

PIERCE TRANSIT

BUS RAPID TRANSIT PACIFIC AVENUE/SR7 GC/CM PROJECT

1. Please describe the process whereby Pierce Transit chose the GC/CM method of project delivery for this project. The answers to Question 4 of the application regarding why the GC/CM contracting procedure is appropriate for the project are debatable. The project is typical of those performed by local agencies and state government and would normally be considered for design-bid-build project delivery with a possibility for the use of design-build if schedules were a concern. Many of the coordination and operational impact items mentioned may have a greater likelihood of success with the direct involvement of Pierce Transit early in the project development (prior to advertisement for any professional services, or at least prior to procurement of a GC/CM). The application does not clearly address whether this work has been started by the agency.
2. Has the agency considered using Design Build as a delivery method for this project? The single source of responsibility for design and construction it provides is important on a project of this nature that encompasses various jurisdictions. Using Progressive Design Build would afford the agency control over the design as well as input from the Design-Builder, similar to GC/CM delivery, while at the same time providing the single source of responsibility.

Response:

1. The project has been in planning for several years, however, our board only recently selected the median lane option which has triggered the need for additional work. Of particular note:
 - As a condition of use of WSDOT-owned right of way, WSDOT has required that we perform further evaluations of additional roundabouts in the corridor. These evaluations were recently completed, and it appears that at least four additional roundabouts will be required by WSDOT. That will result in the need for approximately ten more property acquisitions and tens of thousands of square feet of land disturbance that we will need to study
 - As a result, we have just started additional NEPA review in accordance with Federal (Federal Transit Administration) requirements, which may trigger more requirements.

Additionally, our board has also established a goal of beginning revenue service by the beginning of 2023, or about three and a half years from now.

These factors have affected the viability of potential project delivery methods.

Competitive (traditional or bridging) Design Build would not be the most appropriate choice to meet our project goals due to the following reasons:

- This will be Pierce Transit's first BRT project; without a history of this type of infrastructure and service, agency standards and project requirements (design criteria) have not been defined to the level needed to complete a successful competitive Design Build procurement.

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY REVIEW BOARD

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

QUESTIONS RE: APPLICATION

Meeting Date: July 25, 2019

- Without having right of way and environmental permits and commitments defined or in place, it is not possible to define project requirements sufficiently to generate competitive Design Build proposals.
 - Right of way and property acquisition (which cannot be started until NEPA has sufficiently advanced) will not be completed until well into the construction period.
 - We are still early in our discussions with authorities having jurisdiction, who will include WSDOT, City of Tacoma and Pierce County, and likely multiple utility providers, property owners and residents. All may impose additional requirements that cannot yet be defined.
 - Since project scope and requirements will not be finalized until the NEPA review is completed, under most scenarios a Design Build procurement could not be started until well beyond the time needed to meet the project revenue service date.
 - We would need to spend additional months hiring expertise and developing the necessary contracts and technical requirements (or adapting models that exist from DBIA and others) at significant risk to our project schedule.
2. We have not specifically considered Progressive Design Build but similarly would need to spend substantial additional time to adapt this delivery method for Pierce Transit, which would strain our resources and risk our completion date.

We believe that Heavy Civil GC/CM is the best option to address the project issues noted above. Heavy Civil GC/CM delivery of our BRT project not only meets the requirements of RCW 39.10.360 and PRC criteria, but also provides many of the same benefits of Progressive Design Build as outlined in our application. If our application is approved, we will seek a GC/CM who exhibits the same types of collaboration and technical skills that we would expect from progressive design build delivery.

We have developed templates in our current and previous GC/CM projects that will enable us to bring the GC/CM on board quickly and meet our schedule. Since our in-house resources are limited, we have elected to build on our GC/CM experience rather than attempt to build capabilities in a different delivery method on a project with an ambitious schedule.