Washington State University
Design-Build Forum
"Design-Build – Traditional vs. Progressive – Best of Both"

The following represents the concepts and content recorded by WSU representatives at each of the tables in response to the topics and questions posed for conversation at the Forum. They are not a direct record of all comments made.

Traditional vs. Progressive (assuming that the honorarium is equivalent to the amount of work required):

Pros of progressive:

a. Reasonable cost to compete.
b. Affords the Design-Build team early access to Owner.
c. No design without Owner present.
d. The limited cost to compete means that smaller firms can compete.
e. Develops trust (trust factor).
f. Potential for better team chemistry.
g. Less work for Owner up front.
h. More value/ opportunities.
i. Owner can be involved in consultant and subcontractor selection. Helps reduce going in the wrong direction with Owner involvement.
j. DB participates in Owner Project Requirements - if brought on board before program.
k. Best when the Owner knows what they want.
l. DB at risk later in the process.
m. Has the potential to explore other options - Program as you go rather than being handed the program.
n. Progressive is good for function driven projects.

Pros of Traditional:

a. Good for your non-traditional buildings that need creativity.
b. Traditional is good for form driven projects.
c. There is energy and dedicated time for creativity.
d. Well-defined rules and program certainty equate to sucess.
e. Drives innovation sooner.
f. Competition drives value.

g. Earlier alignment of cost and concept.

h. Requires more early work by the Owner.

i. True test drive of the team.

j. Architects like the thrill but not the cost.

k. Allows newcomers a better opportunity to compete by giving an opportunity to wow the Owner based upon the presentation. Allows them to enter into new markets.

How do we control the level of effort to contain the cost of competition?

a. Set the time limits and don't deviate. Allows people to spend more time and money if you extend.

b. Post RFQ/Pre-RFP Meeting with all teams at the table to discuss the rules of the game.

c. Evaluate the team on the ability to follow direction of cost and scope for design effort. Criteria needs to be subjective.

d. Detailed design is required regardless of level of design requested in order to validate the cost. To truly be able to limit the design - Cost Validation needs to be delayed. Decouple the guaranteed cost of the design.

e. Since nothing is reality based in the beginning, how do we evaluate DB team's future performance?

f. Consider penalties. Do not reward behavior - IE penalize teams who deliver beyond the deliverables.

g. Narrow the proposing teams from three to two.

h. Score the propriety meetings separately.

i. Decrease/limit the time frame for competition.

Perfect Project scenario:

a. Process to get to a positive outcome:

1. Have FUN,
2. Happy Client,
3. Make money,
4. Exceed expectations,
5. Establish conditions of satisfaction.

Set the priorities of these goals early on and review.

b. Process:

1. Advance Notice,
2. A3 Keep it simple,
3. Shortlist,
4. Meeting scenario - no presentation - informal.

c. Scenario:

1. Have the DB team part of the programming process,
2. Facilities Team would have one clear voice,
3. DB would get to meet the selection committee up front,

4. Meetings would be held at the DB's Offices,
5. State funds would be available at one time, not split into biennia.
6. Celebrate milestones - many and often,
7. Hackathon - BIM related.

d. Scenario:

1. A-Team from each firm,
2. Owners Project Requirements,
3. Budget Clarity,
4. Strong Owner governing,
5. Social investment,
6. Share design responsibility amongst team,
7. High performance design,
8. Total cost of ownership,
9. Target value design.

How to do it "better, faster, cheaper"?

a. Look at different design options with pros and cons to decide direction.

b. Have MEP Subs and other critical trades on board early – Subject Matter Experts. Tap into trade expertise.

c. Require a good Design Manager.

d. Periodically hold partnering meetings.

e. Owner needs to have the right people answering questions.

f. Have the DB Team be part of the programming process.

g. IPD - Integrated Project Delivery.

h. Owner, Builder and A/E co-locate. Team solely dedicated to one project.

i. Better is very subjective and interpreted through the lens of the interested party - Operations consider "better" the O&M through LifeCycle of the project, DB may consider team dynamics as "better", Etc.

j. Transparency in numbers - Update contingency weekly thru accurate risk matrix.

k. Target Value Design with Incentives.

Recommendations for Future Topics:

a. Validation Phase. - Length, deliverables, expectations.

b. Mock-ups During Competition.

c. Progressive Best Value - How do you measure?

d. Case Studies.

e. Alignment of funding with process.