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Hire a designer for the least cost, and the product is!

Bid the drawings and specifications, and the result is a happy Contractor who made the biggest mistake.

Build the project with the least costly design, and the Contractor who had the lowest bid, and the outcome is!

There has to be a better way!
A Better Way

1. Select the best firms for the projects

2. Integrate as One Team to deliver projects

3. Work collaboratively together as a team

Using a Qualification Based Selection of a Design Builder

Through Stakeholder Engagement Partnering

With a Structured Collaborative Partnering Program
The Conflict in the Law

Standard of Care
The common law standard of care for performance of design professional services is generally defined as the ordinary and reasonable care usually exercised by one in that profession, on the same type of project, at the same time and in the same place, under similar circumstances and conditions. Perfect performance is not required by the common law.

Spearin Doctrine
United States v. Spearin (248 U.S. 132), also referred to as the Spearin doctrine, is a 1918 United States Supreme Court decision. It remains one of the landmark construction law cases. The owner impliedly warrants the information, plans and specifications which an owner provides to a general contractor. The contractor will not be liable to the owner for loss or damage which results solely from insufficiencies or defects in such information, plans and specifications.

Builder can assume contract is error free with no omissions.

The Owner is accountable to a reasonable standard of care, therefore Errors and Omission are acceptable within a limit.
Construction & Non Farm Labor Productivity Index (1964-2016)

Constant Dollars of Contracts / Workhours of Hourly Workers
Sources: US Department of Commerce, Bureau of Labor Statistics

Non-Farm Productivity Index (1964 = 100%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Perceived Project Risk</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Airport</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>thinks the designer will:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• only be concerned with the own ego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• be over budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• not be what is wanted or needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• miss program elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>thinks the builder will:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• never do what we want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• pursue change orders and additional cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• never finish on time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• cut corners to save money</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Designer** |
| **thinks the designer will:** |
| • never be satisfied with the quality of the work |
| • not pay for changes |
| • never acknowledge schedule delays |
| **thinks the builder will:** |
| • deviate from the design |
| • look for errors and ask to many RFI’s |
| • always say it is not constructible and drawings are deficient |

| **Builder** |
| **thinks the Airport will:** |
| • never be satisfied with the quality of the work |
| • not pay for changes |
| • never acknowledge schedule delays |
| **thinks the designer will:** |
| • provide incomplete unconstructable drawings |
| • claim the drawings are perfectly understandable |
| • always fault the contractors for missing things in their bid |
| **thinks the builder will:** |
| • never make a decision |
| • keep changing the design |
| • blame the design for change orders |
| • always want additional design services for free |
**Organization Behavior:**
The project individual team members behavior will depend on the leadership style - How is the participant control structure organized?

**Operating Management:**
Behavior will reflect the way the project is managed – how is the project management plan created?

**Commercial Terms:**
You will get the behavior you contract for – what is the contractual relationship?
Domains of Project Delivery

**Traditional Project Delivery**
- Organization Structure is hierarchical
- Blame is assigned to party based on contract requirements
- Lowest Bid Wins
- Qualifications are not considered

- Critical Path or Push Scheduling
- Fixed Cost based on Low Bid
• Project Alliance is built on Common Purpose
• Partnered Approach to issue identification and resolution

• Terms of Cost, Scope and schedule is Co-Created prior to finalizing
• Qualifications are considered

• Pull Planning to promote improvement
• Target Value Budgeting
Successful Project Outcome

Project Alliance

Schedule
Scope
Cost
Integrated project delivery (IPD), is a collaborative alliance of people, systems, business structures and practices in a process that harnesses the talents and insights of all participants to optimize project results, increase value to the owner, reduce waste, and maximize efficiency through all phases of design, fabrication, and construction.

Source: the American Institute of Architects
Integrated Project Delivery

- Programming Phase
- Schematic Design Phase
- Design Development Phase
- Construction Documentation Phase
- Procurement of Trades
- Construction Phase
- Closeout Phase
- Operations and Maintenance Phase

- Ability to Control Cost
- Cost of Changes

Design Effort/Stakeholder Involvement vs. Time

Integrated vs. Traditional

Exceptional Project Outcome
Integrated Project Delivery

Programming Phase | Schematic Design Phase | Design Development Phase | Construction Documentation Phase | Procurement of Trades | Construction Phase | Closeout Phase | Operations and Maintenance Phase

Incremental Collection & Verification of Data

Data Requirements

SFO APPROACH

BIM → BIM Handover → SFO Target Systems

TRADITIONAL 2D/3D 2D+3D 2D

Handover

BIM

SFO APPROACH

Inaccurate, Unreliable & Unusable Information

Data Loss
Questions
Exceptional, deviating from the norm, outstanding, excellent, rare

Project, something that is contemplated, devised or planned, a large or major undertaking involving considerable money, resources and equipment.

Outcome, something that follows as a result or consequence and that can be measured
Exceptional Project Outcome

**Business Participation Outcomes**
- LBE Participation Goals
- DBE Participation Goals
- Local Hire Goals
- New Hire Goals
- Create Jobs

**Economic Outcomes**
- Exceed Revenue
- Reduce O & M Cost
- Local Economy Improvement
- Increased Competition
- Minimize Impact on CPE

**Construction Outcomes**
- Safety Incidents
- Operational Impacts
- Profitable Outcome for All
- Non-Conformance Work
- Disputes/Claims

**Social Inclusion Outcomes**
- Environmental Stewardship
- Economical Responsibility
- Maximize Performance
- Optimize Operations

**Design Outcomes**
- Passenger Experience
- Project Recognition/Awards
- End User Satisfaction
- Creative Solutions
- Innovative Solutions

**Sustainability Outcomes**
- Target Budget Performance
- Target Schedule Performance
- Activation/Startup Goals
- Have Fun
- Partnering Goals

**Project Management Outcomes**
- Passenger Experience
- Project Recognition/Awards
- End User Satisfaction
- Creative Solutions
- Innovative Solutions
Basis of Design

**Design, Creativity & Innovation**

**Requirements**
- Mandatory
- Voluntary

**Basis of Design**
- Prescriptive
- Performance
- Advisory
- Encouraging
- Aspirational

**Regulatory Codes**
- National Electric Code
- OSHA Codes
- Building Codes
- National Fire Protection Code
- American Society for Testing and Materials
- American National Standards Institute

**Organization Model Codes**
- LEED Rating System
- IATA Level of Service
- Strategic Plan
- Principles of R.E.A.C.H.
- Building Information Modeling
- Stakeholder Engagement Process
- Structured Collaborative Partnering
- Sustainability Planning, Design & Construction Guidelines

**Our Guiding Principles**
- STRATEGIC PLAN
- PRINCIPLES OF R.E.A.C.H.
- BUILDING INFORMATION MODELING
- STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PROCESS
- STRUCTURED COLLABORATIVE PARTNERING
- SUSTAINABILITY PLANNING, DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION GUIDELINES

**Flexibility**
- High
- Low

**Creativity & Innovation**
- Low
- High
Airport Guiding Principles

- Strategic Plan
- Principles of R.E.A.C.H.
- Building Information Modeling Guide
- Stakeholder Engagement Process
- Structured Collaborative Partnering
- Sustainability Planning, Design & Construction Guidelines

The Airport's Strategic Plan defines the Airport's overall mission, vision and objectives, along with the strategic initiatives that support our vision of "Reaching for #1", with our mission to "provide an exceptional airport in service to our communities".

The Principles of R.E.A.C.H., "Revenue Enhancement and Customer Hospitality", define elements of the Guest Experience, Values, and Journey with the intent of ensuring an "Exceptional Project Outcome" on every project.

The Building Information Modeling Guide is SFO's vision for incorporating Virtual Design & Construction as part of our holistic approach to collaborative & integrated project delivery to streamline the flow of accurate and real time information in support of the objective of providing Exceptional Project Outcomes.

The Stakeholder Engagement Process provides the structure of how we integrate and tap into the collective wisdom of all the individuals involved in a project to develop the program scope, cost and schedule, review design documents, resolve issues during construction, develop and test the project program through activation, and finally, closeout the project.

Structured Collaborative Partnering is intended to be part of a holistic approach to the delivery of Exceptional Projects at the Airport. Partnering is intended to provide a trusted leadership model which is required to develop an integrated high performing team that delivers exceptional results through collaboration.

The Sustainability Planning, Design & Construction Guidelines define the Airport's overall approach to sustainable planning, design and construction. The vision of our sustainability and resiliency objectives are achieved by establishing industry leading goals around social inclusion, environmental stewardship and economic responsibility.
Integrated & Collaborative Elements

- Integrated Project Delivery
- Qualification Based Selection

- Integrated Technology Systems
- Lean Construction Tools

Exceptional Project Team
- Project Management Team
- Design Team
- Builder Team

Collaborative Systems
- 3D Modeling (Revit)
- Building Information Management (BIM)
- Integrated Working Environment
  - Pull Planning
  - Target Value Budgeting

Exceptional Project Outcome “EPO”

Virtual Building Model

Collaborative Alliances
- Airport & Stakeholders
- Designers & Subconsultants
- Builder & Subcontractors

- Stakeholder Engagement Process
- Structured Collaborative Partnering
Risk Will Always Stay With the Responsible Organization

Focus On Aligning Expectations Not Assigning Risk

- Budget expectations
- Funding expectations
- Schedule expectations
- Scope expectations
- Project outcome expectations
- Sharing vision with team

- Interpret vision
- Communicate design
- Develop Project Program
- Develop project contract drawings
- Develop project specifications

- Build project in accordance with contract documents
- Build project within approved budget
- Build project within approved schedule

Risk Will Always Stay With the Responsible Organization

Focus On Aligning Expectations Not Assigning Risk

- Budget expectations
- Funding expectations
- Schedule expectations
- Scope expectations
- Project outcome expectations
- Sharing vision with team

- Interpret vision
- Communicate design
- Develop Project Program
- Develop project contract drawings
- Develop project specifications

- Build project in accordance with contract documents
- Build project within approved budget
- Build project within approved schedule
Aligned Project Delivery

The Project Team

- Airport (Vision)
- Collaborate
- Designer (Design)
- Builder (Construct)

Lines of Communication
Contractual Relationship

The Project

Scope
Cost
Schedule

Deliver
The Project

Align Expectations
Procurement of Trade Packages
Vision
Design
Construction
Project Delivery

Design-Bid-Build

Owner → Builder
   ↓
Designer

Risk Assignment:
- Vision
- Design

Contractual Relationship

Design-Build

Owner → Bridging Designer → Builder
   ↓
Designer

Risk Assignment:
- Vision
- Design
- Construction

Procurement of Construction

Contractual Relationship
Progressive Design Build Delivery

Lines of Communication
Contractual Relationship

Design Phase

- Owner
- Builder
- Designer

Risk Assignment:
- Vision
- Design
- Construction

Collaborate and Align Expectation

Procurement of Trade Packages

Progressive Buyout to GMP

- Owner
- Builder
- Designer

Risk Assignment:
- Vision

Risk Assignment:
- Design
- Construction
# Contract Delivery Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Elements</th>
<th>Design-Bid-Build</th>
<th>CM at Risk</th>
<th>Design-Build (Lump Sum)</th>
<th>Design-Build (Progressive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract Relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer</td>
<td>Designer</td>
<td>Designer</td>
<td>Designer</td>
<td>Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Construction</td>
<td>Procurement of Construction</td>
<td>Procurement of Trade Packages</td>
<td>Procurement of Trade Packages</td>
<td>Procurement of Trade Packages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pricing Model for Direct Construction Cost</strong></td>
<td>Lump Sum/Low Bid</td>
<td>Negotiated GMP</td>
<td>Lump Sum/Low Bid</td>
<td>Negotiated GMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualifications Part of Selection of Builder</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design Philosophy</strong></td>
<td>Owner Managed Design</td>
<td>Design Assist</td>
<td>Collaborative Design</td>
<td>Collaborative &amp; Integrated Design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Not Desirable](https://example.com/not-desirable.png) ![Desirable](https://example.com/desirable.png) ![Very Desirable](https://example.com/very-desirable.png)
Qualification Based Selection

- Selection Based 60% on Qualifications & 40% on Cost as required by the City & County of San Francisco Administrative Code
- Shortlist Based on Written Technical & Qualifications Submission Only
- Oral Interview occur after Short List
- Qualifications evaluation scored based on:
  - Written Technical & Qualifications
    - Team Qualifications
    - Key Personnel Experience
    - Previous Similar Project Experience
    - Design Management Approach
    - Project Management Approach
  - Oral Interviews (Scenario based interview)
- Cost evaluation scored based on: (Optional)
  - Programming Services (Lump Sum)
  - Design Builder Management Cost (Lump Sum)
  - Overhead and Profit Fee (Percentage of Trade Packages Bid)
# Example Cost Calculation

Assume 200 Points Awarded for Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provided in Proposal by Design Builder</th>
<th>D/B Team 1</th>
<th>D/B Team 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programming Service (Lump Sum)</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Builder Management Services (Lump Sum)</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead &amp; Profit Fee (Percentage of Trade Packages)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated by Airport for Calculation & Evaluation Purposes. This information is included in the RFQ/P.

| Estimated Trade Package Value (Lump Sum)                                    | $300,000,000     | $300,000,000     |
| Budget for Design Services (Lump Sum)                                       | $10,000,000      | $10,000,000      |

Calculated Overhead & Profit based on fee provided in RFP

| Overhead & Profit Calculated (Lump Sum)                                     | $15,000,000      | $21,000,000      |

| Total Evaluation Cost (Lump Sum)                                            | $338,000,000     | $347,500,000     |
| Percent Difference                                                          | 2.81% Higher     |                  |
| Percent of Points to be Awarded                                             | 100%             | 97.19%           |
| Point Awarded base on Evaluation                                            | 200              | 194.38           |
Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP)

Components of the GMP

- Programming Services
- Builder Management Services
- Design Services
- Trade Package Base Work
- Trade Package Allowances
- Design Builder O/P Fee
- Design Builder Reserves

The GMP is an open book process and transparent both the Design Builder & Airport
Components of the GMP

- Trade Package Base Work
- Trade Package Reserves

Align Expectations & Risk around Trade Packages
Design-Bid-Build Delivery Timeline

- **Design**
- **Bid**
- **Build**

Project Cost:
- Conceptual Estimate
- Lump Sum Bid

Time:
- Project Completion
- No Collaboration from Builder
PROGRESSIVE DESIGN BUILD

Progressive Design Build Delivery Timeline

- **Design**
- **Build**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buyout</td>
<td>Conceptual Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Build</td>
<td>GMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collaboration
Optimization of Time & Cost

Design–Bid-Build Delivery Timeline
- Design
- Bid
- Build

Progressive Design Build Delivery Timeline
- Design
- Build

Project Cost
- Conceptual Estimate
- Begin Buyout
- Lump Sum Bid
- GMP

Project Budget

Time

Opportunity for Exceptional Project Outcome
Design Builder 
Bids out 
Trade Package Sets

Site Work
- Temporary Facilities
- Site Equipment
- Underground Utilities
- Civil
- Demolition

Foundation
- Piles
- Excavation
- Formwork
- Reinforcement
- Concrete

Superstructure
- Structural Steel
- Metal Deck
- Formwork
- Reinforcement
- Concrete

Core Trades (D/B)
- Electrical
- HVAC
- Plumbing
- Fire Protection
- Exterior Curtain Wall
- Baggage Handling System

Building Systems
- Fire Alarm
- Active Network
- Passive Network
- Security
- Terminal Management

Equipment (E/P)
- Light Fixtures
- Electrical Equipment
- HVAC Equipment
- Window Washing Equipment
- Trash Compactors

Notes:
(D/B) Design Build Trade Package
(E/P) Early Procurement Packages

Architectural
- Drywall
- Ornamental Steel
- Casework
- Plaster
- Glazing
- Doors & Hardware
- Fire Proofing
- Terrazzo
- Flooring

Conveyances
- Elevators
- Escalators
- Moving Walks
- Dumb Waiters
- Passenger Loading Bridges

Trade Bid Packages

Notes:
(D/B) Design Build Trade Package
(E/P) Early Procurement Packages
Questions
One Process With Different Phases
Collaboration & Integration

Project Team Communication

Core Team Communication

Collaboration & Communication

Stakeholders
- End Users
- Regulatory Agencies
- Tenants
- Building Department
- Operations
- Signage Consultant
- Life Safety Consultant
- Landscape Architect
- Structural Engineer
- Electrical Engineer
- Mechanical Engineer
- Civil Engineer
- Structural Steel
- Curtain Wall
- Electrical
- Mechanical
- Floors Ceilings
- Drywall
- Concrete
- Maintenance

Subconsultants
- Finance
- Operations

Subcontractors
- Airport
- Builder
- Designer

End Users
- Finance
- Operations
- Signage Consultant
- Life Safety Consultant
- Landscape Architect
- Structural Engineer
- Electrical Engineer
- Mechanical Engineer
- Civil Engineer
- Structural Steel
- Curtain Wall
- Electrical
- Mechanical
- Floors Ceilings
- Drywall
- Concrete
- Maintenance

Project Team

Collaboration & Integration
Collaboration is where individuals of the project team regardless of discipline shares information directly with another individual of the project team working toward a common set of project outcomes.

Integration is where an individual of the project team regardless of discipline can share the collaborative information in a way that the entire project team can utilize the same information toward a common set of project outcomes.
Collaboration is where individuals of the project team regardless of discipline shares information directly with another individual of the project team working toward a common set of project outcomes.

Integration is where an individual of the project team regardless of discipline can share the collaborative information in a way that the entire project team can utilize the same information toward a common set of project outcomes.
Collaboration & Integration

Share Leadership Downward & Horizontally

Level 4 Leadership

Level 3 Leadership

Level 2 Leadership

Level 1 Leadership

Collaboration

Structured Collaborative Partnering

Integration

Stakeholder Engagement Process

Group Project Team Individuals by Common Objectives
Project Leadership

• All Project Team members will have to be leaders
• Leaders have followers
• Following is voluntary

Leadership is the ability to guide and motivate a group of people toward a common purpose
## Continuum of Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dictatorship Leadership</th>
<th>Leadership Characteristics</th>
<th>Trusted Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Trust</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>High Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatening</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>Incentive</td>
<td>Reward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Fun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Solution</td>
<td>Invention</td>
<td>Multiple Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Learning</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Coaching/Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Professional Growth</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Professional Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Performance</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>High Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Excellence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continuum of Leadership*
Stakeholder Engagement

Collaboration Zone
- Stakeholders taking the lead
- Leadership role is Delegating/Supporting
- Self-sustaining

Cooperation Zone
- Stakeholders following
- Leadership role is Coaching/ Directing
- Requires continuous maintenance

Support Zone
- Stakeholders go along by leadership force

Apathy Zone
- Stakeholders are not involved

Resistance Zone
- Stakeholders protest

Disorder Zone
- Stakeholders are counter productive
- Leadership does not exist
- New leadership is required

Stakeholder Behavior

Agree
- Champion
- Pro-active Supporter
- Active Supporter (overt)
- Active Supporter (covert)
- Passive Supporter
- Neutral Acceptor
- Reluctant Supporter
- Passive Resistor
- Active Resister (overt)
- Active Resister (covert)
- Saboteur
- Destroyer

Drivers for
- Support, Engagement, Involvement
- Communication, Responsibility
- Fear, Disengagement, Cynicism
- Concealment, Suppression

Drivers against

Results

Exceptional
- Collective Wisdom of entire group
- Co-Creation of ideas/solutions
- Creativity is extremely high
- Innovation is required
- Issues are identified and resolved

Good
- Wisdom of limited to individuals
- Limited creation of ideas/solutions
- Creativity is minimal
- Innovation is more routine
- Issues are identified slowly resolved

Acceptable
- Wisdom is limited to authority
- New ideas/solutions are resisted
- Creativity does not exist
- Innovation is stalled
- Issues are not identified

Non-Acceptable
- Wisdom is now ignorance
- New ideas/solutions are feared
- Creativity is considered malicious
- Innovation is shut down
- Issues are purposely hidden

Trusted Leadership
- Leadership by Encouragement
- Leadership by Force
- Ultimate It is the Stakeholders Choice

Dictator Leadership

Drivers for
- Support, Engagement, Involvement
- Communication, Responsibility

Drivers against
- Fear, Disengagement, Cynicism
- Concealment, Suppression

Agree
- Champion
- Pro-active Supporter
- Active Supporter (overt)
- Active Supporter (covert)
- Passive Supporter
- Neutral Acceptor
- Reluctant Supporter
- Passive Resistor
- Active Resister (overt)
- Active Resister (covert)
- Saboteur
- Destroyer

Disagree
- Passionate
- Motivated
- Passionate
- Doubtful
- Support
- Motivated
- Passive
- Resistant
Stakeholder Engagement Process (SEP)

- **Closeout Phase**
  - Develop Punch-list
  - Review Closeout Documents

- **Programming Phase**
  - Develop Project Definition
  - Develop Project Program

- **Design Phase**
  - Provide Design Review
  - Resolve Design Issues

- **Construction Phase**
  - Review Construction
  - Resolve Construction Issues

- **Activation Phase**
  - Develop Simulation Testing
  - Participate in Testing
Stakeholder Engagement Teams

SEP Group 1
Design Vision
1.1 Architecture
1.2 Art Enrichment
1.3 Programming/Space Planning
1.4 Passenger Experience
1.5 Innovative Technology

SEP Group 2
Performance & Code
2.1 Life Safety Systems
2.2 Structural Systems
2.3 Sustainability
2.4 Temporary Certificate of Occupancy
2.5 ADA/Code Requirements

SEP Group 3
Construction Planning
3.1 Civil, Apron, & Underground Utilities
3.2 Site Logistics
3.3 Roadways & Parking
3.4 Demolition & Hazmat
3.5 Curbside, Landside Logistics & Operations
3.6 Airside Logistics & Operation

SEP Group 4
Building Systems
4.1 Elevator, Escalators & Moving Walks
4.2 Doors, Hardware & Keying
4.3 Mechanical Systems
4.4 Electrical & Lighting

SEP Group 5
Special Systems
5.1 Terminal Management Systems
5.2 ITT Systems
5.3 Security Systems

SEP Group 6
Airport Operations
6.1 Graphics & Signage
6.2 Furniture & Millwork
6.3 Restrooms, Janitorial & Window Washing
6.4 Marketing, Ceremonies & Public Relations
6.5 Security Checkpoint

SEP Group 7
Airline Operations
7.1 Baggage Handling System
7.2 Aircraft Systems
7.3 Airline Operation & Coordination
7.4 Airside Logistics & Operation

SEP Group 8
Tenant Coordination
8.1 Existing Tenants
8.2 Tenant Relocations
8.3 Concessions
The Stakeholder Engagement Process Team Organization
Partnering is a structured process in which two or more organizations "THE PROJECT TEAM" come together to form high performing integrated teams. By committing to teamwork communication, trust, transparency, respect, and fairness, a collaborative environment is created that sets goals and objectives to produce an exceptional project outcome.
Issues
Are leading indicators of problems that do not cause harm and are easily solved through non adversarial team co-created solutions because conflict does not exist.

Partnering
A Project Team Alliance where everyone holds each other accountable to a co-created common purpose to deliver an exceptional project.

Problems
Are leading indicators of disputes, that cause harm and are more challenging to solve through non adversarial team co-created solutions because of the fear of conflict.

Dispute Resolution Boards
A Third Party that holds everyone accountable to a legal contract to deliver a project on time and on budget.

Disputes
Are leading indicators of litigation that have caused harm and are now difficult to solve through non adversarial team co-created solutions because of the fear of litigation.
Partnering Elements

- Lessons Learned
- Celebrate Successes
- Goals for Programming
- Develop Partnering Plan
- Develop Partnering Charter
- Agree on Project Outcomes
- Identify Project Outcome Risk
- Develop Team Commitments
- Communicate Project Issues
- Update Team Commitments
- Exceptional Project Outcomes
- Scorecard Measurement
- OAC/FAST Meeting Check-in
- Facilitated On Going Workshops
- Closeout Workshop
- Planning Workshop
- Kickoff Workshop
Metrics & Measurement

PROJECT GOALS

[ ] indicates score associated with comment

A. Meet or exceed customer expectation or the project process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Last Month</th>
<th>This Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
A little behind schedule, and gap increasing [3]
We will be delivering a high quality product [3]
At this point in time it appears to have no effect [n/a]
Everyone is committed to this goal [4]
Poor communication has led to many customer changes [2]

B. To communicate openly, honestly and fairly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Last Month</th>
<th>This Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
Unknown [n/a]
Meeting have been congenial and fruitful [4]
No transparency amongst client, CM and D/B Team. [2]
While we get to know one another there still seem to be some reluctance to be fully open in discussions. [3]

C. To communicate with external stakeholders fairly, promptly, and accurately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Last Month</th>
<th>This Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
Communicating, but predications are not being met. [3]
Communications with Stakeholders has not been 100% [2]
Maintenance is not directly involved with this portion of the process [n/a]