

Topic**Feedback**

Procurement/Selection

What should we be asking?

How have you made the project better

How do you manage design confrontation

What are some lessons learned on recent DB Projects

Building performance history

Provide case studies from concept to operation and testimonials

Ask specific questions about the program

What does your team feel are the risks and opportunities in this project

Why did you assemble this team

How is this team going to help us meet our goals

What has this team done to prepare for this project

1. Teaming questions are good. The hardest question is the one you cannot prepare for.

3. "What are you doing to champion growth of the organization"

4. Generally a question that helps distinguish one team from others

5. Continue with the point scoring matrix wsu currently employs

6. Don't restrict the type of work experience to be used as examples of qualification

7. Tailor the questions related to the type of project

8. Include specific concerns of the selection committee within the bio, what would they like to see come out of the

9. Possibly host a "meet the committee members meeting" early in the RFQ process.

During the interview don't ask questions that are in the RFP be more specific

don't ask so many questions in the Q/P

Ask blatantly "How do you differentiate your from other "talented teams"?"

How do you deal with an issue and give an example?

How do you define success?

What can you do to fit project into budget?

Resume - what have you done that is pertinent to this project? Why are they on the team?

How would WSU score the team?

What is the interview worth

How does the team think?

How does the team problem solve?

How do the teams articulate when they have not worked together?

How do you prove the function of design?

How do you prove the team is dedicated to the owner's success?

RCW dictates questions

Regarding RFQ's and RFP's, the questions asked typically focus on what the proposing team is going to do to be successful. I think a more thoughtful question would be "What needs to happen in order for the owner to achieve their goals for the project". Asking this question provides the db team the opportunity to discuss not only what they need to do, but also what they believe the owner, stakeholders and others have to do in order to ensure success.

Fewer bigger questions

Do not like the questions when asked (What has your TEAM Achieved Together) Finds this quest challenging when they may not have worked together before

What makes the right partner

Asking for experience may contradict the promotion of small and disadvantage businesses

Provide us the story on how your team is the one for the project

The more specific the question, the better. Don't ask the "boiler-plate" questions any more than necessary. Ask what you really want to know.

Better Q/P focused question to allow to teams to differentiate themselves. Allow more ability for teams to tell their

Ask "What is the biggest challenge to this project and how would you resolve it?"

If it is a dart throw where's the value? Redundant?

What expertise does each firm bring to create a cohesive project

Similar project experience vs tangential and applicable (overly specific requirements)

Who can execute a DB project really well? Forget the rest

is recurring teams a consideration with selection

team dynamic, common goals, team experience, vs building

metrics of success prove/test the design

Changing of team members -> more tolerance

Does this team have 5+ projects together? (Less favorable question) People jump firms a lot, limits partnering,

Exclusion of specialty consultants can be problematic -> especially for historic, labs, etc

How do you show on paper, past teaming and effort when you have not been selected in the past? That experience and effort should be relevant even though you didn't win.

What can we do to limit the cost to compete?

Shorter RFP deliverable requirements

Could the prep time be shortened (between rfp/rfq) focused effort is cheaper, but less flexible

6 hour interviews are taxing on firms in terms of costs. Majority of the cost is in the interview. Cut overlap in questions.

Shorter # of pages the better. Our group was in favor of A3's. Though one person did mention separating out resumes.
of pages should be related to the money of the project
Perhaps do more to educate selection committees about what to be paying attention to.
Make the interview comfortable; take the team out for lunch, get to know them in an informal setting
Are Zoom meetings necessary? They can be difficult to engage
Do interviews during the RFQ, so the firms know better what we want, and if they really want to spend the time and energy on the SOQ. Make them online interviews to keep costs down.
Progressive has improved the compete cost
Ask for a level of compete cost
Stipend still doesn't cover full cost to compete
Expand team at interview to dilute cost
Bring the trades in early during interview that have a key role, or limit to 2 people in interview
Have the right team at the interview
Owner wants actual team members at the interview
Smaller Team
Strong teams and applications
Reference check validity of team versus judge presentation skills. Interviews can be scary and uncomfortable but the
The team may be "rough" because they are not comfortable presenting.
Too many repeat steps, workshop sessions are most valuable, No interviews after workshop
How does the owner fill when you see a team put a lot of time and dollars into the presentation? Difficult to have
Try to streamline communication, wants and needs. The teams want curve balls and to not know what they're being
Analyze why the teams that did not make the short list to help improve questions to ask
Closed envelope to open In the interview- here's the problem to solve/discuss
How are small firms able to compete with no marketing firm/ the high cost to compete. Stipend not high enough.
Team repeats similar responses on previous questions and loses pages. Too much overlap in process.
No 1 hour long Q&A with specific questions. Allow the proposal to answer specific structured questions.
Let the firm guide the hour
Work on right sizing the interview to the project size scope complexity.
Bring nothing, insist no design work is provided
Limit number of firms involved: Just builder & Architect
One upmanship
Pre-Qual Process
Answer REQ's Questions (By state) during interview
Avoid submittal dates around holidays!!! People are unavailable or harder to assemble

Does the entire selection committee read all of the SOQs and Ps? - Yes
re-invent the process make it more efficient
Open book
The principal may not be seen again on the project but presents at an interview
A new DB team has to do more heavy lifting for an interview versus a team that already knows the owner.
Small projects had the same methodology as the large and it takes a lot of time.
Opening the pool need to take more risk
UW method- Pick the contractor first and together owner and contractor select design team
WSU request may be stale
Engage the creativity of the team. Example: for a baseball stadium project, ask the team to describe the Flyball rules in 20 words or less.
Ask for a list of preferred subs in the RFP response.
We are not all qualified equally
People jump firms a lot
limits partnering broadening roster
Stipend and honorariums
WSU expects the level of effort to reflect the honorarium price
WSU more upfront of what we want to see

Trade Partners

What are contractors doing to grow the Design-Build Community? Are we going about it the right way?

Mentor protege teams, Can WSU Share in the cost of training up and coming small consultants/contractors?
Allowing pre-payment to smaller firms to limit the burden financially on smaller firms.
Grow the DB Community by talking to other owners
grow design build community by talking to other owners

Extended insurance requirements limit mentoring opportunities because the JV is typically dissolved after the project
Flexibility on payment terms, bonding, capacity, insurance etc
Could not let the smaller team lead for liability reasons (bonding, insurance, etc)
Risk barred by the owner to have mentorship if this is a requirement in the RFP

2. Sometimes hire out of state to satisfy Minority & Women business categories, but that takes away from local talent

In lieu of mentoring - hiring a general in an advisory role. WSU hires as training wheels for the team. Once a month training meeting for the DB - obviously advisory. Design-Build facilitator.

4. WSU could employ more programs at the academic level to educate the next generation coming into the work force. Mentoring, outreach, small and diverse _ incentive _ Not many available _ registration is a burden, busy _ promote diversity and inclusion in existing firms _ OMWBE process sucks _ gc cant absorb risk, spread risk with owner _ design - collaboration with smaller firms _ using small firm staff at big firms when slow _ cash flow, paying firms quickly _ quality

5. Continue incorporating the question of "what are you doing to promote growth in the industry?"

Describe a performance criteria and provide incentives for meeting those
describe a performance criteria and provide incentives for meeting those

Word choice, "immerging" companies versus disadvantage companies

How would teams like to break out the drawings?

No issue with changing the levels of design, that would provide a leaner design process, and making the designs to be at

Bringing the small firm into the office. Incorporating the small firm into the full design rather than just giving them a

Small firms can have DB experience with smaller jobs

thoughtful with work packages early on, knowing strengths and talents of smaller firms as soon as possible

Involve more SB in meetings and planning to help determine what they need in a project or how they need a project to

be approached as far as dollars, scope, language, etc. so they can pursue it better. For example a small business may

Consistent opportunities for smaller business to do DB

reels prequally small, diverse businesses for 5 years. That gives the small businesses some comfort that they will be selected without having to spend time/\$ chasing every project. Then when a project comes to them, they bid it almost

like a hard bid, which they have experience doing. It allows them time to learn the process without all the complexity

Agreement that we need better nomenclature for the design-build process. Mike and Larry, micro and macro

development. Pieces of the space, systems, vignettes, design flexibility in the process. Designers would rather do it by

Subcontracting community has a larger pool of smaller companies and a need for many more. Some are falling away

Liability of reputation should something go astray in final product but no issue with mentoring and bringing folks up in

Non-union firms (often smaller) do not meet apprentice labor requirements especially in eastern WA

Program Design-build

Prepacked scopes may limit interest

Do a request for interest and have teams provide the level of interest in either value or scope

Need to break the projects into large enough packages with must do scopes and potential betterment's
WSU expects the design team to challenge WSU and bring up new ideas; help define scope
Select team based on a potential scope and duration and have the team develop the scope
A lot of Pre-Construction scope needs to be stream lined so the procurement can take place early
Flexible scope, then firm is the scope list
make sure the scope is comprehensive, to reduce duplication of efforts
need to know other scopes inherently (?) included
One big scope, see who submits, then split up scope
Loose scope statement?
Start with list of projects and package with the team involvement in packaging
Let the market decide how to package
Do selection in succession
need to know other scopes immediately included

1. Select multiple awardees off one RFQ.
2. Allow for multiple trade partners within the same discipline, multiple firm involvement
3. Pitfall - Code perspective/satisfaction
4. Let the market choose the team, or have a hybrid approach
5. Additional information meetings for potential DB applicants
6. 1 GC with sub GC's

Breaking apart could get messy
most contractors don't want to be the prime
includes a lot of other trades not just mechanical
not many smaller firms used to being primes

WSU more outreach
Teams need more coaching
Learning curve and slower start
Teams should have at least one member with design build experience
Teams are hesitant to bring up problems early
Daylight problems
Quick pay strategies

Is WSU open to construction manager firm leading a DB project?

Design builders

Has the team available "as needed"

Larger package

Teams to submit a letter of intent

What's the teams ceiling?

Concerned if a Design Builder was involved with managing several different small projects, in different Buildings the Fee would be very high, and may not be cost effective to have a Design Builder in this scenario.

If scope was single trade and contractor was managing the DB process, some folks at the table seemed to think that contractors are not good at shepherding and processing the administration a Design Build Project correctly, if it was small business they may need some assistance in the administration scope.

We all felt that if we had the right partnership developed that this would work, and if the contractor was capable of shepherding the Design Build process and had administration staff to support. Some of the Partnership criteria would be based on- Attitude and Chemistry between the partnership and how they would interact in the problem solving.

Provide more details and information and dollar values in the RFQ and RFP

If evaluation and building assessment of building MEP issues was done prior to sending the RFQ and RFP, this would help Bottom line is that a lot of collaboration honesty and trust would need to be develop in the pre-construction phase, with the owner being very familiar with the MEP issues that are needing to be updated and very clear on what the expectation and goals are. Without this being done prior to the RFQ DB Team would need to spend a lot of time in the pre-construction phase if the design builder was to go into this with minimal information and need to evaluate and provide an assessment in defining what the issues are and what the scope is. With a 2 year time frame it is best to have the Design Build Team be more focused on clear scope and expectations and set up in a way so they can hit the job running and have a better chance of achieving the owners expectations.

U of I example. Hire a GC, and have them list their potential subs. Then they select from the list as needed. Provide a mix of project types to reduce risk.

RFQ will need to "tell the story" so that they know how to respond well. It can be hard to understand WSU's list of priorities.

Approach the work on a building basis rather than trade. A mechanical project might impact a roof project if equipment needs to sit on a roof. Can also do a better job of achieving Clean Building needs that way.

The "discovery process" becomes critical in these types of small, MEP projects.

Do bigger rather than smaller - we are doing.

Idea in the future - the intent to propose concept. - out of time this year.

Small firms, outreach (Ads), coaching

Pair down deliverables
Participation may wane based on what work
2M is about as low to add value
Because of the DB fee structure, a typical subcontractor could be the better cost, but appear higher when bidding against a prime
Strong decision making and prioritizing projects within the larger project to modify scope based on findings (to fit within biennium)
PDQ piece is critical, Fac ops has a good idea on end of line (sp?) priorities. "Get to the punchline quickly"
What did you learn on the site walk?
is there efficiency in bundling the design component outside of the work
Maybe add more of a value eng. or involve them before a hard scope is developed. Example- Instead of putting out a request for a new chiller, we put out a request to evaluate the chiller and see if it needs replaced or if we could lower the load on the current chiller more cost effectively.
Small firms need to know before hand the dollar amount of work, since they have limited funds to invest in the proposal. They may see \$10M and invest, but then it gets cut to \$2M and they can not cover their cost and make it worth their time, so they are a little put off when asked to invest and make the effort to propose on a larger chunk that we may decide to break up and only award them a small piece.
lump all projects
increase the timeline and string it along

Future Topics

Encourage small businesses to attend the forum to get better input from that community, find creative solutions to encourage
Unpacking GMP, what's in/out
Improving the predesign process to help streamline the DB process, make more scalable/flexible
Take the forum to the other WSU campuses
Recruiting OMWBE for the conference
Clean buildings
Long-lead equipment & fiscal cycles
How do we unlock the value of trade partners - are they engaging and providing value. Trade partner engagement - how do you keep them from stopping bringing their ideas to the table.
Early integration of trades
How to change the submittal process in DB and the specs
Changing the design milestones will take a major disruption

General Comments

Create an anonymous Doodle Poll survey with a few simple questions and space for general comments to get more honest feedback from the group.

Look to smaller businesses to say what they want and get their feedback; not from the top down

Trade feedback to minimize finger pointing. Trades don't want to speak when asked what they would do when they don't like what the architect or engineer designed.

Since most folks arrive the day prior to the forum is to have some kind of get together function the afternoon or night before that could promote more introductions, discussions and team involvement. Example having a "No Host Bar", this would provide a more production forum and by possibly getting more visiting done the day before which may promote more team involvement during the Design Build Forum the following day.

A3 style format is great for boiling down the information in an SOQ. It is helpful if the RFP limits the questions to what the primary goals and objectives are from the clients perspective. This allows DB teams to focus their response accordingly.

Recommend adding flexibility in the scope of your RFP. There may be scope that would make sense to do down the line after base scope is defined. This is a lesson we have with the University of Washington on our ongoing seismic work.

Happy to jump on a call to expand.

It may be worth considering a multi biennium funding strategy to tackle system wide updates across campuses. Design Build teams can work with WSU to prioritize and build budgets for future requests. Teams build on lessons learned and can help capture economies of scale. The long term back-log is also encouraging for general contractors like Clark.

We liked the table format and though it was great that companies/roles were broken out and placed at different tables. This allowed for diverse approaches and thinking on the discussion topics and added a lot of value to the conversations.

In terms of discussion topics, we thought the ones chosen for the day were solid and relevant. As for potential ways to improve the selection process for next year, we thought it might be worthwhile to consider crowdsourcing one or two topics from the attendees a couple of weeks before the forum. This would give the attendees some time to put a bit of thought into what they would want to discuss with one another.

We all agreed that having more time for the discussion would be valuable. Only around five more minutes or so per question is what we discussed; just a little longer so everyone could contribute to the conversation. Perhaps next year the forum could run a little longer to accommodate extended discussion, or the tables could be a few people smaller so that everyone can talk a bit during the allotted time.

