

ORIGINAL

CITY OF BELLEVUE, WASHINGTON

RESOLUTION NO. 6874

A RESOLUTION authorizing the use of the alternative public works contracting procedure for the New City Building Redevelopment Project.

WHEREAS, in 2001 the Washington state legislature enacted changes to RCW Chapter 39.10 allowing for the use of a General Contractor/Construction Manager ("GC/CM") alternative public works contracting procedure for qualifying cities and public authorities for construction of public works projects; and

WHEREAS, Bellevue is a qualifying city because it has a population of over 70,000 residents; and

WHEREAS, Bellevue has determined that redevelopment of the New City Building will be in the public interest because it will allow for the collocation and integration of City services; and

WHEREAS, in order for public works projects of qualifying cities to be eligible for use of the GC/CM alternative public works contracting procedure, the project must be valued at over \$10,000,000, and must either involve complex scheduling requirements or the project must involve construction at an existing facility which must continue to operate during construction, or the involvement of the GC/CM must be critical to the success of the project; and

WHEREAS, the value of the New City Building Redevelopment Project is currently estimated to be in the range of \$50,000,000 and \$70,000,000; and

WHEREAS, the existing building at the site requires redevelopment for public safety purposes; and

WHEREAS, the prior owner of the property will continue to lease a portion of the existing building and will require that its equipment facilities continue to operate and be accessible building while the redevelopment is in progress; and

WHEREAS, in order to maximize cost savings on lease-back of current facilities the City may employ early occupancy strategies for the New City Building while the redevelopment is in progress; and

WHEREAS, the City may be required to phase the construction and begin work on the redevelopment prior to completion of design work for other phases in order to maximize cost and operational benefit to the City; and

WHEREAS involvement of the GC/CM during the design phase will allow the City to better manage and control project costs which is critical to the success of the project; and

ORIGINAL

WHEREAS, pursuant to RCW 39.10.030 the City Council made a preliminary determination to use the alternative public works contracting procedure for a specific public works project that the use of the alternative procedure will serve the public interest by providing a substantial fiscal benefit, or that use of the traditional method of awarding contracts in lump sum to the low responsive bidder is not practical for meeting desired quality standards or delivery schedules; and

WHEREAS, RCW 39.10.030 requires adequate public notification and opportunity for public review and comment of a preliminary determination to use the alternative public works contracting procedure by implementing the public hearing process or written public comment procedure; and

WHEREAS, the Bellevue City Council elected to utilize the public hearing process contained in RCW 39.10.030(2)(a) to provide an opportunity for public review and comment and held a duly noticed public hearing on May 19, 2003 and no adverse comments were received at the hearing; now, therefore,

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BELLEVUE, WASHINGTON, DOES
RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. This resolution is the City Council's final determination to use the GC/CM alternative public works contracting procedure for the New City Building Redevelopment Project because it is the most practical method of meeting desired quality standards and delivery schedules for the Project and providing a substantial fiscal benefit.

Section 2. The proposed Evaluation Criteria for the Request for Qualifications attached hereto as Exhibit "A" to this Resolution are hereby approved for use by the Selection Committee in scoring the candidates for the GC/CM for this project.

Passed by the City Council this 7th day of July, 2003,
and signed in authentication of its passage this 7th day of July,
2003.

(SEAL)

Connie B. Marshall
Connie B. Marshall, Mayor

Attest:

Myrna L. Basich
Myrna L. Basich, City Clerk

The evaluation of the Qualifications Proposals is organized around four headings:

- Staff to be Committed to the Project
- Track Record, Experience, References & Safety
- Local Knowledge & Relationships
- Approach & Capabilities

All of the Evaluation Criteria listed under each heading will be considered by the Selection Committee in determining the points for that heading.

RFQ

Staff to be Committed to the Project

20 points maximum

Item Evaluation Criteria

A1	The staff proposed for the Project and the proposer's ability and commitment to provide experienced, qualified, cooperative, pro-active staff for the Project motivated by high levels of professionalism and a commitment to the success of the entire Project team. The commitment of senior staff members during the initial preconstruction period is important. Supporting information: <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Proposed staff organization chart, strategy, qualifications and involvement▪ Resumes and references for the proposed staff▪ Current and projected workload of proposer and of proposed staff	
----	--	--

11-7

RFQ

Track Record, Experience, References & Safety

15 points maximum

Item	Evaluation Criteria	
B1	<p>A demonstrated track record of teamwork, cooperation, fair dealing, client service and relationships of mutual trust and confidence. Supporting information (see Section F8 of this RFQ):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Current and completed projects, references 	
B2	<p>Successful performance on projects that are similar in nature and scope, including both public GC/CM projects and private projects performed on negotiated guaranteed maximum price contracts. Experience with major renovation projects including structural seismic upgrades is desirable. Experience with projects that include sophisticated information technology components is considered necessary.</p>	
B3	<p>A demonstrated track record of contribution to project success, achieved through staff attitudes, construction techniques, management systems, skills, resources, relationships and other factors that made the difference. Supporting information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposed staff organization chart, strategy, qualifications and involvement 	
B4	<p>The absence of a pattern of adversarial relationships, claims or litigation. Supporting information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Litigation and arbitration history ▪ Claims history ▪ References 	
B5	<p>A demonstrated track record of effective project planning, schedules that surpass industry norms, and on-time delivery performance on those schedules. Supporting information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ References ▪ Narrative 	
B6	<p>An excellent safety record on recent projects and a demonstrated commitment to managing projects to promote and ensure a safe work place along with the management and enforcement processes necessary. Supporting information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Safety and accident prevention programs ▪ Workman's compensation Experience Modification Rate, Lost Time Accident Rate and complaints 	

11-8

RFQ

Local Knowledge & Relationships

20 points maximum

Item Evaluation Criteria

C1	Demonstrated knowledge, experience and established working relationships with Puget Sound area and national Subcontractors that may be involved with the Project.	
C2	Demonstrated knowledge, experience and established working relationships with Puget Sound area staff, trades people, trade labor unions, apprenticeship organizations and other labor sources that may be involved with the Project.	
C3	Demonstrated knowledge, experience and established working relationships with Puget Sound area industry groups, design professionals, building and fire department officials, other government agencies and officials, community organizations and others that may be involved with the Project.	
C4	Demonstrated knowledge of Puget Sound area construction industry norms, standards and customs, industry constraints and strengths, weather conditions, and other variables that may affect the Project.	

11-9

Approach & Capabilities

20 points maximum

Item Evaluation Criteria

D1	<p>The ability of the GC/CM to provide leadership and innovative preconstruction services in cooperation with architectural, structural, mechanical and electrical design consultants, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cost estimating. ▪ Planning, sequencing and scheduling of projects with complex phasing requirements ▪ Coordination of sophisticated information technology components ▪ Design review ▪ Review of alternatives ▪ Constructability review and constructability program ▪ Cost reduction & value engineering suggestions ▪ Procurement strategy and planning including bid packages and early bids on selected elements <p>Supporting information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cost estimates for subcontracted work ▪ Narrative 	
D2	<p>The ability to provide effective preconstruction services in those areas that will likely be subcontracted such as mechanical and electrical including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cost estimating. ▪ Planning, sequencing and scheduling ▪ Design review and informal peer review ▪ Review of alternatives ▪ Constructability review and constructability program ▪ Cost reduction & value engineering suggestions ▪ Procurement strategy <p>Supporting information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cost estimating plan for subcontracted work 	
D3	<p>An effective approach to obtaining excellent Subcontractor bids from quality Subcontractors that provides complete, well-defined Subcontractor scopes of work coordinated with other bid packages, and supporting information for bidders in a well-organized process.</p>	
D4	<p>A proactive approach to performing the role of the general contractor to support the work of the Subcontractors. This includes the approach to general conditions work (as that term is used in the Puget Sound -area construction industry) and the Proposing Firm's suggestions for the items to be included in the Specified General Conditions.</p> <p>Supporting information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommendations on Specified General Conditions 	
D5	<p>The Proposing Firm's level of interest in performing some of the subcontract work with its own forces, and its reasons for that approach. [Comments: This is for information; the Owner does not have a preference on this aspect of the work.]</p> <p>Supporting information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Work performed by GC/CM with its own forces 	

11-10

RFQ

Approach & Capabilities (continued)

Item Evaluation Criteria

D6	<p>A demonstrated ability and proactive approach to Subcontractor management, including supervision, coordination, cost containment, review of change proposals, claim avoidance, and other activities. Also, a productive working relationship with Subcontractors, including fair subcontract agreements, effective project management to allow subcontracted work to be performed efficiently, Subcontractor advocacy and representation.</p> <p>Supporting information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Subcontractor cost proposals ▪ Standard subcontract documents 	
D7	<p>A commitment to quality workmanship and faithful execution of design intent along with the demonstrated use of the management, control, inspection, testing and commissioning processes to support and ensure quality.</p>	
D8	<p>Thoughtful comments on draft Agreement and General Conditions demonstrating a knowledge of sound contracting practice, a willingness to accept appropriate responsibilities, allocation of risks where they can best be managed and an approach to the Project from a win-win perspective.</p> <p>Supporting information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommendations for the Agreement 	
D9	<p>Other factors of consideration, and overall assessment of Qualifications Proposal and the capabilities of the Proposing Firm</p> <p>Supporting information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Letter of interest ▪ Information about the Proposing Firm ▪ Current and projected workload ▪ Financial statement ▪ Bonding capacity 	

11-11

RFP

Interview

10 points maximum

Item Evaluation Criteria

E1	Capabilities and attitude of key members of the proposed staff. Supporting information: see Section C of the RFP	
E2	Project approach articulated in discussion of key factors for Project success.	
E3	Participation in and responses to questions and discussion topics.	

RFP

Bid Amounts

15 points maximum

Item Evaluation Criteria

F1	Calculation of the points associated with the bid items submitted in the Final Proposals including the reasonableness of the allocation of cost to the various bid items. Supporting information (see Section D, E and F of the RFP): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Final Proposal bid prices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preconstruction Services Price • Specified General Conditions Price • Percentage for GC/CM Fixed Fee 	
----	--	--

11-12