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CURRENT DESIGN-BUILD STATUTES

K-12 SCHOOL DISTRICTS (Education Code 17250.10 – 17250.50)

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS (Education Code 81700 – 81708)

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITIES (Public Contract Code 10708)

LOCAL AGENCIES—CITIES and COUNTIES (Public Contract Code 22160-22169) (SB 785–2014)

CAVEAT--

Local Agencies such as cities and counties are unable to use Design Build for local street and road projects.

BUT—

AB 1523 is in the Legislature right now to allow Design-Build for local agency transportation projects.
HOW TO GET TO PROGRESSIVE DESIGN-BUILD

• NEW LEGISLATION ALLOWS FOR FIXED PRICE OR STIPULATED SUM

• Best Value--Stipulated Price authorized by e.g. Public Contract Code §22164(f)(1)(A).

• Stipulated price determined by the Public Agency.

• Mechanisms for adjustment of the stipulated sum based on transparent collaboration and buy-out.

• Validation phase where risk shifts from the public agency to design-builder.

• Design phase allows continual project betterment and pricing to realize operational cost and total cost of ownership savings within the stipulated sum.
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Migration to Progressive Design Build
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SMCCCD History with Design Build

• SMCCCD first California CCD to use Design-Build

• AB 1000: Enacted in September 2002. Allowed Design-Build to be used by five CCDs as pilot programs until December 2007
  • José Nuñez, SMCCD Vice Chancellor for Facilities and Jeff Gee, Swinerton Management Consultants lobbied legislature to approve AB 1000

• Current California Education Code 81700 – 81708 allows CCDs to use Design-Build for project > $2.5M through 2020

• SMCCCD two previous Bond Measure Programs has constructed ~$400M of capital projects using Design-Build

• Current Bond Measure Program using Design-Build ~$250M
SMCCCD Practices

**Past District Two-Step Practice**
- Architect Develops Bridging Documents
- RFSOQ and RFP Process to Select Design-Build-Entity
  - Design Competition
  - Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) Established at Contract Award

**Current District Practice Migrating to Progressive Design-Build**
- RFP Qualifications/Best Value Selection Process
  - No Bridging Documents
  - No Design Competition – Design Completed with College/District Input
  - GMP Established After Design is Fully Developed, Agencies Permit Processes and Buyout Completed
Design Build Procurement Process

"Best Value" Qualifications + Cost

- Employs evaluation criteria traditionally used for qualifications-based selection along with a prequalification questionnaire based on the Department of Industrial Relations’ guidelines
- Allows for a larger pool of qualified firms to participate

Request for Statement of Qualifications

- Three highest ranked Design-Build Entities are invited to participate
- Employs objective evaluation criteria as required per Education Code 81700; price, technical expertise, life cycle costs, skilled labor force availability, and acceptable safety record
- Allows for price or costs to be considered with qualifications

Request for Proposals
Reasons for Implementing Current Practice

• District Has More Influence on Design After Contract Award
• District Can Hire DBE Team that is Best Fit for College
• Improved Integrated Design Process
• Leverage IPD and Lean Construction Practices
• Improved Speed to Market
• Open Book/Transparent Cost Management
• Improved Competition
Proposal Renderings

Cañada College Building 1N Kinesiology and Wellness

Skyline College Building 12N Environmental Science
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Learning for Success

Integration + Collaboration = Success
Introduction to Palomar College

- The District and San Marcos campus were founded in 1946 – 71 years young!
- Our $694M Prop M Bond was passed by voters in 2006
- All Prop M projects are done in compliance with the District Educational and Facilities Master Plans last updated in 2009
- Approximately 60% through the Bond
- The District has utilized the following delivery methods:
  1. Design-Bid-Build
  2. CM Multiple Prime
  3. CM@Risk
  4. Design Build – both Design Competition and Best Value
The Project – Existing Conditions

- Currently in a complex of 10 separate buildings, 2 shade structures and 13 shipping containers
- The youngest building built in 1995 with the oldest (2) built in 1946
- Existing area totals approximately 33,750 SF (this includes all shade structures and shipping containers)
Project Vision and Goals

Demonstration to the rest of the District what is possible

• Must be cost efficient = aggressive budget of $15.5M “All In”
• Must be aesthetically pleasing and reduce campus traffic
• Durable and energy efficient
• Be innovative in order to reduce size of facility
• Provide covered, secure parking for maintenance carts
• Timely completion to allow follow-on Athletics project to start construction

Vision

“Leaders keep their eyes on the horizon, not just the bottom line.”
- Warren G. Bennis
Setting up the Evaluation Factors

**PRICE**
- Define the cost they are to provide (set the construction value)

**PRIORITIZE**
- Most points for what is most important to you

**DESIGN**
- Limit what the teams provide in terms of design

---

### EVALUATION FACTORS--MAXIMUM POINTS

Each Design-Build Proposal will be evaluated on the basis of the total number of points scored in the District’s evaluation of the Proposal out of a total possible 1000 points:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Category</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Price Factor:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. PRICE</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Non-Price Factors:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TECHNICAL EXPERTISE</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. APPROACH TO DESIGN EXCELLENCE</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. LIFECYCLE COST</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SKILLED LABOR FORCE AVAILABILITY</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SAFETY RECORD</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. LOCAL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OVERALL POINTS</strong></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did we get what we wanted in the proposals?

LAYERS OF DESIGN

- Conditioned Space vs. Passive Space
- Covered and Secure Parking
- Modular Structural Bays
- High-Bay LED Lighting
- High Bay Fans
- 100% Daylighting
- Durable Materials

PALOMAR MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS COMPLEX
EFFICIENT, MODULAR LAYOUT

REFERENCE

Integration + Collaboration = Success
Cost Breakdown

Project SF Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>Per building SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Site Area</td>
<td>147,500</td>
<td>$450.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Area</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>($15.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Work</td>
<td>118,500</td>
<td>$371.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design-Build Construction Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Per building SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>$13,075,000</td>
<td>$450.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Construction Soft Cost</td>
<td>$(2,310,773)</td>
<td>$(15.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Cost</td>
<td>$10,764,227</td>
<td>$371.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Direct Cost Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Per building SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Work Cost</td>
<td>$1,777,500</td>
<td>$61.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsite Cost</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$8.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Cost</td>
<td>$8,736,727</td>
<td>$301.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Integration + Collaboration = Success
What were our results?
Goals

• Must be cost efficient
• Innovative and reduce SF
• Durable and Energy Efficient
• Covered secure parking for carts
• Aesthetically Pleasing

Cost

Set direct construction cost at $11M
Current GMP Direct Construction Cost = $11.2M

Size

Existing facilities = 33,750 SF
Final Design = 26,850 SF
Used high density storage for warehouse and 16’ceiling heights
Durable & Energy Efficient
Goal – LEED Silver Minimum

Design
- LEED Platinum
- Net Zero Energy
- 5 out of 7 Petals in the Living Building Challenge and would be the first Community College facility in the nation to receive this international recognition
Aesthetically Pleasing?
ANNUAL CONFERENCE & AWARDS PROGRAM

WESTERN PACIFIC REGION
PASADENA, CA

Integration + Collaboration = Success
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