

NOTICE OF MEETING

CITY OF BRANSON



CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE

Committee Meeting – Thursday, November 3, 2016 – 8:30 a.m.
Municipal Court Room – Branson City Hall – 110 W. Maddux

AGENDA

- 1) Call to Order.
- 2) Roll Call.
- 3) Discussion of Consultant Selection Historic Downtown Phase 3.
[GRE Scope & Fee]
- 4) Discussion of Contractor Selection Hwy. 76 Phase 1A Surface Improvements.
- 5) Adjourn.

Where Values are the Difference

NOVEMBER: INTEGRITY

Doing the right thing, even when no one is looking.

For more information please visit www.bransonmo.gov or contact:

Lisa Westfall, City Clerk, 417-337-8522

Posted: October 31, 2016

By: _____ At: _____

Page 1 of 1

TO: Capital Improvements Committee

FROM: David Miller, City Engineer/Director of Public Works

DATE: October 24, 2016

SUBJ: Engineer Selection for Historic Downtown Branson Streetscape Phase IV.

In 2016, the Board of Aldermen approved a contract with Great River Engineers, based on the recommendation from the Capital Improvements Committee. The contract was for the design of the Phase III streetscape improvements in downtown Branson. Great River was retained and they provided excellent service and a quality set of plans. They did an outstanding job of obtaining public input and providing information to the affected property owners and the city. The design process went extremely well and no problems arose. The plans are now out to bid for construction and it is anticipated that the construction will be complete in early 2017.

To keep the downtown project moving forward on schedule it is now critical to start the design process for Phase IV. This phase will be on East Main Street from Commercial Street to Sycamore. This is a very challenging section of road due to the extremely steep grade and the difficulty with access to the businesses that have entries on the steep hill. The construction cost is estimated to be \$3.2 million.

Typically, when the city does a project with multiple phases, as long as the work provided by the consultant is satisfactory, the subsequent phases of work are awarded to that same firm. This avoids the lengthy, and unnecessary, process of requesting proposals from all engineering firms and then going through the selection process. This expedited process of using the same firm is allowed by city code which says that the Board of Aldermen may direct that any or all portions of the engineer selection process be modified to expedite a particular project.

The expedited process typically involves presenting the proposed engineering contract to the Capital Improvements Committee for review and discussion. If the committee concurs with staff's suggestion to enter into another contract with the firm, then that recommendation is presented to the Aldermen as part of the contract approval process.

Attached is the negotiated scope of work with Great River Engineers. The design work includes surveying, administration, waterline design, storm sewer design, landscaping, sidewalk and street design. The total of these design-related fees is \$264,247 which is 8.3% of the estimated construction cost. This is well within the expected range of fees. In addition to the basic design work, the scope includes preproject photography, 4 small group meetings, 4 large town hall style meetings, 27 business interviews, artist renderings and also construction phase services. These additional services total \$221,230.

Lastly, the adopted master plan contemplated an extensive wayfinding signage analysis to be done after the construction started. The city receives many complaints about the difficulty visitors have trying to find downtown and the convention center. There are also complaints about confusion once the visitors are downtown about where the parking lots are located or how best to reach Branson Landing, etc. A wayfinding signage analysis would review the overall directional signage needs and develop recommendations about how to help visitors find downtown and then once they are

downtown, how they can best navigate to their destination – either by vehicle or on foot. The wayfinding will be themed with a consistent color, style and information display so that will help to lessen confusion but also add to the quality appearance of the downtown improvements. Great River Engineering's scope includes \$55,000 to provide the wayfinding signage analysis and recommendations.

The total amount of the basic design services, the additional services and the wayfinding signage analysis is \$430,477.

Scope of Services for the City of Branson
Historic Downtown Streetscape Improvements Phase IV

The City of Branson is planning to complete streetscape improvements on Main Street from Commercial south to Sycamore in downtown Branson, Missouri. The limits of Phase IV are shown in the attached exhibit. The improvements will follow the existing Downtown Masterplan phasing for the City.

As part of this project the Engineer shall:

Task 1. Land Surveying

Item 1. The extents of the topographic survey shall be as follows:

- A. Starting at its western limit, the survey shall begin at the intersection of Commercial and Main Streets and extend approximately **575** feet eastward along Main Street to the Railroad Right of Way. This shall extend the survey past Sycamore and pick up any tie in points for utilities.
- B. The survey shall extend to the north and south along Sycamore to the North alley and the South alley respectively, approximately **200** feet in each direction from the centerline of Main Street.

Item 2. The survey shall include the following information:

- A. Topographic survey information as required for the purpose of design.
- B. Location, as directed by Missouri One-Call and the City, of known utilities
- C. Existing Stormwater collection and conveyance system.
- D. Building entrances and loading areas.

Item 3. At the completion of the project, the following survey related items shall be delivered to the City:

- A. An electronic version of all plans, and drawings created from the survey.
- B. An electronic text file of the coordinates of all the raw data points collected in the field, including control monuments used and any calculated points that pertain to the survey (calculated property corners, points of curvature, radius points, etc.).
- C. Copy of all the deeds, plats, surveys, paper field notes, or other documents that were used to complete the survey work.
- D. If surfaces or contours are part of the deliverables, an electronic version of the surface or DTM will be furnished.

Task 2. Public Involvement

Item 1. Public Meeting and Interviews

- A. GRE will attempt to meet with each business owner in the Phase IV project area individually for the purpose of gaining input for the project. The total number of businesses is estimated at Approximately **25**.
- B. GRE will also meet with the Downtown Branson Betterment Association at least **2** times during the project.

Item 2. Renderings and Visualizations

- A. GRE will complete up to **6** renderings as required for the public meetings, for the purpose of the public meetings.
- B. GRE will complete turning radius Visualizations for all intersections within the project.

Task 3. Pre-Project Photography

Item 1. Pre-Project Photography - This will document the current condition of all entrances, and work to help design and protect both the business owners and the City from claims.

- A. GRE shall complete high definition photography of the project area prior to the start of the project.
- B. This photography will be done at **25** foot intervals along the length of the project.
- C. The pre-project photography shall be GIS linked and the given to the City.

Task 4. Design

Item 1. Drinking Water Improvements

- A. GRE shall design new water line replacements to be 8" minimum or 12" at the discretion of the City.
- B. GRE shall design a replacement for all the required valves and fire hydrants within the project limits to match the new lines sizes as above.
- C. GRE shall prepare applications on behalf of the City for DNR approval as required for the projects drinking water improvements.

Item 2. Storm Water Improvements

- A. GRE shall design replacements for the existing stormwater conveyance system within the project limits.
- B. GRE shall ensure that the Phase IV improvements fit the stormwater masterplan for Downtown to plan for future phases.

Item 3. Sanitary Sewer Improvements

- A. It is not anticipated sanitary sewer improvements will be required in this project and is not included in this scope.

Item 4. Streetscape Planting Plans

- A. GRE will prepare planting plans and details for all street plantings in planters.
- B. GRE will prepare detailed layout of the planters including material callouts and dimensions.

Item 5. Irrigation Plan

- A. GRE will prepare an irrigation plan that will show the locations of the water supply lines, irrigation lines, control panels and locations for irrigation.

- B. GRE will prepare detailed specifications and construction details for the irrigation system.

Item 6. Signage

- A. GRE will prepare detailed construction plans and specifications for the placement of all signage and wayfinding through the project.

Item 7. Sidewalks and Bump Outs

- A. GRE will prepare a demolition plan of the existing sidewalks and ramps.
- B. GRE will design ADA accessible sidewalks consisting of concrete and brick pavers.
- C. GRE will design new ADA assessible ramps at roadway intersections.
- D. GRE will design bump outs for the purpose of both traffic calming and beautification.
- E. Bump outs will be designed to allow movement of a WB-50 tractor trailer to maneuver through intersections as currently accommodated.

Item 8. Roadway

- A. GRE will prepare a demolition plan of the existing roadway.
- B. GRE will design a new concrete roadway.
- C. GRE will coordinate the design of the roadway with the stormwater collection and conveyance system.

Item 9. Turning Movements

- A. GRE will provide a detailed design analysis using AutoTurn Software showing existing and proposed vehicle movements within the project limits.
 - 1. This will include: cars, trucks, RV's, buses and tractor trailers.

Item 10. Parking and Striping

- A. GRE shall incorporate parking areas as determined necessary in conjunction with the new sidewalks and other related improvements.
- B. GRE shall provide a detailed pavement marking plan to accommodate both motorists and pedestrians.

Item 11. Traffic Control Plan

- A. GRE will provide a detailed plan for pedestrian and vehicle movements through the project limits during construction.
- B. GRE will provide a detailed plan for maintaining access to the local businesses during construction.

Item 12. Erosion Control Plan

- A. GRE will provide a design plan to aid in the reduction of sediment run-off during construction.

Item 13. Electric Lighting, Conduit Design and Various Controls

- A. GRE will design the placement of streetlights and pedestrian lights and other electric utilities, and other items within the Phase IV project area, including placement of conduit as requested.

Item 14. Other Utilities

- A. GRE will coordinate with existing gas, telecom and electric utilities within the area, including placement of conduit as requested.

Item 15. Wayfinding Signage System

- A. GRE will create a master Wayfinding sign plan for Downtown Branson. This plan will address all aspects of information signage from Highway signs, Gateways, information kiosks and location markers. The plan will specify the location, signage type and create a legend for all proposed signs.
- B. GRE will design a hierarchy of signs with a unified design concept that compliments the theme developed for the Downtown area.
- C. GRE will create a construction document signage package that details out the construction including any necessary electric or fiber connections to the specified signs.
- D. GRE will prepare detailed sign designs including sign types, sizes, text, poles, and hardware.
- E. GRE will develop installation locations by sign size and type
- F. GRE will prepare sign mock-ups for review and comment by stakeholders
- G. GRE will develop probable costs for fabrication and installation

Task 5. Bidding

Item 1. Bidding Services

- A. GRE shall work with the City through the bidding process.
- B. GRE shall review the bids for construction and make a recommendation for award.

Task 6. Construction Administration

Item 1. Shop Drawing Review

- A. GRE shall provide shop drawing review as needed for the project.

Item 2. On-Call Services

- A. GRE will be available for on-call services during construction, until the not to exceed amount is reached.

Item 3. Construction Related Meetings

- A. GRE will attend up to **12** construction related meetings during the construction of the project.

Task 5. Additional Services

Item 1. Additional Public Meetings.

- A. GRE will also plan to complete up to 4 small group meetings with local business owners or stakeholders during the project.
- B. GRE will also plan to complete up to 4 large town hall style public meetings.

Item 3. Construction Staking

- A. GRE will provide survey control for the purpose of constructing the project.
- B. GRE will provide initial construction staking services to the contractor for the project.

Information to be provided by the City for the purpose of design.

- 1. Any additional GIS shape files for the existing drinking water, wastewater, stormwater and any other utilities not previously supplied as requested by GRE.
- 2. Tree inventory information, arborist reports, soil reports and other pertinent information pertaining to the landscaping of the project.
- 3. Paper and AutoCAD files of prior surveys and designs related to Phase IV and adjacent Phases of the downtown streetscape project.

Deliverables to the City

- 1. Design plans, specifications and opinion of probable costs for construction.
- 2. Related final AutoCAD files as requested by the City.

Branson phase IV basic engineering services

Description	Amount
Land Surveying	\$37,547.00
Project Administration and Management	\$17,250.00
Drinking Water Line Related	\$14,050.00
Stormwater Related	\$28,750.00
Landscape Architecture	\$27,900.00
Design of Sidewalks and Roadway (Preliminary)	\$65,000.00
Design of Sidewalks and Roadway (Final)	\$51,750.00
Electric, Communications and Controls Design	\$14,500.00
QA/QC	\$7,500.00
Total	\$264,247.00
Construction Estimate	\$ 3,200,000.00
% Fee	8.26%

Branson phase iii basic + additional

Description	Amount
Total From Basic Services	\$264,247.00
Pre-Project Photography	\$4,950.00
Public Meetings (Business Owners and DBBA)	\$13,780.00
Public Meetings (Unit Price:\$ 1250 small groups and \$ 3250 large group)	\$29,500.00
Construction Phase Services (Hourly not to exceed)	\$44,000.00
Renderings and Visualizations	\$19,000.00
Wayfinding Signage System	\$55,000.00
Total	\$430,477.00

TO: Capital Improvements Committee

FROM: David Miller

DATE: October 28, 2016

SUBJECT: Highway 76 Revitalization Program – Phase 1A Surface Improvements Design-Build Proposals and Contractor Selection Recommendation

Memo Purpose

The purpose of this memo is to provide the Capital Improvements Committee with a recommendation for the selection of a contractor for the above-referenced project and to provide background related to that recommendation. This Memo will discuss the relative strengths and weaknesses of the two proposals received and the reasons the Evaluation Team made said recommendation. It also provides information for the Committee on plans for incorporating a design-build process into future work on the Highway 76 Revitalization Program.

Recommendation Summary

As further detailed below, the two proposals received were evaluated according to the criteria set forth in the RFP. In summary, the Evaluation Team recommends the selection of Carson-Mitchell (CM) as contractor over Emery, Sapp, and Sons (ESS) for the following primary reasons:

- CM has demonstrated a thorough understanding of the unique demands of the project and is poised to “hit the ground running” in order to meet the tight schedule required.
 - Although the work will be “value-engineered” to be less than the costs proposed, CM’s budget is more directly responsive to the RFP, more realistic, and does not raise concerns about future requests for additional funds.
 - CM has an extensive history of projects conducted within similar environments.
 - The City’s past experience with CM has proven their ability to be flexible in a fluid environment. The 76 Revitalization Program demands a high level of commitment from the contractor to interact with, adjust and meet the demands of the City, stakeholders, and the public’s ongoing needs.
 - A lack of experience with similarly complex projects and generic “cut and paste” responses in the ESS proposal raises questions as to the suitability and ability to provide the attention to detail and flexibility that are critical to the overall success of the project.
-

Background

Division 3-Section 2-353(a)(4) of the City's purchasing ordinance stipulates that the City will award bids to the "lowest and best responsible bidder." This provision allows the bidding process to include some aspects of quality review and subjective evaluation to be incorporated into a project bid. The Branson Police Department utilizes this method to evaluate bidders for critical law enforcement purchases because such things as *schedule* or *quality of service* are important to ensure that the bid is awarded to the "best" responsible bidder.

There have been multiple commitments and assurances from the City that the Highway 76 Revitalization Phase 1A Surface Improvements (aka the Promenade) would be complete before the 2017 tourism season. Unfortunately, once the bids for the first components of the project were opened this past summer, the Engineer's Cost Estimates were found to be significantly under estimated. The City's Engineering Department and Program Management Team are working with the Contractor for the Phase 1A Water Line and Duct Bank projects to do "value engineering" in the field and reduce the costs to be more in line with the budget. Once the Surface Improvement plans, prepared by the City's original engineering consulting firm were obtained and reviewed, it was obvious that those plans called for work that far exceeded the available budget. If not for the commitment to have most of Phase 1A complete by the spring of 2017, the process would have been to utilize the City's ordinary professional services procedures to identify and select a design engineer. The selected design engineer would have prepared detailed design plans to reduce the project costs and allow the City to advertise the work and begin construction. There is not sufficient time for the City to go through that entire and lengthy process as it would have forced the work into the 2017 summer season. Fortunately, there is a better solution - to use the same *field engineering process* of identifying acceptable cost reductions in methods and materials that have been performed and are still ongoing for the water line and duct bank projects. That process could be used to develop cost reductions for the surface improvements once a contractor was awarded the bid. This short timeline process necessitated that the original engineer's surface improvements plans be used for the bidding process even though they contain unnecessary and unaffordable elements such as 15-foot-wide sidewalks where they are impractical, etc. Bids for the project were advertised and two bids were received on Tuesday October 25, 2016.

Evaluation of Proposals

Knowing that there would need to be extensive field-design work done and value engineering changes incorporated into the project, the project contract and specifications were structured similar to the Police Department's approved system wherein evaluation factors would be part of the process to ensure that the lowest and "best" bid would be selected. The bidders were informed that the City would be evaluating five aspects of the bid and the selection decision would *not* be solely based on price. The weighted criteria were: Schedule (25%) Project Management (25%) Price (25%) Traffic Plan (15%) and Safety (10%). The proposal evaluation team was identified consisting of: David Miller (City Engineer), Jim Martin (City Program Manager), Roger Clark (City Project Manager) Mike Yost (Olsson Associates Senior Principal), Todd Chandler (Olsson Associates, Construction Program Manager), and Cheryl Harrison (City Engineering Office Specialist). The team members first reviewed and evaluated the two proposals received and then met for a lengthy and focused meeting to reach a consensus on the Design-Build

Contractor evaluations. The results of that discussion, along with the final recommendation to the Capital Improvements Committee, are described below.

Proposal Review Summary

Two proposals were received for the 76 Revitalization Program Phase 1A Surface Improvements:

- (1) Emery Sapp & Sons, Inc. (Columbia, Missouri) teamed with the engineering firm of Schultz Engineering (Branson, Missouri).
- (2) Carson-Mitchell, Inc. (Springfield, Missouri). They have engineers on staff therefore did not need to team with a separate engineering firm.

For the sake of brevity, the above two firms will be referred to as (1) ESS and (2) CM.

1. Project Schedule (Weight 25%)

- Both firms submitted critical path method (CPM) schedules that include a project timeline chart referred to as a Gantt chart to illustrate the start and finish dates of the terminal elements and summary elements of the project.
- The ESS schedule contained 59 sub-steps. It was relatively generic and many of the different phases of the work simply used “cut & paste” to repeat the same description over and over such as “design-erosion control-demo-traffic signal”. There was no reference in the proposal to working with the contractor (Tom Boyce Excavating) who is currently constructing the waterline and duct bank projects and there will be a major need for coordination and cooperation. With the lack of detail in the ESS schedule, there will probably need to be additional time devoted to ensure the contractor has a good understanding of the project intricacies.
- The CM schedule contained 104 sub-steps. Although there was some “copy & paste” aspects to their schedule, it did contain much more detail which indicates a better understanding of the need for work modifications, field design and value engineering. Their acknowledgement of the need for coordination with other contractors and a more realistic schedule means they will be better able to hit the ground running.

SCORE: ESS – 5 points CM – 8 points

2. Project Management, Organization, and Quality Management (Weight 25%)

- ESS excels at large heavy construction projects. They have the capability to do massive excavation work. They were the contractor on the Fall Creek Road Extension project for Branson in 2008 which moved thousands of cubic yards of rock. They were very efficiently managed. However, they only self-performed the excavation and storm sewers and subcontracted the more detailed items such as concrete placement, etc. Members of the proposal evaluation team have worked with ESS on other projects and have experienced

several instances where ESS was not cooperative and asked for additional payment via change order for very minor items of the contract. This is a cause for concern as this project will require a contractor that is willing to be flexible and willing to work with the city and stakeholders on changes that will be par for the course on the 76 project. Their description of their project management approach for this project was generic and mostly consisted of off-the-shelf marketing verbiage. They have performed \$7 million in design/build projects. The proposal photos illustrate impressive projects, but these projects were new roads through undeveloped areas, which is a much different working environment than the Highway 76 commercial areas. They do not appear to have significant experience with small, detailed “handwork,” such as placing brick pavers, decorative concrete, etc. Their experience indicated that they constructed the beautiful projects associated with Big Cedar Lodge. The review team looked into the Big Cedar project to gain more details and were told the decorative landscaping and hand-work was done by a subcontractor to ESS who is, coincidentally, on the CM team for the Highway 76 Project.

- CM’s project management proposal section was specific and detailed so they could hit-the-ground-running when the construction begins. They have performed \$50 million in design/build projects. The City of Branson has used CM for four major construction projects (1) The RecPlex (2) The BioSolids project (3) The Utility Department Maintenance Building and (4) Liberty Plaza now underway downtown. The BioSolids project was very complicated and required extensive coordination with other entities. CM handled each of these projects extremely well. Their landscaping subcontractor constructed the landscaping at Big Cedar Lodge and did an excellent job. CM also has committed to provide high quality color digital audio/video using a professional drone to fly each site, before and after, the improvements have been constructed to ensure the city is protected from any potential claims that could arise from property owners due to normal construction operations.

SCORE: ESS – 5 points CM – 8 points

3. Contract Price (Weight 25%)

- As explained above, neither price should be considered as the final project cost. The intention is to make design changes in the field and to value engineer methods and materials to reduce the price by hundreds of thousands of dollars. Both teams have engineers associated with their proposal so significant cost reductions should be anticipated. The final cost will be negotiated with whichever firm is selected.
- The ESS proposal price was \$6,793,082. As the lower price, it would be logical that ESS would receive a better score. However, there was an issue with the ESS pricing. All contractors were instructed to submit proposals for the items specified in the construction plans so that all proposals were on a level playing field and the process for negotiating reductions could commence from that point. On page 55 of the ESS proposal, they indicated that three of their items already contain substitutions from the plans and the “pricing reflects the change”. This is contrary to the instructions and could be grounds to consider their proposal as unresponsive. The proper steps would have been to suggest alternatives and provide prices for both what was specified *and for the alternate*. Now

there is no way to accurately negotiate price reductions and their action unfairly makes their pricing appear lower when that may not be true. For instance, they switched the concrete color from the specified Bomanite to Butterfield. The team was already aware of the Butterfield option, but had chosen the Bomanite product line in order to guarantee consistently high standards since Bomanite products are only available to Bomanite Licensed Contractors. If the City maintains the Bomanite specified concrete color, then a price increase will have to be negotiated with ESS and the City's negotiating position is lessened. ESS also front-loaded their proposal by having large fees for both mobilization and demolition which are the very first items that a contractor will undertake. This is not illegal, but it is an indication of manipulations in contractor bidding to increase revenue earlier in a project. One of the ESS pricing reductions was paint instead of thermoplastic for pavement markings. It is doubtful that the City would select this option, but it should be noted that their price for paint was higher than the CM price for the thermoplastic. If the City negotiates the price back to thermoplastic, the ESS proposed amount will be even higher. Another observation was that ESS had a cost reduction for eliminating the ¾" bituminous layer in the paver sections (which may be a selected elimination) because it would be difficult to get asphalt in the winter, but in their proposal they indicate that they may consider bringing their own asphalt plant to the project area.

- CM's price of \$8,125,943 was consistent with the project plans and instructions to proposers and evidenced research to identify more precise estimates.

SCORE: ESS – 7 points CM – 5 points

4. Traffic Plan (Weight 15%)

- The ESS proposal did mention lane closures and shifting traffic but did not address the pedestrian movements which will be a major portion of the work. The verbiage of their proposal was generic and seemed to be worded as a marketing document for the firm.
- The CM proposal acknowledged pedestrians and included a sample section of how they would handle traffic control. Their sample traffic plan included some specific notes addressing critical aspects of the plan that are consistent with how the 76 projects currently underway are being handled. It should be noted that CM contacted Tom Boyce Excavating for how they would handle traffic control in order to save costs for the city and be consistent with how Tom Boyce Excavating has been handling traffic control to date.

SCORE: ESS – 5 points CM – 7 points

5. Safety Plan (Weight 10%)

- ESS had a good general discussion. The biographies of the employees all indicated they had the standard 10 hours of OSHA safety training. There was nothing specific about the Branson project in the description.

- CM’s staff biographies indicated more extensive safety training such as OSHA training in construction safety, accident investigation, fall protection, excavation, first aid, hazardous materials, scaffolding, etc. They also had some training in mine safety and rigging & sling loading. Their safety plan mentioned that they have a Safety Director on staff, perform weekly safety meetings on all of their projects, and also have a safety auditor visit their projects on a regular basis to ensure that the overall safety plan is being followed and offer suggestions for areas of improvement. CM also participates in the Builder’s Association of Kansas City “buildsafe program”.

SCORE: ESS – 5 points CM – 8 points

TOTAL SCORES

	Weight	ESS Score	ESS Weighted Score	CM Score	CM Weighted Score
Schedule	25	5	12.5	8	20
Price	25	7	17.5	5	12.5
Project Management	25	5	12.5	8	20
Traffic Plan	15	5	7.5	7	10.5
Safety Plan	10	5	5	8	8
TOTAL			55		71

Decide-Right Budget Analysis



For informational purposes, it may be beneficial that some explanation of a pure “design/build” process be provided to the committee. Apparently there could be some confusion why the pure process was not used on this Phase 1A bid which is a hybrid of bidding and proposals.

The process that was used for these surface improvements proposals more closely follows the “design/bid/build” method which is the process Branson uses for all projects. The first step in project initiation is to solicit proposals from professional design firms using an RFP. Once the design firm is selected, a contract and price is negotiated and the design work commences. When the design is 100% complete, the work is advertised and contractors submit sealed bids, and the lowest *and best* contractor is awarded the construction contract. Branson generally experiences few change orders or requests for a price increase.

The alternative to this process, and one that usually results in faster construction and lower costs, is the pure “design/build” process. With a design/build process, a project concept is developed and RFPs are used to solicit proposals from teams that include both a consulting design firm *and* a contractor that team together on a project proposal. After the best team is selected, lengthy and complex negotiations occur to determine prices, schedules and all other aspects of the work resulting in a guaranteed maximum price. Obviously this system requires the use of some highly specialized contractual documents. Fortunately, such documents have been developed by the Engineering Joint Contract Documents Committee (EJCDC), which is a joint venture of three major organizations of professional engineers: The American Council of Engineering Companies, The American Society of Civil Engineers and the National Society of Professional Engineers. In the future, these documents will allow Branson to fully implement a design/build process, however, this process is currently not contained within the Branson purchasing ordinance. To allow a full design/build process, the City code book chapter on purchasing will need to be revised after review and analysis by the Branson City Attorney. As with any major code changes, it is anticipated that the process could take several months and that would not allow the Phase 1A Surface Improvements to be complete by the spring of 2017. Staff’s intention is to begin the reviews and development of City code for design/build so that this method can be used on the Highway 76 Phase 1B project and also other municipal capital projects.