

# PRC PROJECT PRESENTATION QUESTIONS

– DECEMBER 5, 2019 –

## ***City of Richland – Fire Station #73 and #75 – Design Build***

1. There are three types of Design Build; Traditional, Progressive and Bridging. Please clarify which type of Design Build you intend to utilize.

We will utilize Progressive Design Build for this project. This is the same method we used for our two previous Design Build projects.

2. Without the benefit of more detailed budget information and assuming you have imbedded within your total construction cost a construction contingency in the 5% to 7% range, it appears as though your combined “Owners and Design” contingency is in the range of 4% and 4.2% of total construction cost, your “Building and On-Site” construction costs per square foot are in the range of \$310/SF to \$320/SF of total construction cost, which means your “Building Only” cost per square foot is in the \$290/SF to \$300/SF of total construction cost. Given the “essential facility” nature of both fire stations, which drives more stringent design and building complexities, the overall budget and the contingencies appear to be inadequate. Please clarify the adequacy of the proposed budget regarding the proposed projects.

The general breakdown of our budget for this project is based on the outcome of the Fire Station 74 Design Build project completed in 2015, with an escalation factor included. That project was also an essential facility and included the same complexities. It should also be noted that upon project completion, there was a small surplus of funds that was returned to the owner by the Design Build team.

The subsequent City Hall project budget was modeled similarly to that of Fire Station 74, and easily met the City’s quality expectations. We have been very intentional in our approach to Target Value Design, and will continue the same for the proposed Fire Station #73 & #75 project. We set our budget, and work together with the Design Build team to design to that value. We recognize and accept that the decisions we make during design could result in reduced square footage of the final facility, but will not sacrifice the essential facility requirements.

Because we are heavily involved in the design and construction process, we are able to identify potential risks early, thus reducing the amount of contingency budget required. While the budget information we’ve provided is only an estimate at this point, we are confident that it is sufficient for the needs of this project.

3. Within the last paragraph of Section 4, you describe the benefit of two facilities under one contract – that being your ability to “stagger the schedules to utilize the same crews and subcontractors to work on both stations back to back”. In Attachment C, Proposal Schedule, you show only one schedule titled Fire Stations #73 and #75, indicating both projects are planned to be done concurrently. Please clarify what you intend to do regarding project scheduling. If the direction you intend to go is to stagger or overlap the two projects, then, please clarify the Project Organization Charts people and % of assignment to each project.

Please see the attached revised schedule with a potential 2-month staggered construction start. We expect DB teams will propose different approaches for staggering projects based on availability of their own forces, as well as how they would approach scheduling of subcontractors. We also recognize it is possible that a DB team may propose to complete both facilities simultaneously.

4. In Section 6, City of Richland Darrin Sweeney is proposed as the on-site Project Manager and Hill International Becky Blankenship is proposed as the 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Project and Construction Manager. Please clarify the difference between the two titles and roles. In addition, the Attachment B Project Organization Chart indicated Becky Blankenship as the primary Project Manager while the individual role descriptions indicate Darrin Sweeney is the Primary Project Manager. Please clarify who is the single point of Project Management responsibility on each project.

Becky’s role as the 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Project and Construction Manager is considered a higher level of oversight, including review of payment applications and budget estimates, support in preparing and executing any Change Orders, and a general assessment of how the project is being executed within the requirements of RCW 39.10.

Darrin’s role is much more involved, as he will be onsite on a daily basis. He will serve as the City of Richland’s Primary Project Manager and single point of Project Management responsibility for each project.

5. In Section 6, the last sentence in the Becky Blankenship sentence is incomplete. Please complete the sentence.

The sentence should read: “Becky Blankenship has been a certified Design Build Professional for 7 years.”

6. Referencing Item No. 4 of the Application: It states that the DB team will need to work with Bonneville Power, Richland Energy & Public Works, and WSDOT to relocate utilities and manage easements... how/why is it more beneficial for the

project to have the DB team perform these tasks versus The City of Richland (with established easement & permit relationships) in a D-B-B procurement?

The intent is for both the City of Richland and the DB team to work together in performing these tasks. While the City does indeed have established relationships with these entities, we feel it would be beneficial for the DB team to be directly involved in the coordination so that they have direct knowledge of the agreements made and how they could potentially affect the design.

7. Referencing Item Nos. 4 & 5 of the Application: It states that the DB delivery method will reduce the overall project duration... What is your estimate of time (and/or cost) savings of utilizing DB procurement versus traditional?

Our estimate of cost and time savings is based on our previous DB projects, particularly Fire Station 74. Based on this historical data, along with current Fire Station engineer estimates provided for neighboring cities, we estimate the potential cost savings to be well above 10 percent. We estimate a time savings of approximately 3 months based on a phased plan review and permitting process.