

AGENDA

Design Build Push Button Task Team

Microsoft Teams Meeting

June 11, 2020 1:00 pm - 3:00 pm

- Greeting and Introductions

Summary Notes: Attendees Present were:

Walter Kloss, Amy Scales, Amir Asgarinik, Vince Vacchiano, Jo Ellyn Guthrie, Robert Grimsley, Lou Buenaventura, Arielle Zazik, Kati Sherrard, Dan Egan, Ananth Prasad, Dan Hurtado, Joe Santos, Scott Arnold, Larry Ritchie, Latashi Kitchen, Suzannah Ray

- Background on the Design Build Push Button program

Discussion Point: Still seeing DBPB projects used in different ways all to accomplish increased safety. Continue discussion on the pros and cons of creating different types of DBPB projects with more specific scopes.

Summary Notes:

Larry provided an update to the group. Design-Build Pushbutton is being used in a variety of different ways but centered around Design-Build Pushbutton safety. The group discussed having a menu of Design-Build Pushbutton options but having specific criteria for Design-Build Pushbutton safety jobs. SCO will look at trying to come up with a way to utilize state funds and federal funds. With this, districts would be able to utilize Design-Build Pushbutton for a wide variety of projects. Some of the group was hesitant since separate procurements for projects that are not safety projects may not create a lot of interest due to the small size.

D1 is considering separate contracts for types of work (Safety, Roadway/Drainage, and Signalization/Lighting/ITS). They are also considering separating the contracts for the southern 6 counties and the northern 6 counties. Due to challenges with managing these contracts, D1 is not considering both at this time (either separate by type of work or separate by location). Industry was not sure how it would all work and some have issues with breaking the districts up. D1 is trying to find the best way to do this and is requesting feedback from the Design-Build Pushbutton task team. D1 may look at breaking the district up to north and south or having the 3 categories, but not both.

Action: SCO will get with management to discuss.

- Task Work order amounts and durations

Action: *Discuss increasing the contract time and amounts with Management and FHWA.*

Summary Notes:

Larry informed the group the request has been made to increase TWOs to 1.5 million and 18 months. Some concerns were raised with not having advance notice on when and how many TWOs are issued the second year. It takes more effort with some concept plans to identify the cost. Issues with the cost of SUE was also discussed. Industry would like to see SUE paid for outside of the design fee.

- Design, Mobilization and Maintenance of traffic costs in the RFP

Action: *Discuss possibly negotiating price per project, fixed fee/percentage for design fee.*

Summary Notes:

Larry notified the group the request to increase design fees was sent to management for review. Larry requested industry and districts provide numbers/justification that the fees being charged and paid are not covering the costs. Industry is not in favor of negotiating design fees and is requesting a set number.

Action: Industry and districts to provide information/justification for increased design fees within the next month.

- Constructability Analysis – streamlining the process

Action: *Get more feedback from other districts.*

Summary Notes:

Larry asked the group how the Constructability Analysis is used. It was discussed at the last meeting to simplify or streamline the Constructability Analysis so it would be a pass/fail. From the meeting today, it does not sound feasible. Districts have had issues with the Constructability Analysis. This section of the RFP needs the most work. Industry has concerns with coming up with quantities and researching what it takes to build a project from the concept plans. If districts were to reduce the amount of work required, the design fee should reflect that.

Action: SCO to revise the Constructability Analysis section.

- Stipends

Action: Look into the history of why stipends are not paid on Design-Build Pushbutton contracts and if Department will be able to pay in the future. Possibly adding an incentive for Firms if they complete the project early.

Summary Notes:

Larry informed the group SCO is looking into the stipend calculation and why stipends are not paid for Design-Build Pushbutton projects. D1 questioned the group with regards to having a scope of work, no initial TWOs, and not having to submit plans. The districts could provide a tentative list of projects, but no plans. Stipends would not be needed. Industry thinks it may be more difficult to attract interest as subcontractors would not have anything to look at. Larry mentioned there is nothing in the statute that prohibits the Department from paying stipends on Design-Build Pushbutton jobs. Industry questioned Low Bid Design-Build jobs that include ATCs and why isn't the Department paying stipends on these jobs? Design-Build Pushbutton is adjusted score with no ATCs and no stipends.

Action: SCO will continue to work on stipends.

- Different ways to bid DBPB (Master Pay item List)

Action: Review the MPIL to find items that haven't been used in years and possibly removing unused items from the MPIL.

Summary Notes:

Larry looked at different ways to bid Design-Build Pushbutton projects but doesn't know that there is much to work with. Bidding on unknowns and tightening up the RFP. Industry suggested having a higher price for future projects and not tying future projects to master pay item list.

- CPPR for Design Build Push Button

Action: Look for rules on CPPR, time constraints

Summary Notes:

The group discussed CPPR. Industry mentioned possibly having a weighted system since most TWOs go well, but there may be one that goes bad. SCO would have to look at a weighted analysis. Administrative issues and federal requirements being the biggest issues for districts.

- RFP review

Action: Sent current RFP to the group to review and provide comments.

Summary Notes:

Larry asked the group to review and provide comments on the current boilerplate Design-Build Pushbutton RFP and to point out items that we need to focus on. SCO is looking into the evaluation and inventory phase which looks like it could be a cut and paste. Some RFPs are very specific, while others just refer to the first phase. Need to separate the first and second phase. Industry noted Design-Build Pushbutton prequalification's have changed over the years and now driving towards joint ventures. Larry informed the group that this is not the Departments intent and will look into it.

- Setting our next meeting

Summary Notes:

Larry thanked everyone for their comments and feedback. SCO will send out a survey monkey for the next meeting.