

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

March 28, 2019

Minutes

*Northwest Carpenters Facility
25120 Pacific Highway South
Kent, Washington 98032*

Attendees:

Janice Zahn - Chair Ports	Jim Dugan - Vice Chair Construction Manager
Ato Apiafe - MWBE	Jeff Jurgensen - Construction Manager
Timothy Buckley - Private Sector	Art McCluskey - Owner- General Public
Quinn Dolan - General Contractor	Sam Obunike - Design Industry- Engineer
Bryan Eppler - Specialty Subcontractor- Telecon	Mark Ottele - General Contractor
Curt Gimmetstad - General Contractor	John Palewicz -Owner- Higher Education
Thomas Golden - Design Industry- Architect	Yelena Semenova – Owner - State DES
Rustin Hall - Design Industry- Architect	Mike Shinn - Specialty Subcontractor
Howard Hillinger - Construction Manager	David Talcott - Design Industry Engineer
Brian Holecek - General Contractor- Telecon	Kyle Twohig - Owner- Cities

Guests:

Ali Abbaszadegan, R&C Management	Leslie Jones, Sound Transit
Brian Aiken, Ellensburg School District	Kristine Keller, OAC Services
Morris Aldridge, Tacoma Public Schools	Michelle Langi, Parametrix
Maggie Anderson, Parametrix	David Mount, Mahlum
Brian Aske, Lease Crutcher Lewis	Steve Murakami, Lake WA School District OAC
Rebecca Baibak, Integrus	Drew Phillips, Forma Construction
Talia Baker, Department of Enterprise Services	Shane Phillips, Mott MacDonald
Toni Bernethy, Yelm Community Schools	Jim Pinariniki, Port of Port Townsend
Brian Buck, Lake WA School District	AJ Porrini, Turner Construction
Steven Clark, Integrus Architecture	Barbara Posthumus, Lake WA School District
Dan Cody, Parametrix	Rusty Pritchard, OAC Services, Ellensburg School District
Rick Conte, Sound Transit	Dri Ralph, Northshore School District
Nick Datz, Parametrix	Traci Rogstad, Northshore School District
Damon Gardella, OAC Services	Susan Steinbrenner, Evergreen Public Schools
Marc Gleason, McGranahan Architects	Amy Stenvall, Northshore
Bryan Gormley, Cornerstone General Contractors	Eric Towes, Port of Port Townsend
TaeHee Han, Sound Transit	Brian Wharton, Yelm Community Schools
Randy Harlow, Sound Transit	Kasey Wyatt, KWA
Andrew Johnson, Lydig Construction	

New Member Training:

Janice began orientation for new members Kyle Twohig, Tom Golden, Jeff Jurgensen, Timothy Buckley, and John Palewicz. She reviewed the establishment of PRC under CPARB, the terms for the Chair and Vice Chair, explained the quorum rules. The committee also reviews and approves public body certifications based on experience of using either Design-Build (DB) or GC/CM within the past five years. Meetings are set a year in advance and dates approved in November.

Janice reviewed panel member expectations and the Open Public Meetings Act. Jim emphasized that the authority of the PRC is always within the confines of RCW 39.10. Several members shared lessons learned with the panel.

8:00 am Business Meeting

PRC Chair: Janice Zahn

- Design-Build Project Application Review – All changes approved.

Next meeting: May 23, 2019

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

March 28, 2019

Minutes

- GC/CM Project Application - All changes approved.
- GC/CM Certification –

Questions & Answers:

- Q. Does the PRC want to include a Design-Build Best Practices on the GC/CM on the certification and recertification, and is that the only guide that would be suggested?
- A. CPARB does not have a Best Practices Guideline that was put together for GC/CM. Over time it is expected there will be a similar guideline on GC/CM coming from one of the subcommittees.
- Q. When a certification expires, does the PRC provide a notification or is it incumbent on the owner to keep track of that themselves?
- A. It is the personal responsibility of the public body. A reminder is sent out 6 months prior to the expiration of their certification. There is also a reference table on the PRC website for all certifications and recertifications.
- Q. CPARB wants the GC/CM application to refer to the Design-Build Best Practices Guidelines. Is that what the Committee wants?
- A. CPARB highly recommended it even though PRC can not score them on it. They also plan on developing GC/CM Best Practices Guidelines.
- GC/CM Certification – All changes approved.
 - Recertification Application – All changes approved. Comment: Suggested providing a description about the agency's processes, a brief description and summary of what the PRC is looking for.
 - Bylaws, Section 4: Compensation – Revised edits approved. Further edits or suggestions should be submitted to Talia prior to the next meeting for review in June.

Questions & Answers:

- Q. The state says the PRC cannot support more than bimonthly meetings. Has that been overcome?
- A. Yes. That was a hold due to the capitol budget, but has finally been approved by the legislature.
- Q. Is the PRC going to have to advertise or tell the public there is going to be another meeting?
- A. Yes, Admin will need to post a public notice. Another notice will also have to be sent to the Code Reviser.

9:30 am Lake WA School District - GC/CM – Recertification

PRC Chair: Janice Zahn

Jeff Jurgensen recused himself due to OAC being part of the presentation for the recertification.

It is determined that Parametrix does small works related to Lake WA School District and does have a contract, but it is not related to this specific scope of DB and GC/CM, therefore Jim Dugan will be able to remain on the panel for deliberation.

Committee Members: Ato Apiafi, Timothy Buckley, Quinn Dolan, Jim Dugan, Bryan Eppler (call-in), Curt Gimmestad, Tom Golden, Rustin Hall, Brian Holecek (call-in), Art McCluskey, Mark Ottele, John Palewicz, Yelena Semenova, Mike Shinn, David Talcott, Kyle Twohig, Janice Zahn

Presentation: The mission for the Lake Washington School District is that each student will graduate prepared to lead a rewarding and responsible life as a contributing member of our community and greater society. The district currently has 29,987 students and have grown in the last 10 years by 6200 students. They are the 3rd largest school district in the state.

LWSD has a Capital Facilities Levy Program that is approximately \$15-20M per year, which includes 50-75 projects a year. They utilize a small works roster, have two JOCs, do Design-Bid-Build and use KCDA and other co-ops to

Next meeting: May 23, 2019

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

March 28, 2019

Minutes

complete that work. They have three (3) GC/CM projects completed and have six (6) GC/CM projects currently in construction and five (5) GC/CM projects currently in design.

For MC/CM and EC/CM Utilization, there are three projects utilizing this and they are meeting the greater than \$3M threshold. They have a contract with an auditing firm to perform the required audits on the process.

Lessons learned includes bringing the GC/CM in early and the benefits of using consultants. Target value cost modeling is helpful in turning around numbers with the GC/CM much faster. They also bundle their projects by location or project type so that they can have a GC/CM contractor on multiple jobs. They are learning that they need to take a more proactive approach in getting others to bid against the self-performing work. The district is expanding the use of auditors.

Questions & Answers:

- Q. In the organizational chart there are 10 project managers. Talk a little bit about the composition of those project managers and how they were brought on board.
- A. We do not consider them professional services or consultants, they are contract labor. They are badged, have access cards to the schools, and we meet with them daily. They are our employees and on our team as they are all OAC.*
- Q. How do you bring your experience of the OWMBE program to the table as an organization?
- A. We partner with minority union groups or local community groups and push for awareness and inclusion in removing barriers. We are now looking at how to collect data regarding the composition of MWBE within the context of Lake Washington School District. We have also put additional resources into our equity efforts to make sure we have equitable operations and focus on that in the day-to-day operations of the students.*
- Q. LWSD highlighted that there was the challenge of a limited competition on the self-performance packages on the GC/CM. Do you have any experience negotiation that self-performance part of work and what other tools would you used to combat that issue?
- A. We have not gotten to the point of negotiating that work but have encouraged people by making a move into neutral sites and removing some of the barriers to bid. We are successful at it, and note that we want to do better at it.*
- Q. Has the self-determination process that you presented here changed since your original certification?
- A. Our organization chart has changed slightly. The process is the same but some titles have changed.*
- Q. On lessons learned, there is tension at the end of the GC/CM design phase where contractors are holding contingencies to get every dollar pushed into the brick and mortar. How do you, as an owner, manage that tension?
- A. We have had GMP final amendments that did not include allowances and we watch those buckets. It is part of the reason we are looking at a 3rd party auditor to cover the GC/CM, to make sure that the public stewardship of the money is there and that the scope is getting completed. We also look at targeting undefined scopes of work in later bid packages to make sure we are getting competitive bids and are not relying on allowances alone.*
- Q. How is the 3rd party auditor doing?
- A. It has been three years now and they are doing great. Our relationship with the GC/CM contractors is great and they are really taking advantage of the K-12 environment. They are locked into their start dates and doing a great job.*
- Q. There is a bunch of program support that are folks contracted through OAC. Could you walk through the names in the application table?
- A. Presenters clarified who is actually school district staff and others.*

Next meeting: May 23, 2019

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

March 28, 2019

Minutes

Public Comments:

Brian Aske, Lease Crutcher Lewis – I'm here to support Lake Washington's application and encourage the PRC to approve their recertification for GC/CM. We currently have 2 GC/CM projects with Lake Washington and have witnessed them leveraging the delivery method quite well. I would encourage Lake Washington to consider Design-Build and Progressive Design-Build as well. While you cannot negotiate self-performed work in a GC/CM, you can with MC/CM and EC/CM as per RCW. You can do those under Design-Build or Progressive Design-Build so that could be another opportunity.

Andrew Johnson, Lydig Construction – I'm here to support Lake Washington's recertification and approval of the PRC. I've worked with the District on a Design-Bid-Build in 2006. They are most impressive in their strategy that has forced collaboration from a group that can be contentious. They excel at getting contractors and JOC's to find aligned strategies that are better for the district and the students.

Rebecca Baibek, Integrus Architecture – I want to echo the support for Lake Washington. They really navigate through the tension and work with the GC/CM partner and clients to make sure the architect brings forward the most value for constituents.

Brian Gormley, Cornerstone General Contractors – I appreciate the districts understanding of the requirements of the process and most importantly the collaboration effort and how this delivery method is leading to successful projects.

Marc Gleason, McGranahan Architects – We've worked on four different projects with the district over the years. They've done a great job with the sophistication of their staff. When they don't have the quantity, they bring in folks like OAC. There is a spirit of cooperation and they're good at bringing all the parts together. They bring a very good contract of clarifying contingencies and general conditions and I'm here to advocate for them and support their recertification.

Deliberation:

Mike commented negotiation with general contractors on bid packages happens in Eastern Washington, but not on the west side. The law says they can, but it only occurs the further you get from Olympia.

Jim commented that having that 3rd party auditor to add to the team is essential.

Janice expressed that it was meaningful to have five different public testimonies, both from the contractor and designer side. The owner does understand the challenges.

Conclusion:

Ato Apiafi moved to approve recertification and Janice Zahn seconded the motion.

Recertification was unanimously Approved.

10:00 am Sound Transit – GC/CM – Recertification

Chair: Curt Gimmestad

Committee Members: Ato Apiafi, Timothy Buckley, Quinn Dolan, Bryan Eppler (call-in), Tom Golden, Rustin Hall, Howard Hillinger, Brian Holecek (call-in), Jeff Jurgenson, Art McCluskey, Mark Ottele, Yelena Semenova, Mike Shinn, David Talcott, Kyle Twohig, Janice Zahn

Presentation:

Leslie Jones provided an overview of their GC/CM portfolio. Nick Datz discussed how Sound Transit determines the selection of the appropriate delivery method for capital projects. Randy Harlow summarized how these projects meet the RCW 39.10 criteria, successful management of these projects, and an overview of the utilization of small and disadvantaged businesses on GC/CM projects.

Next meeting: May 23, 2019

Sound Transit provides Light Rail, Sounder Rail, and Express Bus Services to most of Washington's congested urban areas of King, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties. There is Light Rail to University of Washington to the Tacoma Dome going to the Theater District. For Sounder Rail, from Everett to Seattle and Lakewood/Tacoma to Seattle, as well as 28 regional bus routes.

Sound Transit is expanding the regional light rail system to 116 miles. A new service will be opening every 2-6 years. The system will stretch from Everett to Tacoma, extend from North Seattle to Ballard, from Seattle to Bellevue and downtown Redmond, and from Kirkland to Issaquah.

They have successfully managed 10 GC/CM projects, totaling \$2.6B in overall projects.

Sound Transit goes through a Contract Packaging Workshop where they evaluate individual projects and determine the best delivery method. This is based on the Transit Cooperative Resource Program- TCRP-131, which provided structure and guidelines to delivery selection. It is the model that the FTA accepted. The project will come to the workshop, the evaluation members will review the project goals, and modify those if necessary. The workshop group will then establish the evaluation criteria for the project, ranging from scope, schedule, budget, complexity, innovation opportunities, jurisdictions, all sorts of phases and elements of a project- for that specific project. Once they establish that criteria, they look at the various packaging opportunities for that project. They look at each of the delivery methods, Design Bid Build, Design-Build, and GC/CM against that criteria and those packages and come up with what they recommend is the most advantageous for that project.

Once the method is established, it goes through a Phase Gate process that consists of a series of gates that represent key decision or transition points for a project's progression from design and environmental review, construction, and finally transition to operations.

One of the lessons learned is to bring the GC/CM in earlier, at the 30 percent design level, and really build on their input and ability to augment the project. Sound Transit has also learned that they need to staff projects with team members that have the right aptitude and experience to assist with both design and construction management. The whole cohesive team is really important. They have settled on a hybrid mix of both lump sum and schedule driven components to capture all costs realistically and deliver the project effectively. They have also learned that support for timely decisions and issue resolution so they can be a partner in the process.

Sound Transit utilizes small and disadvantaged businesses by setting goals on the projects early. They work with them very closely and demonstrate exceeding the goals on three GC/CM projects.

Questions & Answers:

Q. Would you break down how you unpackaged your multimillion dollar projects?

A. On a GC/CM contract, Sound Transit will negotiate with our client to identify how many packages they can do, which project or package they believe they can get the most small businesses or DBE based on scope of work. Then once they put that package together, they have 60 days to get us a small business participation plan; at that time, we are able to look at what kind of work are they going to be using to achieve their overall goal.

Q. Have there been any litigation since 2016, and have that been resolved?

A. There is litigation in place with one of our Ewing contracts, University Station, but it has not been resolved yet.

Q. Have there been any audit findings in there?

A. There have not been any audit findings.

Next meeting: May 23, 2019

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

March 28, 2019

Minutes

- Q. Drill down a bit and give me lessons learned, good or bad, of one thing lessons learned on the GC/CM process.
- A. Early on, we've had very few change managers, very few schedule managers. We thought one individual could handle both of those for \$100M project. We quickly learned that just the sheer volume of decisions that needed to be made and any changes that needed to be implemented overtaxed just that one individual. So we've added staff, some of that through the consultant communities, some of that from our own staffing levels. That is really what we were driving at was trying to structure our team to best support the overall team. Those timely decisions have proven to be the critical factor in some of those Northgate jobs where we have a very low change order rate right now, just based on being able to provide that timely feedback.*
- Q. On the East Link project, why did Sound Transit go with Design-Bid-Build instead of GC/CM on some of those?
- A. Well, specifically for the Downtown Bellevue tunnel, the tunneling contractors were not well-suited for a Heavy Civil type of GC/CM approach. With the South Bellevue line, with Design-Bid-Build, it did not have the same schedule complexity that the other two did. We felt that project would lend itself to a bridge contractor that could be a smaller version rather than the large contractors that will pursue some of the Heavy Civil GC/CM. We are trying to find that sweet spot between cost and management efficiencies.*
- As for the Development Corridor, the size of the contracts really did not jump out at us as one that needed a GC/CM, but it was also primarily in a green field area that were not in a heavy urban area. The Design-Build for the SR520 to Redmond project was driven primarily by our project partner over in Redmond that wanted to have a lot of input into the Design-Build strategy. We did not feel that we were able to get there with a GC/CM strategy and our project partners that felt Design-Build offered us the best opportunity to meet their needs.*
- Q. Could you talk more about the Heavy Civil GC/CM and lessons learned there?
- A. The negotiation element has opened our eyes quite a bit. We have been learning that we need to augment our staff to have the estimating detail that we did not necessarily have moving into our first one. As we have moved through our E130 and E335 contract and through those negotiations, we have brought in consultants that are better suited or more aware of some of the market conditions within the Heavy Civil industry and especially these large mega projects. This has really helped us hone in during the negotiations on better pricing and more value within those contracts.*
- Q. You mentioned attitudes and perception associated to the people working within these delivery models which is really encouraging to hear. So how do you keep working on that as you bring on more people as things expand? How do you keep that method of thought and approach fresh?
- A. A lot of what we do to groom our staff is pair them up with team members that show the right attitude, and experience level and allow them to serve as sort of GC/CM mentors along the way. So with UW Station, our Resident Engineer there displayed the experience level and the attitude to hire the Deputy Construction Manager and work on that project. They were paired up to allow that experience, and that attitude was conveyed to the Deputy Construction Manager. That Deputy Construction Manager is now the Construction Manager on one of our Northgate projects and is doing the same with another Resident Engineer and other deputies. It is that kind of organic growth, we try to spread that attitude through the agency.*
- Q. Do you mind drilling in on your new gate #2 a little more?
- A. So when we went through the process procurement for the Phase Gate here, we were looking at project delivery, we were looking at more in construction than towards that in design. We were already through that element when we realized in getting that feedback that moving it up is really advantageous. The phasing and question you asked us in regards to selection, that gate is only looking at that delivery method selection. One thing we asked ourselves is, "What are the risks for the project and how are we best managing that risk for that method; what is the staff experience for that method? What are the strategies for the procurement and design and contractor?" So we are really digging into the elements on why we made that decision.*

Next meeting: May 23, 2019

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

March 28, 2019

Minutes

Q. When Heavy Civil was authorized about 5-6 years ago, Sound Transit was very active in putting that in place. How do you think that has worked out because you were a big advocate of it and you certainly have done several. Has it worked out as expected? And with reauthorization coming up, are there any thoughts about some changes of the statutory language that would make it work better?

A. As far as implementing and lessons learned from the Heavy Civil perspective, we have generally been happy with the outcome. Having those Heavy Civil GC/CM's has really helped us with the negotiation element, scope the project so we can address some of those cost pressures in ways that we probably would not have had in a traditional GC/CM area.

As far as potential changes to the RCW, the reauthorization committee is just getting under way, so we will be going through our lessons learned and what we have learned on the projects to see if there are any elements or areas that need recommendations.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Deliberation:

Ato questioned Curt: when you have the team dynamics, you mentioned attitude. How do you know up front if an entity is going to be a good team player? Is there some kind of litmus test or magic that you learned about how you upfront get an insight as to how a team is going to work out?

Curt replied that there is the Project Selection Team associated to what the delivery model has to offer. If the industry has gained the experience and understanding in order for any of these models to work, everybody has got to trust the other person on the other side of the table or sitting in the chair next to them. We are looking out for the best interest of everybody in the collective group.

The panel was pleased that the owner has dealt with the issue of deciding what method of delivery to use on a project and it was really refreshing to see that this robust program of delivery method is there at Sound Transit, the Phase Gate associated with that is a key thing as there are a lot of factors going into the contract selection method.

The key is looking at all the different ways that they have applied their process and also that in the Lessons Learned, it is both about process decision making as well as people because in the end it is all about those components working together.

Conclusion:

Mike Shinn moved to approve recertification, Jeff Jurgensen seconded the motion.

Recertification was unanimously approved.

11:00 AM Committee Discussion

Due to unforeseen last minute events, representatives of Washington State University were unable to attend in person. Janice Zahn held a short discussion period with the Committee to discuss the WSU's combined GC/CM & DB Recertification Application, recertification expiration dates and options for their recertification.

Janice Zahn addressed the Committee regarding possible options for the WSU application. In December, WSU provided a combined recertification application for both DB & GC/CM. The Design-Build certification expires on March 28, 2019 and the GC/CM does not expire until July 26, 2019. The request from WSU is to hear and evaluate their DB recertification portion of the presentation so they do not have to completely reapply due to circumstances beyond their control. The second request is to come back to the PRC in May for the review of the GC/CM portion of their application. WSU is one of the leading Public Bodies in our state for utilizing Alternative Delivery Methods.

Next meeting: May 23, 2019

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

March 28, 2019

Minutes

The Committee discussed possible implications of and requirements. The RCW does not require a presentation for the PRC to make a decision. The PRC only needs to meet at a public meeting and make a decision. What are the possible precedents of the Committee making an exception and to take the presentation remotely via teleconference. What about the public that did not get an opportunity to comment? The public has the option to send an email, letter or phone call before, during or after the meeting to review the application. John Palewicz restated the RCWs that address application review and determination requirements. The application has been online for more than 30-days, there has been ample opportunity for the public to make comment, so the Committee has determined that holding up the application with a concern for the opportunity for public to comment would not be reasonable.

Chair Zahn called for a vote from the Committee in favor of reviewing the WSU DB Recertification portion of the application. Bryan Eppler and Brian Holecek abstained from the voting. 17/19 members voted to review the DB portion of the WSU Recertification application.

11:15 am **WA State University - DB only – Recertification**

Chair: Jim Dugan

Committee Members: Ato Apiafi, Timothy Buckley, Quinn Dolan, Bryan Eppler (call-in), Curt Gimmetstad, Tom Golden, Rustin Hall, Howard Hillinger, Brian Holecek (call-in), Jeff Jurgenson, Art McCluskey, David Talcott, Sam Obunike, Mark Ottele, John Palewicz, Yelena Semenova, Mike Shinn, Kyle Twohig, Janice Zahn.

Presentation (via WebEx):

Joe Kline, Associate Vice President of Capital at WSU introduced the team.

WSU has 5 campuses, over 12M square feet at their campus' Research and Extension Center, and at every county in the state, and over \$150-\$300M in their capital project portfolio. They have approximately 425 employees in Facilities.

Their credentials include one registered architect, a number of professional engineers (civil, construction, and mechanical) we have certified designers and other subject matter experts in the mechanical, electrical, product field. As far as staff, they have been working towards certifications in DBIA. They currently have five DBIA professionals and associates. WSU has four lead PM's and a Certified Construction Manager. They continually look at educational opportunities for their staff and are either able to do so in house with physical lunch and learns, and webinars. These enable them to go to more regional activities sponsored by DBIA or IA or those types of things, but also at the national level.

They have participated in presentations with the organization, SCUP National Conferences and Tradeline Conferences. They collaborate a lot with their college Engineering and Architecture program on campus. They also participate with the State of Washington of the Owners Group along with Olivia Yang.

There are 20 projects completed or started during the recertification period totaling about \$625M. Joe reviewed each project with its budget amount and delivery method.

WSU developed and trained on 45 discrete PM/CM training topics. They continue to develop and provide recurring training for their Capital staff and provide onboarding training for all new employees. Training areas include Source Selection, Pre-Design and Design Construction Administration, Closeouts, Disputes, Cost and Time Changes, Funding and Contract Types, Risk Analysis and Negotiations, and Contractor Performance Evaluations. They have standardized processes, and improved schedule and cost analysis for contracts. They have defined the PM/CM roles and responsibilities, and perform risk analysis and share it with their contractors.

Next meeting: May 23, 2019

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

March 28, 2019

Minutes

WSU is ready to be recertified. They are having their 5th annual Design-Build Conference in July and have gotten a huge response and a ton of feedback. WSU has participated on CPARB and many of the subcommittees and the trainings, Design-Bid and Design-Build trainings. They have done a complete rewrite and review for their contracts in 2015, and continue to tweak them to reflect their best practices, as well as feedback from their Design-Build Conference. They conduct both internal and external training, and are active in both DBIA, CMAA, and AIA and other trade organizations they lead.

WSU has shown a history of alternative procurement success, demonstrated success on a wide variety of project types, and have an experienced team of project managers and construction managers.

Questions & Answers:

Q. Would you elaborate on your OMWBE program?

A. We participated in several outreach events into integration both on the contractor side and the designer side. The feedback we have gotten is how are we going to develop a program to increase utilization. Since then, we have had two Design/Build selections where we have added in our selection process MWBE discussions with our design builders. We are making it a focus in our interviewing and evaluation to firms we do business with.

Q. Could you talk a little bit more about your decision making process in selecting delivery methods and who is involved in that process?

A. We look at each project as it comes in and use a bridging model. When we look at projects like the Multicultural Center, it had a heavy design focus so lent itself well to the traditional Design-Build method. Moving to some of the reservations, we thought it really lent itself to the Progressive Design-Build method. We try to look at that very early. We also try to diversify our funding sources. Donor funded projects might lend well to GC/CM or Design-Build depending on how those funds might come in. We make recommendations on the process and get approval from our Board of Regents. As soon as a project is identified, we begin discussing delivery method prior to getting pre-design funding.

Q. In the process, when you make the decision of whether it's traditional or progressive, and how do you make that decision?

A. When a project is proposed, we immediately sit down with the client and begin asking questions regarding the details of the project. The answers to those questions will lead us to design focused elements, specific requirements or special elements which might lead to progressive with elements of our selection criteria aimed at those requirements. There is also a charrette piece where we get feedback from designers and contractors, similar to a six-hour interview. The first 3-4 hours are a traditional presentation of qualifications, plans, etc. The last 2-3 hours which is similar to the first design meeting you might have as an architect. That piece is more about ideas and how the teams work together.

Q. Elaborate on any audits you've done and lessons learned from those audits.

A. The State Auditors did an audit where there were two non-findings that they noted to us. One was to clean up our initial Design-Build contract we have a distinct protest process. We actually had that fixed before the audit was done. We identified the honorarium as a pain point for funding even for successful projects. We were awarding the honorarium amount right away and the auditor pointed out it was not specifically allowed by the RCW, so we stopped doing that and cleaned up the way we did our contracts. Internally we tweak our contract documents based on reviewing the process. We added pre-propositional meeting conferences so we could get feedback from the teams and clarify deliverables. We were able to set ground rules for the RFP process and set expectations early.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Deliberation:

Ato expressed that he was impressed with points of Design-Build successful projects that WSU has completed. They have experience and proof that they can carry out this application.

Next meeting: May 23, 2019

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

March 28, 2019

Minutes

Kyle admired dedication to training and hosting their own annual conference really shows a commitment to training their own staff and the community to go above and beyond to spread that knowledge.

Curt liked the training, the lessons learned and the outreach forums. They have had some challenges in the Design-Build market. They are listening and learning and applying lessons to support of the application.

Rustin stated they have had many years on alternate delivery and are willing to listen and learn from their experiences.

Janice mentioned that their ability to share what is working well as well as when they have had lessons learned. She liked the fact that it is not cookie cutter, and they take each project on its merits and nuances to determine the most appropriate delivery method. She really liked that they have small projects under \$10M as well as the over \$50M ranges because it shows their ability to use the delivery method in multiple types of projects.

Timothy appreciated the successful demonstration of using the entire toolkit to determine the delivery method and including the funding source in that quotient. He also appreciated the application of lessons learned and using the Design-Build conference to share that knowledge in both directions.

Tom appreciated their willingness to tweak and search for the optimal procurement methods.

Conclusion:

David Talcott moved to approve recertification and Timothy Buckley 2nd the motion.

Recertification for Design-Build was unanimously approved 19/19.

12:00 pm **30-minute lunch and split into 2 rooms**

12:30 pm (Room A) **Port of Port Townsend – GC/CM Project - *Point Hudson Jetty (south) Renovation***

Panel Chair: Rustin Hall

Panel: Ato Apiafi, Timothy Buckley Curt Gimmestad, Howard Hillinger, Yelena Semenova, Janice Zahn

Presentation: Eric Toews of Port of Port Townsend reviewed the project organizational chart for the Point Hudson Jetty Renovation Project. The Project Team includes Jim Pivanik, Eric Toews, and Abigail Berg of Port of Port Townsend, their Attorney Frank Chemelick, Shane Philips and Daniel Blochar of Mott MacDonald, and a GC/CM Contractor to be determined.

Mott MacDonald is the Engineer of Record. They will lead the procurement process and participate in the contractor selection process. They will collaborate with the Port and GC/CM and work with them to develop and communicate strategies for attaining project goals. They will perform construction contract administration, review of submittals, construction quality monitoring, and contract closeout.

Shane reviewed the preconstruction services and focus on facility renovation and making sure the contractor recognizes and acknowledges the risk of the projects. The Community has been very vocal in the maintaining the historical structure of the Port Hudson Marina. The Point Hudson Marina & Jetty was originally constructed in 1934, is located in the commercial historic district and is an anchor point for community vitality in Port Townsend.

Project Scope consists of a comprehensive renovation of the 258' long South Jetty. This includes removal of over 150 creosote treated battered pilings, progressive incremental replacement of old pilings with new galvanized steel batter pilings, backfilling the core of batter pile framework with granite quarry spalls, tying the pile tops together with galvanized steel cross-bracing and dredging the main entrance channel to the Marina.

Next meeting: May 23, 2019

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

March 28, 2019

Minutes

The project involves complex scheduling, phasing and coordination in a challenging marine work environment. The Marina must remain protected and open throughout the project. GC/CM involvement is critical to the Design phase. The project design and permitting is funded by a Public Infrastructure Fund Grant of \$150K, with construction funding to be provided via bank loan. Full funding is anticipated in August 2019.

Questions & Answers:

Q. Has anyone on your team worked with RCW 39.10 and have experience with that statute?

A. MacDonald has extensive experience and has a depth and breadth of resources to bare. We have one of the most experienced attorneys in Washington State for Construction Contracting,

Q. Do you have the necessary experience to do a GC/CM project? Would you bring a comfort level to the table, maybe team members that have in-depth experience?

A. What you have at this table is people who are experience in traditional Design-Bid-Build. We have MacDonald and attorney's Shane Philips and Schnelling have experience in contracting for alternate delivery methodologies that apply to 39.10. Shane Philips' practice has not specifically done GC/CM. Port of Seattle is the only one who has used this process and have been a resource to help us with this application. We think we can rely on them for ongoing support.

Q. Why are you determined to use GC/CM or Design Build? How did you make that decision?

A. In talking to Mr. Hruska, we wanted more control over the Design than in Design-Build. We want to have more input on how we design and we believe GC/CM will allow us to put the team together to make sure the design is right. A full replacement might lend itself better to Design-Build, but since this is rehabilitation of a historic structure, and there are a lot more complications. It made more sense to have more control over the design.

Q. The attorney that is being retained for the contracting, is he actually doing a general reading of the documents?

Because two months is a really short period of time. The PRC is not used to seeing the GC/CM having a dotted line linking them to the Designer of record. There would be some concerns on how you would keep separation between a designer and a contractor for GC/CM. Is this something you have talked about?

A. Yes. We did consider it. We are looking at trying to leverage where we already were with the process and we feel we have a team that has sufficient experience to come up to speed in a timely fashion. We are working to get this project accomplished before the fall storms arise. Time constraints caused us to stay with the team we have.

Q. As I understand, you do not currently have the funding for the project?

A. We do not have the money in the bank, but the Port has the bonding capacity of up to \$5M and we know it is pretty hard to bond for lower than \$5M.

Q. Regarding schedule, in that process from the design side, what is your anticipation with getting the contractor on board and them having time to get the subcontractors on board? How do you see that playing out with your timeline?

A. The critical path is that the first step is to get the permits secured, and parallel getting the selection completed. From the design standpoint, the conceptual design is already completed. The help we need from the contractor is really about the optimization of design in the contract construction period and within budget. There really is a limited number of construction firms that would have the capability in the light of the pilings and what is needed. It may likely not even require subcontractors.

Public Comment:

No public comments.

Deliberation:

Ato stated there are huge holes in the system. He thinks approving this project would be irresponsible. He does not think they qualify. There are some elements that should be in place. If you come back in a couple months and assure with more confidence, we may approve.

Next meeting: May 23, 2019

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

March 28, 2019

Minutes

Yelena also stated concern. She thinks the project meets the criteria, but the public body does not because they do not have any experience or anyone who they can immediately hire that has experience in the presence of the public body.

Howard considered with such time constraints and without having anyone who understands the complexities and the nuances of the subcontracting, he just does not see where they have the ability to be successful.

Timothy agreed that they don't appear to understand the breadth of what the process needs to be. It sounds like they were going to hire a contractor to do all this work, but with the timing of this project, drawings in August and hope to be started in September, get all the requirements in place, that is a huge challenge. He thinks they are going to find that they are taking on quite a bit.

Rustin stated they do not have the time or the expertise. Checking the schedule, he cannot think of how else to say it. They need to review that and come back. The Port of Port Townsend can pick up the expertise, and review the schedule. He thinks this project very much fits GC/CM.

Yelena quantified that it is not just the documents. It is that they do not have the funding yet. They say they will have funding secured, they think, but they do not have the funding to start the project.

Rustin thinks they need to review the documents and requirements, and when they get that funding in place, then they can come back. They do not need to have the funding in place for the first part of the project.

Janice agreed that the project is appropriate. This schedule feels too tight to get the work done, and would want to make sure that the permit that gets submitted actually has the means of the contract that is going to get used. Usually when public bodies come to the PRC, they get approval and advertise the next day. So if they come back in May, they can still meet their schedule. She thinks there is more work that needs to be done here, and she would be more than happy to have staff spend some more time with them to get them ready. RCW 39.10 has so many parts and pieces that can trip people up, so the ability to understand it is really important. She also thinks the separation of the Designer and GC/CM is important.

Ato feels this is a very good fit for GC/CM, but the team is not ready yet. In a couple months they may be ready, but they need someone more experienced with GC/CM. It does not have to be in-house, and hopefully the funding.

Timothy agrees it is a critical project. The two biggest issues is not having a subject matter expert involved on the team to guide through the process and he is still nervous about the funding not being clearly established.

Conclusion:

Ato Apiafi moved to disapprove this GC/CM project and Curt Gimmestad seconded the motion.

Application for GC/CM was unanimously Disapproved.

12:30 pm (Room B) **Evergreen School District – GC/CM Project - *Wy'east Middle School Replacement***

Panel Chair: John Palewicz

Panel: Quinn Dolan, Thomas Golden, Jeff Jurgensen, Art McCluskey, Sam Obunike, Mark Ottele, Mike Shinn

Presentation:

The project team introduced themselves. Eight members have GC/CM experience and have shared prior projects as a team and are AGC GC/CM workshop certified. They have established roles and responsibilities matrices and limits of authority, and have set milestones for design and construction.

Wy'east Middle School is an 118,000 sf structure plus 22 portable classrooms. The existing site has a multi-building campus, 3 parking lots, 4 sports fields, and a track. The replacement school will be 103,000 square feet of new construction and 37,000 square feet of renovation with a portion constructed as two or three stories.

Next meeting: May 23, 2019

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

March 28, 2019

Minutes

The design will consolidate the multiple buildings into a single structure for improved safety, functionality, and reserved site area for future growth. Construction will disrupt and cause relocation of some programs.

There are 5 identified complexities to this project.

1. Parking and access to the site will be compromised during all phases due to the addition of construction parking and construction offices.
2. Phase 2 and 3, the construction zone located in the center of campus will cause students to travel through and around construction zones.
3. Demolition is in close proximity to existing parking.
4. It is important to maintain the fire access loop during all construction phases and allow students to access the sports fields.
5. We must maintain safe student access to buildings during all phases of construction.

As far as qualifying for GC/CM, this project meets 4 out of 5 criteria. Implementation of the project involves complex scheduling, phasing, or coordination. The project involves construction at an existing facility that must continue to operate during construction, with educational programs required to be relocated. Involvement of the GC/CM is critical during the design phase, and the project encompasses a complex or technical work environment.

They reviewed their management plan, project schedule, and budget.

This project is budgeted at \$80M, and is fully funded. Funding has been secured through the passage of the \$695,000,000 capital improvement bond on February 13, 2018, estimated state School Construction Assistance Program funds of \$30,000,000, and a portion of already collected local impact fees.

Questions & Answers:

Q. How will the project team meet the challenge of two other projects being completed on parallel schedules with Wy'east Middle School project?

A. R&C Management Group, together with Evergreen Public Schools, has ample staffing to meet the challenges of simultaneous project completions. R7C currently has eight full time staff dedicated to the EPS projects. Their staff includes five senior program/project managers and three assistant management staff. Their staff has gradually increased, and will continue to do so based on program/project needs. Additionally, EPS has a construction management staff of five full time employees, three of which are senior program/project managers.

Q. What other jobs are you going to have at the same time as this one?

A. We are doing 6 elementary schools. Our elementary schools are from exhibit homes so once you have completed design on one you have seen them all. The heavy lifting around design standards has been done. Only the up-front programming has been done. We have 3-4 projects running concurrently, all are state projects right now. Once you start construction, you are at the easy part of the project.

Public Comment:

No public comments.

Deliberation:

The application is very well done. The job certainly meets the GC/CM criteria. The School District did a very good job of presenting their case.

Conclusion:

Mark Ottele moved to approve this project for GC/CM and Mike Shinn seconded the motion.

Application for GC/CM was unanimously Approved.

Next meeting: May 23, 2019

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

March 28, 2019

Minutes

1:30 pm (Room A) **Ellensburg School District – GC/CM Project**
- New Elementary & Mt Stuart Elementary School

Panel Chair: Ato Apiafi

Panel: Tim Buckley, Jim Dugan, Rustin Hall, Yelena Semenova, Janice Zahn

Presentation:

Brian Aiken, Executive Director of Finance and Operations for Ellensburg School District, presented the project team.

The program is to build a new elementary school as the Ellensburg School District has over 475 students currently sitting in portables. They have students already in elementary grade levels in portables ready to go to a new school, and the second portion of this has changed due to complexities and some of the problems that existed in Mt. Stuart Elementary School. This school was not going to be a candidate for remodel, and so they will replace that school on the same site while the other school is underway. They will modernize Lincoln Elementary School and then add a new addition to that school. When completed, all of their schools and school districts will be remodeled or rebuilt.

The design team is well under way, and have actually already had 5 of our 6 design meetings, including site meetings on other schools. It has been an unprecedented amount of board members, staff, students, and community engaged as in this process so far.

They sold \$50M project bond, so funding is in the bank. This original bond program is going to last until 2024 and is very sequential. There is no space to house people, so it is going to be rough to build a new school, move kids in and do a second school. They have now reduced that with this methodology of 18 months.

With 2 projects moving to one site, they purchased the adjacent 29 acres to the 31 acres that they already own for the existing Mt. Stuart Elementary School. The new elementary school is planning on going on the new site. When the Mt. Stuart project was planning on being replaced; they have some challenges in terms of the coordination of being an offsite school. There are some limitations as this site, being 18 acres of RCO land that the state has, which needs to remain. We are looking at contractors to help in planning to include in their site package to mitigate some of that water issue, both in terms of the wetlands and the irrigation of this site.

In terms of the GC/CM schedule, they have already gone out and advertised ahead of time. Right now, they do not have anyone under contract but the interviews begin next week with short listed firms. The School District knew going in, that they actually had 4 but shortlisted it to 3, that pending approval from PRC, if it does not go forward, they can reapply. They are prepared and already have the contract documents in draft to the contractor's now for review.

Questions & Answers:

Q. Did I see contingency of \$1.23M? Is that 5% contingency?

A. *This is \$1.2M in contingency for the owner. \$1.9M contingency for a \$30M project.*

Q. The school district has a project that is GC/CM originally scheduled to complete in 2018 and now scheduled for completion mid-2019. We want to understand a little more about what happened with that project schedule.

A. *That's Morgan Middle School. That's a \$48M project. It was scheduled to be done last summer, and was a very complex build. Part of the building was saved while part was demolished. The Phase 3 process where the wing was to be added, we ran into weather issues. We waited to finish some of that exterior work until June when students were out of school. It will be done in a high quality way and under budget. The punch list is complete and we will be finishing that in June.*

Next meeting: May 23, 2019

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

March 28, 2019

Minutes

Q. So what are some lessons learned?

A. What I would like to see is a high level executive series of meetings, to work often, and cut some of the complexities and project off early. Once we had kids in school it really slowed things down, so that was one of the lessons learned. We would also bring the contractor in earlier and at a higher level. We are also more sophisticated as a team to use today's technology better.

Q. Based on your chart, most of your team that has construction or design experience are not employed by the school. Does anybody employed by the school have design or construction experience?

A. Ihae built five schools, so this will be 3 more to add to that list. That does not include Morgan Middle School which is about to finish under the GC/CM process. The Director has been involved in every project for the last 28 years.

Public Comment:

No public comments.

Deliberation:

Ato stated that in his opinion the PRC is good to approve based on what they have heard.

Jim stated that he enjoyed reading the application, as it was textbook. The governance is approved, it satisfies statute.

Janice especially appreciated the lessons learned comments. This is the right project for GC/CM.

Timothy reiterated they have the right team, and the right attitude for the project. There is a huge opportunity to join both projects and save time. The involvement of the GC/CM early on will really help ferret out the complex issues.

Conclusion:

Jim Dugan moved to approve this project for GC/CM, and Ato Apiafi seconded the motion.

Application for GC/CM was unanimously Approved.

1:30 pm (Room B) **Yelm Community Schools – GC/CM Project
- *Downing Elementary School Replacement***

Panel Chair: Mark Ottele

Panel: Ato Apiafi, Quinn Dolan, Tom Golden, Rustin Hall, Jeff Jurgensen, Art McCluskey, John Palewicz, Mike Shinn

Presentation:

Kasey Wyatt, project manager, introduced the team and reviewed the organizational chart.

Brian Wharton, Superintendent, outlined the bond issue which passed at 64%. The community is behind this project and sees it as absolutely necessary. The bond is for the completion of two schools. There is also about \$9M for safety projects for the other seven schools in the district.

One of the things they did early was identify the need for a stronger team. They really worked hard to get the best people as part of their pre-bond work. The other parts that are really important are the aspects of safety, including safety while the projects are being constructed. Yelm Middle School will be the temporary elementary school while Southworth is being completed, to mitigate the need to bring in other classrooms.

- Yelm Middle School is grades 6-8. It is a 100,000 sf building on 19 acres that serves 725 students. Kasey reviewed the schedule and the total approved budget of \$68.4M. The Yelm project meets 4 out of 5 criteria for GC/CM.
- Southworth Elementary is grades K-5. It is a 65,000 sf building on 13.5 acres and serves 550 students. It has an approved budget of \$43.6M.

The last portion of this project is upgrading and replacing some of the field facilities for this district.

Next meeting: May 23, 2019

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

March 28, 2019

Minutes

For Kasey, this will be the 16th GC/CM project. This is the 5th project where they have used a bundled approach, to do more than one project at once. Heather has similar expertise, with 18 years of industry experience and K-12 Design experience.

This will be an occupied site. Yelm Community Schools will be addressing staff and public safety as part of their mitigation. They are doing outreach before construction and continuing communication throughout construction. They have a communications specialist as part of the team.

The GC/CM partner will help with both the coordinating of the move and preparing the elementary, including plumbing, teaching walls, or other safety issues that are needed for Middle Schools. They will be facilitating changes as they move to the elementary school as a swing site. There will be demolition of the existing middle school, so GC/CM partnership and coordination of sequencing, cost and schedule, and outdoor athletics is a priority for the district and City of Yelm.

In Southworth, because of the challenging site, they are looking at a 2-story solution. There is a lot of complexity on the site, mostly due to utilities and water on the site. The size and shape of the site, both narrow will be a challenge for access and logistics. They are relying on the GC/CM to identify issues early, and are looking at costing options.

These projects meet the criteria of RCW 39.10. They have the appropriate budget and team. The Yelm community is very invested in their time frame, so they want to press forward and do this in the best way that they can.

Questions & Answers:

Q. Will you be using one GC/CM or will there be different contractors?

A. Yes, one GC/CM is the approach approved by the District for the following reasons:

- a. More efficient communication, collaboration and coordination for projects that are tied together sequentially.*
- b. Opportunity to establish a baseline schedule and plan for the sequential projects with input from and involvement with the same design team and GC/CM*
- c. Reduces risk and provides better opportunities for lessons learned*
- d. Planning and design efficiencies with having the same Owner – Architect – Contractor Team.*
- e. More dutiful use of time for decision makers and stakeholders who may otherwise have to attend separate/additional meetings, presentations, etc.*
- f. Continuity of project leadership for the projects*
- g. Cost savings for reduced overhead – for example much of the schematic design work will be happening concurrently with the same leadership team and Architect.*
- h. Higher level of accountability for the GC/CM as each project is contingent upon the timely completion of each building.*

Q. Please provide the anticipated time commitment of the project team members shown on the organizational chart.

A. Brian Wharton, Superintendent, YCS – as needed

Chris Hanson, Facilities Director, YCS – as needed

Graehm Wallace, Attorney, Perkins Coie – as needed

Kasey Wyatt, Project Manager, KWA – 95% throughout (Kasey is 100% at YCS and has dedicated 5% of her time to small safety and security upgrades as part of the bond program)

Heather Hocklander, Architect, BCRA – 50% GCCM Selection, 50% Design & 10% Construction

Jim Wolch, Architect, BCRA – 50% GCCM Selection, 50% Design & 10% Construction

Rod Asa, Architect, BCRA 60% Construction (CA)

Q. At the end of question 6 you answered “Not Applicable” to the request for verification that you have developed or will develop specific GC/CM contract terms. What is your plan to develop them?

A. Perkins Coie and KWA are currently developing the GC/CM Agreement. The contract document will be a modified AIA A133 and AIA A201. Modifications will be based on lessons learned from previous projects.

Next meeting: May 23, 2019

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

March 28, 2019

Minutes

Q. You showed logical lines of authority, but you did not talk much about continuity.

A. It starts with the School Board having the ultimate authority. Then decisions go to Brian Wharton, the superintendent, and then to Kacey to make recommendations regarding collaboration of the partners. There is also a facility director to make sure we stay within the systems of construction and design standards.

Q. Have you done much outreach in the market right now building schools?

A. We have done some outreach, but did not want to be too presumptuous. We have talked to a few K-12 GC/CM contractors.

Q. What keeps you up at night as the project manager on these two schools? What do you see as the risks?

A. Having to do this in a Design-Bid-Build scenario would keep me up at night because the sequencing is such a big task. Developing phasing plans would be a challenge for this project.

Q. I assume both these projects are front funding?

A. Yes. They are front-funding.

Q. Is there a reason you put the contingency in the construction cost?

A. The contingency that is in the construction cost is GC/CM's risk contingency.

Public Comment:

Laurie, Superintendent All of the projects are on occupied sites and really looking at the safety of students and staff. All the projects are being finished on or ahead of schedule. The budgets are all below budget. The school received a CMMA award for work on one of the projects and the success of the project. Kasey and Heather are very knowledgeable with GC/CM and their work was apparent and critical, and directly responsible for the success of those projects.

Rob Robinson, Vice President of Skanska. This project clearly meets the minimal requirements of the RCW 39.10 for GC/CM. They've thought about GC/CM and the expertise the owner has hired has tons of experience. As a contractor, we've lots of opportunity so we look for owners and teams that work well for projects, and we are very much in support of the project.

Drew Philips, Forman Construction. You guys have done a good job. Working with Heather and Kasey is a joy and they will keep the project on schedule. I look forward to the collaboration. They're pretty smart.

Deliberation:

Art stated the project clearly meets the RCW requirements. As long as they can get contractors to bid on it. It is a bit busy right now.

Conclusion:

Quinn Dolan made a motion to approve this project for GC/CM. John Palewicz seconded the motion.

Application for GC/CM was unanimously approved.

2:30 pm (Room A) **Tacoma Public Schools – DB Project**
 – Downing Elementary School Replacement

Panel Chair: Mark Ottele

Panel: Ato Apiafi, Rustin Hall, Jeff Jurgensen, Art McCluskey, John Palewicz

Presentation:

Morris Aldridge of Tacoma Public Schools introduced the presentation team: Jim Dugan, Maggie Anderson, Michelle Langi, and Dan Cody. TPS is the 4th largest school district in Washington with about 30,000 students serving K-12. Downing Elementary School is located in northwest Tacoma on a 10 acre site. This project is to replace the existing facility to house 450 students in a 50,000 sq ft multi-story building. They plan to build the

Next meeting: May 23, 2019

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

March 28, 2019

Minutes

new school and then demolish the old buildings and replace with parking, and play fields. This project has an approved budget of \$42.7M and the schedule is estimated to start April of 2021 and conclude June 2022.

Questions & Answers:

- Q. JJ – What Lessons have you learned on the 2 prior DB projects you have done that you can apply to this project? What changes will you have going forward? Did you utilize teaming agreements between DB team and contractor, architect or pm team, or will you?
- A. On Boze elementary we did not utilize teaming agreements because the team chosen had already worked together and felt it was unnecessary. Looking forward it would be wise to have teaming agreements where the builder and architect have very little experience working together or use a charter. Do not have any bad experiences to add to lessons learned as yet. Morris added that they realize they do not have to spend \$400 per square feet to get a great elementary school. When you choose a team that understands the buildings need to be functional and can be done extremely well, you do not need to spend that kind of money.*
- Q. Please share some insight on how to push the envelope for showing support for OMWBE for public school.
- A. Challenge has been working with and encouraging women to be more involved. Have a women owned roofing company, but there are very few in the construction industry that can compete and participate in the multi-million dollar projects. We are working with contractors to finish the paperwork done so they can compete and can participate. The goal is to have contractors that reflect the diverse community they are directly supporting with the new facility.*
- Q. The application leans more to traditional DB, what is the progressive element?
- A. TPS uses a lot of traditional standards, but are open to allow the design team to be creative and forward thinking.*
- Q. Dan Cody has a lot on his plate with other projects, and according to the organization chart with spending 80% of time allocated to construction and 20% in design. How does that work with your schedule?
- A. Dan's primary focus is alternative project delivery. He supervises 23 project managers who assist with putting the projects together. He's more of a boots on the ground worker, and is onsite as much as possible.*

Public Comment:

No public comments.

Deliberation:

Ato loves the enthusiasm of the team, their experience is exceptional.

Art McCluskey is unsure about the funding.

John Palewicz pointed out that they are not required to have the funding secured to be approved to use DB, only to outline where the funding is expected to come from.

Conclusion:

John Palewicz moved to approve this project for DB, and Ato Apiafi seconded the motion.

Application for DB was unanimously Approved. 6/6

3:30 pm

Adjourn

Next meeting: May 23, 2019