September 25, 2023

TO:	Todd Trepanier, P.E. Regional Administrator
THRU:	Larry Larson, P.E. Assistant Regional Administrator for Development
FROM:	Terrence Lynch, P.E. Project Engineer
SUBJECT:	XL5905; US 395/NSC Sprague to Spokane River MP 157.93 – 158.55 Stage 3 Sprague Avenue to Alki Avenue <b>Delivery Method Approval</b>

The purpose of the memorandum is to obtain your approval and endorsement to utilize the Design-Bid-Build delivery method for the above project. Please provide your signature for approval on the attached Matrix approval form and forward on for endorsement as appropriate.

## **Project Description**

The North Spokane Corridor (NSC) Project is an I1 Urban Mobility project within the city of Spokane. As part of the NSC series of projects, this stage will construct twin elevated structures from Alki Avenue (northern extents) to Sprague Avenue (southern extents). The work will also include grading, utility relocations, retaining walls, drainage, minor paving, sidewalks, and channelization of some City of Spokane Streets.

## Conclusion

The Final Project Delivery Method Selection Checklist was completed for this project. The method indicated from the responses was a Design-Bid-Build. With Region approval on the attached checklist, the project will proceed with utilizing the Design-Bid-Build delivery method.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at 509-324-6189 or LynchTe@wsdot.wa.gov.

## **Final Project Delivery Method Selection Checklist**

Pro	pject US395/NSC Sprague to Spokane River Stage 3 (Sprague to Alki)	Date:	10/14/20	22				
י_	Title: WIN: F0001							
Rc	Route: US 395 PIN: 60015							
M	P(s): 157.52 - 157.93	· ·	additional PIN		t bott	om or	r	
(	Cost: \$67,329,179 attached to this form.							
Pa	rt I — RCW 47.20.785 Project Qualifications for Design-Build Method							
	Are construction activities highly specialized?				Yes	$\boxtimes$	No	
Are there complex staging, maintenance of traffic, constraints, risks, etc. that will affect the								
2. construction methodology?       □ Yes         3. Does the project provide opportunity for greater innovation & efficiencies between the designer & □ Yes							No	
	Would use of DB result in significant reduction to the overall project schedule or critical mi	-					No	
	(es was selected for any of questions 1 through 4 above, Design-Build is a viable PDM option				105		110	
	No was selected for <u>all</u> of the questions 1 through 4 above, it indicates Design-Bid-Build as th	-	-	oriz	ztion	ı Lev	/el	
list	red at end of form.							
Pa	rt II — Project Questions							
	A. Are there 3rd party agreements with local government or agencies that require a full of	lesign be	fore				No	
	<b>execution?</b> (Is a significant portion of the project impacted?)							
	Justification: UPRR and BNSF require approximately 60% to 75% design to review before		g the C&M	Agr	reen	nent		
	<ul> <li>B. Are there long lead, lengthy environmental permits or ROW issues that would delay st Construction? (Is a significant portion of the project impacted?)</li> </ul>	art of	C		Yes		No	
	Justification: Commercial property requires longer lead time		L		1			
Ш	C. Is early obligation of funds necessary? (Such as a deadline to obligate grant funding)		F				Vac	
$\supset$					NO		Yes	
	Justification:							
Ш	D. Is there time to prepare 100% design?		[	×ι	Yes		No	
СН								
S (	Justification:							
	E. Is there a need to compress the schedule?		E		No		Yes	
	Justification:							
	F. Do funding limits restrict when the schedule can start?							
	(Such as the Biennium)		[	י ב	Yes	$\mathbf{X}$	No	
	Justification:							
	G. Are there significant risks that could be better managed by others than WSDOT?							
Z			Ľ	׾	No		Yes	
0	Justification:							
$\vdash$	H. Does the project involve specialty engineering or high-tech designs or have other oppo	ortunities	s for	×I	No		Yes	
V/	innovation?			. ב			105	
O V A	Justification:							
Z	<ol> <li>Does the project require complex phasing and staging with the possibility of high impa nublic?</li> </ol>	icts to th	e	X I	No		Yes	
& INN	public?							
Š	Justification: J. Does an existing road or facility need to remain in service? (no options for detour, or no alt	to to faci						
ТΥ	J. DOES AN EXISTING FOAD OF TACHITY NEED TO FEMALE IN SERVICE? (no options for detour, or no alt available, and a significant portion of the project is impacted)	ernate raci	lity [	X I	No		Yes	
XIT	Justification:		L		I			
ΕX	K. Is WSDOT willing to give up control of design and/or construction on this project?							
РГ					$\boxtimes$	Yes		

## **Final Project Delivery Method Selection Checklist**

Part II — Project Questions						
$\mathbb{N}$	Justification:					
СО	L. Are critical 3rd party involvement and changes likely during design & construction?		🛛 Yes	🗆 No		
	Justification: Children of the Sun Trail geometry not determined, ROW					
<b>DST</b>	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		
С	Justification:					
	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.					
Pro	Project Delivery Method indicated from the responses to the questions in Part III (above)Score:103					
	🖾 DBB 🛛 DB 🖓 Inconclusive					

The project cost is:

- □ less than \$25 million get Authorization Level 1 (below)
- Section 25 million or greater, but less than \$100 million get Authorization Levels 1 & 2 (below)
- **\$100 million or greater** Workshop to get Authorization Levels 1 & 2 (below)

Final Project Delivery Method Selected					
🛛 Design-Bid-Build	Design-Build				
Authorization Level 1					
Project Engineer		Digitally signed by Terrence W.			
Name: Terrence Lynch		Signature: Date: 2023.07.26 13:58:09 -07'00'			
PDE/EM Manager					
Name:		Signature:			
Authorization Level 2					
<b>Regional Administrator</b>					
Name: Todd Trepanier		Signature:			

Attach project information, assumptions and additional justification to Form