

## **Questions for Metro Parks Tacoma – GCCM**

### **Reference: Eastside Community and Aquatics Center**

#### **Organization**

1. PRC website data indicates that City of Tacoma was re-certified for GCCM project delivery, such recertification expiring on 1/26/15. There does not appear to be any posted update to this status. Please clarify. Is Tacoma Metro Parks a 'separate' owner/agency from the City of Tacoma?
2. Page 11 within the application includes an 'Organization and Responsibilities matrix' for the project. Please clarify/comment as to the following aspects/data on this chart:
  - What distinguishes 'light red' shaded responsibility from 'dark red' responsibility?
  - A/E has only 'Input and concur' role/responsibility during construction-no approval authority under AIA or contract anticipated?
  - PM advisor [Parametrix?] is designated as 'primary' during construction-along with the owner. Please clarify these responsibilities versus the GCCM.
  - Project Org. Chart indicates total FTE of .2 [Dugan and Cody] for both design and construction phases of the project, and yet Parametrix is assigned as 'Primary' in responsibility virtually throughout the project's duration; please clarify.
3. From the application, it looks like 80% of Jeremy Woolley's time will be dedicated to this project. What will the remaining 20% be spent on?
4. Please provide a listing of each individual's GCCM experience for ARC Architects Stan Lotking, Emily Wheeler, Paul Curtis and Coreen Van Ausdell.
5. Please explain in what is meant by and how you intend to "encouragement of teaming and joint-venture arrangements by proposers" under the GCCM Procurement.

#### **Schedule**

1. Page 18 summary bar chart schedule indicates 'Site Access' construction occurring over the summer of 2016 prior to the MACC negotiation; is this accomplished by the GCCM under a 'mini-MACC' arrangement/vehicle?
2. Page 6 within the application indicates that the existing water line crossing the site must stay in operation throughout construction while page 8 indicates that a new water transmission line will be constructed as a part of the project; please clarify.
3. Please comment/clarify phasing/scheduling strategies as to anticipated construction phasing needs versus funding availability. See also below, RE: funding.

## Funding

1. What is the *current* MACC for the project? Page 14 within the application refers to 'early MACC's and budgets' to be established [prior to MACC negotiations], but no details as to apportionment or timing of any anticipated 'early MACC's' or partial 'mini-MACC's' to accommodate phased construction; please comment/clarify.
2. Page 3 within the application addresses funding status indicating that just over 40% of the anticipated 30.8mm\$ project cost has been 'secured'. Please clarify/ comment with respect to:
  - Are bond funds referred to as having been approved in 2014 by the voters in hand and included in the 12.4mm\$ as secured?
  - How will acquisition [or not] of 3mm\$ anticipated private [donation] Foundation funds impact either design or construction schedule?
  - What impacts to design and/or construction are anticipated by either timing or success of Federal fundraising?
3. Incomplete funding, how are you conveying this to prospect GCCM responders and what are the consequences to the project and the successful GCCM if the full funding is not received? There appears to be \$18 million unfunded needs, this would represent an entirely different scope and complexity of project if these funds are not received or are only partially received.

### Per page 9:

a\r\c\Architects is only under contract for planning and schematic design which ends in December 2105. "the District has an option to extend their services..." While experienced in recreation center work, they appear to have no GC/CM experience. Without a design firm under contract, the owner team appears to be incomplete.

There is no timeline shown for the acquisition of the funds need to complete the project yet DD starts in January 2016 with a MACC due in Nov 2016. With a projected \$3M in fundraising and \$15M in Federal funding, there appears to be a significant risk to the owner as well as the GC/CM.

Per page 5: Agency Approvals

There is no listing for any Federal approvals. The Project Schedule shows about 3 1/2months for Permit Approvals which might be OK for Tacoma as they are a partner but seems optimistic for any federal approvals.

### General observation:

Parametrix staff has a 5-10% role and have the strongest component of GC/CM experience. Parametrix looks to be the critical component in the successful use of GC/CM for the project.

Funding issues are a significant concern.