

DESIGN BUILD TEAM AGENDA

Date: April 26, 2004
Time: 10:00 AM
Place: Tacoma AGC Building

<u>Attending:</u>	Bob Adams	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Craig McDaniel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rick Smith	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Jody Alseth	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mark Mulvihill	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Janiece Thoresen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Jeff Carpenter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Don Petersen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	John Wise	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Bruce Dibert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Dan Patsula	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tom Zamzow	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Kim Henry	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Steve Quinn	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	Patty Lynch	<input type="checkbox"/>	Keith Sabol.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	Max Kuney	<input type="checkbox"/>	Scott Sawyer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Opening: There are several new members to the group and introductions were made.

RTID

Sound Transit will make a vote on the 1st week in May to determine whether they will support RTID or not. A limited discussion regarding what else would need to happen regarding RTID to get to a vote this November. If RTID passes there will obviously be significant impacts to WSDOT, UCO and the contracting community. However, this team will continue to focus on the fully funded projects at this time.

Project Updates

UCO: Kirkland is the primary focus on the team management right now. There is a question as to whether this project will require an Environmental Assessment (EA) or simply a Categorical Exception. If this project requires an EA then the timing will become more challenging to meet the deadlines utilizing design-build.

TNB Craig McDaniel, Chief Engineer for WSDOT on the TNB, made the presentation. The project design is 100% complete. However, on a design-build this still allows modifications to the design throughout the life of the construction project.

Both Caissons are now in the ground. The first is full depth and the second one is about halfway. Soon they will begin building the columns upward rather than further into the ground.

Utilities on the TNB are also moving forward. The Design-Build is responsible for all utility relocation and has done an amazing amount of work. Significant accomplishments include lifting and moving an entire pump station.

Craig touched on environmental compliance as well. There is a difference in the agency in how we comply with permits vs what is actually required by contract. On a standard project WSDOT may perform activities beyond what the letter of the permit requires. On a design build project, the design-builder will meet the letter of the permit but may have a financial concern is additional requirements are added which add cost to the project. It is a law vs. relationship situation. Recent events have been much better and the design builder is committed to address all concerns.

Summary of Design Build Institute of America (DBIA) Transportation Conference

Janiece Thoresen, of Mowat Construction, attended this conference along with Jeff Carpenter and Rick Smith of WSDOT. Janiece felt the project was extremely informative but the topics were very general with little time for specifics.

Rick Smith agreed and added that it was somewhat gratifying to hear that other states are wrestling with the same issues as WSDOT without finding any easy answers either.

There was some discussion regarding the cost of design-build but no presentation offered anything really new regarding how to estimate design-build vs. design-bid-build.

FHWA did make the statement at the conference that the requirement of a completed environmental document (EIS, EA, Cat Ex) may be modified on a case-by-case basis utilizing the SEP-14 process. This could have significant impacts on larger projects nationwide.

RFQ Comments

No comments were submitted regarding the proposed RFQ. However, the primary issue remains how WSDOT can objectively measure and separate design-build teams. The RFQ scoring may not contain any evaluation of proposed solutions and must be based solely upon the qualifications of the team.

Some of the areas which may be considered include:

- Team organization
- Environmental history
- Maintenance of Traffic History
- Public Relations history
- Safety
- MWDBE/Training history

There was some concern regarding environmental in tying it to number of warnings/violations. Firms which traditionally work in high risk areas may be unfairly penalized while firms from out of the area may never have even had an opportunity to receive a penalty.

There was some discussion as to recognizing that local experience should be very important. Northwest contractors primary environmental focus is on stormwater treatment and abatement. While contractors in the southwest the primary concern is fugitive dust. An understanding of local conditions, requirements, and expectations should be critical to the success of a project.

This “relevant experience” was generally agreed to be of value on almost every area.

RFP Handout

Bruce Dibert brought six copies of a marked up RFP. The goal for the RFP is October/November timeframe of this year there will be a finished product.

John Wise, of Kiewit, asked whether it was possible for have a Draft RFP go out to shortlisted firms with CONFIDENTIAL comments/questions coming back. This has been done on other projects nationwide and John strongly felt that it made for a far better product.

- Jeff Carpenter to speak with the Attorney General regarding this question.

I-5 Everett HOV Project

The I-5 Everett HOV Project WILL be design-build. Bob Dyer, of Utah Department of Transportation has been hired as the Project Director. Bob will be returning to WSDOT with design-build experience from Utah’s I-15 project as well as from subsequent Utah Design-Build experiences.

The I-5 Project extends from SR 526 (Boeing Freeway) to the SR 2 Interchange in downtown Everett. This project is a fully funded “Nickel” project which as accelerated by the Legislature with the intention that it be complete for the 2010 Olympics in Vancouver BC.

Some of the project highlights include:

Roadway Widening

- 6 miles of NB HOV lane from the vicinity of SR 526 through SR 2, ending South of Marine View Drive
- 4.6 miles of SB HOV lane from North of SR 2 to SR 526
- 0.9 miles of NB Auxiliary lane from 41st Street Interchange to the SR 2 Interchange
- 0.7 miles of SB Auxiliary lane from SR 2 Interchange through the 41st Street Interchange

Stormwater Quality Treatment Facilities

- Provide six water quality treatment facilities (10 acres of treatment)
- Wetland mitigation area of 3 acres

Bridge Widening / New Construction

- 3 Cast In Place Box Girder bridges 850 linear feet of widening

AGC/WSDOT ADMINISTRATION TEAM

A G E N D A (cont)

Date: April 26, 2004

- 16 prestressed girder bridges 4000 linear feet of widening/replacement
- 1 new bridge (tbd) 500 linear feet long

Retaining Walls

- 13,000 linear feet of walls at 19 locations

Noise Walls

- 14,000 linear feet at 5 locations

ITS elements

- 4 new signals & 8 new closed circuit cameras
- Approximately 29,000 linear feet of fiber optic cable

Illumination

- Replace all illumination – 218 new luminaries

HMA

- Repave I-5 northbound between SR 526 and Lowell Road
- Repave I-5 northbound and southbound between SR 2 and Marine View Drive

Project Challenges

There is an unstable slope on I-5 (northbound – outside) as I-5 goes down into Everett. The widening will be performed on the inside.

Maintenance of Traffic will be significant on this project

Schedule will be important for this project

Issues Database

The issues tracking database (copy attached) is a method for WSDOT to track issues related to design-build as they arise.

The team has agreed that, absent of any specific request, that issues within the database will be dealt with in the order on the database.

The WSDOT/AGC team makes recommendations related to these decisions. The final outcome of the various issues rests within WSDOT.

Issue	Recommendation.
2 – Subcontracting	Consider exempting out design consultants from this percentage.

AGC/WSDOT ADMINISTRATION TEAM

A G E N D A (cont)

Date: April 26, 2004

- 3 – Tracking designers Designers need to be tracked only related to DBE requirements. This could be done on the quarterly reporting.
- 4 – Material Price adj. They are in favor of it. Essentially, they are bidding this risk on all WSDOT projects.

Future Meetings

The feedback from several team members after this meeting was that our topics were too broad. Members of the team do not have the time, nor necessarily the expertise, to address such broad topics.

Future meetings will be focused more on specific areas within the RFQ/RFP to help to avoid this.

However, RFQ and RFP's will be circulated to the team for comment as they are drafted for specific projects.

Future meetings dates:

- May 24th – 1:00 pm @ Tacoma AGC
- June 28th – 1:00 pm @ Tacoma AGC
- July 26th – 1:00 pm @ Tacoma AGC
- August 23rd – 1:00 pm @ Tacoma AGC

Action Items:

- Identify/explain Tacoma Narrows Bridge bonding requirements Craig McDaniel
- Identify agenda topics for May meeting (by May 14) Jeff Carpenter

Team's Future Items

RFP Development

- ✓ Local Agency Agreements Pending DB Guidebook Update
- ✓ Design-Builder's role in RFP Development Pending DB Guidebook Update
- Insurance Requirements*** ***Future***
- ✓ Back up (warranty) of owner provided data. Pending DB Guidebook Update
- ✓ Stipends – Use formula or case-by-case
- ✓ Design Support Pending DB Guidebook Update
 - How involved should a consultant be in the development of a DB RFP before they are precluded from competing on a DB team?
- ✓ Should WSDOT set contract time or leave it to DB firms (A+B format)?

Selection Process

Scoring matrix

Confidentiality

Should/can this extend into RFP development?

What amount of time should WSDOT provide?

For developing the RFQ?

For preparing the SOQ?

For evaluating/shortlisting the SOQ?

For developing the RFP?

For preparing the proposal?

For evaluating/scoring the proposal?

Should WSDOT provide a mechanism to alter price/technical proposal following submittal? To what level?

Warranties

Co-location – mandatory or points oriented?

Contract Administration

What portion of the Best and Final Proposal should be binding?

Can WSDOT take intermediate buy-off?

What constitutes a change on a design-build project?

Change Procedures

DRB/Conflict Resolution

Environmental Compliance

WSDOT involvement in design review

QC/QA Plan. (WSDOT involvement?)

Special Provisions

Final owner acceptance