

## QIC CMGC / Best Value Focus Group

February 21, 2013

### Attending:

- Jay Hosay – Co-Chair      Messer
- Allan Cox – Co-Chair      Bell & Associates
- Brian Hay                      Hardaway
- Wayne Johnson              Thomas Miller Partners
- Larry Hart                      Thomas Miller Partners
- Page Inman                      Inman-EMJ (Via conference call)
- Tim McKeehan                University of Tennessee (Via conference call)
- Andy Sneed                      WASCO
- Lisa Namie                      Fleming Architects (Via conference call)

1. Future meetings of the CM/GC BV Focus Group will be held the 4th Wednesday of each month, 9:00 a.m. CST at AGC Tennessee's office. Call in via conference call is available.
2. Question was asked on expectation of amount of time and work of Focus Group considering the ground work that has been done. Alan Robertson commented that the previous groups work is a good place to start. The initial focus will be to help the state SPA's understand information needed to make the selection of the appropriate delivery method.
3. Stream and UT have submitted a forecast of delivery methods for their respective agency's proposed FY 13/14 projects.
4. For the next QIC full committee meeting, our focus group will present CM/GC and BV overview. Allan and Jay will present.
5. Page Inman reiterated the concerns that have been expressed regarding evaluator training and their ability to properly evaluate CM/GC and BV responses. Alan Robertson commented that the State may add some time to the large group for discussion for this issue. QIC CM/GC BV focus group to discuss this further at future meetings.
6. Lisa mentioned the need to have the architect's voice a part of the CM/GC BV evaluations as a voting member or an advisor. Jay Hosay added that we could address the concerns of the competency of the evaluators if the Architect can review and coach the team on the important aspects of the proposal.
7. Bryan Hay suggested that the CM/GC and BV committee be split to focus the resources on either method or the other. His thoughts are CM/GC is a negotiated approach and both the Design/Bid/Build and Best Value are competitive bid. The BV and DBB could be combined

and the 2nd committee could be CM/GC with the committee's combining their discussions on the "qualifications" side of the approaches.

8. Tim McKeehan pointed out that typically on the UT's BV approaches a short list of prequalified bidders (3-5) is developed from the responses, versus all firms that meet a threshold of points is allowed to bid the project. He suggested that this be clarified in the BV descriptions being presented next week.