

**The following are questions to be sent to Kurtis Kingsolver at City of Tacoma for their Public Body DB Certification:**

- 1) On page 4 of the application it is noted that, "Project progress schedules consisting of a network analysis using the Critical Path Method are required for projects of significant size". Please clarify what "significant size" means and whether or not City of Tacoma Project Staff use standard criteria when determining that project schedules with the Critical Path Method will be required. If so, please provide the criteria used.
- 2) Section 2 Contracting Method Assessment and Approval Process: Can you address where is the internal Public Works DB related experience and qualifications considered?
- 3) Section 3 Project Delivery Knowledge and Experience: Please explain the types, structure of your DB contract utilized and provide a short explanation of your procurement process of for DB projects.
- 4) Please describe the types of Design Build procurement you have utilized—Progressive, Best Value, and Low Bid. Has the City's DB procurements utilized bridging documents?
  - a. In your opinion, for Best Value procurements, how important is the development of an accurate program and budget?
  - b. For Best Value procurements, how does the city establish the required DB team deliverables and how is the weighting and scoring established?
- 5) Section 3, Honorarium Determination:
  - a. Best value as well as other performance goals were listed as criteria for selection of the DB team for the Murray Morgan Bridge project. That would likely require a significant design and estimating effort on the part of proposing teams. The honorarium was listed as \$100,000 for each of the unsuccessful teams. One of the three shortlisted firms dropped out prior to the proposal submittal date so only one honorarium was paid. DB best practice discussions indicate an honorarium of \$100,000 for a \$47,000,000 project is likely far short of the design and estimating effort required. For DB to be sustainable, compensation in relation to the effort required must be provided.

In the lessons learned process did the City inquire why the one team dropped out? Was the relative lack of compensation part of the reason?

Has the City considered reducing the deliverable requirements on future projects or basing selection more on team qualifications to better fit the scope of a \$100,000 honorarium ?

Has the City considered increasing the honorarium on future projects to be more consistent with the fee schedule for schematic design?

- b. Has the City considered alternative approaches to balance cost of requirements in its proposals and submittals.
- c. DB Honorarium Determination- The cost to compete for Design Build projects has been an issue receiving significant attention during the last few years. As potential DB teams turn away from other agency projects due to the financial risk during competition, how is the City of Tacoma capturing this information so that the honorarium can in fact be adjusted to generate meaningful competition? Is the City taking any other measures to address the financial risk to ensure meaningful competition?

- 6) Section 8, Ability to Properly Manage the Public Body's Capital Facilities Plan: Of the approximately 225 projects over the next six years, are there any planned DB projects in the next 3 recertification years?
- 7) Section 8, Where in Capital Facilities Planning Process is the determination made to recommend use of DB?