CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY REVIEW BOARD PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE QUESTIONS RE: APPLICATION

Meeting Date: March 28, 2019

TACOMA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

DOWNTOWN DOWNING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL REPLACEMENT

DB PROJECT

1. How will the project team meet the challenge of several concurrent projects (see page 11 of application) being completed on parallel schedules with the Downtown Downing Elementary School Replacement project?

The District has successfully run/completed concurrent projects throughout the 2013 Bond Program. Each of the District's projects is assigned a full-time project manager who stays with the project from programming through close-out. Each project manager can comfortably handle one project in construction and one project in design. In addition to the project manager, there are internal support staff (administrative, clerical, accounting, etc.) who work with the project manager to make sure that all of the project needs are met. The Executive Director of Planning and Construction conducts weekly project update meetings on each project with each of the project managers and their support staff.

The Downing Elementary School Replacement project has been assigned to Michelle Langi and Dan Cody to provide project management. This team is also assigned to the Boze Elementary School D/B project that recently broke ground and will achieve substantial completion of the building by May of 2020 and substantial completion of a subsequent phase that includes demolition of the existing building and associated sitework by August 2020.

With a February 2020 Bond approval, the earliest that a D/B Agreement would be signed for Downing Elementary would be in April of 2020 and Preconstruction Services would begin. Essentially, there will be a 4-5 month overlap of the two projects with Downing ES is in programming and schematic design and Boze ES wrapping up construction. With the project managers and support staff assigned and available to Downing ES, we see no issues or challenges related to manpower or capacity for this team.

2. Please provide some background why Progressive DB was chosen in lieu of GC/CM project delivery.

We elaborated on some of the benefits of Progressive D/B (PDB) in sections 4 and 5 of the application. Maybe three of the biggest advantages that we see are earlier certainty of cost, decreased owner's risk from A/E errors and omissions and the potential for a shorter delivery schedule.

Certainty of Cost – Change orders during construction provide perhaps the highest risk of overshooting the available budget on both D/B/B and GC/CM delivery. Essentially, in PDB, once the GMP price is agreed upon, the only change orders that would effect the price would come from owner-directed changes in scope or from unforeseen, latent conditions in the ground.

Decreased Risk from A/E E&O – Building on the above, perhaps the highest risk of change orders during construction is from errors and omissions in the bidding and construction documents. In D/B/B and GC/CM, the Owner holds the design team contract and, due to the Spearin Doctrine, upon release of the documents for bidding purposes, the Owner implicitly warrants the suitability of the documents released. Therefore, the Owner is liable for all costs associated with change

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY REVIEW BOARD PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE QUESTIONS RE: APPLICATION

Meeting Date: March 28, 2019

orders resulting from errors and omissions in the documents. In D/B, the contractor holds the contract with the design team and carries the responsibility for the completeness and suitability of the documents, thus reducing the Owner's risk of change order costs.

Delivery Schedule – Experience has shown the team that PD/B delivery method has the potential to substantially reduce the time that it takes to provide programming and design on a project. The District's current project for Boze ES D/B, a similar sized project, was able to go from programming to permit in-hand and breaking ground in 12 months. For similar projects that are delivered D/B/B or GC/CM that timeframe has been running 4-6 months (or more) longer.

3. Page 5 of the application provides a Project Budget, but also states funding is dependent on a capital bond issue being presented to the voters in February 2020. As RCW 39.10.280(2)(c)(iv) requires "necessary and appropriate funding ..." as a condition of project approval by the PRC, please describe funding alternatives that will allow the approval of this project.

The District's team acknowledges the quoted portion of the statutes.

We are applying for approval to utilize PD/B delivery for this project in advance of the full funding required for this project being available.

- We are at the end of the funds that were approved in the 2013 Capital Bond
- The last few projects of the 2013 Capital Bond are currently in design and construction and their final costs (Total Cost of Construction) are still to be determined
- We are unsure of the total actual funds available due to unsteady market conditions and construction escalation that make it difficult to assess remaining funding
- Project funding will dovetail into the Capital Bond Funds that will be presented to the public for voting in February 2020

However, it is the District's intent that no contract will be signed, obligating any parties until after the February 2020 Capital Bond is approved by voters.

The reason for the advanced PRC application for this project is to allow the District team to proceed with PD/B procurement and the ensuing contract negotiations leading up to the Capital Bond approval is purely schedule related. In our experience the PRC approval together with the PD/B procurement process takes approximately 4 ½ months. In order to meet the proposed opening date of Fall 2022 for this facility, we believe that it will be imperative for us to have a "signature ready" contract in-hand in anticipation of the Capital Bond approval by voters. If we were to wait until after the passing of the Capital Bond to begin PRC approval and PD/B procurement, there wouldn't be adequate time in the schedule to design and construct the facility for a Fall 2022 opening, in essence pushing out the opening to the following year.

If the Capital Bond is approved, we will sign a contract with the Design/Builder and we will begin Preconstruction Services in March of 2020. If the Bond is not approved, a contract will not be executed and the Design/Builder would receive an honorarium like the other unsuccessful Finalists.