

Color Key: Frequency of issues discussed as inciated by table notes
Over 20 Conversation Points Recorded
Between 10 and 20 Conversation Points Recorded
Between 5 and 10 Conversation Points Recorded
Under 5 Conversation Points Recorded

Key Comments (regardless of frequency)

List of Issues

Cost to Compete	<p>Might be precluding smaller firms from competing.</p> <p>Huge cost up front.</p> <p>Stipend is woefully inadequate.</p> <p>Small projects equal no profit.</p> <p>Would like to see upfront payment.</p> <p>The more info for owner, easier selection. More expensive for design team. Find middle ground.</p> <p>Compensation should be made more clear</p> <p>Tie state fee schedule to honorarium</p> <p>Carries heavy risk because level of effort much higher than stipend. Actual costs should be covered by owner.</p> <p>Design effort still exceeds reduced requirements for competition sake and cost certainty sake.</p> <p>Design competition is limiting the competition. Not sustainable.</p> <p>"competitors pay higher stipend"</p> <p>Possible higher fees from the DB community to recover costs from other pursuits</p>
------------------------	---

Cost Certainty	<p>Contractor requires certain level of design.</p> <p>Share cost certainty with team in a way that won't hurt design.</p> <p>Guaranteed prices is too simple need more complexity, set target range rather than a lump sum.</p> <p>The design that occurred in the beginning may get value engineered out.</p> <p>Owner needs to understand what parts are in the cost, telecom, electrical Mechanical, that WSU Architects reviewing may not fully understand.</p> <p>High Contingencies due to unknowns.</p>
-----------------------	---

Design Level / Deliverables	<p>Time frame for proposal</p> <p>Clarity of deliverables</p> <p>Schedule</p> <p>owner suggest only accepting certain submittals so that design teams don't spend too much.</p> <p>Deduct points for going over deliverables.</p> <p>Need to be SPECIFIC about what is required.</p> <p>What is owner looking for, example BIM modeling</p> <p>Level of design does not match time and/or reimbursement.</p>
------------------------------------	--

Funding	<p>Legislative Funding is three step and does not line up with Design-Build.</p> <p>Disconnect between capital and operating monies, if better system is included early.</p>
----------------	--

Color Key: Frequency of issues discussed as inciated by table notes
Over 20 Conversation Points Recorded
Between 10 and 20 Conversation Points Recorded
Between 5 and 10 Conversation Points Recorded
Under 5 Conversation Points Recorded

List of Issues

Key Comments (regardless of frequency)

Validation Phase	<p>Want to see a separate contract so they are confident with how much they can commit.</p> <p>Risk gets increased as WSU compresses validation phase and proprietary meetings.</p> <p>Validation phase should be utilized to adjust price and scope.</p> <p>Board of regents schedule to coincide with validation period.</p> <p>It allows the programming changes in the validation period.</p> <p>Allows time for DB team to value engineer design components presented in the proposal</p> <p>Validation period is a good process</p> <p>Cost guarantee may require longer duration of validation period</p> <p>Is it better to fix a number or allow a range.</p> <p>Validation would have happened whether formal or not</p> <p>Validation process - is it helpful? Prehaps too early to tell.</p>
Proprietary Meetings	<p>Building user and selection committee difficulty and what is required of the meeting</p> <p>Eliminate after first propriety meeting.</p> <p>disconnect between needs of the meeting - Owner wants schemes, DB wants technical aspects.</p> <p>Two part meeting, or two meetings, design and technical separated.</p> <p>Notify D/B of Committee Members.</p> <p>Really tough to get good clear feedback at proprietary meetings</p>
Programming	<p>Match program and expectations to the budget</p> <p>Program prioritization</p> <p>Pre-Design program not extensive enough, crucial info missing.</p> <p>Programming document changes need to be decreased,</p> <p>DB teams should be more involved in what changes are realistic to budget.</p> <p>Need to have clear idea of end product for DB team early or money wasted making changes in program versus fine tuning design.</p> <p>Provide better cost estimating</p> <p>Pre-Designers are scared to limit owner.</p> <p>Solid programing and pre-design critical</p> <p>Limit design in programing as it limits creative freedom to teams</p> <p>Owner wants flexibility in program, DB wants more specificity for equal playing ground.</p> <p>Matrix Specific - helps and allows betterments to stand out.</p> <p>Be realistic in programing, if program exceeds budget it encourages DBs to overpromise, not the right incentive process.</p>

Color Key: Frequency of issues discussed as inciated by table notes
Over 20 Conversation Points Recorded
Between 10 and 20 Conversation Points Recorded
Between 5 and 10 Conversation Points Recorded
Under 5 Conversation Points Recorded

List of Issues

Key Comments (regardless of frequency)

Design Standards	<p>Still looks like a spec.</p> <p>Standards evolve and are unknown in the beginning</p> <p>Continual updating is "killing teams trying to finish design"</p> <p>Where is owner willing to reduce standard requirements.</p> <p>Branch campus use of construction standards is difficult to gauge and price what is applicable and really desired from Contractor / A/E Standpoint.</p> <p>Challenges in aligning process with campus standards and facilities services operations expectiones based on years of experience and expectation of detailed involvement. This creates uncertainty and makes it difficult for DB to deliver good pricing.</p>
Documents	<p>Want to see completed agreement, gc's and division 01 with the RFQ, at latest with the RFP, not as an addendum. Too risky - cannot back out with all of the investments up to that point.</p> <p>All documents available at RFQ Phase.</p> <p>Renovation - have original documents ready day one.</p> <p>Earlier communication, more information earlier</p> <p>Construction standards need completion/improvement</p> <p>Requirement of High Ed Experience - shouldn't limit to.</p> <p>Size the RFQ to the project. (Example of Police Station = Digital Classroom)</p> <p>Spec for cost reporting in division 01 is very elaborate long and could be revised (look at both RFP and 01 29 00)</p> <p>Campus standards may not apply to some WSU projects</p> <p>Facilities provides lots of input, is helpful</p>
Intellectual Property	<p>Withhold design due to competitive selection.</p> <p>Idea transfer to winning team.... Owner should compensate other team if wanting to use.</p> <p>Quote below from MOU that scares the firms: - causes DB to limit info included and losses competitive advantage.</p> <p><i>"In exchange for WSU payment to the Proposer for proposal work performed, Proposer agrees to relinquish all proposal work product to WSU for WSU to review, copy, distribute, and potentially use for its WSU Public Safety Building project, even though the Proposer may not become signatory to a Design-Build services contract with WSU, so long as the work product is not patented or otherwise protected as a uniquely proprietary work product. "</i></p> <p>Risky for design team to deny the honorarium because it may show owner that you are not a team player.</p> <p>Requesting VE Items up front - Subs are leery prior to selection.</p> <p>Sharing ideas with no Return on Investment.</p>

Color Key: Frequency of issues discussed as inciated by table notes
Over 20 Conversation Points Recorded
Between 10 and 20 Conversation Points Recorded
Between 5 and 10 Conversation Points Recorded
Under 5 Conversation Points Recorded

List of Issues

Key Comments (regardless of frequency)

Method of Delivery (Progressive versus Competitive)	Justify selection criteria for delivery method. Really want to be selected solely upon qualification Utilize Progressive for smaller projects, at least. Progressive takes expense away from project. Not one size fits all approach. Competitive delivery encourages over promising by DB. Decisions are made before the Owner is even at the table with the DB, and the DB does not want to make changes by the time the Owner is at the table. What is the decision process to select delivery method? WSU tends to want more involvement after selection, requires team to modify design yet hold firm to schedule and budget.
Incentives	Incentive for contractor to stretch the scope
Teaming/Timing	How early info is out to inform teams Be open to new teams Select contractor/ architect separate, forced collaboration could be a concern. Webpage difficult to navigate Difficult for contractors to gauge Owners comfort with Engineers and Architects Collaboration and team confidence = Positive Public Perception
Listing of Sub tiers	For technical HVAC and structural Is getting the subs on board early better than having the competition later? Definition of trade partners versus subs during RFQ/RFP and their role when they are included. How to incorporate competitive pricing in DB. Mechanical and Electrical aren't guarenteed anything, but have everything to loose.
Changes in Contingencies	How to. How do you stay on schedule when client is making design changes?
Debrief	Appreciate the feedback

Best WSU Trait

Desire to get better

Listening and Making Adjustments

Integration

Listen and Evolve

Flexible and trying to improve process

Works well with teams and is flexible

Validation Period

This forum

Collaborative

Good Communication between Facilities Managers and Project Managers

Commitment to Improving the Process

Proprietary Meetings Very Detailed

Worst WSU Trait

Pay More for pursuit and or validation effort. If there is Value then pay for it.

Program, Scope and Budget Alignment

Defining Scope

User Groups Involvement

Risk Sharing

Chummy Relationships make it hard for out of towners

Better Bridging Document Info, don't shortcut it.

Not one size fits all

Cost Certainty

Cost of Competitive Method

DB Seems Exclusive

Comfort with Teams thins competition

Flexibility based on scale

Perfect Owner

Characteristic

Financially Stable	Unlimited Budget
	More incentives and less penalties
	Allowance for owner changes and additions
	Can guarantee appropriate reliable assured funding sources
	Allowance for owner changes and additions
	Compensates fairly
	Stay out of the DB Teams Contingency
Fair	Fair to design team
	Owner is involved, buys in, and is invested in the success and quality of the project from the point of view of the process
Trusting	Relationship oriented with trust of parties and allows team to function at a high level
	Trusts the process
	Recognize that proprietary meetings are two way
	Must let go and embrace Design-Build the model and the roles
	Trust Design-Builder
	Letting go of control as appropriate
Flexible	Doesn't hold D/Bs feet to fire; some things have to flex
	Some flexibility in programming
	Open to diversity - New D/ B team with no previous experience with the University.
	Level of detail as required for project, flexibility within each standard
Adaptable to change	
Consistent	Constancy throughout projects across board
	Consistent with proprietary meetings, from project to project
Definitive	Defines the Core program needs
	Prioritizes!
	Secondary program list
	Defines what are the goals for the proprietary meeting
Knowledgeable	Realistic schedules
	Understands the risks
	Understanding of DB business model
	Has completed due diligence
	For every proprietary meeting, have two parts - one for tech, one fore design
Owner has the right people at the meetings	
Ownership is educated enough to understand priorities of user groups	
Signs off on CDs	

Perfect Owner Continued

Characteristic

Leader	Willing to drive decisions
	Timely decision, committing to decisions
	Transparency of decision process and budget
	Good, willing decision maker
	Willing to assume appropriate risk
	Accountable for owner issues
	Good administrator of user groups
	Owner who is a good arbitrator
	Manages top tier
	Strong leadership and commitment to program so that they can push back on facilities.
	Decision makers are in the room
	Single point of contact for final decision
	Doesn't switch on previous decisions
	Controls the client
Strong team leader on selection side	
Clear	Clarity of ambition
	Programming documents explain current and future needs and wants.
	Clarity of basis of design
	Knowledge to Decide
	Consistency in Delivery
	Supplies accurate documents
	Clear basis of design with realistic cost and schedule
	Clearly define roles of players
	Has a clear spec, not a thousand reference documents
	Clear communication and expectations
	Definition of materials, or preference and interest in using
	Clearly defined objective statement - similar to team charter
	Upfront with time lines
	Communicates clearly to user groups
Responsive	Responsiveness - has/provides access to information
	Engaged participant
	Ability to provide timely decisions and information requirements = equipment in building or user requirements, etc.
Involved	Maintenance/Operations integrated part of planning process
	Designers look at longer term maintenance of project and impact on future
	Owner would fund long tem M/O Cost
	Empowerment of an individual to speak for group and make decisions (avoid death by committee)
	Owner that is invested in projects design
	Engaged Owner with Both A/E and Contractor from Day one

Perfect Owner Continued

Characteristic

Involved Continued	First 30% of project owner involvement
	PM is visible early to help control budget
	Early involvement should be about the project and not too focused the team
	Very involved early and throughout construction
	Available
Respected	Integrated ownership team
	Select the right team
	Someone who is respected and teams want to work for or meet with
	Owner needs to own site conditions
	Appropriate risk distribution to those best able to manage it

Perfect Design-Builder

Characteristic

Collaborative	Embraces collaboration
	One who embraces integrated leadership.
	No bad ideas, no silos, tons of internal collaboration, subcontractors talk to all design team members
	Must let go and embrace Design-Build the model and the roles
	Clearly define roles of players
	Brings the right skillset to meeting
	Technically savvy - BIM and progressive tools
	Good Communication throughout project and all members of team
	Unified relationships between AEC
	Right people at the design meetings
	Ability to work together through decisions between design and budget
	Trust and collaboration within the team
	Collaboration AFTER selection
	Use charrettes to enhance creativity and communication
	DB needs to address any quality concerns brought forth by other design team members
	Collocated - Designer and Builder sharing physical space
Select team members that work well with others	
Build authentic team	
Open	Embraces connection with users
	A/E is truly integrated with GC and includes honest open communication
	Designer who shares design intent openly and contractor willing and interested in incorporating that intent in creative ways that solve budget problems
	Trust
Strong Leadership	Strong leadership and commitment to program so that they can push back on facilities.
	Decision makers are in the room

Perfect Design-Builder Continued

Characteristic

Strong Leadership Cont'd	Does not fear tension so that teams perform at high level Fosters team creativity with discipline to stay on track
Communicative	Communicating to lay people A/E is truly integrated with GC and includes honest open communication Good and Clear Communicator Better communication with second and third tier subs Questioning during proprietary meetings Enable effective dialog around design and budget issues
Respects and Is Respected	One who respects design profession More responsive Each team member works in DB scenario in similar manner regarding professional standards as with other delivery methods. And respects and values each other team members Contractor respects design and design process Owner does not have to act as referee Builder cannot treat A/E same as a subcontractor Have a design manager who is trained as an architect
Honest	One who does not overcommit Super transparent with all members of the team Knows when to say no.
Knowledgeable	Understanding of Owners process to get decisions made Understanding Owners limitations of owner to provide incentives Understands the process, the deliverables, process schedule and budget Understand nuances of outside pressures Teams understand how each work, understand how small changes filter out Strong awareness of owner agreement to avoid conflict and issues later Understands utilities...
Committed	Relationship oriented with trust of parties and allows team to function at a high level Empowered, consistent project managers, team need continuity Continuity is a critical point for successful team Team leader that manages collaboration and communication of AEC Team Team involved winning the project remains during design and construction
Realistic	PM that isn't afraid to say no, avoid yes man Willing to facilitate realistic discussions and solutions

Perfect Design-Builder Continued

Characteristic

Realistic Cont'd	Clear basis of design with realistic cost and schedule Strong cost awareness by both designer and GC
------------------	---

Transparent	Transparency Clear expectations on responsibilities Open Book policy with costs
-------------	---

Value	Brings the best value to owner Meets all criteria and is accountable for quality Balance is important
-------	---

Timely	Timely submittals and deliverables
--------	------------------------------------

Future Topics

Accountability to Regards to End Product (cost building performance quality of building)

Alignment of state budget process and delivery

BIM Technology Incorporation

Clearly explain the evaluation process

Compensation models, and competitive bid of design fees

Completion process, wrap-up, confirm expectations were met, report, review with users

Contract forms, pros & cons

CPARB and legislative news

Criteria for Project Selection as a DB versus other procurements

DB contingency management

DB Prime and Teaming Agreements

DB standards

Delivery Methodology versus Documentation

Design Standards

Did D/B Team Meet Performance Requirements

Expectations of Design Build Team after award of the project
(Closeout, OM, TSO, Extends to walkthrough with users programmatic use)

Future Plans

Grade report at end

Have KPIs in place

How much does a design-Build pursuit cost

How to incorporate incentives not just penalties, measurements for improved better solutions

Meet and Great and Future Projects Create Relationships

Owner and User Group Process Instruction and Education

Owners delivery of project needs to match design-builders (operations, capital and contract admin)

Performance Guarantees: Expectations and Costs

Progressive Versus Competitive Selection

Price verification - impact on progressive design build

Public Entities How to Clarify Funding Process

Savings and competitive bid fees

Sub consultant Commitment to Design Build Team

Survey of costs to teams

Update on What's New With DB at WSU

What can WSU do to run schedule along; IE submittals and reviews

What Feedback was most valuable

What is new at WSU, future plans, what happened to the web site
