

GC/CM Committee

Meeting Notes 10/25/2023 (#40)

Page 1 of 8

Committee Members: (13 positions, 7 = Quorum)

x Nick Datz–Chair		
	Shannon Gustine (General Contractors)	Mark Nakagawara (Cities)
x Aaron Young (DES)		Santosh Kuruvilla (Engineers)
x Sam Miller (Architects)		Todd Mitchell (Construction Trades Labor)
	Scott Middleton (Specialty Contractors)	John Palewicz (Private Industry)
x Traci Rogstad (K-12 Schools)		___ (OMWBE)
	Alexis Blue (Higher Ed)	Janice Zahn (Ports)

Guests & Stakeholders:

x	Cathy Ridley, Exeltech Consulting, attending on behalf of Santosh Kuruvilla, representing Engineers		
x	Claire Hornacek, Maul Foster & Alongi		
x	David Jobs, OAC Services		
x	Shelly Henderson, Mukilteo School District		
x	Ian Hernandez, attending on behalf of Mark Nakagawara, representing Cities		
x	Keith Michel, attending on behalf of Shannon Gustine, representing General Contractors		
x	Mitch Romero, Parametrix, attending on behalf of Howard Hillinger		
x	Angela Peterson, Port of Seattle, Construction Contracting Manager		

Meeting started at 1:03 p.m.

Discussion Highlights:

Chapter leads will address the comments in each chapter:

Chair Datz: working on Introduction and Subcontracting chapters

Keith Michel: Close Out, Alternative Subcontractor Selection, Total Construction Costs chapters

Sam Miller: Preconstruction chapter

Mitch Romero: Evaluating Use, GCCM Readiness chapters

Angela Peterson: Procurement chapter

Howard Hillinger: Heavy Civil chapter

Chair Datz will send links to the OneDrive folder.

The next meeting will be addressing outstanding comments. The only things left should be things to be addressed by the committee, the list of graphics, and any DEI gaps that they notice in the chapters.

They'll also talk about how next year they'll get into the executive briefing opportunity if they want to go down that road and hammer out a few more of those details. David Jobs will present ideas of what that might look like. As for as the rest of it, they'll talk about adjustments to the committee team to see if they want to make

any permanent adjustments for the December CPARB meeting. They'll also go over the review process which will be put on the OneDrive.

Next Meeting: November 29, 2023 at 1:00 p.m.

Action items:

1. Introductions:
 - a. Nick Datz, with Sound Transit, representing Transportation
 - b. Cathy Ridley, with Exeltech Consulting, attending on behalf of Santosh Kuruvilla, representing Engineers
 - c. Claire Hornacek, with Maul Foster & Alongi, notetaking
 - d. David Jobs, with OAC Services, with owners rep firm listening in on today's meeting
 - e. Shelly Henderson, with Mukilteo School District
 - f. Ian Hernandez, attending on behalf of Mark Nakagawara, representing Cities
 - g. Keith Michel, attending on behalf of Shannon Gustine, representing General Contractors
 - h. Mitch Romero, with Parametrix, attending on behalf of Howard Hillinger
 - i. Angela Peterson, with Port of Seattle, Construction Contracting Manager
 - j. Sam Miller, with LMN Architects, representing Architects
 - k. Traci Rogstad, with Renton School District, representing K-12 Schools
 - l. Aaron Young, representing Department of Enterprise Services (DES)
2. A quorum was established and Chair Datz asked if anyone had edits to the meeting notes from August. No one stated that they had edits. Chair Datz put forward a motion to approve the notes from the last GC/CM Committee meeting held on August 30, 2023. Keith Michel—General Contractors approved the motion to approve the notes from the August meeting as issued. Sam Miller—Architects seconded the motion. The group confirmed by verbal approval and the August 30 meeting notes were accepted.
3. Chair Datz announced that the meeting's agenda was mostly organizational and administrative.
 - a. He said the plan for the meeting was to get into mapping out how to bring the Best Practices document to the finish line. Chair Datz said the committee has a good initial document as it stands. All the chapters are built out, but there are lots of comments left on the chapters. The committee needs a plan to address comments and clean up all those chapters. Another agenda item is getting other flagged items, like the charts and graphics, developed. The biggest thing is making sure the entire document has a consistent, singular voice.
 - b. Chair Datz opened it up to the group for ideas on how best to do this. He said especially with the winter months, the holidays, and vacation time, now is the crunch time to get things done. The last time Chair Datz was at CPARB he told them springtime was a realistic timeline to get the document finished. Chair Datz also stated that he wanted to determine a reasonable timeline to get the document in front of CPARB for comments before finalizing the full document.
4. Chair Datz asked for anyone to throw out ideas and added that they have about 11 chapters for the draft currently, for reference.
 - a. Angela Peterson—Ports said **Patricia Roth** from King County had offered to read through it and could possibly be a resource for looking at consistency and making it one voice unless anyone has other resources. She hadn't spoken with her in a few months.
 - b. Mitch Romero said he had a meeting with her later that day and he could mention it to her.

- c. Chair Datz said that would be great. He added that Howard Hillinger had some people from Parametrix go through some early drafts to try to put it into one voice. He was unsure if that resource is still available.
- d. Mitch replied that he was happy to ask Howard Hillinger about that.
- e. Chair Datz said that would be a huge help, and the committee should probably figure out a good time to get into that. He said Patricia Roth and Parametrix working together to give it that singular voice, once they get the final document, would be super helpful.
- f. Chair Datz explained the committee had a bunch of chapter leads who were responsible for each chapter, and some are still on the committee but some are not anymore. Chair Datz asked if it made sense to divvy up all the chapters up to people to try to clean them up, or should they see if any of those leads were around to finalize them? Chair Datz said he knew he was the lead on a couple of chapters. He is happy to take those on.
- g. Sam Miller—Architects agreed that divide and conquer was usually a good idea, but asked how much cleaning up of the individual chapters is left. What other cleaning up did Chair Datz have in mind?
- h. Chair Datz explained that there were outstanding comments consistently throughout the document. That was the biggest thing he wanted to address. Most of it was addressing all the comments and making sure those have been cleaned up and incorporated into the document. Every chapter had comments on it.
- i. Sam Miller—Architects suggested that the first step be to divvy out chapters to each chapter lead or co-chapter lead. That would get it one step closer to the one voice effort.
- j. Chair Datz said he thought that was a good idea.
- k. Scott Middleton and Chair Datz were in charge of the introduction chapter. Chair Datz said he would address the comments on it. Shannon Gustine did chapters two and three. Chair Datz asked if Keith Michel—General Contractors could step in to help with those chapters. Others who helped were Olivia Yang, Penny Koal, Sam Miller—Architects, Janice Zahn, Howard, and Chair Datz.
- l. Keith Michel—General Contractors said he was willing to follow up on this next step for certain chapters, but he is also a lead on the Construction Services and Total Contract Cost chapters. Chair Datz said he would rather have him focus on those.
- m. Chair Datz said Shannon Gustine's chapters are Evaluating the Use of GC/CM and GC/CM Readiness. He asked if anyone could jump in and address those comments? Mitch volunteered.
- n. Mitch asked if they are still sharing the document via email. Chair Datz said he has it in OneDrive and asked if he had shared that with Mitch. Mitch said the copies he edited were hard copies and his input was copy/pasted.
- o. Chair Datz said he would give Mitch access to the OneDrive. He said it has all the chapters there individually and combined into a single manual. Chair Datz asked that they all work in the combined manual because that's where he took all the notes as they talked about the document as a group. The Procurement chapter is missing because Angela Peterson—Ports was still working on it.
- p. Angela Peterson—Ports said there were a lot of outstanding things in the Procurement chapter. She said maybe she'll get the committee back one last time to clean it up together and then she will let Chair Datz know.
- q. Chair Datz said the Alternative Subcontractor Selection chapter lead was Scott Middleton, who is now retired. Chair Datz listed the other people who worked on that chapter, including himself, Keith Michel—General Contractors, Andrew (last name?), Mike (last name?), Janice Zahn, Shelly Henderson, and Todd Mitchell. Chair Datz asked if anyone wanted to jump in and grab that chapter. Keith Michel—General Contractors volunteered.

- r. Chair Datz said that there was also Subcontracting, which he was the lead on, so he would take that chapter as well.
 - s. Chair Datz said for the Civil chapter, Tom Peterson did a lot of the legwork. Santosh Kuruvilla was involved. Curt **Gimmestad?** and Howard Hillinger were both involved a bit. Chair Datz said that was the last chapter they needed help with.
 - t. Keith Michel—General Contractors asked who in attendance had good heavy civil experience to help with that chapter. Mitch said he would volunteer Howard Hillinger but he might not be too happy with him. Chair Datz volunteered Howard Hillinger, who was not present at the meeting, to lead that chapter.
 - u. Keith Michel—General Contractors suggested to either have Howard Hillinger address the comments or send the original lead a follow up. He didn't remember how involved the comments were in that section.
 - v. Mitch said he would talk to Howard Hillinger to make sure he could help.
 - w. Chair Datz said he would reach out to Tom Peterson to see if he remembered how the comments were from that section. Tom Peterson hadn't seen it in a while so he may not be ready to jump back in. If that doesn't work out, Chair Datz said he would update it.
 - x. Sam Miller—Architects asked about the Preconstruction section. Chair Datz confirmed that Sam Miller—Architects lead that chapter.
 - y. Angela said she may reach out to Sam Miller—Architects because there were some things in her chapter that should maybe go into one of the chapters he was working on. She wanted to make sure they were on the same page.
5. Sam Miller—Architects thought that tied into a broader point. He said as they were going through some of these chapters, they were mentioning linkages to other chapters. He said maybe whoever is taking the lead on each chapter in the second review, if there are comments in their chapters that relate to other chapters, that they reach out to the other lead.
- a. Chair Datz agreed that was a good point. He also added that as they're going through the chapters, if there are questions or if anything needs clarification (if comments can't be answered or resolved,) he thinks that's what they should use the next meeting for: resolving outstanding comments that leads couldn't resolve on their own.
 - b. Chair Datz confirmed that was all the chapters. He also said that some flags were in the document for graphics. He asked that everyone who was taking lead on these chapters address all comments besides flags for graphics or comments that need to be addressed as a group during the next meeting. During the next meeting they'll compile a list of all the graphics that they need and see if anyone has capacity to develop them, or if anyone has a firm or agency in mind that can do that kind of work, or if anyone has access to graphics that are already made.
 - c. Mitch said he got a text from Howard Hillinger saying he would do the Heavy Civil chapter.
 - d. Chair Datz asked how much time is reasonable for cleaning up the chapters. He asked if they want to try to meet in December, or push to January? Leads need to make sure they've gone through this review and they're ready in January. Chair Datz said he would rather not wait so long, but he knows there is a lot going on in the next couple months.
 - e. Sam Miller—Architects said it might be good to keep the momentum going. Keith Michel—General Contractors agreed.
 - f. Chair Datz confirmed that everyone will get their chapters done by the next meeting on November 29, 2023.
 - g. Chair Datz asked that each chapter lead try to get their chapters as resolved as possible by the next meeting and bring all unresolvable problems to the group.

- h. Keith Michel—General Contractors asked if Chair Datz would share the OneDrive with the group and confirmed that Chair Datz wanted everyone working within the complied document.
 - i. Chair Datz said that is correct, except for Angela Peterson—Ports. She is the exception to the rule. Everyone else, he encouraged to work within the complied document.
 - j. Keith Michel—General Contractors asked if the assignments are also being noted on the shared OneDrive document.
 - k. Chair Datz confirmed that he would add the assignments to the OneDrive document.
6. Chair Datz said that was all he really wanted to talk about during the meeting. They all have a fair amount of offline work to get through. He asked if there was anything else to go over.
- a. Aaron Young (DES) asked for a copy of the latest draft.
 - b. Chair Datz said he would send everyone on the meeting invite a link to his OneDrive and the actual folder to work out of once he organizes it. He said to reach out via email or phone call if people have questions.
 - c. David Jobs said, like Aaron Young (DES), he is joining this project late in the game. Stacy Shewell has looked through and noticed different voices. It's a notable challenge and he wondered if there's a way to do an executive briefing from the perspective of each entity, referencing into the document in a shorter, more concise manner that gives direction to the reader. For example, if you're a general contractor or an architect, this is what you want to be paying attention to. He put himself in the perspective of wanting to learn best practices of GC/CM, but how much information can he take in at once versus taking in one piece to start with that then drives him to look for more information. He suggested an introduction to the document from the perspective of each voice that directs you through the documents to find the information you need.
 - d. Chair Datz said that is an interesting idea but didn't want to say no or yes to it in the moment. He would rather focus on the effort to get comments addressed first, then maybe after would be a good opportunity to discuss that. He looks at this effort as finalizing the document. He said maybe they can come back to it after getting through the next couple of meetings, once the document is closer to its final state.
 - e. Sam Miller—Architects said they've referenced the Design Build Best Practices Manual in the past. He asked if they should be looking to that as a model in terms of voice and graphic layout. Is it related or not? He said this was just a question for the group, he didn't think it had to be answered in the moment. Once the committee gets into finalizing, are they thinking that this will be a companion document or a separate thing?
 - f. Chair Datz said CPARB wasn't too happy with the format of the last one.
 - g. Sam Miller—Architects asked what about it wasn't well received, so they can avoid that.
 - h. Chair Datz said the only real challenge was that it was not provided in a format anyone could modify. It was InDesign, which is a little more of a specialty kind of marketing program. It's a beautiful document and great from a usability perspective but now it's aged and difficult to update. Formatting matters, and Parametrix volunteered to help with the organization. It's a heavy lift. The committee needs to recognize that. What this document looks like in its final form is nebulous in Chair Datz's mind because it's an overwhelming amount of text and pages compared to the Design Build Manual. He said they should pick the formatting process carefully.
 - i. Mitch said they have quite a bit of resources in terms of word processing. If the plan is to keep it in Word, it shouldn't be a big deal, but he wants to connect with Howard Hillinger on that.
 - j. Chair Datz said he needs to meet with CPARB and Talia Baker and understand if there are any rules or requirements. The other thing the committee needs to think about is accessibility. He said they have some digging to do on that end. For where they are now, he was thinking that they'll just get the Word

document to a final state. Where it converts from there, they'll let others figure it out and take orders from them.

- k. Keith Michel—General Contractors suggested that an agenda item for the next meeting in November be what (if any) adjustments need to be made to the members of this subcommittee. That could be ratified by CPARB at the December session.
- l. Chair Datz said yes.
- m. Keith Michel—General Contractors said he liked the goal of “sometime next spring” for getting the document finished, but he anticipates there will be comments and attention refining on this probably all the way until summer break. It takes cycles to get this in front of CPARB, then that’s a whole new feedback loop, something they’ll have to keep getting together to improve and refine. Keith Michel—General Contractors said he’s thankful there are some new faces in the meeting and some consistent attendance from people who used to be new. He looked at the official list on the website and suggested that maybe he should substitute Shannon Gustine officially. She’s out of the region now. There are also a couple proxies consistently attending who have maybe earned their ability to be on the committee officially. He suggested they create an agenda item for that, to get organized on official substitutions and the committee make-up, so that they can be stabilized through finalizing this next year.
- n. Chair Datz said that is a good point and they’ll have that on the agenda next month. He asked Angela Peterson—Ports, Ian Hernandez (Cities), and Shelly to talk to their respective members and see whether officially substituting for them on the committee might be appropriate.
- o. Chair Datz asked if there was anything else anyone wanted to discuss.
- p. Keith Michel—General Contractors added that as the committee navigates comments and makes refinements in the next month, to keep in mind how GC/CM is driven through diversity and inclusion. The **BE/DE** report came out during GC/CM work. He remembered the first two years were kind of brainstorming, which went into the changes and the law that took effect in 2021. Then they shifted into best practices and the industry continued to move, and the RCWs were updated since they began. He asked that members continue to stay sensitive. There could be gaps in what best practices are now..
- q. Angela Peterson—Ports said that was a great point. She thinks that the definitions also are changing, so that might be something to look into. She’s not sure how they are used in their best practice guide, but now small businesses can be certified, so that might be something new.
- r. Chair Datz suggested maybe as chapter leads are going through and cleaning up the document and notice a gap, to add that as another flag. There are three flags to be looking for: unresolved questions, graphics, and DEI updates.
- s. Chair Datz said they need to think about the external review process. He would like to bring something to CPARB as a recommendation, rather than CPARB just telling the committee what to do. They will tell us what to do, but he thinks the committee can narrow it down a bit if they come in with a plan. The PRC potentially wants to look at it as well. He talked to them last week about it. What he’s thinking is when they get the draft to a final point, then they give it to CPARB and let them put it on their website for public comment for four weeks, or a clear amount of time. PRC and CPARB would have an opportunity to comment as well. Then the committee address all the comments together over a month or two and figure out if they need to be incorporated. That might be the easiest way to do comments. If anyone has a better review process, he’s open to ideas.
- t. Keith Michel—General Contractors said he thinks Talia Baker and some of the support DES staff might have preferences with that. On the other subcommittee work he’s been working on all summer, they managed comments flowing back to them before being redistributed to the committee as a whole. He thinks they prefer to be the receiver of public commentary on the work that CPARB and these committees are doing. But he thinks the point Chair Datz made is for this committee to come up with a tool that is effective for them to manage the comments that come in.

- u. Chair Datz said what he doesn't want is to get a bunch of different versions of a Word document with comments on it. They need the comments clearly laid out, correctly referencing the relevant section in the document so they have an opportunity to respond to what's in the comment. If they're going to take comments, then they have to go through all the comments. He thinks talking to Talia Baker to see if they have a process is good. He asked what the group thinks about keeping it open for four weeks.
- v. Keith Michel—General Contractors said he thinks it really doesn't matter how much time they have, it's how much time they have that morning.
- w. Chair Datz said he thinks letting it sit on CPARB's website for bit is kind of a meaningful gesture.
- x. Keith Michel asked what the other committees have done.
- y. Chair Datz said he's not sure anyone had a deadline. It was all public documentation that anyone was able to speak up on at any given time. But he thinks prior to finalizing the document they solicit people to join in the discussion and contribute. Maybe a month is enough.
- z. Keith Michel—General Contractors said to post the document to the DAC or something. He asked how to advertise it. This is five years' worth of work. Public input is valuable prior to finalizing the document that they hope is a good resource for lots of people to rely upon going forward.
- aa. Chair Datz asked what other people thought. He said a month struck him as kind of short.
- bb. Angela Peterson—Ports clarified that's one month for the PRC to review, get comments back to the committee to address the comments and then they would put it out for public comment? Or that is the public comment period?
- cc. Chair Datz said he doesn't want multiple review periods with different entities. He would really like to streamline it and have everybody give their comments at the same time. CPARB comments will probably get more precedence, but it makes it easier for the committee to get everyone's comments, create a final version, and have one version. And hopefully that's the accepted version.
- dd. Sam Miller—Architects said he agrees with that because it would streamline the process, and maybe more importantly, with multiple rounds of comments they could get contradictory comments. Having all the comments together and weighing them and coming up with a solution is better than multiple rounds.
- ee. Chair Datz said that literally happened to him that day.
- ff. Keith Michel—General Contractors said that Chair Datz's original question was about trying to set a plan to communicate to CPARB, which he liked. His suggestion would be to back plan from a May CPARB meeting which is already scheduled for next spring. They will determine a month or six weeks or whatever duration they want to facilitate a public comment period. Then that gives them a deadline for a finished draft. Which is probably only two or three meetings away, plus the holidays
- gg. Aaron Young (DES) added that after it is put out for comments, they'll probably need time to address comments before it goes to CPARB.
- hh. Chair Datz said yes, that's what he's thinking about. So, if they look at May, then a couple meetings for the committee to address the comments, plus whatever period they choose to have it open (let's say three months all together), that puts it at February that they need to have something complete to CPARB. He said if they stay on their schedule that's totally feasible. He asked the committee if two months to incorporate comments would be sufficient.
- ii. Keith Michel—General Contractors said they should commit to that and see how many comments they end up having to deal with.
- jj. Chair Datz confirmed, two months to incorporate, one month open for comments. He will build out that schedule and present it at the next CPARB meeting. He will also ask Talia Baker about what process they have for comments and recommendations for formatting.
- kk. Chair Datz summarized the meeting's action items:

GC/CM Committee

Meeting Notes 10/25/2023 (#40)

Page 8 of 8

1. Chair Datz: working on Introduction and Subcontracting chapters
2. Keith Michel: Close Out, Alternative Subcontractor Selection, Total Construction Costs chapters
3. Sam Miller: Preconstruction chapter
4. Mitch Romero: Evaluating Use, GCCM Readiness chapters
5. Angela Peterson: Procurement chapter
6. Howard Hillinger: Heavy Civil chapter

Chair Datz will send links to the OneDrive folder.

7. The next meeting will be addressing outstanding comments. The only things left should be things to be addressed by the committee, the list of graphics, and any DEI gaps that they notice in the chapters.

They'll also talk about how next year they'll get into the executive briefing opportunity if they want to go down that road and hammer out a few more of those details. David Jobs will present ideas of what that might look like. As for the rest of it, they'll talk about adjustments to the committee team to see if they want to make any permanent adjustments for the December CPARB meeting. They'll also go over the review process which will be put on the OneDrive.

Meeting adjourned at 1:48 p.m.

References/Resources:

None.