

WHITE SALMON VALLEY POOL METROPOLITAN PARK DISTRICT – GC/CM PROJECT

– WHITE SALMON VALLEY POOL PLANNING & CONSTRUCTION

1. What experience does Plan B Cost Consultancy LLC have with RCW 39.10 in the state of Washington?
 - *They have CM/GC experience in Oregon and are referring it to be GC/CM which it is not. RCW 39.10 is a much more robust set of rules and regulations than CM/GC in the state of Oregon. There are a lot of projects being referred to as GC/CM when in fact they are CM/GC projects.*

1. PlanB is an entity of Cumming Corp. and currently does not have any active projects within Washington State, however their parent company has extensive experience throughout the state. In familiarizing themselves with the State of Washington rules and regulations located in Chapter 39.10 RCW ALTERNATIVE PUBLIC WORKS CONTRACTING PROCEDURES they are confident that all regulations relating to the CM/GC alternative contracting procedures can be met with oversight by the project team consisting of the White Salmon Valley Pool Metropolitan Park District, PlanB Cost Consultancy, ALSC Architects and the assistance of legal counsel of VanKoten and Cleaveland, LLC. PlanB is quite familiar with the regulations in Oregon State and will apply their knowledge to the specific regulations in Washington.
2. The Owner's rep has extensive experience in Oregon CM/GC delivery, please describe differences between Oregon and WA statutes.

2. PlanB understands that there are similar processes between both states but also several differences that need to be adhered to. The primary difference is GC/CM process is approved by a State level board vs. a local jurisdiction or municipality. We also understand that certain subcontractor values will also need to follow the same process unlike in Oregon. We also acknowledge that although this project is not an extremely complex project, it does fall within the parameters best suited to GC/CM contracting method, there are additional stages to be followed before final contract award.
3. As an owner new to GC/CM, what local owner(s) are you working with to mentor your staff, share best practices, and lessons learned?

3. We have been working with local contractors and suppliers as resources for general construction knowledge and have also established a mentoring relationship with the City of White Salmon who has extensive experience with GC/CM. We also have a working relationship with Columbia Gorge Community College who offered their assistance and guidance as well.
4. What experience does your legal counsel have working with and on GC/CM projects?
 - *It appears they plan on using the AIA 133 and 201 documents. However, without severe modifications, they are not conducive to GC/CM delivery.*

4. We agree that modification of the contract documents may be necessary to comport with the GC/CM process. Our legal counsel has been a municipal and special districts attorney since 2011. In that time, he has been involved in the procurement of design and construction services of many types. Specific projects include the design and construction of a municipal senior center and food bank, health clinic, and a biomass thermal energy research and demonstration center. All of these projects involved strict adherence to the applicable procurement rules for the particular project. We are confident he will be able to follow the procurement rules, identify appropriate modifications, and carry out such in conformance with the procurement guidelines.

5. What is the schedule for the selection of the GC/CM? Are you planning on advertising and completing the entire selection process with protest periods to be done in 1 month?

5. The schedule for the selection process for the GC/CM is as follows, but is subject to change:

Project Advertisement (DJC) – 12/6/20 & 12/9/20

RFP Issued – 12/9/20

Project Information Meeting – 12/16/20

SOQ from interested firms Due – 12/23/20

Notification of Qualified Contractors – 12/30/20

Proposals due – 1/8/21

Interviews (if needed) – 1/15/21

Phase 2 Final Proposals (with fee schedule) – 1/22/21

Notice of successful and unsuccessful firms – 1/25/21

Contract Execution for Preconstruction Services – 1/29/21

6. To what extent will the Proposers' Fee make up the percentage of the total score?

6. After the initial selection process has been completed and the highest ranked finalists have been established, we will request that each firm prepare a final proposal that will include their percentage fees and fixed amounts for general conditions. We anticipate this score to be 15% of the total score.

7. Permitting is scheduled to begin at the same time as design development. Please describe the permitting processes and who will have the responsibility for obtaining each permit type.

7. The permitting process for both permits will be the responsibility of Architectural firm, ALSC Architects. We have scheduled it this way to take advantage of the completed process at the end of design development phase in order to streamline and fast track the process. We have made note that the Water Recreation Facility permit issued through the Health Department is a long lead time item and the District will assist the architect in obtaining this permit.

8. It appears this project is only 26% funded at time of application. What is the contingency plan if state grants, private foundation grants, RCO grant and local donations do not manifest fully or according to the proposed schedule? Is there a drop dead date identified to cancel the project?

8. To date, the complete project is over a quarter funded: funding is in place for the architectural and project management consultant services. This funding also includes a budget allowance for the GC/CM preconstruction services. The District hopes to have final project funding in place by the time the design process is complete and the GMP has been established. The District will re-assess the project status moving forward at this time. This is another reason why using the GC/CM method is appropriate for this project.