

**CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY REVIEW BOARD (CPARB)
DESIGN BUILD BEST PRACTICES COMMITTEE REPORT**

November 2015

MISSION AND GOALS

- CPARB charged the committee with identifying best practices to assist public agencies in the effective utilization of Design Build.
- Evaluate the current use of Design Build procurement, understand what is working and where there is room for improvement. The committee's work targets best practices guidelines that enable public owners, architects, engineers, and contractors to utilize Design Build effectively.
- Help the industry and public owners implement the project delivery tool as good stewards of public dollars.
- Owners are interested in how Design Build is impacting professional practice. They need to know what architects and contractors are experiencing in order to expand their perspective on the process.
- Respond to the recommendations of the AELC Report on Alternative Project Delivery:
 - Public owners are learning from their experiences and modifying their procurement methods to improve outcomes. Invite agencies to share their lessons learned and provide insight on Design Build project delivery.
 - Design Build procurement continues to evolve. Identify and evaluate the impact of new methodologies such as Progressive Design Build, adding a Verification Phase and Performance Contracting.
 - Identify best practices to assist public agencies in considering and choosing between Design Bid Build, GC/CM and Design Build project delivery.
 - Identify best practices to assist public agencies in effective utilization of Design Build including preparing for the project and selecting a Design Builder.
 - Evaluate constraints and recommend opportunities for architects, engineers and contractors to compete effectively with a focus on the needs of small businesses.
- It is not necessarily the intent to modify legislation related to Design Build.
- committee should have a broader focus than just the application of Design Build to vertical construction.

TERMINOLOGY

- Owners, design professionals and contractors do not have a common terminology for many aspects of Design Build procurement. Terms vary from agency to agency, state to state.
- Adopt a common terminology to create a common language that facilitates communication between owners, design professionals and contractors.

PREDESIGN

- **NCARB:** The process of discovering the owner/client's requirements and desires for a project and setting them down in written, numerical, and graphic form.
- **Dictionary of Construction:** Pre-design services include assistance of the owner in establishing the program, schedule, budget, and project limitations.
- **OFM:** The pre-design study involves data collection, analysis, organization, communication and evaluation through which all viable alternatives and elements of the selected facility's design are explored. It includes the establishment of an agency's or institution's programmatic, qualitative and financial needs, schedule requirements, and limitations for a project. It should explore the facility's physical attributes, as well as the design response to meet service delivery and facility user needs. In addition, pre-design should evaluate the delivery system to be used and the recommended funding method.

While the pre-design is a solid foundation from which to begin design, it does not impose constraints that cannot be altered during the design process if additional information becomes available.

The project drawings/diagrams section contains conceptual (pre-schematic) drawings of the proposed capital construction project in enough detail to describe the project. Site diagrams illustrating various alternative sites and site layouts should also be provided. Drawings/diagrams should be **conceptual or pre-schematic** only. Schematic-level documents are neither desirable nor required for pre-design.

TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

- **United Facilities Criteria (UFC), Department of Defense:** RFP technical specifications for Design-Build construction projects clearly define program/project requirements, performance attributes, performance factors, submittal procedures, as well as other mandatory requirements such as building envelopes. [They identify] ...mandatory Federal, technical, regulatory, fire protection, life safety code, and quality requirements...
 - **Nominal Criteria:** ...are typical of many Design-Build projects and essentially represent an almost total performance specification approach. The Government states the purpose, function, and characteristics of the project in sufficient detail to delineate and characterize functional features and the image or visual appearance of the project. For nominal criteria special site, architectural, structural, and mechanical requirements are identified. Minimum requirements for mechanical and electrical equipment layouts including provisions for testing, adjusting, balancing, and commissioning should be specified.
 - **Partial Criteria:** ...represent the middle ground. The Government prepares concept floor plans which indicate a special mechanical and electrical equipment layout, overall dimensions, and desirable column locations. Enlarged floor plans are provided, as required, to explain special design conditions. Minimum requirements for mechanical and electrical equipment layouts including provisions for testing, adjusting, balancing, and commissioning should be specified. Preliminary exterior elevations and cross sections are required for special design

requirements. A site plan is required to indicate the building orientation and circulation to the building entrances.

- Full Criteria: ...represent a more prescriptive approach. The Government provides enlarged floor plans, fire protection information, typical wall sections to indicate materials' usage, and structure. The following would be included: Preliminary site plan, landscaping plan, exterior elevations, cross sections, floor plans, finish schedule, door schedule, foundation, framing plan, and sections. The criteria begin to resemble the traditional design of the design-bid-build approach. In many cases, the full criteria approach may only apply to critical project elements or features. In other cases, such as in "site-adapt" projects, the criteria may resemble a complete design.
- Some Design-Build projects have project criteria developed in the RFP that essentially provide a complete design, with the minor details left to the D-B contractor. In this case, it must be made clear in the RFP that to be technically acceptable, the Design-Build contractor must provide the design and construction as indicated in the RFP. The award process is based upon "best value" considering past performance, experience, and technical capabilities of the construction contractor, as well as price. This can be an advantage when the Government wants to obtain a specific design and/or select a highly-qualified contractor for construction of specialized or critical facilities.
- *Note that DoD technical requirements do not directly prescribe (but may be construed to infer) required information such as surveys, studies, soils reports, as-built drawings, etc. which may be required for the project.*

BRIDGING DOCUMENTS

- **Bridging Institute of America (BIA)**: ... a design team is selected [by the Owner and] goes through Schematic Design in the same way an architect would do in traditional design services, with reviews and approvals by the Owner. Typically, the project budget and schedule would also be reconfirmed at this point. [Subsequently the design team] prepares the Bridging Contract Documents. While this will typically require about the same level of effort as the preparation of Design Development documents in the traditional Design-Bid-Build method, (the Bridging Documents) are quite different from "DD" documents. They will be much more complete in many aspects, usually the architectural, and much less complete in others, typically some elements of the engineering.
- **Drewry Simmons Vornehm, LLP: Schematic Design**. The Owner engages a [Design Criteria Consultant] DCC to carry out the schematic design after the program of requirements and budget are set and the site is identified. Consultation between the DCC and engineers will occur. However, few engineering drawings typically will be made a part of the DCC's drawings at this stage of the design process.

Design Development + RFP. The DCC carries out the preparation of the bridging contract documents which form the basis for the agreement between the Owner and Design-Builder. This requires an effort by the DCC at least as extensive as an architect's traditional design development services, however, the resulting documents are very different as there will be much more architectural design completed. The DCC and its consulting engineers will prepare a combination of performance and design specifications. The DCC's drawings and specifications together with other legal documents make up the bridging contract documents, which also serve as the Request for Proposal. The guiding criteria is that everything should be fully designed and/or specified by the DCC and incorporated into the DCC's design documents in order to protect the Owner, the design, and the quality of the construction. On the flip side, nothing should be fully designed and/or specified that can be adequately covered by code and/or performance specifications (i.e. foundation and structural system, expansion joints, etc.).

ALIGNING OWNER NEEDS AND GOALS WITH DELIVERY TYPE

- Each project has unique circumstances that should be considered in selecting a project delivery method. A detailed evaluation of the project specific situation is required to determine the most effective method.
- Risks exist on every project regardless of delivery method. The risk of the price changing exists in every project.
- Design Build does not necessarily guarantee the final cost. The risk of cost changing is related to the point in the process that contract is awarded. The earlier in the process it is established the greater the potential for change.

DESIGN BUILD DELIVERY TYPES

There are multiple formats for implementing Design Build projects. Identifying and describing the different types is helpful to creating a consistent understanding among owners, contractors and design professionals.

In general, there are three broad formats for DB project delivery.

The three types are not mutually exclusive. In Washington State all three require qualifications, a technical approach design concept and cost factors. The effort to compete for a Design Build contract is dependent on the specificity of the design concept and cost required to submit a proposal.

There are differences between Design Build procurement for horizontal and vertical construction.

RCW 39.10.340 describes the award process for Design Build projects in Washington State. A brief summary follows:

RFQ Evaluation Factors (see 39.10.330-1.d.i)

- Must include, but not limited to: technical qualifications; capability to perform; past performance of the proposers' team, including the architect-engineer and construction members; and other appropriate factors.
- May also include: past performance in utilization of small business entities and/or disadvantaged business enterprises.
- Cost or price-related factors are not permitted in the request for qualifications phase;

Final Proposal (RFP) Evaluation Factors (see 39.10.330-1.d.ii)

- Shall include, but not limited to: RFQ evaluation factors above, technical approach design concept; ability of professional personnel; past performance; ability to meet time and budget requirements; ability to provide a performance and payment bond; recent, current, and projected workloads of the firm; location; and cost or price-related factors that may include operating costs.
- May include: outreach plan to include small business entities and disadvantaged business enterprises.
- Alternatively, if the public owner determines that all finalists will be capable of producing a design that adequately meets project requirements, the public body may award the contract to the firm that submits the responsive proposal with the lowest price.

CONTRACT AWARD

- The point in the process that a Design Build contract is awarded is an important differentiator between procurement types. Note that all forms involve “competition” for cost to some extent. The following titles utilize DBIA nomenclature:
 - **Progressive** allows the owner to select the design builder based on qualifications and cost factors, prior to submittal of a design concept and final cost proposal. Agreement on scope and cost comes later in the process.
 - **Best Value** allows the owner to select the design builder based on qualifications, a design concept and cost proposal. Agreement on final scope and cost is made at, or very close to, the time, the design builder is selected.
 - **Cost Centered** allows the owner to select the design builder based on their qualifications, plan to implement the owner’s design concept and cost proposal. Agreement on final scope and cost is made at, or very close to, the time, the design builder is selected.
- During the RFP phase of Design Build team selection,
 - Progressive tends to favor qualifications criteria,
 - Best Value may be any combination of qualifications, design concept and cost, and
 - Cost Centered tends to favor cost.
- The amount of work required to compete for each types varies:
 - Progressive typically requires the least effort for competing Design Build teams.
 - Preparing the design concept and cost proposal typically requires a significant effort for the competing teams in Best Value selection.
 - Preparing technical and/or management proposals and a final cost proposal requires a significant effort for competing teams in Cost Centered selections.
- The owner should evaluate their needs in terms of risk, design control and cost certainty.
 - The owner relinquishes a level of control over the design once the bid has been awarded.
 - Risk involved with setting a price prior to confirming the alignment of a design proposal and cost with the owner’s programmatic and operating needs.

PERFORMANCE GUARANTEES AND/OR INCENTIVES

- Design Build is by definition a performance-based contract.
- Design Build and Design Build Operate Maintain are currently the only procurement methods utilized for performance contracting and/or operations and maintenance.
- Design Build provides a single contractual entity that is responsible for guaranteeing performance requirements.
- Current State funded Design Build projects have requirements for guarantees and/or incentives for energy performance.

PROGRESSIVE (QUALIFICATIONS AND COST FACTORS)

- Defining characteristic of Progressive Design Build is the absence of price for construction at the time the Design Builder is selected.
 - Cost is a required component of the selection but does not have to be a price for construction, it can be overhead and profit and/or other factors.
- The term Progressive comes from the idea that the Design Builder and Owner work together to establish a price after the Design Build team is selected.
- Qualifications may play a larger role in team selection than other Design Build types.
 - Increased focus on the professional services rendered by the Design Build team.
 - Potential to reduce cost and risk issues for competing Design Build teams if the requirements for a “technical approach design concept” and “cost or price-related factors” are limited in scope.
- Increased opportunity for Owner participation.
- Water utilities were early adopters of this approach. The Waterways Water Design Council developed a Design Build contract that is similar to DBIA’s 530 document.
 - DBIA Document 530, Standard Form of Agreement Between Owner and Design-Builder – Cost Plus Fee with an Option for a Guaranteed Maximum Price, includes an option for establishing the GMP after the agreement is executed.
- Progressive selection may include requirements for a concept design.
 - The Denver Waterways Water Treatment Plant was procured as a Progressive Design Build project with a design competition. The technical design concept was a selection criteria. The price was agreed upon subsequent to team selection.
- Progressive offers the flexibility of having the Design Build team participate in the development of the project goals, program, performance criteria, and project budget.
 - Integrates the designer with the constructor as early in the process.
 - An effective method if limited scope and cost information are available at the time the Owner wants to select a Design Build team. Works for projects where it is hard to define technical requirements that must be in place prior to commencing team selection for Best Value and/or Cost Centered selection.
 - There may be two architects, one to prepare the predesign study and technical criteria for the selection process and the other to participate in the Design Build team, or
 - there may be one architect who prepares the predesign and technical criteria and then follows through as a member of the Design Build team.
 - The design architect is a member of the Design Build team and follows the project through to completion.
- Progressive Design Build allows the owner, architect and contractor to develop a relationship as part of the process of establishing a price. Best Value and Cost Centered do not offer the same opportunity because the price is established as part of the selection.
- Progressive Design Build is “a brave new world.” Agencies are just beginning to get experience. Some agencies are concerned about relinquishing the cost competition and price certainty that is embedded in other DB selection types.
 - How does owner know they are getting the best value or cost?
 - Does the owner have the ability to negotiate with a fair price with the contractor?

BEST VALUE SELECTION (QUALIFICATIONS, QUALITATIVE PROPOSAL AND FIRM PRICE)

- Frequently referred to as “design competition” based Design Build selection.
- Most common form of procurement in Washington State
- Competitive proposals and costs
- Best design and fixed price = best value
- The design architect is a member of the Design Build team and follows the project through to completion.
- Best Value it is typical for two A/E teams to be involved in the process. One is contracted to the Owner and helps develop the program. The other is contracted to the Design Builder.
- The quality of the design proposal is very important in some selections. WSDOT, for example, weights the fixed price of the work higher than design quality and typically picks the low bid unless the competitive cost proposals are close and one submittal has a better design.
- Owners’ value the competitive process embodied in Best Value selections.
- Validation allows the Owner to pick the Design Builder based on the design concept and initial cost information and then work with the team to develop the project before signing a GMP or lump sum contract.

COST CENTERED SELECTION (QUALIFICATIONS AND FIRM PRICE)

- Competitive proposals and costs.
- The Owner selects and works with an A/E team to prepare Bridging Documents which prescribe the design concept for the project and the basis of the RFQ/RFP for Design Build team selection. The process may or may not include a pre-design.
- Bridging documents are frequently comparable to 100% design development
- Design Build teams make their proposals on the basis of completing the documents and building the project. There may be less effort and cost involved in competing.
- The architect on the Design Build team prepares the construction documents.
- Bridging may pose risks for the Owner due to the more prescriptive requirements. It may reduce the level of innovation and integration between the architect and the contractor due to level of design development.
- Opportunity for owner to have greater involvement in and control over design. Follows the EPC model of “engineer/procure/construct” that is a precursor to Design Build. The Federal Government and the State of California have both used this model extensively. Current Design Build models for public projects grew out of Federal legislation in 1996 based on this model.
- The Bridging Institute of America (BIA) promotes the benefits of the Cost Centered selection process.
- Selection is typically focused on cost. Teams are required to follow the prescriptive design requirements contained in the Bridging documents.

PRE-AWARD PROCESS

- “Be careful about what you win.” Design Build can be high risk, firms have won Design Build projects but lost millions of dollars. Firms need to consider the professional and financial risks beyond competition and selection.
- Owner/Architect Relationship
 - One of the biggest challenges for architects is the loss of a direct contractual relationship with the owner.
- Contractor/Architect Relationship
 - Some firms prefer the opportunity to know who the contractor will be from the beginning of the job.
 - Traditional A/E – contractor relationship changes to a contractor/subcontractor relationship, which is a different business model.
 - Contractor success rate in pursuing projects is much lower than the A/E success rate. Every A/E should negotiate clear terms and conditions with their prospective Design Build partner at the outset of the pursuit.

AN EQUITABLE BALANCE BETWEEN RISK AND REWARD

- Competing for and implementing Best Value Design Build selections involves significant risks for design professionals and contractors.
 - The risk must be balanced by a commensurate reward.
 - Stipends should be based on the level of effort required. Consider the State Fee Schedule compensation for Schematic Design.
 - Use of architect’s concepts
- Project funding should align with the selection process.
 - The biennial funding cycle for State projects, construction funding is separated from design funding. Lack of assurance that the project will be fully funded increases the risk for owners and Design Build teams.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PARTICIPATION

SECTION 1096 OF THE 2015 STATE CAPITAL BUDGET

*(3) The department [of Enterprise Services], with assistance from the capital projects authority review board [CPARB], shall provide recommendations to the governor, house capital budget committee, and senate ways and means committee, on ways to improve the project delivery methods. **It must include, at a minimum, methods to incorporate more architectural and engineering firms and contractors to be eligible for design build projects...***

- Best practice guidelines should encourage participation.
- Small, medium and large businesses are concerned about the opportunities to participate.
- Currently, it seems like Design Build contracting is being done by a small group of AE firms and contractors who have team experience because they were early adopters of the project delivery method, have the resources to deal with the cost of competing and risk of contracting and have existing client relationships.

- It is challenging for businesses of all sizes who have been successful in doing in public works through Design Bid Build to build those relationships with contractors and compete for Design Build contracts. Few have the qualifications to compete with large, national companies who have been doing the work for a long time.
- The qualifications process can be exclusionary due to project size, bonding requirements or the competition requirements.
- A large segment of the industry specializes in private sector work and is capable of performing the integrated delivery, collaboration, and early participation. In some cases, the private industry is out performing the public sector in terms of cost metrics and schedule metrics.
- Those who were early adopters should be acknowledged for taking the risk, but the selection process should not stop there in terms of distributing the work. New procurement methods should encompass the entire industry.
- If the field is not broadened what will happen to many of the firms who have been in the industry for the past twenty to fifty years?
- Will public Owners make a commitment to the A/E/C community in the state to bring the whole industry forward into Design Build? There is concern that it is an inequitable business practice because only a small segment of the industry is currently participating. The group of competing architects, engineers, and contractors may be reduced depending on the selection criteria and opportunities for teaming.
- Qualified professionals, such as women and minorities have limited opportunities in general. Design Build selection and contracting procedures make it an even more exclusive procurement method than Design Bid Build and GCCM.
- Owners look for the builder and designer to have worked together before - it's all about the relationship and the alignment. The Owner does not want the firms "dating" on the project, they want a designer and builder who are experienced as a team.
- What is the role of the Owner in the equation? Good Owners get good projects. Owners who are inexperienced may not get the best results. Should the constraint on past experience apply to the Owners too?

CHALLENGES

COST OF COMPETING

- Significant time, effort and cost to compete in an RFQ/RFP process for Best Value selection.
- The effort and cost may be too great for small firms that do not have the resources to take the risk.
- Large firms may not pursue project opportunities due to the cost and time involved.
- Progressive selection may reduce the risk to designers and builders.
 - It is not clear if there is an impact on competition from newcomers who can demonstrate their skills through the Technical Approach Design Concept.

DELIVERABLES

- Is there an effective means to reduce the deliverables?

QUALIFICATIONS

- RFQ criteria that require previous Design Build experience of the designer and builder as a team or as separate entities limits the number of firms that can compete, discouraging otherwise qualified companies from submitting.
- Qualifications often include previous experience with the public Owner. Typically, this excludes firms that have relevant experience with other public and private clients but not the advertising agency.
- Qualifications tend to focus on firm experience. Expanding the criteria to include people within the firm who gained their experience elsewhere expands the opportunities for firms to compete.
- There are large national firms who have done a significant number of Design Build projects versus medium size companies that may not have done as many.
- Design Build involves collaboration and integrated project delivery tools which is practiced by designers and builders in both the private and public sector.
- Contractors provide design management for owners even though the A/E team is not directly contracted to them.
- Experienced teams without project specific experience should be considered for new project types.

SMALL, WOMEN AND MINORITY OWNED BUSINESSES

- Small architecture firms in Washington State have been the prime consultants for projects with construction costs of thirty million dollars or more. Although these small businesses are qualified to serve as the lead architect on a Design Build team many have not done a Design Build project and are not therefore able to compete effectively.
- Owners and the Design Build competitors should look at all the small business opportunities for the SPE or even half of the SPE.
- Need for caution. Across the country there have been more challenges than success stories. Virginia had a success story, but Colorado has had challenges with their projects and the small businesses involved.
- Washington State is unique. There are varying levels of certification that other states do not have such as SCS (Small Contractor and Supplier Certification) or the old DBE (Disadvantaged Business Enterprise).
- The Miller Act in Washington State is behind in comparison to the Federal Government. No one is talking about the impact on small businesses and their opportunities in Washington State.
- The Small Business Administration's 8(a) Business Development Program is a business assistance program for small disadvantaged businesses. The 8(a) Program offers a broad scope of assistance to firms that are owned and controlled at least 51% by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals.
 - 8(a) firms are able to form joint ventures and teams to bid on contracts. This enhances the ability of 8(a) firms to perform larger prime contracts and overcome the effects of contract bundling, the combining of two or more contracts together into one large contract. The [Mentor-Protégé Program](#) enables starting 8(a) companies to learn the ropes from other more experienced businesses. 8(a) can increase access to Design Build contracts.
 - Many contractors are qualified for projects but do not want to go through the mentor/mentee relationship. There should be other avenues of entry.
 - Questions about the success of mentor/mentee programs around the country. There are different procurement practices and approaches to meeting goals versus set asides for 8(a).

FINDING DESIGN BUILD PARTNERS

- Challenges finding the best partners to create a Design Build team.
- Owners do not always get the best Design Build teams competing for Best Value selections due to the cost of pursuing the work. Contractors and design firms limit the number of projects they pursue due to the risks involved.
- Progressive selection may also be challenging. This is particularly true in a new environment where there are many firms, particularly smaller firms, which do not have the qualifications. It is difficult for these firms to compete as Owners move towards alternative delivery methods.

OPPORTUNITIES

- Opportunity for smaller businesses to partner with more experienced firms to get experience.
- Progressive increases opportunity because there is not as much focus on price, which allows more people to participate and develop expertise.
- Public works projects may include a significant SCS or DBE requirement for the selection process.
- Demonstrate experience with projects of similar scope and complexity be described from the standpoint of meeting RFQ criteria.
- Acknowledge team experience of a designer and builder who have worked together on a Design Bid Build or GCCM project. Successful track records for those project types are the result of a “forced marriage.” If the team was able to deliver a project that met all of the performance requirements in terms of cost, budget, schedule, and change orders it should be capable of working together if they choose to join forces in advance.
- Acknowledge experience of a contractor who is teamed with an architect that does not have Design Build experience and/or an architect who has Design Build experience and is teamed with a contractor who does not.
- Sound Transit and UW discourage exclusive relationships with consultants and request that DB teams not to select more than one or two key partners in order to avoid locking everybody up.
- In the early days of DPDS, the firms had to have DPDS experience, which limited the pool. Therefore, the selection criteria were broadened to DPDS or similar project experience. Design Build could do something similar. The firms could demonstrate they have the experience that is necessary for the project.
- Owners are looking for a relationship with a designer and a builder that will provide the best outcomes. working with the Design Build team during the RFP phase helps owners makes choice.
 - WSU does not require the firms to have worked together previously. However, they do want to understand their ability to work collaboratively. Teams should be able to come to the table with different points of view. WSU gets a sense of this by visiting their offices to see if they can work together, are collaborative, and are open to ideas.
 - The same concept could be utilized without the design competition. Proprietary meetings are can be part of a Progressive Design Build selection. They provide an opportunity to engage the owner and the team in a discussion of design management process and see how teams work in action.
- Design Build is typically used for large projects. Utilizing it for appropriate small and medium size projects would open the door for smaller designers and builders.
 - Progressive Design Build may be a great opportunity for much smaller projects. The designer and contractor would be together early on and would help the Owner develop a project and get it done quickly.

- Provide a range in scope and scale opportunities for small business. There are a number of successful DBE architectural firms in Seattle and Washington State that are able to compete and bid in this environment.

AGENCY PREPAREDNESS

- Agencies may not understand the full scope of their obligation as partners in the Design Build process.
 - Project scope and budget should be aligned before the selection process begins.
 - Designers and builders are concerned that owners do not always understand their ongoing role as partners is once the competition has been awarded.
- A copy of the RFP and the Technical Requirements should be included in the RFQ.
 - Prospective competitors should have an opportunity to understand the full scope of the project and determine if the scope and budget are likely to result in a feasible project.
 - Completion of the proposal and Technical Requirements should not be ongoing during the RFQ phase of the selection process.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

BEST VALUE SELECTION

- The selection process should be reliable, rigorous and objective to ensure that the best value proposal is identified.
 - There is significant variation in how best value is determined which makes it difficult for competitors to know how to prepare their proposals.
 - If the price is variable and the proposed quality, program and scope are variable, the selection process is very complex. Can cost can be isolated? What are the different ways of evaluating the ultimate value? Can you fix a variable or multiple variables? Can the assessment of best value be clarified?

POST-AWARD PROCESS

- How is escalation handled in a changing marketplace?

DESIGN MANAGEMENT

- Olivia noted that design management is an important issue. She observed that owners and designers were exchanging scripts: owners are doing less, Design Build teams are doing more.

IMPLEMENTATION

- How will the guidelines be shared with owners in order to provide them with the appropriate guidance?
- Does the Project Review Committee (PRC) has the right tools to be able to evaluate proposed Design Build projects? Revisions to the application process might be in order.
 - PRC review provides an opportunity for education.

- Should the PRC's review include confirming the alignment of the project budget and scope prior to allowing the agency to proceed with the project?
- Many projects are not reviewed by the PRC because they are administered by owners with agency certification. Certified agencies are reviewed every three years.

APPENDIX/CASE STUDIES

- Evaluating best practices from public owners outside Washington State would contribute to the dialogue.
- UC Irvine has been doing Design Build for twenty-five years. They started with Cost Centered approach (Bridging) which didn't work very well for them, and their process evolved over time.

DRAFT