
From: Preedy, Matt
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2009 3:31 PM
To: Benito, Roland
Subject: RE: DRAFT Work Plan Outline for Bored Tunnel RFP (ELA Cmnts) 5_7_09

Thanks for the input, we knew this was a brain dump or cut/paste from the Miami tunnel project. PB acknowledges that they are not going to be doing all of this work, they just wanted a list of stuff that "somebody" had to do. I also agree that the majority of the document is repetitive.

With that said, I am setting up a weekly RFP coordination meeting, to be held on Tuesday afternoons, 1:00 to 3:00. I would like to meet with you, Eldon Jacobsen(PB) and Don Phelps(HMM) in advance of the first meeting to talk logistics. Are you in tomorrow afternoon? Would like to get together then.....

Matt.

-----Original Message-----

From: Benito, Roland
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2009 2:50 PM
To: Preedy, Matt
Subject: RE: DRAFT Work Plan Outline for Bored Tunnel RFP (ELA Cmnts) 5_7_09

Matt -

Below are my comments to the PB prepared RFQ/RFP Development outline. In general, the outline provided do not conform to the WSDOT structure of DB contracts. It is evident that PB just pulled the outline from a different project and submitted it to WSDOT. Had PB invested a couple of hours in reviewing past WSDOT DB contracts, the effort developing the outline would have been worthwhile.

If you print the Outline, you get 9 pages of which only 2 are useful, the rest a rehash and relabeling of the first 2 pages.

Comments: PAGE 1

1. The RFQ outline consist of 2 lines and implies for PD to draft it for WSDOT review. Is this the intent?
2. For an RFQ development outline, it would be nice to outline all of the things that have to be developed for the whole RFQ process - RFQ Evaluation Plan, Draft RFQ, Scheduling Evaluators, Supporting Documents and references etc.
3. Volume 1 - Agreement - Draft DB Contract Agreement - What is this document?
4. For the RFP, WSDOT basic documents are the Instructions to Proposers(ITP), Chapter 1 - General Provisions, Chapter 2 - Technical Requirements, and Reference Documents. The provided outline "Technical Requirements" is actually the General Provisions.
5. Volume II Division 1,Section 10 needs to be removed from this section since it is covered explicitly and in detail on the Technical Requirements Sections.
6. Volume III and Reference Documents are all the same type of documents - Reference Documents. The Title of Additional Mandatory Requirements is misleading.

Comments: PAGE 2

1. Why is the CM procurement in this outline at all?
2. Same with Right of Way
3. UTILITIES - Why are we defining the scope of work for the DB Contractor at all? IT is the DB's scope of work to address in order to deliver the project, it could be a lot or it could be minimal depending on the DB's method and strategy in delivering the project.

4. The Fire/Life Safety and Tunnel Vulnerability Assessment are Technical Requirements and should be in Chapter 2.

Matt - What you BP has provided is not an outline at all but a listing of things that they think should be done. Not in any order or priority nor how you final document will be ordered.

If we want to keep moving forward, we need to start getting quality work from our consultants that gets us to our goals. The outline is reminiscent of the one meeting we had to look at project packaging options where schedule and options did not make much sense and we kept just getting tol that there was an error and they will give us the "right one". Whatever happened to quality processes that are supposed to be in place?

Roland

-----Original Message-----

From: Preedy, Matt
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2009 11:03 AM
To: Benito, Roland
Subject: FW: DRAFT Work Plan Outline for Bored Tunnel RFP (ELA Cmnts) 5_7_09
Importance: High

Take a look at the attachment, any sections missing? Thoughts on responsibility for sections? Would like to have your thoughts by Wednesday if possible....

Matt.

-----Original Message-----

From: Rigsby, Mike (Consultant)
Sent: Friday, May 08, 2009 8:06 AM
To: White, John; Everett, Susan; Preedy, Matt; Greco, Theresa; Bohlke, Brenda (Consultant); Reilly, John; Reilly, John; Jarnagan, Harry (Consultant); Phelps, Don (Consultant)
Cc: 'abbott@pbworld.com'; Conte, Rick (Consultant); Clark, Gordon T. (Consultant)
Subject: FW: DRAFT Work Plan Outline for Bored Tunnel RFP (ELA Cmnts) 5_7_09
Importance: High

Attached is the spreadsheet Eldon discussed yesterday showing our work plan outline and a column to designate lead and support responsibilities. Please let me know if you have any questions or comments. Thanks.

Mike Rigsby
Parsons Brinckerhoff
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program
206-382-6352

From: Abbott, Eldon L.
Sent: Thu 5/7/2009 1:10 PM
To: Rigsby, Mike; Conte, Rick
Subject: DRAFT Work Plan Outline for Bored Tunnel RFP (ELA Cmnts) 5_7_09

As requested, here is the "Look Ahead Schedule" spreadsheet for AWV RFQ/P production. Mike or Rick, since I do not have the WSDOT email address, please forward this spreadsheet on the all of the WSDOT staff at this mornings meeting.

Thanks,

Eldon

Eldon L. Abbott

PB
75 Arlington Street
Boston, MA 02116

Telephone: 617-960-4850
Fax: 617-482-8487
Cell Phone: 617-504-2971

Email Address: abbott@pbworld.com

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.

*** eSafe1 scanned this email for malicious content ***

*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***