Final Project Delivery Method Selection Checklist

Project Title: SR 526 Corridor Improvements	Date: 7/31/2019
	WIN: A52604K
Route: SR 526	PIN: 152604K
MP(s):	List any additional PINs at bottom or attached to this form.
Cost: $39.2 million	

Part I — Cost RCW 47.20.785 does not encourage Design-Build for a project contract cost (PE & Construction) less than $2 Million

Is the Project Estimate less than $2 Million?

- ☐ Yes — A selection process and authorization are not required — the delivery method is Design-Bid-Build.
- ☑ No — Continue to Part II

Part II — RCW 47.20.785 Project Qualifications for Design-Build Method

1. Are construction activities highly specialized?	☐ Yes	☒ No
2. Is a DB approach critical in developing the construction methodology?	☐ Yes	☒ No
3. Does the project provide opportunity for greater innovation & efficiencies between the designer & builder? *Due to the location of the project, a strategic construction approach should be considered to minimize impacts to nationally, regionally and locally important employers.*	☒ Yes	☐ No
4. Would use of DB result in significant reduction to the overall project schedule or critical milestones?	☐ Yes	☒ No

If **Yes** was selected for any of questions 1 through 4 above, Design-Build is a viable PDM option. (Go to Part III)

If **No** was selected for all of the questions 1 through 4 above, it indicates Design-Bid-Build as the PDM — get authorization (end).

Part III — Project Questions

SCHEDULE

A. Are there 3rd party agreements with local government or agencies that require a full design before execution? (Is a significant portion of the project impacted?)	☐ Yes	☒ No
Justification: No agreements of this nature are anticipated. Local governments and other stakeholders have been, and will continue to be, included throughout the project.		
B. Are there long lead, lengthy environmental permits or ROW issues that would delay start of Construction? (Is a significant portion of the project impacted?)	☐ Yes	☒ No
Justification: Impacts to environmentally sensitive areas are minimal with either of the proposed designs. No right-of-way acquisition is anticipated but construction easements may be required for work adjacent to the properties.		
C. Is early obligation of funds necessary? (Such as a deadline to obligate grant funding)	☒ No	☐ Yes
Justification: The project is prgrammed to match available funding. Funding can be adjusted to be used later than the programmed time frame but not before.		
D. Is there time to prepare 100% design?	☒ Yes	☐ No
Justification: The currently set advertisement date is January 11, 2021. Final copy of plans, specifications and estimate would need to be received by WSDOT December 28, 2020 to hit that date providing roughly 15 months between preferred alternative selection and advertisement date.		
E. Is there a need to compress the schedule?	☒ No	☐ Yes
Justification: 97% of the construction funds are not available until July 1, 2021 at the earliest. The project's funding is programmed to match the time requried to develop and deliver the project.		
F. Do funding limits restrict when the schedule can start? (Such as the Biennium)	☒ Yes	☐ No

Final Project Delivery Method Selection Checklist

Part III — Project Questions

Justification: 97% of the construction funds are not available until the 2021 - 2023 biennium meaning the majority of work cannot take place until July 1, 2021 at the earliest. There are no restrictions/limitations on that money being spent in later bienniums should construction last longer thatn two seasons but does hinder the project's ability to begin construction early.

COMPLEXITY & INNOVATION

G. Are there significant risks that could be better managed by others than WSDOT? ☒ No ☐ Yes

Justification: Either of the two remaining alternatives proposes to construct alterations to the SR 526/Seaway Blvd. interchange, adds a peak use shoulder largely within the existing pavement footprint and makes improvements to the SR 526/SR 527/SR 99 intersection. A key risk to construction will be finding available work windows which accommodate Boeing's shift changes. A key risk to design/budget is inclusion of noisewalls and extent of ITS. Neither of these risks would likely be managed by others as the RFQ document would likely protect certain days and times through WSDOT coordination with Boeing, necessity of noisewalls is driven by environmental policy, and extent of ITS is ultimately a WSDOT decision.

H. Does the project involve specialty engineering or high-tech designs or have other opportunities for innovation? ☒ No ☐ Yes

Justification: The addition/modification of varying structure types along the corridor allows for some potential for innovation but are not considered specialty or high-tech.

I. Does the project require complex phasing and staging with the possibility of high impacts to the public? ☒ No ☐ Yes

Justification: This project is located along the primary route to and from Boeing's Everett manufacturing plant. This corridor see's commuter traffic from three distinct shifts spread throughout the day along with significant freight operations in off-peak hours for Boeing, Paine Field and industry in the Southwest Everett Industrial Area. In addition, several areas may require work immediately adjacent to residential neighborhoods which could impact quality of life of residents or impact available work hours. Phasing and staging may be affected by the constraints but would likely not require complex planning. These constraints would likely be in place for the contractor regardless of delivery method.

J. Does an existing road or facility need to remain in service? (no options for detour, or no alternate facility available, and a significant portion of the project is impacted) ☐ No ☒ Yes

Justification: SR 526, Seaway Boulevard, and the ramp connection between them are the primary high speed, high volume facility accessing the SW Everett Industrial Area, Paine Field and Boeing Everett Manufacturing Center. Diverting commuter traffic onto adjacent local roadways would cause undue harm to the local traffic operations.

K. Is WSDOT willing to give up control of design and/or construction on this project? ☐ No ☒ Yes

Justification: Complex or specialty design is not anticipated on this project. WSDOT is confident that state forces, the state's consultant or a design-builder's engineer could sufficiently design and construct the project.

L. Are critical 3rd party involvement and changes likely during design & construction? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Justification: 3rd party representatives have been present during the conceptual design phase through stakeholder advisory group meetings, stakeholder interviews, community briefings and 1:1 meetings. Early invovlement of stakeholders has been key to determining the preferred alternative and will reduce the liklihood of changes during design and construction.

COST

M. Is early certainty of the total project cost important? (Increased certainty of total cost early in the project needed due to funding or project constraints) ☐ No ☒ Yes

Justification: The Legislature allocated funding for this project through the 2015 Connecting Washington initiative. Certainty of total cost early in the project is needed to ensure that WSDOT can complete the project within the allocated budget.

Final Project Delivery Method Selection Checklist

Part III — Project Questions			
Sum each column to the right—a checked answer is worth one (1) point. The column with the most points indicates the recommended delivery method.		DBB	DB
Project Delivery Method indicated from the responses to the questions in Part III (above)	Score:	7	6
☒ DBB ☐ DB ☐ Inconclusive			

The project cost is:

- ☐ **less than $25 million** — get Authorization Level 1 (below)
- ☒ **$25 million or greater, but less than $100 million** — get Authorization Levels 1 & 2 (below)
- ☐ **$100 million or greater** — apply Project Delivery Selection Matrix / Workshop

Final Project Delivery Method Selected		
☒ **Design-Bid-Build** ☐ **Design-Build**		
Authorization Level 1		
Project Engineer		
Name: Kyengo Ndile, PE, PMP	Signature:	K Ndile 21 Aug 2019
PDE/EM Manager		
Name: Cathy George, PE	Signature:	8/21/19
Authorization Level 2		
ASCE/ASDE		
Name: Dean Moon, PE	Signature:	Dean R Moon 8/27/2019
Regional Administrator		
Name: ~~Mike Cotton, PE, DBIA~~ **Mike Cotton**, PE, DBIA	Signature:	Mike Cotton 3.10.2020

AR

Attach project information, assumptions and additional justification to Form