

# AGENDA

Design Build Push Button Task Team

Turnpike Headquarters, Turkey Lake Room 3001

February 19, 2020 1:00 pm - 4:00 pm

- Greeting and Introductions

*Summary Notes: Attendees Present were:*

*Robert Grimsley, Kati Sherrard, Felipe Jaramillo, Dan Egan, Vince Vacchiano, Amir Asgarinik, Jo Ellyn Guthrie, Larry Ritchie, Latashi Kitchen, Suzannah Ray*

*Teleconference: Amy Tootle, Lou Buenaventura, Dan Hurtado, Kevin Reichart, Ananth Prasad*

- Background on the Design Build Push Button program

*Summary Notes: Larry provided background of the Design-Build Pushbutton program which was established in 2009 with an agreement with FHWA to get small safety projects under contract quickly.*

- Goals of the DBPB Task Team

*Summary Notes: Larry discussed the goals of the Design-Build Pushbutton Task Team.*

*Goals will be to move on the low hanging fruit to get done very quickly, then long term goals to help improve the process.*

*D5– would like to know how everyone is using PB contracts. D5 is using all different types: roadway, drainage, etc. may be encountering different problems depending on how it is used.*

*D7 – signal lane, extensions, safety related, turn lane improvements (didn't go out of traffic ops)*

*D1 – design & construction in same office, both involved through the entire process. Get work done quickly. Very beneficial. Pay item list too large. Doing projects with lower bid items because that's all district can afford to do. Drainage is the bulk of D1 projects. May need to do a standalone pushbutton for each type of work (drainage, etc)*

*Felipe – When projects are not focused, don't know what to expect. Had to have pay items added (marine for D1 structures maintenance).*

*Larry – original intent was traffic safety. Discussing idea of targeted DB PB projects. Drainage related DB projects. May be able to bid on them more appropriately.*

*Dan – come up with multiple project rough scopes & then bid. Issue with D1 is size of districts. Split districts up into a north & south. Limiting bidding pool from doing it districtwide.*

*Vince – struggle to get multiple WOs completed on time.*

*Felipe – want to build the jobs at a price the owner is comfortable with. Need to get focused. Unknowns – drainage is big one. If District's are not sure of scope, its hard bid appropriately. Some pay items have components that are incidental to construction – incidentals should be listed in the contract.*

*Kati – identify those items & pay individually. Anything above is paid separate after contract is executed.*

*D1 – bid 20% Design fee for everything but other districts bid different % for each item.*

**Action:** Reduce the MPIL, develop TWOs and DBPB projects to focus on specific project types instead of a standard for all types.

- **Task Work order amounts and durations**

*Summary Notes: process review in D7, need more time and money. Haven't accounted for inflation. More complex & lots of components. Will have to run through management for safety & FHWA for federal. Still working within DBPB contract. Have ability to stretch this out.*

*D1, D5, D7 - problems with mast arms procurement. 1.5 years. 1.5 – 2 M*

*Felipe – 2.5 M – 1.5 years.*

*Larry – flex time for procurement of materials.*

*Vince – designers & contractors don't want to do this. Eats up a lot of time*

*Robert – SA for time to finish*

*D1 – time ext request – just submit a letter (this is a contract change)*

*Lou – steel and aluminum items long lead time.*

*Felipe – Fed highway – look online at standard boilerplate for TWO*

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

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

*Summary Notes: concerns with percentages too low.*

*Felipe – designers would like to negotiate each TWO and do away with percentages. Design fees are higher than the percentages being used.*

*Larry – negotiate but with a ceiling?*

*Dan – fixed percentage per pay item amount*

*Mobilization & MOT – Felipe - both 10%. Heavy PM required. 2 PM on each DBPB contract. Mob starting to be an issue. People are biggest \$\$\$. Recommend increase*

*Vince – D5 has 1 contractor PM on each contract*

*Kati -paying a significant amount for MOT*

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

- Constructability Analysis – streamlining the process

*Summary Notes: process is too lengthy; not cost effective*

*Felipe – geotech, R/W, utility, SUE can stop a job. Ones that don't trigger any of those four, constructability is not needed. 2% only covers writing the report. Doesn't make sense. Timing of the const analysis requires time so 30 days is not long enough. Should be pass or fail. Spending time & money that is not required. Recommendations – more selective & pay more. Working in very urban environments takes money up front*

*Dan – Not enough SUE is being completed like required on any other job due to the funding.*

*Larry – any value in paying for items separately? Will take a look at language in the RFP & ways to show intent. Longer goal – incorporating pay items to meet what districts need to meet the same function without having to generate report.*

*Split TWO – undertake procurement on initial set of tasks. Any additional TWO, Progressive DB. Negotiate design & then construction separately. Incorporating pay-items instead of CA?*

**Action:** *Get more feedback from other districts*

- Stipends

*Summary Notes: only ASDB procurement that doesn't pay stipends.*

*Felipe – Contractor is paying designer during procurement.*

*Dan – a lot of work for a designer without ample compensation.*

*Larry – look into why stipends are not used on DBPB jobs. Kati believes there were 15K stipends on the first PB, but Dept did away with them after.*

*Vince - would like to investigate different ways to incentivize contractors into ways to get the job done early.*

**Action:** Look into the history of why stipends aren't paid on PB contracts and if Dept. will be able to pay in the future. Possibly adding an incentive for Firms if they complete the project early.

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

*Summary Notes: possible eliminating or removing the MPIL? Initial tasks have a traditional procurement and then negotiate design fee for remaining TWOs.*

*Dan – look at all PB jobs to see which pay items have never been used.*

*Felipe – fewer pay items means less room for mistake for estimator. Adding pay items through an SA should be easy. Don't know how to minimize risks with adding a pay item.*

*SCO – work with districts to get the number pay items down & get more focused*

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

- **CPPR for Design Build Push Button**

*Summary Notes: does dept management get scored on DBPB like other jobs? NO for each task only per contract. No issue with CPPR on DBPB contracts if it is for the contract and not per Task Work Order.*

*Dan asked “No CPPR on anything under a certain amount and anything under 1 year??”*

*Felipe – would have to create PB guidelines for grading*

*No issues with CPPR for PB contracts – NOT per TWO*

**Action:** Look for rules on CPPR, time constraints

- RFP review (homework)

*Summary Notes: Everyone look at RFP; review & provide feedback.*

*Possibly develop different PB RFP (Safety, state funds – drainage repair).*

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

- Setting our next meeting

*Summary Notes: May or June. Survey Monkey – allow group to select multiple dates instead of only 1 date, rotate the location of meeting*

**Action: Set up next meeting**