

Senate Committee on Local Government
Senator Patricia Wiggins, Chair
State Capitol, Sacramento, California 95814
(916) 651-4115
www.sen.ca.gov/locgov

September 9, 2009

Local Agencies and Design-Build Contracting:
A Briefing Paper for Legislators and Their Staffs

Each year, a handful of design-build bills move through the Legislature. You or your boss may be asked by a lobbyist to carry a bill that grants design-build authority to a local entity. You or your boss may be preparing to hear a design-build bill in a committee or on the Floor. If this is the first time you've heard of design-build, then you're in luck because this paper was written just for you.

Before you is a brief introduction to design-build contracting and the legislative history of relevant statutes. This paper focuses on local governments' design-build authorizations and only quickly mentions school districts and transit operators. The use of design-build by state agencies, including the State Department of General Services, is beyond this scope of this paper.

Contracting by local agencies

In the contracting world, "project delivery method" refers to the contracting agency's method of procuring design and construction services. Design-build is just one of several different project delivery methods.

The Local Agency Public Construction Act spells out the requirements and procedures that local officials must follow when awarding public works contracts (Public Contract Code §20100, et seq.). The Act has historically required public agencies to use the *design-bid-build* method. However, over the past 10 years, the Legislature has allowed specified state departments and local agencies to use the alternative *design-build* method.

What is *design-bid-build*?

The *design-bid-build* method is the most widely-used and well-established project delivery method. This approach splits construction projects into two distinct phases: design and construction. During the design phase, the local agency prepares detailed project plans and specifications using its own employees or by hiring outside architects and engineers. The design phase generally accounts for 5 to 10% of the project's total cost. Once project designs are complete, local officials invite bids from the construction community and award the contract to the lowest responsible bidder. The construction phase makes up the remaining 90 to 95% of the project's total cost.

Design-bid-build was a reaction to the favoritism, corruption, and waste associated with major infrastructure projects in the 19th century. Ever since contracting reforms formally separated the design and construction phases at the turn of the century, design-bid-build became the traditional procurement method for public agencies. However, some public officials are concerned about the efficiency of the design-bid-build method in terms of project cost, schedule, and productivity. For this reason, there is growing interest among local and state agencies to experiment with alternative project delivery methods.

What is *design-build*?

The *design-build* project delivery method is one of the most popular alternatives to design-bid-build. Under design-build, the owner contracts with a single entity to both design and construct a project. Before inviting bids, the owner prepares documents that describe the basic concept of the project, as opposed to a complete set of drawings and specifications of the final product. In the bidding phase, the owner typically evaluates bids on a best-value basis, incorporating technical factors, such as qualifications and design quality, in addition to price. The winning “design-build entity,” which can be a single firm, a consortium, or a joint venture, is responsible for completing the design and all construction at the contract’s fixed price.

Proponents say the design-build method can expedite project completion (and, therefore, reduce construction costs) when compared to the design-bid-build method. This advantage occurs in part because design-build allows construction to begin during the design phase. Also, because the designer and contractor are members of the same entity, the contracting agency does not get pulled into time-consuming and costly disputes and lawsuits that often occur between the two parties. Proponents also say that design-build promotes innovative design and construction approaches by giving contractors more flexibility over design, materials, and construction methods.

Design-build is not without its disadvantages. Because the owner does not fully define the project upon entering into a contract, the owner gives up control over design and construction quality. Furthermore, because the designer and builder are on the same team, they share a financial incentive to reduce quality to increase their profits. Critics also say design-build results in more expensive change orders and opens the door to favoritism in the selection process.

Which method is better?

Each project delivery method offers certain advantages and disadvantages and no single method is appropriate for all projects. Experts say the appropriate use of a particular method depends on many factors, including the project budget, schedule, risk allocation, the contracting agency's level of expertise, and the ability of the owner to define the scope of work clearly. On one hand, projects that are relatively simple, like office buildings, and require a quick turn around are ideal design-build candidates. On the other hand, projects with major unknowns in scope, complex environmental or permitting issues, or unresolved third party concerns are not suitable design-build candidates.

Legislative history

Beginning in the 1990s, the Legislature passed several bills authorizing specified local agencies to enter into design-build contracts to construct public works. The Counties of Alameda, Sacramento, Santa Clara, Solano, and Tulare and the Cities of West Sacramento and Davis were the first local governments permitted to experiment with the design-build method. For several years, the Legislature continued to take a piecemeal approach, adding counties and cities one at a time to the list of those eligible to use the design-build method.

Today, all **counties** can use the design-build method to construct buildings and related improvements and wastewater treatment facilities that cost more than \$2.5 million (Public Contract Code §20133; SB 416, Ashburn, 2007). Similarly, all **cities** can use the design-build method to construct buildings and related improvements worth more than \$1 million (Public Contract Code §20175.2; AB 642, Wolk, 2008). A pilot program also permits cities, counties, and special districts to use the design-build method to construct 20 local wastewater treatment facilities, local solid waste facilities, or local water recycling facilities (Public Contract Code §20193, et seq.; AB 642, Wolk 2008).

Cities and counties have used their design-build authority to construct a variety of buildings, including a juvenile justice center, a children's shelter, a library, county recorder's office buildings, police stations, and a pump station.

The California Constitution gives **charter cities** broad control over their "municipal affairs." The courts have ruled that a city's contracting procedures are a municipal rather than a statewide concern (*Piledrivers' Local Union v. City of Santa Monica* (1984) 151 Cal.App.3d 509; *Smith v. City of Riverside* (1973) 34 Cal.App.3d 529). Therefore, charter cities have the authority to establish their own public contracting rules.

Redevelopment officials can use the design-build method for 10 public improvement projects worth more than \$1 million (Public Contract Code §20688.6; SB 4xx, Cogdill, 2009). Redevelopment agencies must submit their projects to the State Public Works Board for approval. The Board maintains a list of approved and denied projects at www.spwb.ca.gov/redevelopment_agency/.

An attempt in 2006 to authorize all **special districts** to use the design-build method (SB 1431, Cox, 2006) died in the Senate Appropriations Committee. The Legislature continues to take an incremental approach towards granting design-build authority to special districts. Table 1 summarizes the legislation authorizing various special districts to use the design-build method.

Bills introduced in the 2009-10 legislative session reflect special districts' growing interest in the design-build method:

- The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California wants to use the design-build method to construct and install solar energy projects (AB 958, Eng, 2009; Status: Governor's Desk).

- Health care districts, which are under pressure to comply with the state’s seismic safety standards, want to use the design-build method (AB 405, Caballero, 2009; Status: Assembly Appropriations Committee, two-year bill).
- Transit operators want an extension of their design-build authority sunset date from January 1, 2011 to January 1, 2015 (AB 729, Evans, 2009; Status: Governor’s Desk).

Table 1. Special districts’ design-build authority.

Special district	Authorization	Types of projects
Orange County Sanitation District	SB 645, Correa, 2007	Projects exceeding \$6 million
Santa Clara Valley Trans. Authority	AB 904, Alquist, 1999	Transit stations, park-and-ride lots, maintenance facilities, and office buildings
Santa Clara Valley Water District	AB 674, Dutra, 2001	Projects exceeding \$2.5 million
Sonoma Valley Health Care District	SB 1699, Wiggins, 2008	Hospital or health facility buildings and improvements exceeding \$2.5 million
Transit operators	AB 958, Scott, 2000	Capital maintenance or capacity-enhancing rail projects exceeding \$25 million and non-rail transit projects exceeding \$2.5 million

For a summary of the bills and code sections authorizing local agencies to use the design-build method, see Appendix A.

Nuts and bolts

State law spells out the criteria and procedures that local officials must follow when using the design-build method. Here are the major provisions for counties, cities, redevelopment agencies, and some special districts:

Authorized projects. State law limits the types and cost of projects that are eligible for local agency design-build contracting. Cities and counties, for example, can use the design-build method for buildings and related improvements, but not for the construction of streets and highways, public rail transit, and water resources facilities. A handful of special districts can use the design-build method for more complex projects. See Appendix A for a summary of the types and cost requirements of projects eligible for design-build contracting.

Prevailing wage enforcement. Labor compliance programs (LCPs) enforce prevailing wage for public agencies that award public work contracts. As a condition of using the design-build method, local agencies must establish LCPs or contract with a third party to operate their LCPs. The State Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) is responsible for the approval and review of LCPs. This requirement doesn’t apply if the local agency or the design-build entity has a collective bargaining agreement that binds all of the contractors performing work on the project. In the contracting world, this form of an agreement is called a “project labor agreement.”

Recently, the Legislature shifted the enforcement of prevailing wage requirements to the DIR (SB 9xx, Padilla, 2009). Local agencies that use the design-build method will not establish LCPs, but instead, they will pay the DIR a fee. The DIR will use the fees to fund its prevailing wage enforcement activities. There is no exemption for local agencies or design-build entities that have entered into project labor agreements. These requirements take effect once the DIR sets up the new fee-supported system. For more information, visit the DIR's LCP webpage: www.dir.ca.gov/lcp.asp.

Method. Local officials must follow a four-step design-build method:

- Prepare documents describing the project and its specifications.
- Prepare a detailed request for proposals, inviting competitive bids.
- Establish a detailed procedure to pre-qualify design-build entities.
- Establish the procedures to select the design-build entity.

When pre-qualifying design-build entities, local officials must collect at least 11 types of information. The design-build entity must list its proposed mechanical subcontractors and licenses. The entity must also report past worker safety violations, contracting problems, contract defaults, license violations, payroll violations, and bankruptcies. The entity must verify this information under oath.

When awarding contracts, local officials must select the design-build entity by using either a competitive bidding process in which the award goes to the lowest responsible bidder, or a “best value competition” in which the local officials set the criteria. If local officials choose to evaluate bids based on best-value, they must include the following five factors among their criteria and assign a minimum 10% weight to each:

- Price;
- Technical design and construction expertise;
- Life cycle costs over 15 years or more;
- Skilled labor force availability; and
- Safety record.

Cities must weigh these five best value factors *equally*. Local agencies' design-build statutes define “skilled labor force availability” to mean the bidder has an agreement with a registered apprenticeship program, approved by the California Apprenticeship Council, which has graduated apprentices in each of the preceding five years.

The local agency must rank the top three responsive bidders and award the contract to the bidder whose proposal was ranked “most advantageous.” When local officials announce the award, they must also identify the second and third ranked bidders.

Performance. The winning design-build entity:

- Must be bonded and carry errors-and-omissions insurance that covers its design and architectural services.
- Must adhere to local performance criteria and design standards. Deviations require local officials' written consent.

- May use subcontractors who were not listed in its original bid. The entity must award subcontracts by following a process set by the county or city, including publishing notices and setting deadlines.

If the local agency's bid request required the design-build entity to carry a performance and payment bond, local officials can retain only 5% of the contract.

Evaluation. Because design-build contracting is a relatively new practice in the public sector, legislators want local agencies to report to the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) regarding their design-build experiences. The Legislative Analyst, in turn, must report on these design-build experiences to the Legislature by certain deadlines.

In 2005, the Legislative Analyst's Office published a review of state and local design-build practices, *Design-Build: An Alternative Construction System*. The Legislative Analyst compared the advantages and disadvantages of the design-build and design-bid-build methods. The report found that the design-build method can be a useful option for some public construction projects. The report also recommended:

- The Legislature should adopt an inclusive, uniform design-build statute that applies to all public entities.
- Design-build should be optional and not replace design-bid-build.
- Contracts for most project costs should be based on competitive bidding.
- State law should ensure access for the greatest number of contractors.
- There should be no cost limitations.
- Design-build contracting should be limited to buildings and related infrastructure.

This report is available on the Legislative Analyst Office's website:
www.lao.ca.gov/laoapp/PubDetails.aspx?id=1218.

The design-build statutes for local agencies also include sunset dates (Table 2). As these statutes expire, local agencies will likely ask the Legislature to extend their design-build authority. At that time, the Legislature may extend the authority, make the authority permanent, or allow the authority to expire by not taking any action.

Table 2. Design-build legislation sunset dates

Sunset Date	Agency
None	Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
January 1, 2011	Counties Santa Clara Valley Water District Sonoma Valley Health Care District Transit operators
January 1, 2013	Orange County Sanitation District
January 1, 2016	Cities Redevelopment agencies
January 1, 2020	Counties, cities, and special districts (solid waste, water treatment, and water recycling facilities ONLY)

2000 Compromise

The counties' design-build language in current law is the product of a compromise struck in 2000 among local officials, labor groups, and contractors (AB 2296, Dutra, 2000). Local officials wanted the flexibility and potential cost savings offered by design-build contracts. Labor unions wanted to ensure that contractors protected workers' interests. Contractors wanted to be sure that they had fair access to contracts. Since 2000, Legislators have used the counties' design-build language as a template for new design-build authorizations, including cities, redevelopment agencies, and individual special districts' authorizations.

Concerns still exist

Not all parties are fond of the statutes born out of the 2000 compromise.

Non-union contractors believe the statutes give an unfair advantage to union contractors. As a condition of using the design-build method, a local agency must establish a labor compliance program (LCP). However, if the local agency or the design-build entity has entered into a project labor agreement with its contractors and subcontractors, the local agency is exempt from the LCP requirement. Non-union contractors oppose this exemption, arguing that local agencies are more likely to favor union contractors because PLAs are much cheaper to form than LCPs.

The statutes require local agencies to include "skilled labor force availability" as one of their best value factors. Non-union contractors oppose the statutes' definition of "skilled labor force availability," which requires contractors to obtain apprentices exclusively from apprenticeship programs that have graduated apprentices in the preceding five years. Because labor unions mostly control existing apprenticeship programs, non-union contractors believe this language puts them at a disadvantage.

Public agencies' employees typically oppose design-build authorizations because they worry about losing their jobs to private firms. Legislators face opposition from public agencies' employees when they try to authorize design-build contracting for non-building projects. For example, SB 233 (Cox, 2007) unsuccessfully attempted to expand the definition of "project" to include all public improvements, except for streets, roads, and bridges. In the end, the author could only expand the definition to include wastewater treatment facilities.

Credits

Helen Ho, a Committee Consultant to the Senate Local Government Committee, authored this briefing memo as part of her assignment as a 2008-09 Senate Fellow. Production assistance came from Elvia Diaz, the Committee Assistant.

Careful reading and useful comments improved the final memo. The Committee's staff is grateful to the following people who were generous with their time and expertise:

- Kiana Buss, California State Association of Counties
- Jennifer Klein, Assembly Local Government Committee
- Marianne O'Malley, Legislative Analyst's Office
- Thomas Vu, California Special Districts Association
- Doug Yoakam, Senator Dave Cox's office

Sources

These materials were helpful in preparing this briefing memo:

Cox, Dave (2008). A look at design/build in the legislature. *California Constructor*, 38 (2), 22. <http://www.agc-ca.org/publications.aspx?id=266>.

Federal Highway Administration (2006). *Design-build effectiveness study*. Washington DC: US Department of Transportation. <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/reports/designbuild/designbuild0.htm>.

Legislative Analyst's Office (2005). *Design-build: an alternative construction system*. Sacramento: Legislative Analyst's Office. <http://www.lao.ca.gov/laoapp/PubDetails.aspx?id=1218>.

Yakowenko, Gerald (2004). Megaproject procurement: breaking from tradition. *Public Roads*, 68(1). <http://www.tfrc.gov/pubrds/04jul/index.htm>.

APPENDIX A:
An Inventory of Local Agencies' Design-Build Statutes

Local agency	Code section	Related legislation	Sunset date	Types of projects
Cities	PCC §20175.2	AB 642 (Wolk, 2008) SB 645 (Correa, 2007) SB 535 (Runner, 2006) AB 1329 (Wolk, 2005)	January 1, 2016	Buildings and related improvements exceeding \$1 million
Cities, counties, and special districts	PCC §20193, et seq.	AB 642 (Wolk, 2008)	January 1, 2020	Regional and local wastewater treatment facilities, solid waste facilities, and water recycling facilities exceeding \$2.5 million; limit 20
Community college districts	EDC §81700, et seq.	SB 614 (Simitian, 2007) AB 1000 (Simitian, 2002)	January 1, 2014	Community college facilities exceeding \$2.5 million
Counties	PCC §20133	SB 416 (Ashburn, 2007) SB 233 (Cox, 2007) SB 287 (Cox, 2005) AB 1511 (Evans, 2005) AB 2296 (Dutra, 2000)	January 1, 2011	Buildings and related improvements and county sanitation wastewater treatment facilities exceeding \$2.5 million
Orange County Sanitation District	PCC §20785	SB 645 (Correa, 2007)	January 1, 2013	Projects, including public wastewater facilities, exceeding \$6 million
Redevelopment agencies	PCC §20688.6	SB 4xx (Cogdill, 2009)	January 1, 2016	Public improvement projects exceeding \$1 million; limit 10
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority	PCC §20301.5	AB 2909 (Asm Trans, 2000) AB 904 (Alquist, 1999)	None	Transit center or station, transit park-and-ride lot, bus and light rail maintenance facility, office building, and the Fremont-South Bay Commuter Rail Project
Santa Clara Valley Water District	PCC §21162	AB 674 (Dutra, 2001)	January 1, 2011	Projects exceeding \$2.5 million
School districts	EDC §17250.10, et seq.	SB 614 (Simitian, 2007) AB 1402 (Simitian, 2001)	January 1, 2014	School facilities exceeding \$2.5 million
Sonoma Valley Health Care District	H&SC §32132.5	SB 1699 (Wiggins, 2008)	January 1, 2011	Buildings and improvements directly related to a Sonoma Valley Health Care District hospital or health facility building exceeding \$2.5 million
Transit operators	PCC §20209.5, et seq.	AB 378 (Duvall, 2008) AB 372 (Nation, 2006) SB 1130 (Scott, 2004) AB 958 (Scott, 2000)	January 1, 2011	Capital maintenance or capacity-enhancing rail projects exceeding \$25 million and non-rail transit projects exceeding \$2.5 million

APPENDIX B:
An Inventory of Local Agency Design-Build Bills

2009

Bill Number	Author	Status	Subject
AB 263	Miller	Introduced (Asm Trans)	Authorizes the Riverside County Transportation Commission to use D/B for transportation improvements on SR 91
AB 405	Caballero	Asm Appr	Authorizes health care districts to use D/B
AB 729	Evans	Governor's Desk	Extends the sunset date for transit operators' D/B authorization
AB 958	Eng	Governor's Desk	Authorizes metropolitan water districts to use D/B for solar energy systems
AB 1062	Garrick	Introduced (Asm B&P)	Revises the definition of "skilled labor force availability" in public entities' design-build statutes
AB 1063	Garrick	Introduced (Asm B&P)	Revises the definition of "acceptable safety record" in public entities' design-build statutes
AB 1064	Garrick	Introduced (Asm B&P)	Deletes a labor compliance program exemption in public entities' design-build statutes
SB 4xx	Cogdill	Signed	Authorizes various public agencies, including redevelopment agencies, to use D/B for specific projects
SB 9xx	Padilla	Signed	Amends the labor compliance program law and makes conforming changes to public agencies' design-build statutes
SB 43	Alquist	Governor's Desk	Authorizes a JPA, that includes the City of Santa Clara and the City's redevelopment agency, to award a no-bid D/B contract for the construction of a football stadium

2008

Bill Number	Author	Status	Subject
AB 387	Duvall	Signed	Exempts transit operators from a \$2.5 million threshold requirement when using D/B to acquire and install security technology
AB 642	Wolk	Signed	Authorizes all cities to use D/B; authorizes cities, counties, and special districts to use D/B for 20 wastewater, solid waste, or water recycling facilities
AB 704	Eng	Failed in SLG	Authorizes metropolitan water districts to use D/B for solar energy systems
AB 2993	Plescia	Introduced	Authorizes metropolitan water districts to use D/B for renewable energy projects
SB 1350	Cedillo	Died in Senate Appr	Authorizes the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Commission to use D/B for a tunnel closing the gap between I-710 and I-210 in LA County
SB 1486	Ducheny	Signed	As a part of enacting the Otay Mesa East Toll Facility Act, authorizes the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) to use D/B for specified state highway projects and facilities
SB 1699	Wiggins	Signed	Authorizes the Sonoma Valley Health Care District to use D/B

2007

Bill Number	Author	Status	Subject
AB 1036	Keene	Introduced	Authorizes sanitation districts and levee districts to use D/B
AB 1240	Benoit	Introduced	Extends transit operators' D/B authorization to the Riverside County Transportation Commission
AB 1373	Emmerson	Introduced	Authorizes the San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) to use D/B for improvements to highways that provide access to emergency service health facilities in San Bernardino County
AB 1499	Garrick	Introduced	Authorizes the Department of Transportation to use D/B for highway construction
SB 56	Runner	Died in Asm Appr	Authorizes state and local transportation entities to use D/B for 10 transportation projects
SB 233	Cox	Signed	Authorizes counties to use D/B for county wastewater treatment facilities
SB 416	Ashburn	Signed	Authorizes all counties to use D/B
SB 442	Ackerman	Failed in Sen Trans	Authorizes the Orange County Transit District to use D/B for a HOV lane
SB 614	Simitian	Signed	Amends school districts and community college districts' design-build statutes: (1) reduces the minimum project cost threshold from \$10 million to \$2.5 million; (2) extends the sunset dates; and (3) authorizes all community college districts to use D/B
SB 645	Correa	Signed	Extends cities' D/B authority to the City of Stanton; authorizes the Orange County Sanitation District to use D/B
SB 683	Runner	Introduced	Authorizes the City of Santa Paula to use D/B for a wastewater treatment plant

2006

Bill Number	Author	Status	Subject
AB 372	Nation	Signed	Extends the sunset date for transportation operators' D/B authority from January 1, 2007 to January 1, 2011 and adds new cost requirements
AB 2580	Walters	Died on Asm Floor	Authorizes the Orange County Sanitation District to use D/B
AB 2604	Emmerson	Failed in Asm Trans	Authorizes the San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) to use D/B for improvements to the interchange of Tippecanoe Avenue and Interstate 10 in the City of San Bernardino
SB 92	Dunn	Died on Asm Floor	Authorizes the Orange County Sanitation District to use D/B
SB 371	Torlakson	Died on Asm Floor	Authorizes certain state and local transportation entities to use D/B for specified highway construction projects; later amended in the Senate Appropriations Committee to only contain intent language
SB 535	Runner	Signed	Extends cities' D/B authorization to the City of Victorville
SB 1026	Kuehl	Signed	Authorizes the LA County Metropolitan Transportation Authority to use D/B for an HOV lane
SB 1431	Cox	Died in Senate Appr	Authorizes all cities, counties, and special districts to use D/B for public improvements

2005

Bill Number	Author	Status	Subject
AB 245	Walters	Gut and amend	Authorizes Orange County to use D/B
AB 1329	Wolk	Signed	Authorizes cities in the Counties of Solano and Yolo to use D/B
AB 1511	Evans	Signed	Extends counties' D/B authorization to 6 more counties; lowers minimum project cost threshold; and extends sunset date from January 1, 2006 to January 1, 2010
AB 1699	Frommer	Gut and amend	Authorizes self-help transportation agencies to use D/B for eight state highway construction projects
SB 287	Cox	Signed	Extends counties' D/B authority to 17 more counties

2004

Bill Number	Author	Status	Subject
AB 2438	Leslie	Introduced	Extends counties' D/B authority to Placer County solely for the construction of a justice facility
AB 2746	Strickland	Introduced	Extends counties' D/B authority to the Cities of Fillmore and Santa Paula
SB 1793	McPherson	Died in Asm	Authorizes various local transportation authorities to use D/B for highway construction projects. Similar to AB 692 (2003), but applies to different transportation authorities.
SB 1130	Scott	Signed	Clarifies that transit operators may not use D/B for state highway construction or local street and road projects

2003

Bill Number	Author	Status	Subject
AB 692	Dutra	Vetoed	Authorizes various local transportation authorities to use D/B for highway construction projects
AB 1267	Runner	Introduced	Extends counties' D/B authorization to San Bernardino County.
SB 908	Denham	Introduced	Extends counties' D/B authority to the Monterey County Water Resources Agency for the construction of the Salinas River Diversion Facility

2002

Bill Number	Author	Status	Subject
AB 1000	Simitian	Signed	Authorizes specified community college districts to use D/B
SB 356	Johannessen	Failed in the SLG	Authorizes four cities to use D/B for projects that cost up to \$30 million
SB 1759	Johannessen & Torlakson	Signed	Authorizes four cities to use D/B for projects exceeding \$5 million
SB 1904	Vasconcellos	Died in Asm B&P	Authorizes certain school districts to select design-build entities based upon qualifications, experience, and expertise

2001

Bill Number	Author	Status	Subject
AB 674	Dutra	Signed	Extends counties' D/B authorization to Santa Clara Valley Water District
AB 1402	Simitian	Signed	Authorizes school districts to use D/B
AB 1415	Leach	Failed in Asm B&P	Authorizes the City of Brentwood to use D/B
AB 1436	Correa	Failed on Sen Floor	Authorizes a local military base reuse authority to use D/B
SB 127	Johnson	Introduced	Commissions the LAO to conduct a study and report to the Legislature on the appropriateness of expanding the number of local government entities that may use D/B

2000

Bill Number	Author	Status	Subject
AB 424	Wildman	Vetoed	Authorizes school districts to use D/B
AB 958	Scott	Signed	Authorizes transit operators to use D/B
AB 2296	Dutra	Signed	Authorizes seven counties to use D/B
AB 2366	Margett	Died in SLG	Establishes an inclusive, uniform D/B statute that authorizes all local agencies to use D/B for general building projects
AB 2909	Asm Trans	Signed	Authorizes the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority to use D/B for the Fremont-South Bay Commuter Rail Project
SB 1144	Johannessen	Signed	Extends the D/B authorization sunset date for the Cities of West Sacramento and Davis
SB 2117	Johnson	Vetoed	Authorizes the City of Tustin and the Tustin Community Redevelopment Agency to use D/B for redevelopment projects at the Tustin Marine Corps Air Station

1999

Bill Number	Author	Status	Subject
AB 470	Wildman	Vetoed	Authorizes school districts to use D/B
AB 904	Alquist	Signed	Authorizes the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority to use D/B for a transit center or station, transit park-and-ride lot, bus and light rail maintenance facility, or office building
AB 1394	Margett	Introduced	Establishes an inclusive, uniform D/B statute that authorizes all public entities to use D/B for general building projects

1998

Bill Number	Author	Status	Subject
AB 1136	Wildman	Vetoed	Requires public entities authorized to use D/B to report to the Joint Legislative Audit Committee about their design-build experiences
AB 2044	Goldsmith	Died in Senate Appr	Establishes a uniform D/B statute that authorizes all public entities to use D/B for public works projects

1997

Bill Number	Author	Status	Subject
AB 774	Morrow	Introduced	Establishes a uniform D/B statute that authorizes all public entities to use D/B for public works projects

1996

Bill Number	Author	Status	Subject
SB 1914	Johannessen	Signed	Extends counties' D/B authority (AB 1717, Cortese, 1995) to the Cities of West Sacramento and Davis

1995

Bill Number	Author	Status	Subject
AB 1717	Cortese	Signed	Authorizes five counties to use D/B

Key: **ALG** = Assembly Local Government Committee
Appr = Appropriations Committee
Asm = Assembly
B&P = Business & Professions Committee
D/B = design-build project delivery method
Introduced = the bill was never heard in a policy committee
Sen = Senate
SLG = Senate Local Government Committee