for any public comments. There were none.

The next item of business was the scoring and ranking of applicants. Mr. Andries explained the scoring and ranking of proposals and he noted that proposals were distributed to the committee members prior to this meeting for review, outlining the following:

The purpose of this meeting is to score and rank the Proposals to determine the 3 Proposers that will be granted interviews. Ballots were provided to each committee member for the purpose of ranking each Proposal 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> for four different evaluation and selection criteria. The following scores are assigned to each rank: 1st = 3 points, 2nd = 2 points and 3rd = 1 point. Scoring will be in descending order with the highest total score representing the best score.

The first evaluation and selection criteria outlined in Tab 1 of the RFQ is History, Organization, Financial Condition of Proposer, which includes:

- Business organization and history of the Proposer
- Organization structure
- Financial condition

Mr. Andries requested the committee members share their thoughts and recommendations for this criteria. There were none.

Mr. Andries requested that committee members complete their ranking on this evaluation and selection criteria on their ballots.

Mr. Andries explained that the second evaluation and selection criteria that was outlined in Tab 2 of the RFQ is Qualifications & Staffing Plan, which includes:

- Pre-Construction Program
- Experience of key personnel including proposed partners and others proposed in key roles for the project.
- Relationships with the sub-contractor market
- Pre-construction phase staffing plans
- Construction phase staffing plans

Mr. Andries requested the committee members share their thoughts and recommendations for this criteria. There were none.

Mr. Andries requested that committee members complete their ranking on this evaluation and selection criteria on their ballots.

Mr. Andries explained that the third evaluation and selection criteria that was outlined in Tab 3 of the RFQ is Approach & Methodology, which includes:

- Management approach
- Project organization

- Expectation of being able to propose and meet an acceptable GMP on time that meets the Owner’s expectations
- Unique capabilities/resources
- Proposed strategy to maximize DBE, SE, and/or Veteran-Owned Firms participation on this Project
- Safety program

Mr. Andries requested the committee members share their thoughts and recommendations for this criteria. There were none.

Mr. Andries requested that committee members complete their ranking on this evaluation and selection criteria on their ballots.

Mr. Andries explained that the fourth and final evaluation and selection criteria that was outlined in Tab 4 of the RFQ is Past Performance and Experience on Similar Projects, which includes:

- Pre-construction and construction experience of Proposer and its Management Team on similar projects with comparable scale and complexity.
- Experience with innovative delivery and procurement strategies
- Experience in proposing innovative design alterations that preserve quality at less cost
- History of previous professional relationship(s) between proposed team members, the Architect, and the Owner
- Demonstration of ability to provide well integrated, team approach to pre-construction services on past projects
- Satisfaction on similar projects verified with past employers/customers.
- Past performance of DBE, SE and/or Veteran-Owned Firms participation on similar projects
- Safety record

Mr. Andries requested the committee members share their thoughts and recommendations for this criteria.

Committee members shared some strong points and weak points of the proposers’ submittals for this project.

Mr. Andries requested that committee members complete their ranking on this evaluation and selection criteria on their ballots.

Mr. Andries collected the ballots and read the rankings aloud. The rankings were recorded, scored and totaled to derive a total score for each Proposer. The following scores are assigned to each rank: 1st = 3 points, 2nd = 2 points and 3rd = 1 point. Scoring is descending order with the highest total score representing the best score.

The following scores were recorded.

**History, Organization, Financial Condition of Proposer**

	<b>Robert Mayard</b>	<b>Amy Petersen</b>	<b>Scott Hebert</b>	<b>Gene Sellers</b>	<b>Thomas K. Bulliard II</b>	<b>Total</b>
J.B. Mouton, LLC	1	3	2	3	3	12
DonahueFavret Contractors, Inc.	2	1				3
MAPP, LLC					1	1
Milton J. Womack, Inc.	3					3
Woodward Design+Build, LLC						
Ratcliff Construction Company, LLC						
The Lemoine Company, LLC		2	3	2	2	9
Kent Design Build, Inc. and Broadmoor, LLC, AJV			1	1		2
Ryan Gootee General Contractors						
The McDonnell Group, LLC						

### Qualifications and Staffing Plan

	Robert Mayard	Amy Petersen	Scott Hebert	Gene Sellers	Thomas K. Bulliard II	Total
J.B. Mouton, LLC	3	3	3	3	2	14
DonahueFavret Contractors, Inc.						
MAPP, LLC		1			1	2
Milton J. Womack, Inc.	2					2
Woodward Design+Build, LLC						
Ratcliff Construction Company, LLC						
The Lemoine Company, LLC	1	2	2	2	3	10
Kent Design Build, Inc. and Broadmoor, LLC, AJV			1	1		2
Ryan Gootee General Contractors						
The McDonnel Group, LLC						

### Approach and Methodology

	Robert Mayard	Amy Petersen	Scott Hebert	Gene Sellers	Thomas K. Bulliard II	Total
J.B. Mouton, LLC		2	3	3	3	11
DonahueFavret Contractors, Inc.	1	3				4
MAPP, LLC		1			1	2
Milton J. Womack, Inc.						
Woodward Design+Build, LLC						
Ratcliff Construction Company, LLC	3					3
The Lemoine Company, LLC	2		2	2	2	8
Kent Design Build, Inc. and Broadmoor, LLC, AJV			1	1		2
Ryan Gootee General Contractors						
The McDonnel Group, LLC						

### Past Performance and Experience on Similar Projects

	Robert Mayard	Amy Petersen	Scott Hebert	Gene Sellers	Thomas K. Bulliard II	Total
J.B. Mouton, LLC	1	3	3	3	3	13
DonahueFavret Contractors, Inc.						
MAPP, LLC					1	1
Milton J. Womack, Inc.	2	1				3
Woodward Design+Build, LLC						
Ratcliff Construction Company, LLC						
The Lemoine Company, LLC	3	2	1	2	2	10
Kent Design Build, Inc. and Broadmoor, LLC, AJV			2	1		3
Ryan Gootee General Contractors						
The McDonnel Group, LLC						

A sum of the rankings was calculated to determine the total score:

	History, Organization, Financial Condition of Proposer	Qualifications and Staffing Plan	Approach and Methodology	Past Performance and Experience on Similar Projects	Total
J.B. Mouton, LLC	12	14	11	13	50
DonahueFavret Contractors, Inc.	3		4		7
MAPP, LLC	1	2	2	1	6
Milton J. Womack, Inc.	3	2		3	8
Woodward Design+Build, LLC					
Ratcliff Construction Company, LLC			3		3
The Lemoine Company, LLC	9	10	8	10	37
Kent Design Build, Inc. and Broadmoor, LLC, AJV	2	2	2	3	9
Ryan Gootee General Contractors					
The McDonnel Group, LLC					

Mr. Andries then explained that the 3 Proposers with the highest scoring Proposals will be invited to an interview. Those Proposers invited are:

- J.B. Mouton, LLC
- The Lemoine Company, LLC
- Kent Design Build, Inc. and Broadmoor, LLC, AJV

Mr. Andries explained that these firms will be contacted and provided additional information on the interviews.

Mr. Andries explained the interview process to the committee members, answered their questions on the process, explained how executive session works, and the balloting procedure after the interviews are complete and the public meeting resumes.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:18 AM.