

# CPARB Data Collection Schedule Update

Dec. 8, 2016

## Background

[RCW 39.10.230](#) directed the Capital Projects Advisory Review Board (CPARB) to develop and administer questionnaires designed to provide quantitative and qualitative data on alternative public works contracting procedures on which evaluations are based.

In 2011, the [last data analysis](#) was completed by the Washington State Department of Enterprise Services (DES) and it was determined that the data was not usable because it was incomplete and the data set was too small to test for significance or correlation. Following 2011 the data collection was suspended due to severe budget cuts.

In 2013, the [JLARC Report: Alternative Public Works Procedures Sunset Review](#) recommended that CPARB rethink its approach to collecting project information and include GCCM subcontractor information. Following this recommendation CPARB initiated a Data Collection Committee that created the attached CPARB Data Collection Proposal. CPARB determined the proposed data will be meaningful to assist CPARB in making policy recommendations to the Legislature. CPARB approved the proposal in November 2015.

DES had been attempting to piggyback the data collection site on a new system being created for E&AS but the implementation timeline became too protracted.

## Current Plan

Since May of 2016, DES has been working with the University of Washington (UW) to host an on-line data collection system anticipated to be "live" by Spring 2017. DES will provide customer service with direct contact with public owners. UW will provide technical support.

DES staff will update the CPARB Data Collection Effort webpage with current information and provide a link to the data collection system when ready.

## Schedule

Sept. 2016	Beta started
Feb. 2017	Show draft to CPARB for opportunity for comment
Mar.-May	Go Live

## Budget

\$50,000

# CPARB Data Collection Proposal

(Approved Nov. 2015)

The information about Design Build and GC/CM projects is to be collected and the intent of the information is to assist CPARB with the following issues:

1. Is the process fair and open to a broad range of business in Washington State?
2. Is there correlation between outreach plans and the level of participation of Small Business/DBE businesses?
3. Do we see any trends in the project reports that we could help to drive proposed legislative changes?
4. Do we see best practices or training needs that could assist organizations in presenting their information during upcoming training?

## **1. Project Set Up**

Information entered at the time the project is funded (Certified Public Body or PRC Applicant will submit)

- Name of Public Body
- Name of Project
- Project Budget
- Does this project plan to use a Small Business/DBE outreach plan?
- Construction Period (m/year to m/year)

## **2. Design Build or GC/CM Selection**

Information entered on the Design builder or GC/CM selection within two months of contract execution between Public Body and D/B or GC/CM

- Number and names of firms responding to RFQ
- Number and names of firms selected for interviews
- Names of firms selected to submit to RFP
- Name of awarded contract

## **3. Subcontractor Identification - GC/CM- Design Build**

Information entered after substantial completion of project

- Number and names of firms responding to subcontract bid requests
- Names of the selected firms.
- Information on project contractor and subcontractors submitted to Labor & Industries regarding intents and affidavits.

## **4. Post Project Team Report:** (Less than 500 words)

Information entered within 2 months of final completion of project. The Project team is defined as the Owner, A/E, Contractor and any consultants and subcontractors who would be willing to participate.

- The project team is required to answer the following questions:
  1. What were the best practices on this project?
  2. Are there any suggested modifications to Public Works Legislation (RCW 39.10) that would have helped the project be more successful?
  3. Did the project team discover there were areas/topics where additional training would have helped the project be more successful? What were those areas/topics?