

Table of Contents

Complied 2016 Meeting Minutes

for the

WSDOT/AGC/ACEC Design-Build Committee

Meetings

- I. January 14, 2016 Meeting Minutes
 - a. Sign-in Sheet

- II. February 25, 2016 Meeting Minutes
 - a. Sign-in Sheet
 - b. Draft 2016 Goals and Topics Spreadsheet
 - c. Draft 2016 SME Sign-up Sheet
 - d. Practical Solution Workshop Specification for DB Contracts
 - e. DB Manual Outline
 - f. DB Procurement Consistency – consolidated comments
 - g. Minority, Small, Veteran and Women’s Business Enterprise (MSVWBE) Participation – DBB Language

- III. September 21, 2016 Meeting Minutes
 - a. Sign-in Sheet

- IV. December 1, 2016 Meeting Minutes

WSDOT/AGC/ACEC DESIGN-BUILD TEAM MEETING Meeting Minutes

January 14, 2016
1:00 pm to 4:00 pm

WSDOT Kent Maintenance Facility Conference Rm
26620 68th Ave S, Kent, WA 98032
No Teleconference line requested

Co-Chairs Scotty Ireland and Paul Mayo

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. **Sign-In Sheet / Introductions** (1:00 pm – 1:10 pm) Scotty
 - A. Safety Briefing
Scotty and Paul provided the typical safety briefing to the Team and guests.
 - B. Review and update Sign-In Sheet
Sign-in sheet attached
 - C. Introduction of new & existing members, SME's and other Guests
New members attending included Ankur Talwar (PCL) and Mike Fleming (WSDOT - State Project Development Office); Ben Upsall attended in place of Dan Campbell (GeoEngineers); John Donahue (WSDOT - State Project Development Office) also attended to provide a presentation for Practical Solutions

2. **Review Previous Meeting Minutes** (1:10 pm – 1:15 pm) Scotty

The December 3rd DRAFT meeting minutes were posted to TheHub on 1/4/2016. No comments were received, and they were finalized and posted to the website on 1/14/2016. Meeting minutes are located at:
<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Business/Construction/MeetingMinutes.htm>
There were no additional comments to the meeting minutes and they were accepted.

3. **Old Business** (1:15 pm – 2:05 pm)
 - A. Design-Build Contract Document Template Status (5 Min) Scotty

Scotty provided a briefing to the Team of the status of the Chapter 2 technical requirements. Based on the work of the Team, the State Construction Office is schedule to begin the final review for FHWA approval with the goal of completing the approval process in the next six months. Scotty confirmed that the Final Draft sections reviewed by the Team are being used for the two most recent DB projects (SR 167/405 Direct Connectors and I-5/SR 16 Direct Connectors), so the DB community is already benefitting from the Team's work. WSDOT is able to use these documents with FHWA's acknowledgement because FHWA has delegated approval to WSDOT if the documents are treated as project specific provisions reviewed and approved by the State Construction Office prior to advertisement.

Scotty stated that it was recently determined that he would be the designated State Construction Office approval authority for the DB Template documents prior to their submission to FHWA. He will be coordinating with the State Specification Engineer to perform a final consistency check prior to the final review and submission to FHWA.

ACTION ITEM: *Scotty said WSDOT will provide regular status updates of WSDOT DB contract template efforts at each meeting.*

 - B. GCCM Task Force status update (5 Min) Scotty / Paul

Scotty informed the Team that due to a reorganization of the State Construction Office staff and responsibilities, he has designated as the new WSDOT GCCM Task Force Co-Lead to serve with Geoff Owen (Kiewit Infrastructure) instead of Mark Gaines as initially. Due to the change, he has not been able to coordinate with Geoff yet, but anticipates scheduling the "kick-off" meeting in the next two months. The goal of the Task Force will: be evaluating current GCCM practice within Washington; evaluate existing legislation; and develop recommendations for proposed legislation that would provide WSDOT legislative authority to use GCCM. The Team will consist of approximately 9-10 people. Scotty and Paul have received a few solicitations of interest and will confirm who is serving as soon as the team is formed.

ACTION ITEM: *Scotty said WSDOT will provide regular status updates at each meeting.*

C. 2016 Goals and Topics – Finalize (40 Min)

Scotty / Paul/Richard

After some discussion by the committee, Scotty and Paul are going to finalize the topics for the next several meetings, with the overall work plan for 2016 to be finalized at a future meeting.

ACTION ITEM: *Scotty and Paul will finalize the topics in the Work Plan for the next several meetings.*

4. **New Business** (2:05 pm – 3:25pm)

A. Practical Solutions for Design-Build (60 Min)

John Donahue

John Donahue (WSDOT - State Project Development Office) provided a presentation for Practical Solutions. The presentation provided: a review of practical solutions; reasons for change; new policy regarding practical design; explanation of concepts and terminology; process and tools; and examples of practical design application. It was noted that Practical Design and Practical Solutions are often used interchangeably incorrectly. Practical Solutions is the overarching concept comprised of Least Cost Planning and Practical Design. Least Cost Planning applies initial planning and scoping of projects based on the need and least cost solution. Practical Design applies to the determining the most appropriate design standards for the solution that's focused on performance standards. WSDOT will no longer be using generic design matrices for its projects. Currently, DB projects have a generic design matrix specified in the RFP (depending on the type of project), along with any preapproved deviations. The result of implementing Practical Design to design-build will be each project's RFP would have a project specific Basis of Design specifying project specific design requirements as opposed to the generic design matrix. Scotty noted that currently, DBs have the ability to propose "practical solutions" and "practical design" through the ATC and DBIC processes already, so essentially, practical solutions are already an integral part of the DB Delivery Method. WSDOT may be looking at other applications of Practical Solutions in DB projects, including variable scope based on specified performance requirements, or benefit/cost based projects. Prior to implementing these types of changes, WSDOT will be consulting with the DB community.

ACTION ITEM: *WSDOT will post the Practical Solutions presentation to the Hub for the Team's reference.*

ACTION ITEM: *WSDOT will keep the Team updated on its intentions on furthering the implementation of Practical Solutions into a DB project.*

B. Design-Build Manual Outline (10 Min)

Scotty

Scotty reported that the WSDOT DB Work Group was in the process of completing the DRAFT DB Manual outline and would be sharing this with the Team for comment at the next meeting. WSDOT's intentions are to develop the manual in stages, one section at a time that will be posted as "interim guidance", essentially serving as official policy until the manual can be completed in its entirety. It will be focused on providing policy and guidance for the planning, development, procurement and administration of DB projects statewide.

ACTION ITEM: *WSDOT will provide the Team with a copy of the DB Manual outline and it's plan for development at the next meeting.*

C. Design-Build Section 2.6 Review of Changes (10 Min)

Dan Campbell/Phil Larson

The intent of this topic was to review the most current Section 2.6 specifications being used in the I-405/SR 167 Direct Connector Project as compared to the two most recent DB projects (referred to as SR 530 Oso Slide and SR 167 Hot Lanes). Significant changes had been made to Section 2.6 as compared to the SR 530 and SR 167 version based on issues on those two projects. Phil Larson (GFA) and Dan Campbell (GeoEngineers) were both involved with the two previous projects and are teamed on the new project. Dan was not available to discuss these, but Phil Larson (GFA) did confirm that the most recent RFP advertisement (I-405/SR 167 Direct Connector Project) appeared to have addressed most of the issues that were experienced on the two previous projects. Scotty noted that the I-405/SR 167 Direct Connector Project is using the Section 2.6 that was revised based on the Teams comments and recommendations earlier in the year. He also noted that there had been some additional refinements that should help reduce unnecessary cost to WSDOT and the DBr, and that this version will also be used for the upcoming I-5/SR 16 Direct Connector Project.

ACTION ITEM: *Dan and Phil will provide the Team an update on how the new Section 2.6 is working based on their pursuit on the will post the I-405/SR 167 Direct Connector Project.*

5. Review and Expand Action Items (3:25 pm – 3:40 pm)

All

Design-Build Contract Document Templates:

- o *WSDOT will provide regular status updates of WSDOT DB contract template efforts at each meeting.*

GCCM Task Force:

- o *WSDOT will provide regular status updates at each meeting.*

2016 Goals and Topics

- o *Scotty and Paul will finalize the topics in the Work Plan for the next several meetings.*

Practical Solutions:

- o *WSDOT will post the Practical Solutions presentation to the Hub for the Team's reference.*
- o *WSDOT will keep the Team updated on its intentions on furthering the implementation of Practical Solutions into a DB project.*

Design-Build Manual:

- o *WSDOT will provide the Team with a copy of the DB Manual outline and it's plan for development at the next meeting.*

Section 2.6:

- o *Dan Campbell and Phil Larson will provide the Team an update on how the new Section 2.6 is working based on their pursuit on the will post the I-405/SR 167 Direct Connector Project.*

6. Future Meetings (3:40 pm – 3:45 pm)

All

2016 Meeting Dates:

February 25, 2016
April 7, 2016
May 26, 2016
June 30, 2016
September 1, 2016
October 13, 2016
December 1, 2016

2016 Meeting Location: Kent Maintenance Facility Conference Room (reserved for all DB Sub-committee meetings in 2016). The facility address is:

26620 68th Ave S
Kent, WA 98032

Any planned changes to the programmed meeting dates or location will occur at least one week prior to the meeting.

Conference Call-In: Consistency in representation is important to the Team's success. If a member is not able to attend, a conference call line will be made available for the meeting if requested in advance.

WSDOT/AGC/ACEC
 Design-Build Committee Meeting
Team Member Sign In

Type	Member	Organization	Phone	E-mail	Attendee Initials
O	Adams, Bob ²	Atkinson Constr.	425-255-7551	bob.adams@atkn.com	/ /
WSDOT	Barry, Ed	WSDOT-HQ DN	206-805-2924	barryed@wsdot.wa.gov	A<
AGC	Bednarczyk, Marek	Graham Constr.	206-729-8844	marekb@grahamus.com	He;
WSDOT	Boutwell, Jami	WSDOT-NWR 405	425-456-8504	boutwej@> wsdot.wa.gov	
WSDOT	Brown, Chris	WSDOT-AWV	206-805-5435	BrownCD@wsdot.wa.gov	
ACEC	Campbell, Dan	Geo Engineers	425-861-6094	dcamQbell @geoengineers.com	S"
O	Christopher, Chris ²	WSDOT-HQ CN	360-705-7821	christc@wsdot.wa .gov	
WSDOT	Clarke, Brenden	WSDOT - OR	360-357-2606	clarkeb@wsdot.wa.gov	/
ACEC	Crowe, Eric	AECOM	425-208-9083	Eric.crowe@aecom.com	.
WSDOT	Eckard, Teresa	WSDOT-HQ CN	360-705-7908	eckardt @wsdot.wa.gov	v
FHWA		FHWA			
AGC	Ankur Talwar	PCL	!/:i.511u5 1 d	ARTalwar@Qcl.com	(, 111({ .
WSDOT	Hodgson, Lisa	WSDOT-NWR 405	425-420-9984	hodgsol@wsdot.wa.gov	C...
WSDOT	Ireland, Scotty ¹	WSDOT-HQ CN	360-705-7468	irelans@ wsdot.wa.gov	j)
WSDOT	Jepperson, Omar	WSDOT-NWR 405	425-456-8610	jeQQerO@ wsdot.wa.gov	
AGC	Larson, Phil	Atkinson	425-508-6718	Qhil.larson@atkn.com	
AGC	Mayo, Paul ¹	Flatiron Corp	425-508-7713	Qmayo@flatironcorQ.com	"/NJ
WSDOT	McNabb, Gil	WSDOT-NWR 405	425-456-8643	mcnabbg@ wsdot.wa.gov	'-''''
WSDOT	Mizuhata, Julra	WSDOT-NWR 520	425-576-7059	MizuhaJ@wsdot.wa.gov	-c, -ril)Cl
ACEC	Ostfeld, Eric	Parsons	206-643-4269	Eric.ostfeld @Qarsons.com	rk.
ACEC	Patterson, Richard ³	Buckland & Taylor	206-321-6655	rdQn@b-t.com	ap
AGC	Pindras, Greg	Max J. Kuney	509-535-0651	gregQ@maxkuney.com	/ .TE:IT
AGC	Prouty, Jim	Granite Construction	425-551-3100	Jim.Qrouty@gcinc.com	!)_, a.P,
ACEC	Rohila, Manish	Rohila Consulting	425-246-1749	manish@rohilaconsulting.com	UR..
AGC	Vanderwood, Jerry	AGC Chief Lobbyist	206.284.0061	jvanderwood@agcwa.com	
AGC	Young, Frank	Kiewit	206-295-8735	frank.young@kiewit.com	f llf

- 1 WSDOT / AGC DB Subcommittee Co-chairs
- 2 WSDOT/AGC Co-lead
- 3 ACEC Lead

Guests - Please print clearly

Attendee	Organization	Phone	E-mail
M. <i>Uf\$+14-</i>	<i>WSpd</i>	<i>70-S-7q</i>	<i>2 2IQ iV,A..1\ c.J?b:IT.W.c\</i>
		<i>lot-T-T</i>	<i>&Mf4U e,1,.. Quo&NIP-. -"ft&.</i>

WSDOT/AGC/ACEC DESIGN-BUILD TEAM MEETING

February 25, 2016
1:00 pm to 4:00 pm

WSDOT Kent Maintenance Facility Conference Rm
26620 68th Ave S, Kent, WA 98032

No Teleconference line requested

Agenda

Co-Chairs **Scotty Ireland and Paul Mayo**

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. **Sign-In Sheet / Introductions** (1:00 pm – 1:15 pm) Scotty
 - A. Safety Briefing
 - B. Review and update Sign-In Sheet
 - C. Introduction of new & existing members, SME's and other Guests

Scotty and Teresa shared that they were leaving WSDOT, March 15th and April 1st respectively. Craig described how HQ Const supports the importance of developing the DB program and consistency in DB delivery, especially with regions that have not done DB before. Mark G. emphasized the importance WSDOT places with this group and intends to provide the support needed to continue to develop the DB Program. Paul discussed the JTC study group on WSDOT DB delivery.

2. **Review Previous Meeting Minutes** (1:15 pm – 1:20 pm) Scotty

The January 14th DRAFT meeting minutes were posted to TheHub on 2/18/2016 and are expected to be finalized and posted by 2/29/2016. Meeting minutes are located at:

<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Business/Construction/MeetingMinutes.htm>

3. **Old Business** (1:20 pm – 2:20 pm)
 - A. Design-Build Contract Document Template Status (5 Min) Teresa

Teresa discussed the status of the Chapter 2 sections. Draft sections are completed. Mark and Dave Erickson (State Bridge Construction and Roadway Engineers) will review two sections for consistency purposes. Based on their assessments, Greg Morehouse (State Specification Engineer) will evaluate the remaining sections for similar content in preparation for final approval by WSDOT. After approval of the final sections, they will be submitted to FHWA for approval. Timing is approximately 6 months.

In the interim, the final draft sections, with input from the committee, will be used in all DB projects until the Templates are approved, just like the current projects being advertised.

- B. GCCM Task Force status update (5 Min) Scotty / Paul

Mark G. discussed getting the task force kicked off, need a WSDOT co-chair for the task force, replacing Scotty. Work of the task force is important in preparation for pursuing changes in legislation.

Geoff Owen (AGC co-chair) has several potential members representing AGC. WSDOT will have representatives from HQ Const (TBD ASCE), HQ Design (Mike Fleming), NWR-Sound Transit (Ed Barry) and WSF (Genevieve Rucki). There will be two representatives from ACEC. Mark G said Howard Hillinger (Parametrix) is interested and will be considered. Richard Patterson will need to coordinate for other ACEC representation.

Paul mentioned that there are Best Practices for GCCM from a blue ribbon panel that are available for reference. Mark noted that GCCM legislation has been developed a couple times by WSDOT, but hasn't been taken forward due to other, higher priorities.

The kickoff meeting will likely happen March/April pending WSDOT's progress on filling the co-chair position.

- C. JTC Design-Build Study Update (10 Min) Scotty

Teresa noted that she had forwarded a link to the DB Study overview and Task 1 White Paper to the Team. The DB study team selected 6 WSDOT projects that represent a cross section of WSDOT's past projects and interviewed PE's responsible for those projects. State Construction Office and industry staff were also interviewed. Results of interviews will be incorporated in the Study and be used to develop recommendations WSDOT's DB Program. Scotty and Paul had performed a brief review of the White Paper and noted it's intent was to: educate the JTC members on the basic characteristics of DB; describe key project elements, characteristics and goals; describe differences as compared to Design-Bid-Build; describe

agency and organizational characteristics that result in successful implementation of DB delivery; identify key policy considerations; and assess if there should be a spectrum of implementation. Scotty and Paul noted that based on the Team's knowledge and experience in DB delivery, most of the information will be a review; however, there are some findings that are applicable to the Team's proposed 2016 topics and goals.

Paul and Scotty asked the Team to review the report and be prepared to discuss its findings at the next meeting (April 7).

D. 2016 Goals and Topics – Finalize (40 Min)

Scotty / Paul/Richard

Everyone has been requested to volunteer for 3 topics. A spreadsheet was passed around, incorporating proposer of topic and topics folks wished to work on. Teresa will incorporate the names written in to the spreadsheet in the meeting and send a **copy to Paul, Richard and Scotty to fill in the remaining blanks.**

Based on the committee's recommendations at the Dec/Jan meetings, Paul proposed the following goals for 2016:

- Improve DB Program Consistency
- Monitor implementation of PDMSG
- Inventory options for small DB procurement process
- Continue to review and refine technical requirements

The goals were approved and will be the basis for all directing the committee through 2016.

4. **New Business** (2:20 pm – 3:45pm)

A. Next Steps in Practical Solutions for Design-Build (20 Min)

Scotty

Scotty discussed Practical Solution (PS) for Design-Build and referred to John Donahue's presentation last meeting and asked the question to the committee of how can PS and Practical Design principals apply to DB? A draft Practical Design workshop specification was forwarded to the committee for the ITP and Chapter 1. In summary, the specification establishes a workshop that evaluates practical design options after the DB team is selected to focus on potential options early in the design stage. WSDOT wants industry input as soon as possible to facilitate implementation into projects this as soon as possible.

Craig McDaniel discussed the background behind the draft specification, noting that incorporating potential scope changes during the proposal, bringing in cost considerations, could impact the level playing field. Doing something after the proposal was considered next. Olympic Region developed the idea of the workshop early in design that would allow a collaborative effort to incorporate PD solutions. Comments from the committee included:

- Some ATC's that weren't pursued, may be proposed again by the Design-Builder.
- General discussion on why scope reduction is not typically considered as an ATC.
- Paul talked about using the ATC's by losing teams – time to consider ATC's, facilitate a review of that info for the selected Proposer.
- It was noted that if an ATC was not included in a proposal, it cannot be used by WSDOT.
- The intent of the workshop would give WSDOT the opportunity to collaborate on possible PS's.
- Paul - Document Deviations as backup to practical design.
- Does the change order process provide for this anyway?

Scotty asked for input by COB next Wednesday, March 2nd.

B. Design-Build Manual Outline (attached) (20 Min)

Teresa

Teresa discussed how the DB Manual will be developed. Each section will be developed stand alone as interim guidance, so it can be used as soon as possible within WSDOT. Once all of the sections are completed, the Manual will be finalized.

Teresa will post the DB Manual Outline document on TheHub and asked for comments by 2 weeks.

C. DB Procurement Consistency (30 Min)

Paul

The topic of DB Procurement Consistency was brought forward by the Team as part of the 2016 topics. Information regarding WSDOT's procurement history was compiled by Jon Harris and Paul Mayo for the Team's assessment. Prior

to the meeting, feedback was solicited from the Team, which was limited. Paul presented the information as data for reference to support observations and discussions. Scotty opened the discussion noting WSDOT is evaluating its SOQ evaluation process (aka - short listing), which establishes who can submit a Proposal. Areas of focus and consideration include: evaluation team demographics that consider areas of expertise, experience in DB practices, evaluator's involvement or affiliation to the region/program administering the project (directly involved or non-vested in outcome), and the role of the WSDOT observer in the evaluation process to ensure unbiased assessment and consistency in evaluations. In summary, it's WSDOT best interest to ensure that the evaluation team is comprised of evaluators that have the ability to review and assess the information presented in the SOQ's and provide a consistent, unbiased, qualitative assessment of the information with respect to the criteria specified in the RFQ. Documented comments were explained by specific Team members that provided them. General observations and questions were also discussed. These included:

Q - Marek – Is there any way to know how the evaluation is done?

A – Scotty – Noted WSDOT has a formal evaluation process that provides guidance with flexibility in the process. It's WSDOT's intent to put the guidance in the forthcoming DB Manual and be supplemented with training. This will help create consistency in process across the state – including reference checking, etc.

Observation – Marek noted that based on the recent shortlisting of two WSDOT DB projects, there appeared to be inconsistencies between how the WSDOT evaluation teams scored the same teams on the same goal.

Observation – Frank noted that based on the data, it appears that WSDOT equalizes technical proposals noting the scoring seems very close. Band width on scoring is very small;

Observation – Phil noted that recent technical scores are farther apart than previously;

Observation – Craig noted that based on recent SOQ evaluations and feedback from debriefings, a formal performance evaluation process might help contribute to a more consistent reference checks;

Observation – Paul inquired about the use of a mediator or observer in the evaluation process; Craig and Scotty talked about the current process, noting WSDOT uses an Observer. Scotty noted he has functioned in that role for a recent project;

Observation - Geoff Owen suggested that if there are questions or concerns about consistency, WSDOT should contact Sound Transit about their process.

There were other general discussions about the potential for limited completion in the DB market. It was noted that there are several firms that are consistently shortlisted and selected to submit proposals, which can result in limited completion, potentially discouraging other firms from submitting SOQs. It was noted that if a DB firm is experienced and has successful performance, that would lead to a firm having the potential of being a strong submitter. Several members suggested limiting completion for smaller jobs to be focused on new DB firms - not let firms submit that have previous experience compete. Scotty noted that this would be viewed as limiting competition in public contracting and is likely not legal. Scotty talked about options that could include selecting more than 3 shortlisted firms – or not limiting the number of submitters going into the proposal phase after evaluations of the SOQ's – essentially, let industry “self-determine” who will submit proposals based on their own assessment of their performance amongst their competition. It was noted that there are complications with that option. It requires significant effort by WSDOT staff to support the proposal phase and there is a higher probability for proposers to drop out because of increased completion and the cost to develop a proposal. Due to the costs of preparing a proposal, some DB firms may not pursue projects without limited completion in the proposal phase, which could result in WSDOT ending up with “low bid” firms and approaches instead of getting the desired performance out of DB delivery. Other general discussion took place.

Paul will coordinate with topic leads to develop a draft recommendation paper with suggested best practices that will address reference process, conflict vetting, observer, Design-Builder and WSDOT team performance reviews, and assessment of Sound Transit's process, and Clarity of SOQ requested info.

Memo of observations and recommendations – Paul/Scotty/Richard

D. Minority, Small, Veteran and Women's Business Enterprise (MSVWBE) Participation (15 Min)

Scotty

Scotty summarized the proposed MSVWBE language. The version presented was based on the most recent general special provision being added to WSDOT Bid-Build projects:

- it's a refinement of the existing MWBE participation language applicable to state funded projects only;
- the goals are voluntary;
- specific goals are established for each group;
- WSDOT will modify it for the DB spec;
- goals are nested – if a firm is certified as a minority, small, veteran, women's business – the participation would count towards each category (essentially four times)

Question - Phil Larson asked WSDOT if it was encouraging MWBE firms to get certified for the Small and Veteran's categories if they are eligible.

Answer - Craig said OEO was staffed and funded to work on outreach and education for MSVWBE firms.

Scotty requested comments to WSDOT as it applies to DB contracts by COB Wednesday, March 2nd

5. WSDOT DB Program News and Update (3:45pm – 3:50pm)

Scotty

Scotty briefly noted:

- WSDOT has transitioned the ownership of PDMSG to the State Project Development Office (PDO) and the effort to further refine and implement will be managed through Greg Lippincott. As part of this transition, the PDO will be evaluating the results of the PDMSG implementation. It's the expectation that when this information becomes available (approximately 6 months), it will be shared with the Team.
- WSDOT has completed the shortlisting for its two DB projects. The I5-SR 16 Project shortlisting is under protest and under further evaluation.

6. Review and Expand Action Items (3:50 pm – 3:55pm)

All

- Paul and Scotty asked the Team to review the JTC White Paper report and be prepared to discuss its findings at the next meeting (April 7).
- Teresa Post items for review – email group when posted and with deadlines
- Committee review of Practical Solutions, Manual Outline, MSVWBE language
- Paul/Scotty/Richard provide observations and recommendation memo for DB procurement consistency
- Paul/Scotty/Richard flesh out the SME's for topics

7. Future Meetings (3:55 pm – 4:00pm)

All

2016 Meeting Dates:

April 7, 2016
May 26, 2016
June 30, 2016
September 1, 2016
October 13, 2016
December 1, 2016

2016 Meeting Location: Kent Maintenance Facility Conference Room (reserved for all DB Sub-committee meetings in 2016). The facility address is:

26620 68th Ave S
Kent, WA 98032

Any planned changes to the programed meeting dates or location will occur at least one week prior to the meeting.

Conference Call-In: Consistency in representation is important to the Team's success. If a member is not able to attend, a conference call line will be made available for the meeting if requested in advance.

WSDOT/AGC/ACEC
Design-Build Committee Meeting
Team Member Sign In

Type	Member	Organization	Phone	E-mail	Attendee Initials
O	Adams, Bob ²	Atkinson Constr.	425-255-7551	bob.adams@atkn.com	
WSDOT	Barry, Ed	WSDOT- I)W(L.	206-805-2924	bar!'.J'.ed (a)wsdot.wa.gov	
AGC	Bednarczyk, Marek	Graham Constr.	206-729-8844	marekb@grahamus.com	b
WSDOT	Boutwell, Jami	WSDOT-NWR 405	425-456-8504	boutwej@wsdot.wa.gov	v^ Jj
WSDOT	Brown, Chris	WSDOT-AWV	206-805-5435	BrownCD@wsdot.wa.gov	...
ACEC	Campbell, Dan	GeoEngineers	425-861-6094	dcamQbell @geoengineers.com	
O	Christopher, Chris ²	WSDOT-HQ CN	360-705-7821	christc@wsdot .wa.gov	--
WSDOT	Clarke, Brenden	WSDOT - OR	360-357-2606	clarkeb@wsdot.wa.gov	
ACEC	Crowe, Eric	AECOM	425-208-9083	Eric.crowe@aecom.com	(
WSDOT	Eckard, Teresa	WSDOT-HQ CN	360-705-7908	eckardt @wsdot.wa. gov	
FHWA		FHWA			- "
AGC	Ankur Talwar	PCL	2..Nr--431-1 2.	ARTalwar @Qcl.com	- .
WSDOT	Hodgson, Lisa	WSDOT-NWR 405	45-ztO-!!!!!!8ç	hodgsol@wsdot.wa.gov	
WSDOT	Ireland, Scotty ¹	WSDOT-HQ CN	360-705-7468	irelans@wsdot.wa.gov	
WSDOT	Jepperson, Omar	WSDOT-NWR 405	425-456-8610	jeQQerO@wsdot.wa.gov	
AGC	Larson, Phil	Atkinson	425-508-6718	Qhil.larson@atkn.com	
AGC	Mayo, Paul ¹	Flatiron Corp	425-508-7713	Qmayo@flatironcor Q.com	(PrJ)
WSDOT	McNabb, Gil	WSDOT-NWR 405	425-456-8643	mcnabbg@wsdot.wa.gov	fi. -M.
WSDOT	Mizuhata, Julia	WSDOT-NWR 520	425-576-7059	MizuhaJ@wsdot.wa. gov	
ACEC	Ostfeld, Eric	Parsons	206-643-4269	Eric.ostfeld @oarsons.com	k. _
ACEC	Patterson, Richard ³	Bucklund & Taylor	206-321-6655	rdon(ci)b-t..a5iii ytf?f(\.	
AGC	Pindras, Greg	Max J. Kuney	509-535-0651	gregQ@maxkuney.com	
AGC	Prouty, Jim	Granite Construction	425-551-3100	Jim.Qrouty@gcinc .com	H.,t.l,f.
ACEC	Rohila, Manish	Rohila Consulting	425-246-1749	manish@rohilaconsulti ng.com	• \)Jl
AGC	Vanderwood, Jerry	AGC Chief Lobbyist	206.284.0061	jvanderwood@agcwa.com	
AGC	Young, Frank	Kiewit	206-295-8735	frank.young@kiewit.com	t--\t

- 1 WSDOT / AGC DB Subcommittee Co-chairs
- 2 WSDOT/AGC Co-lead
- 3 ACEC Lead

Craig M Daniel

Guests-Please print clearly

Attendee	Organization	Phone	E-mail
11...A") 1-)j).!!E1(1 T1u. 0/1J	'ft. -1.ft'f - 'f 12..	J ot-M eff t J' (g. FLAT l/t.OA;>'toe/J.e.,M
M\et: r:1rJE5	WSO<!!	La,701i-78)7	o,"IJJ" WTélf. WO.g a.,...
BfH-J u,r .llfu_	""IN:llrll.US	2.0l-'l'-'11	PSAt,t, U- - oi)7
6. JI),.fd!J'..)	JC;1: rr	T:(,..,D-leof,6N4	ll'.1't? -JP:.. Lol'-1

**DRAFT WSDOT/AGC/ACEC Design-Build Committee
2016 Meeting Topic Schedule**

Meeting Dates for 2016	Meeting Topics	Subject Matter Experts / Discussion Lead	Pre-Meeting Material	Final Deliverables	Notes/Comments
January 14, 2016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revisit TR Section 2.6—How is it working 2. Overview of DB Manual Development 3. Practical Solutions for DB 	WSDOT – ACEC – AGC –	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Observations from members with delivery experience with new requirements? 2. None 3. Presentation from WSDOT HQ Design 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revised or Blessed TR Section 2.6 2. Manual Outline for review 3. Recommendation Memo 	
February 25, 2016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Next Steps in Practical Solutions 2. DB Procurement Consistency 3. Review DB Manual Outline 4. MSVWBE Participation 	WSDOT – ACEC – AGC –	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Information from OR 2. Lists from members-consolidated Inventory of all past Submitters and Shortlists? 3. DB Manual Outline 4. Info from WSDOT HQ Construction 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recommendation Memo 2. Recommendation Memo 3. Recommendation Memo 4. Recommendation Memo 	
April 7, 2016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DB Delivery Consistency Necessary Change in BC Approval Process Concept Plans 2. Utility GT Section 1-07.17 3. Project Goals—Too Many? 4. HMA/Striping TR improvements 	WSDOT – ACEC – AGC –	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lists from members—consolidated 2. Current CT section 1-07.17 and past comments/incorporation status 3. Inventory of all past Project Goals? 4. Jim Proudly Suggestions 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recommendation Memo 2. Revised or Blessed GT Section 1-07.17 3. Recommendation Memo 4. Revised or Blessed TRs 	
May 26, 2016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DB Start Up and Close out Consistency 2. Review additional DB Manual materials 3. ROW/Survey TR 	WSDOT – ACEC – AGC –	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Historic close out data from WSDOT/Members? Where is the issue/problem? 2. DB manual outline and other available material 3. Current TR Sections 2.5 and 2.24 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recommendation Memo 2. Consolidated Comments 3. Revised or Blessed TR Section 2.5 and 2.24 	
June 30, 2016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discuss Basic Configuration/Innovation 2. PDMSG Status 3. GT Section 1-04.4 Changes 4. WSDOT Personnel DB Selection/Training 	WSDOT – ACEC – AGC –	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Historic BC description/trends 2. List of projects thru process Any process changes since Release 3. Current GT Section 1-04.4 4. DBIA as Resource?/Member programs 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recommendation Memo 2. Findings & Recommendation Memo 3. Revised or Blessed GT Section 1-04.4 4. Recommendation Memo 	
September 1, 2016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Small DB Project Procurement 2. DB Elevator Speech/Pocket Card 	WSDOT – ACEC – AGC –	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Examples from other States? 2. Member suggestions 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recommendation Memo 2. Pocket Card 	
October 13, 2016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Partnering 2. DRB/ADR Update 3. ADA 	WSDOT – ACEC – AGC –	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ideal program outlines from several respected facilitators? Chuck Cowan— 2. WSDOT draft language 3. List from Members-Consolidated 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recommendation Memo/Proposed TR 2. None 3. Revised or Blessed TR 	
December 1, 2016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recognition 2. 2017 Goals and Topics 	WSDOT – Scotty Ireland ACEC – Richard Patterson AGC – Paul Mayo		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2017 Goals and Meeting Topic Matrix 	

Meeting Dates for 2016	Meeting Topics	Subject Matter Experts / Discussion Lead		
		WSDOT	ACEC	AGC
14-Jan-16	1. Revisit TR Section 2.6—How is it working 2. Overview of DB Manual Development 3. Practical Solutions for DB	Lisa Hodgson	Dan Campbell/Ben Upsall	Paul/Phil
		Ed Barry	Eric Ostfeld	
25-Feb-16	1. Next Steps in Practical Solutions 2. DB Procurement Consistency 3. Review DB Manual Outline 4. MSVWBE Participation	Scotty/Ed Barry		
		Ed Barry/ Teresa/Jami	Eric Ostfeld/Richard P.	Paul/ Marek/Jon Harris
		Scotty		
7-Apr-16	1. DB Delivery Consistency Necessary Change in BC Approval Process Concept Plans 2. Utility GT Section 1-07.17 3. Project Goals—Too Many? 4. HMA/Striping TR improvements	Ed Barry	Eric Crowe	Paul/Frank Young
				Paul Mayo
		Jami		Marek
				Jim Prouty
26-May-16	1. DB Start Up and Close out Consistency 2. Review additional DB Manual materials 3. ROW/Survey TR	Julia M.		Marek/Jim Prouty/Phil L.
		Lisa Hodgson		
				Paul/Phil L./?? Ore Allizance???
30-Jun-16	1. Discuss Basic Configuration/Innovation 2. PDMSG Status 3. GT Section 1-04.4 Changes 4. WSDOT Personnel DB Selection/Training (Joint training)	Brenden Clarke		Greg Pindras
				Frank Young
		Julia M.	Ben Upsall	Paul/Phil Larson
1-Sep-16	1. Small DB Project Procurement 2. DB Elevator Speech/Pocket Card		Ben Upsall/Richard P.	Marek/Jim Prouty/Greg Pindras
		Julia M.	Ben Upsall	
13-Oct-16	1. Partnering 2. DRB/ADR Update 3. ADA	Scotty/Julia M.		Frank Young
		Lisa Hodgson		
		Ed Barry	Manish Rohila	Greg Pindras/Phil L.
1-Dec-16	1. Recognition 2. 2017 Goals and Topics	Scotty	Richard P.	Paul

Red = Proposed addendum language. Black text is the current contract language for reference.

ITP Changes:

2.9 PRACTICAL DESIGN

Practical design concepts that focus on the Project purpose and need and seek a low-cost solution to meet the purpose and need are encouraged. The Project purpose and need statements are defined in the Project Definition which is a part of the Design Approval (Appendix O). Concepts that require a Deviation or modify the Basic Configuration shall be submitted as an ATC. Concepts that simply delete scope, lower performance requirements, lower standards, or reduce Contract requirements are not considered practical design.

2.9.1 Practical Design Review

Within 7 Calendar Days of Contract execution, and prior to issuing Notice to Proceed, the parties will conduct a Practical Design Review (PDR). During the PDR, the Design-Builder and WSDOT will bring together key project management and technical staff to collaboratively identify practical design opportunities that may reduce project cost, shorten duration, or reduce risk while satisfying the Project's purpose and need.

RFP Changes

1-04.3 PRACTICAL DESIGN REVIEW

Within 7 Calendar Days of Contract execution, and prior to issuing Notice to Proceed, the parties will participate in a Practical Design Review (PDR) to identify cost reduction ideas, and other Contract changes while satisfying the Project's purpose and need. The PDR is a structured, thirty calendar day period for the parties to identify potential changes, evaluate those changes, and negotiate approved changes, if any. Approved changes shall be executed prior to the conclusion of the PDR, unless otherwise approved by the WSDOT Engineer.

Changes identified through the PDR shall be submitted and administered as Design-Builder Initiated Changes in accordance with the RFP, Section 1-04.4(2). WSDOT anticipates NTP will be granted at the conclusion of the PDR. WSDOT may shorten or conclude the PDR at any time.

Compensation for the Design-Builder's participation in the PDR will be by daily rate multiplied by the actual calendar day duration of the PDR. WSDOT has established a single daily rate of \$XX,XXX for the PDR in the Proposal. The daily rate shall be full compensation for the Design-Builder's key project management and technical staff's participation in the PDR, including negotiation of approved changes. The Design-Builder's costs for the PDR shall be separate from, and will not be considered as part of, the Proposal Price.

1-04.4(2) DESIGN-BUILDER INITIATED CHANGES

It is the desire of WSDOT to allow the Design-Builder to have significant flexibility in determining how best to design and construct the Project, within the parameters established by the Contract Documents. The Design-Builder is encouraged to propose changes whenever it identifies potential savings. This Section 1-04.4(2) sets forth the requirements applicable for addressing Design-Builder Initiated Changes. Approval of a Design-Builder Initiated Change is at WSDOT's sole discretion. Design-Builder Initiated Changes fall into one of the following three categories:

1. Changes that require either a Design Deviation and/or are based on an idea(s) derived from a Proposal submitted by an unsuccessful Proposer. All cost savings realized shall be shared between the Parties in accordance with Section 1-04.4(2).3.

Red = Proposed addendum language. Black text is the current contract language for reference.

2. Changes that do not meet the requirements of item 1 above, and are deemed by WSDOT in its sole discretion to be equal or better than the Contract requirement proposed to be changed. All cost savings realized shall be kept by the Design-Builder. These changes if approved will be implemented into the Contract as a no cost change order. Section 1-04.4(2).3 Contract Price Adjustments Split Between Parties does not apply to this category of change.
3. Changes that do not meet the requirements of either items 1 or 2 above. Any cost savings derived from this change shall be shared as the parties mutually agree. Section 1-04.4(2).3 Contract Price Adjustments Split Between Parties does not apply to this category of change.
4. *Changes resulting from the Practical Design Review. Any cost or time savings derived from this change shall be negotiated. Negotiations will take into consideration the value of deletions, additions, cost savings, time, lost profit, risk, overhead, engineering, and other tangible costs. Section 1-04.4(2).3 Contract Price Adjustments Split Between Parties does not apply to this category of change.*

1. General Policy and Regulations

1.1. *Intro*

- 1.1.1. Executive Summary
- 1.1.2. Definitions/Abbreviations

1.2. *Understanding Design-Build*

- 1.2.1. What is Design-Build
- 1.2.2. WSDOT Roles & Responsibilities
- 1.2.3. Design-Builder Roles and Responsibilities

1.3. *Training and Resources*

- 1.3.1. Training Modules
 - 1.3.1.1. *Design-Build 101*
 - 1.3.1.2. *RFP Development*
 - 1.3.1.3. *RFQ/RFP Procurement Process*
 - 1.3.1.4. *Design Administration*
 - 1.3.1.5. *Construction Administration*
 - 1.3.1.6. *Closeout*
 - 1.3.1.7. *Train the Trainer*
 - 1.3.1.8. *Design-Builder/WSDOT Staff DB Training (project kickoff)*
- 1.3.2. Computer side chats
- 1.3.3. CATS
- 1.3.4. SAMS
- 1.3.5. Resource Documents

1.4. *Laws Affecting Design-Build*

- 1.4.1. Washington State Law
 - 1.4.1.1. *Enabling Legislation*
 - 1.4.1.2. *Surety Bonds*
- 1.4.2. Federal Law
 - 1.4.2.1. *FHWA DB Rule*
 - 1.4.2.2. *FHWA Stewardship Agreement*
 - 1.4.2.3. *Brooks Act Exemption*
 - 1.4.2.4. *Differing Site Conditions Exemption*

1.5. *Project Delivery Method Selection Guidance (PDMSG)*

- 1.5.1. Overview
- 1.5.2. Timing for Determining Probable and Final
- 1.5.3. Process Required based on Project Cost
- 1.5.4. Project Holds, Exceptions, or Changes to the PDM
- 1.5.5. Approval Process
- 1.5.6. FHWA Involvement
 - 1.5.6.1. *NEPA and Design-Build*

2. Planning and Preliminary Engineering

2.1. *Planning*

- 2.1.1. Developing the PMP
- 2.1.2. Organization Structure
- 2.1.3. Use of Executive Oversight Committee
- 2.1.4. Assemble the Project Team

- 2.1.5. Develop the Risk Matrix
 - 2.1.5.1. *Design Issues*
 - 2.1.5.2. *Local Agency, Utility, and Railroad Issues*
 - 2.1.5.3. *Construction*
 - 2.1.5.4. *Force Majeure and Acts of God*
 - 2.1.5.5. *Differing Site Conditions*
 - 2.1.5.6. *Completion and Warranty*
- 2.1.6. Practical Design in Design-Build
 - 2.1.6.1. *Basis of Design*

2.2. Preliminary Engineering

- 2.2.1. Preliminary Survey/Mapping
- 2.2.2. Geotechnical Conditions
- 2.2.3. Environmental (NEPA/SEPA)
- 2.2.4. Hydraulic Data
- 2.2.5. ROW and Access Determination
- 2.2.6. Traffic
- 2.2.7. Noise
- 2.2.8. Utilities
- 2.2.9. Pavement
- 2.2.10. Local Agencies
- 2.2.11. Railroad
- 2.2.12. Third Party/Adjacent Property Owners
- 2.2.13. Community Relations
- 2.2.14. Structures
- 2.2.15. Other

3. Design-Build Contract Development

3.1. RFQ Document Preparation

- 3.1.1. Using the Template Document
- 3.1.2. What to ask for in the SOQ's
 - 3.1.2.1. *Determining Project Goals*
 - 3.1.2.2. *Determining Key Personnel*
- 3.1.3. Scoring Considerations
 - 3.1.3.1. *Key personnel vs. DB team*
 - 3.1.3.2. *Other*

3.2. ITP Document Preparation

- 3.2.1. What to ask for in the Proposal's
- 3.2.2. A + B Bidding
- 3.2.3. Lane Rental
- 3.2.4. Alternative Technical Concepts
- 3.2.5. Upset Price
- 3.2.6. BAFO
- 3.2.7. Betterments
- 3.2.8. Stipend
- 3.2.9. Scoring Considerations

3.3. RFP Document(s) Preparation

- 3.3.1. Using the Template Documents
- 3.3.2. Overall Organization
- 3.3.3. Level of Design
 - 3.3.3.1. *Basic Configuration*

- 3.3.3.2. *Conceptual Design*
- 3.3.3.3. *Practical Design*
- 3.3.3.4. *Geotechnical Baseline Report*
- 3.3.3.5. *Hydraulics Report*
- 3.3.3.6. *Pavement Design Report*
- 3.3.4. **General Provisions (Chapter 1)**
 - 3.3.4.1. *Organization*
 - 3.3.4.2. *Standard Specifications, Amendments, and State and Region GSP's*
 - 3.3.4.3. *Contract Bonds*
 - 3.3.4.4. *Third Party Beneficiaries*
 - 3.3.4.5. *Escrowed Proposal Documents*
 - 3.3.4.6. *Contract Time*
 - 3.3.4.7. *Differing Site Conditions*
 - 3.3.4.8. *Utility Relocations*
 - 3.3.4.9. *Insurance*
 - 3.3.4.10. *Liquidated Damages*
 - 3.3.4.11. *Dispute Review Board*
 - 3.3.4.12. *Engineer of Record*
 - 3.3.4.13. *Escalation Clauses*
 - 3.3.4.14. *Measurement and Payment*
- 3.3.5. **Technical Specifications (Chapter 2)**
 - 3.3.5.1. *Organization*
 - 3.3.5.2. *Project-Specific revisions to Template Documents*
 - 3.3.5.3. *Mandatory Standards/BOD*
 - 3.3.5.3.1. *Hierarchy/Conflicts between Standards*
 - 3.3.5.4. *Geotech*
 - 3.3.5.5. *Pavement*
 - 3.3.5.6. *Environmental*
 - 3.3.5.7. *NEPA*
 - 3.3.5.8. *Communications*
 - 3.3.5.9. *Utilities*
 - 3.3.5.10. *Bridges/Structures*
 - 3.3.5.10.1. *Noise Wall Best Practices*
 - 3.3.5.11. *Hydraulics*
 - 3.3.5.12. *Maintenance of Traffic*
 - 3.3.5.13. *Railroad*
 - 3.3.5.14. *Right of Way*
 - 3.3.5.15. *Quality Management Plan*
 - 3.3.5.16. *Maintenance During Construction*
 - 3.3.5.17. *Warranties*
 - 3.3.5.18. *Risk Allocation and Additional Compensation*
- 3.3.6. **Contract Form**
- 3.3.7. **Appendix Preparation**
 - 3.3.7.1. *Contract vs. Reference Documents*
 - 3.3.7.2. *Organization of Appendices*
 - 3.3.7.2.1. *A – Project Files*
 - 3.3.7.2.2. *B – Specifications*
 - 3.3.7.2.2.1. *Standard Specifications*
 - 3.3.7.2.2.2. *Amendments*
 - 3.3.7.2.2.3. *Statewide GSP's*
 - 3.3.7.2.2.4. *Regional GSP's*
 - 3.3.7.2.2.5. *Federal Specifications*
 - 3.3.7.2.3. *C – Commitments List*

3.3.7.2.4.	D – Manuals
3.3.7.2.5.	E – Environmental
3.3.7.2.6.	F – Forms
3.3.7.2.7.	G – Geotech
3.3.7.2.8.	H – Hydraulics
3.3.7.2.9.	I – Illumination, Electrical, ITS, Tolling
3.3.7.2.10.	J – Pavement
3.3.7.2.11.	K – Prevailing Wages
3.3.7.2.12.	L – Landscape and Urban Design
3.3.7.2.13.	M – Conceptual Plans
	3.3.7.2.14. N – As-Builts
3.3.7.2.15.	O – Design Documentation
3.3.7.2.16.	P – Permits
3.3.7.2.17.	Q – Maintenance
3.3.7.2.18.	R – Right of Way
3.3.7.2.19.	S – Structures
3.3.7.2.20.	T – Traffic, Signing
3.3.7.2.21.	U – Utilities
3.3.7.2.22.	V – Materials, Quality
3.3.7.2.23.	W – Communications

4. Procurement Process

4.1. General Overview

- 4.1.1. Two-step Process
 - 4.1.1.1. *RFQ and Shortlist*
 - 4.1.1.2. *RFP and Proposal*
- 4.1.2. One-step Process

4.2. Organizational Conflicts of Interest

4.3. Industry Outreach

- 4.3.1. Paid Advertisements
- 4.3.2. Magazine Articles
- 4.3.3. Letters of Interest

4.4. Confidentiality/Public Disclosure

4.5. Coordination with Ad & Award Office

4.6. Managing Organizational Conflicts of Interest

4.7. RFQ Administration

- 4.7.1. Prequalification
- 4.7.2. Issuing the RFQ
 - 4.7.2.1. *Required Approvals*
- 4.7.3. Voluntary Submitter's Meeting
- 4.7.4. Identifying Potential Submitters
- 4.7.5. Communications with Potential Submitters
- 4.7.6. Ex-Parte Communications
- 4.7.7. Formal Questions and Answers
- 4.7.8. Addenda
- 4.7.9. SOQ Due Date
- 4.7.10. SOQ Evaluations
- 4.7.11. Shortlist
- 4.7.12. Protests
- 4.7.13. Submitter Debrief Meetings

4.8. ITP Administration

- 4.8.1. Voluntary Proposer's Meeting
- 4.8.2. Primary Point of Contact
 - 4.8.2.1. *WSDOT*
 - 4.8.2.2. *Proposer*
- 4.8.3. Formal Questions and Answers
- 4.8.4. Addenda
- 4.8.5. One-on-One Meetings
- 4.8.6. Supplemental Boring Program
- 4.8.7. Evaluating Alternative Technical Concepts
- 4.8.8. Proposal Due Date
- 4.8.9. Proposal Evaluations
- 4.8.10. Best Value Determination
- 4.8.11. Award and Execution
- 4.8.12. Proposer Debrief Meetings

4.9. Award and Execution

- 4.9.1. Protests
- 4.9.2. Identifying Betterments

5. Contract Administration

5.1. Pre-award Planning

- 5.1.1. Establishing an Owner's Design-Build Culture
- 5.1.2. Project Management Plans
 - 5.1.2.1. *Determining Staff Size and "Engineering Percentage"*
- 5.1.3. Developing an Effective Quality Verification Plan
- 5.1.4. Escrowed Proposal Documents
- 5.1.5. Conformed RFP Documents

5.2. General Administration

- 5.2.1. Disputes Review Board
- 5.2.2. Partnering
- 5.2.3. DB's QMP
- 5.2.4. Engineer of Record

5.3. Design Administration

- 5.3.1. Design QC, QA, QV

5.4. Construction Administration

- 5.4.1. Construction QC, QA, QV
- 5.4.2. Construction Independent Assurance
- 5.4.3. Applicability of the Construction Manual
- 5.4.4. SAMS
 - 5.4.4.1. *F & t Analysis*
 - 5.4.4.2. *Paired t Analysis*
- 5.4.5. CATS
- 5.4.6. NCR's and NCI's
- 5.4.7. Inspection
- 5.4.8. Materials Testing

5.5. Documentation Review, Transmittal, and Tracking

5.6. External Audits

5.7. Change Orders

5.7.1. Approval Authority

5.7.2. Entitlement

5.7.2.1. *Differing Site Conditions*

5.7.2.2. *Hazardous Materials*

5.7.2.3. *Utilities*

5.7.2.4. *Necessary Change to Basic Configuration*

5.7.2.5. *Drilled Shafts*

5.7.3. Category A vs. B

5.7.4. Design-Builder Mark-ups

5.8. Payments Using Cost-Loaded Schedule

5.9. WSDOT Documentation

6. Closeout

6.1.1. Final Records

6.1.2. Documentation from Design-Builder

6.1.3. WSDOT Documentation

6.1.4. Closing NCR's

6.1.5. Materials Certification

6.1.6. Records Retention

7. Appendices

7.1. *Organization Conflicts of Interest Manual*

7.2. *Federal Design-Build Rule*

7.3. *Washington State Law related to Design-Build*

7.4. *Surety Bond Process Approved by OFM*

FROM MAREK BEDNARCZK

1. Utilization of references in the SOQ scoring
 - a. What is the purpose of contacting reference and how do they influence the scoring?
 - Verification of presented information in the SOQ document
 - General report on the company or individual (PM, CM)
 - Personal opinion on the company or individual
2. Consistency of scoring from project to project, region to region
 - a. Had same exact PM on two separate projects with same goals and same write up but received scores in the 50% range in one project and 80% on other project.
 - b. One region graded entire SOQ before moving onto the next one where other region graded each key personnel & major participant across all team before moving on (all PMs, then all CMs, then all DMs, etc).
3. Provide more transparency on the process of how the SOQs are evaluated:
 - How many evaluators are used?
 - Is there a mediator?
 - How much time is given to evaluators to read the document?
 - What happens following the scores from each evaluator?
 - Are scores combined or average taken?
 - If there is round table meeting following the evaluations to agree on the scores, who participates in those meeting?
 - If evaluators have worked with proposed team individuals how do you ensure no personal bias/favoritism is applied in the scoring?
4. Clarity of SOQ requested information
 - a. In some instances our interpretation of the goals differs from what WSDOT envisioned. Need to provide clear enough direction to eliminate/minimize room for interpretation or provide one meeting with WSDOT per team to explain/clarify any questions/concerns from each team prior to SOQ submittal.

FROM FRANK YOUNG

- It is my opinion (not substantiated on any formal analysis) that WSDOT equalizes all the technical proposals during the evaluations. In my review of the proposals on several past bids, for what I believe the DB supplied either a design or an approach should have provided more points than the competition – all proposals received similar or close scores. It looks like WSDOT doesn't want to reward the better DB teams with the deserved points they have earned. Too much of the selection is controlled by the dollars.
- WSDOT should advance the top three to the final round and provide larger stipends.

FROM JIM PROUTY

DB Procurement Consistency Comments, SOQ Phase:

- The procurement process still needs to remain a 2 step. Without this, prospective bidders may not pursue if the bid list is open.
- For smaller design build projects, let's say 20M and below, the process needs to be simplified.
- Example:
 - 2 page form
 - Maybe 1,000 words or less
- The current requirements are the same for a 2M design build as for a 200M design build, which does not make sense and can limit competition based on the level of effort / cost that is required.
- For smaller projects, WSDOT may also want to consider less emphasis on design build experience depending upon the complexity of the project. This can limit competition and potentially make the project more expensive for the end user, the taxpayer.

Other Sub Topic, RFP Phase:

- ATC Process
 - For smaller design build projects, there is limited time to obtain ATC approvals for incorporation into the project price. There also is resistance to make much change from WSDOT. If certain items are non-negotiable, they should be identified so both parties do not spend time on items that are not up for negotiation.

Instructions for use:

Use in all state funded (100%) projects with an estimated cost of \$250,000 or more.

Section 1-07.11 is supplemented with the following:

(NEW DATE)

VOLUNTARY - Minority, Small, Veteran and Women's Business Enterprise (MSVWBE) Participation

General Statement

Voluntary goals for minority, small, veteran and women business enterprises are included in this Contract. The Contractor is encouraged to utilize MSVWBEs in accordance with these Specifications, RCW 39.19 and Executive Order 13-01 (issued by the Governor of Washington on May 10, 2013).

No preference will be included in the evaluation of the Contractor's Proposal or Bid; no minimum level of MSVWBE participation is required as a condition of award or completion of the Contract; and a Proposal or Bid will not be rejected or considered non-responsive on that basis.

The goals are voluntary and outreach efforts to provide MSVWBEs maximum practicable opportunities are encouraged.

Non-Discrimination

Contractors shall not create barriers to open and fair opportunities for all businesses, including MSVWBEs, to participate in the Work on this Contract. This includes the opportunity to compete for subcontracts as sources of supplies, equipment, construction or services.

The Contractor shall make Voluntary MSVWBE Participation a part of all subcontracts and agreements entered into as a result of this Contract.

Voluntary MSVWBE Participation Goals

Goals for voluntary MSVWBE participation have been established as a percentage of Contractor's total Bid amount.

The Contracting Agency has established the following voluntary goals:

Minority	10%
Small	5%
Veteran	5%
Women	6%

Amounts paid to an MSVWBE will be credited to every voluntary goal in which they are eligible. In other words participation may be credited for participation in more than one category. If the Contractor is a MSVWBE their Work will be credited to the voluntary goals in which they are eligible.

Definitions

Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) – A minority owned business meeting the requirements of RCW 39.19 and WAC 326-20 and certified by the Washington State Office of Minority & Women's Business Enterprises.

Small Business – A business meeting the Washington State requirements for a “Small business”, “Minibusines” or “Microbusiness” as defined in RCW 39.26.010 and included on the WSDOT Office of Equal Opportunity list of Small Businesses at <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/equalopportunity/bddirectory.htm>

Veteran Business – A veteran owned business meeting the requirements of RCW 43.60A.010 and included on the WSDOT Office of Equal Opportunity list of Small Businesses at <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/equalopportunity/bddirectory.htm>

Women Business Enterprise (WBE) – A women owned business meeting the requirements or RCW 39.19 and WAC 326-20 certified by the Washington State Office of Minority & Women’s Business Enterprises.

MSVWBE Inclusion Plan
A MSVWBE Inclusion Plan shall be submitted to the Engineer prior to the start of Work on the project. The plan is submitted for the Contracting Agency’s information. Approval of the plan is not required; an incomplete plan will be returned for correction and resubmittal. The plan shall include the information identified in the guidelines at

<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/EqualOpportunity/PoliciesRegs/mwbe.htm>.

MSVWBE Reporting

A Monthly Report of Amounts Paid to MSVWBEs shall be submitted to the Engineer each month between Execution of the Contract and Physical Completion of the Contract using the application available at <https://remoteapps.wsdot.wa.gov/mapsdata/tools/dbeparticipation>. The monthly report is due 20 calendar days following the end of the month whether payments were made or work occurred.

The monthly report shall include payments to all eligible businesses regardless of their listing on the MSVWBE Inclusion Plan. If the Contractor is a MSVWBE the amounts paid by the Contracting Agency for Work performed by the Contractor shall also be reported.

After Execution of the Contract, the Contractor shall send an e-mail to DBEPAdmin@wsdot.wa.gov containing the following information: the first and last name, e-mail address, title and phone number of the person that will be submitting the above documents for their company. The e-mail shall include the WSDOT Contract number they will be reporting on. After receipt of this information by WSDOT, the Contractor will receive an e-mail response containing their username and password for the application

and a link to the application.
Reporting instructions are
available in the application.

MSVWBE Payment

All costs for implementation
of the requirements for
Voluntary MSVWBE
Participation shall be
included in the associated
items of Contract Work.

WSDOT/AGC/ACEC DESIGN-BUILD TEAM MEETING

Agenda

Co-Chairs Art McCluskey and Paul Mayo

AGENDA ITEMS:

December 01, 2016
9:00 am to 12:00 pm
WSDOT Kent Maintenance Facility Conference. Rm
26620 68th Ave S., Kent, WA 98032
No Teleconference line requested

1. Sign-In Sheet / Introductions (9:00 am – 9:15 am)

Art

- A. Safety Briefing
- B. Review and update Sign-In Sheet
- C. Introduction of new & existing members, SME's and other Guests

All attendees were requested to indicate their attendance by completing the sign-in sheet. Existing Team members provided initials next to their name; new members provided name, organization, phone, and email address information. The Sign-In sheet data will be used by the Team to create an updated member's list.

2. Review Previous Meeting Minutes (9:15 am – 9:20 am)

Art

Meeting minutes are located at:

<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Business/Construction/MeetingMinutes.htm>

There were no additional comments to the meeting minutes and they were accepted.

3. Old Business (9:20 am – 10:00 am)

- A. [Design-Build Contract Document Template Status](#) (10 Min) Art / Jolena
- B. Design-Build RFP Template Team Review Status Update (2.5, 2.7, and 2.28) (10 Min) Jolena
- C. Design-Build RFP Template General Provisions Team Topics Preview (10 Min) Art / Paul
- D. Team Membership Update (10 Min) Paul

3.A

Jolena stated all templates except General Provision have been sent to FHWA. The plan is to have approved templates by the 1st qtr. of 2017

3.B

Jolena stated that access to the HUB was unfriendly to users and was working incorrectly. An example of this was the in-line commenting option would not allow team members to make comments within the document. Jolena said she was open to suggestions for an improved method to accomplish the work. Eric remarked that there were new technologies on the market that could be tried for collaborating work. Scotty mentioned Drop-Box as a possible solution.

Paul asked if Drop-Box worked in real time and could users see the comments. Blue Beam was another suggested platform. Paul stated that the real question came down to hosting, payment of and accessing the system. Eric said that the group had a learning curve with the HUB and that the group was likely to experience that same curve with new technology. A portal site, similar to SharePoint, was also suggested as an alternative. Richard and Paul agreed to look into options and report back at the next meeting with their findings.

Jolena informed the group that if they had any suggestions to the work they were reviewing, to send them to her and she would track them in excel and update the HUB in the meantime.

Action Items: Richard and Paul will research SharePoint, Blue Beam, and Drop box.

3.C

No General Provisions topics received.

3.D

Paul and Richard will select and notify the team of new members by January 1.

AGC final decision is with its officers.

There are 5 to 6 AGC members and 6 ACEC members with 2 on-call.

Still 3 strikes you're out rule. No more than 2 consecutive absences.

4. New Business (10:00 am – 11:30 am)

- A. 2017 Topic Development (60 Min)
- B. Revised SME List (15 Min)
- C. [Tentative 2017 Meeting Dates](#) (15 Min)

All
Art / Paul
Art / Paul / Richard / Jolena

4.A

Paul reviewed the JTC report and the team identified the following topics:

- Training.
One hour on the August agenda. WSDOT mentioned DB Training Conference for Fall of 2017. AGC said they would like to be included to present on “How to Partner” and Top 10 things.
- Standardization of DB processes.
Three 1 hour spots requested on 2017 agendas for manual review. WSDOT to send out DB Manual outline for team to select top 3. A Skype meeting may be required before the scheduled team meeting to discuss comments.
- Reliance on consultants.
One hour on 2017 agenda to discuss best practices. Consultants are not going away.
- Flexibility in procurement and delivery options.
One hour for each on 2017 agendas: Small DB Project Procurement and Scaling.
- Preliminary design and project development.
Two hours requested on mid-year 2017 agenda to discuss Basic Configuration/Innovation, Practical Design and bringing down number of Project goals.
- Evaluation criteria.
One hour requested on 2017 agenda to discuss WSDOT evaluation criteria and evaluation manual.
- Lessons-learned.
One hour requested on 2017 agenda to discuss closeout process (What, When and Why). Design side and document package. Is there a checklist for closeouts?

Art added the following topics from the 2016 Work Plan:

- PDMSG-What does the data show?
- DB Speech
- Check-in for the TR Sections
- DRB/ADR Updates
- ADA
- Recognitions

Members added the following topics:

- Report for June ACEC meeting @ WSDOT
- DBE
- Prevailing wages for DB
- General Provisions

Action Items: Art, Paul and Richard to complete work plan and send to the team before 1/1.

4.B

Paul will add AGC SMEs

Richard will added ACEC SMEs

Art will Added WSDOT SMEs

4.C

1/26 - Thursday
3/23 - Thursday
5/25 – Thursday
6/29 – Thursday
8/24 – Thursday
9/28 - Thursday
11/30 – Thursday

- 5. WSDOT DB Program News and Update** (11:30 am – 11:40 am) Art
- A. Contract 8952, I-5 NB MLK to NE Ravenna Bridge; **Advertisement Notice/RFQ 10/3/16**
 - B. SR 520/Montlake to Lake Washington - I/C and Bridge Replacement - Montlake Interchange and West Approach Bridge - South (**>\$80M, 03/2017**)
 - C. I-5/Chamber Way Bridge - Replacement - (Bridge 5/227) (**\$5M-\$10M, 04/2017**)
 - D. I-5/Portland Ave to Port of Tacoma Rd - SB HOV - Construct HOV lanes, ramps, widen structures and paving (**>\$80M, 05/2017**)
 - E. I-90/Eastgate to SR 900 - Peak Use Shoulder Lanes (**\$50M-\$60M, 10/2017**)
 - F. I-5/DuPont-Steilacoom Rd to Thorne Ln - Corridor Improvements (**>\$80M, 10/2017**)
 - G. US 101/Coffee Creek - Remove Fish Barrier (115 MC093) (**\$10M-\$15M, 03/2017**)

6. Review and Expand Action Items (11:40 am – 11:50 am) All

7. Future Meetings (11:50 am – 12:00 pm)
All

Remaining 2016 Meeting Dates:

None

Meeting Location Remainder of 2016 and 2017: Kent Maintenance Facility Conference Room.

The facility address is: 26620 68th Ave S, Kent, WA 98032

The meetings will be held from 9:00 am to 12:00 pm

Future 2017 Meeting Dates:

Dates and locations TBD by WSDOT; current meeting frequency to be maintained; information will be published as soon as reservations are confirmed.

1/26 - Thursday
3/23 - Thursday
5/25 – Thursday
6/29 – Thursday
8/24 – Thursday
9/28 - Thursday
11/30 – Thursday

Any planned changes to the programmed meeting dates or location will occur at least one week prior to the meeting.