

GC/CM Committee

Committee Members: (13 positions, 7 = Quorum)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> x Nick Datz—Chair Shannon Gustine (General Contractors) x Aaron Young (DES) Sam Miller (Architects) Scott Middleton (Specialty Contractors) Traci Rogstad (K-12 Schools) x Alexis Blue (Higher Ed) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mark Nakagawara (Cities) Santosh Kuruvilla (Engineers) Todd Mitchell (Construction Trades Labor) John Palewicz (Private Industry) ___ (OMWBE) Janice Zahn (Ports)
--	--

Guests & Stakeholders:

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

Meeting started at 2:01 p.m.

Discussion Highlights:

Continue addressing outstanding comments for each chapter, assign graphics, and confirm timeline for manual completion.

Next Meeting: March, 27 2024

Action items:

1. Introductions:
 - a. Nick Datz, with Sound Transit, representing Public Owners
 - b. Alexis Blue, representing Higher Education
 - c. Claire Hornacek, with Maul Foster & Alongi, notetaking
 - d. Ian Hernandez, from the City of Seattle, representing Cities
 - e. Angela Peterson, with Port of Seattle, Construction Contracting Manager
 - f. Aaron Young, representing Department of Enterprise Services (DES)
 - g. Shelly Henderson, representing Mukilteo School District
2. Chair Datz asked if anyone had edits to the meeting notes from the January 2024 meeting. No one stated that they had comments or edits. Chair Datz put forward a motion to approve the notes from the last GC/CM Committee meeting held on January 31, 2024. Angela Peterson—Ports made a motion to approve

the notes from the January meeting as issued. Alexis Blue—Higher Education seconded the motion. The group confirmed by verbal approval and the January 31, 2024 meeting notes were accepted.

3. Chair Datz explained that the plan for the meeting was to review the last few chapters and address any outstanding comments.
4. Chair Datz shared the best practices manual on his screen and began going through the sections that still had unresolved comments. He noted that Keith Michel—General Contractors was not present at the meeting and was not able to review the total contract cost section. Chair Datz noted uncertainty about whether Keith Michel—General Contractors went through the Close Out and Alternative Subcontractor Selection chapters. Chair Datz said he briefly reviewed those chapters and resolved older comments but noted that he will still need to connect with Keith Michel—General Contractors to determine if there are any other edits.
5. The Alternative Subcontractor Selection chapter is complete and the closeout for that section is minimal. Chair Datz will connect with Keith Michel—General Contractors to determine what else needs to be included, as well as the total contract cost. There is still a fair amount of work with total contract costs left to do, and he noted this section needs to be turned into a narrative.
 - a. Chair Datz asked the group whether anyone had capacity to go through the Alternative Subcontractor Selection chapter and convert it into a narrative format. Hearing no responses, Chair Datz indicated he will reach out to Keith Michel—General Contractor to first see if he is able to make those updates and if not, Chair Datz would work on it.
 - b. Once updates are made to the Alternative Subcontractor Selection chapter, Chair Datz will email the updated chapter to the committee for review and provide any comments or feedback. This approach will help to keep the process moving and send it to the Capital Projects Advisory Review Board (CPARB) before their summer break.
6. Chair Datz shared that the focus for the meeting was to review the outstanding chapters and outstanding comments and work on addressing and cleaning them up together as a committee. He suggested also going through the graphic list and determining how those graphics could be assigned to committee members.
7. Chair Datz shared the GCCM Best Practices Manual on the screen and began reviewing all the outstanding comments. He noted that some of the comments were still tied to deleted content or chapters. He deleted those comments as they had already removed the text they applied to.
8. Chair Datz reviewed some of the comments relating to graphics and reference links.
 - a. Sam Miller—Architects was not present at the meeting to provide an update on the Preconstruction chapter. Chair Datz shared that Sam Miller—Architects went through and updated the Preconstruction chapter but was unsure if he was able to review and clean up edits and comments.
 - b. Chair Datz noted that he will work with Keith Michel—General Contractors to review and clean up comments and edits, as well as touch base with Sam Miller—Architects regarding this section.
9. Chair Datz moved on to the Procurement chapter, assigned to Angela Peterson—Ports.
 - a. Chair Datz said he pulled the Procurement section into the main OneDrive document. He asked Angela Peterson—Ports whether there were any outstanding questions or edits in that chapter that need to be addressed.
 - b. Angela Peterson—Ports noted that after reviewing the meeting minutes, it did not appear that there were any outstanding issues or comments to address.
10. Chair Datz moved on to the Preconstruction Services chapter and pointed out one comment regarding best practices and transparency around estimating. He asked her if she had had a chance to review it.
 - a. Angela Peterson—Ports reviewed the comment and said it did not ring a bell, noting she may need more details on this. The comment was from almost two years ago.
 - b. She made a note that the comment was on page 29 of the document and indicated she would read the entire section so she understands the whole context and can address the comment.
11. Chair Datz moved on to the Alternative Subcontractor Selection chapter assigned to Keith Michel—General Contractors.

- a. One comment addressed the makeup of the evaluation committee for alternative subcontractor selection. Chair Datz asked the committee whether there was anything to add on this, such as additional detail or highlighting a best practice.
 - i. Aaron Young—DES expressed that there may be a need for an owner representative on the selection committee. Chair Datz clarified that all that is currently indicated in that section is that there needs to be one representative from the public body.
 - ii. Angela Peterson—Ports noted that there are no contractors present, but with the Port, they typically have a diverse panel. She asked whether diversity was something that should be included in that section. However, she noted it may not always be possible for contractors and would depend on the makeup of their company.
 - iii. Aaron Young—DES said that in the past DES has included their consultant on the selection panel. He was unsure of whether it was a best practice, or just something they decided to do.
 - iv. Angela Peterson—Ports added that it could depend on the value of the overall project. If it's a smaller project, perhaps not, but for \$300 million or above it may be a consideration. Aaron Young—DES said if it's not a best practice then perhaps it shouldn't be included.
 - v. Angela Peterson—Ports asked if this section touches on diversity at all. She noted that diversity is something they have been trying to weave in and this might be a good place to include it.
 - vi. Chair Datz agreed and said it would be worthwhile to include it in this section. He suggested that perhaps the best practice could be to work with the contractor to ensure a diverse panel with the appropriate experience on the work being done. The committee agreed with those changes and Chair Datz proceeded to include those updates.
 - b. Chair Datz moved on to the Selection section and highlighted a comment that noted a revision must be made based on the statute regarding scores added together to select the highest ranked firm. He was unsure of the statute to which this comment was referring and asked the group if anyone knew it off the top of their heads.
 - i. Angela Peterson—Ports noted it was related to the following paragraph that discusses SGC's, which indicates that nonprice factors must be added to the scoring of the price factors (SGC and Fee) to determine the highest scoring firm.
 - ii. She suggested removing SCG and Fee and instead just calling it "price factors." Chair Datz agreed and removed SCG and Fee and added "scoring of the fee."
 - c. Shelly Henderson—School District asked Chair Datz to return to the Evaluation Committee section and clarified whether it should say "GCCM" and not "the contractor." Chair Datz agreed and made that update.
12. Chair Datz went through the document and noted that many of the comments have been addressed already, and those remaining are from Keith Michel—General Contractors. Chair Datz will connect with him to work through and address many of those comments.
13. Chair Datz moved on to the Close Out chapter, noting that it still needs additional work.
- a. Listed in the Close Out chapter was a bullet about audits. Chair Datz noted that audits are discussed throughout the document and wondered whether it needed to be discussed here.
 - b. The Close Out chapter did not have a lot of detail and Chair Datz suggested the group spend a few minutes brainstorming topics that should be addressed in this section.
 - c. Angela Peterson—Ports pointed out that there was a bullet for Cost Reconciliation, but it did not include any information. Appearing as a holding place, Chair Datz said he did not believe it was assigned to anybody.
 - d. Angela Peterson—Ports said she would check her document from the Ports guide to see if there was any information related to Close Out.
 - e. Chair Datz asked Angela—Ports if she could meet with him for about an hour to expand on this chapter. She agreed. Chair Datz will have a similar meeting with Keith Michel—General Contractors on his assigned Total Contracting Costs section. After drafting these sections, they

will be sent out to the committee for their review and feedback. Chair Datz noted he needs to refresh himself with the GCCM close out process.

- f. Aaron Young—DES asked whether there are any recurring problems with closing out GCCM contracts compared to traditional Design-Bid-Build.
 - g. Chair Datz noted one challenge is the various audits, which can draw out the process especially if they are done at the end. This is why it is recommended to complete periodic audits throughout the contract.
 - h. Chair Datz said the biggest updates he sees to this section are to clean up the big bucket sections, including audits and ensuring the money has been spent appropriately. Additionally, the section related to change orders and ensuring that the owners are doing everything appropriately.
 - i. Chair Datz asked the committee if there were any other items they would like to include or discuss in the Close Out section. Hearing none, he reiterated that he and Angela Peterson—Ports will connect and work on that section.
14. Chair Datz pulled up a list he created that identifies the various graphics (charts, tables, etc.) that are needed throughout the document. He suggested going through each of the graphics listed and either seeing if anyone would like to take on creating them, or if there were any known graphics that could be used.
- a. Chair Datz reviewed the first graphic, Delivery Method Comparison.
 - i. Chair Datz said he would take this one and that he has other graphics he has used in presentations for comparing the different delivery methods.
 - b. The next graphic was for Project Evaluation and represents the MacLeamy curve.
 - i. Angela Peterson—Ports said this graphic could be found on Google and said she would be willing to find one. Chair Datz assigned this graphic to Angela Peterson—Ports.
 - c. Chair Datz asked if anyone had or knew of a good example for the GCCM Schedule Example graphic.
 - i. Angela Peterson—Ports clarified whether this graphic was one relating to the various elements of delivery and when they occur. She said she had a graphic to use for that.
 - ii. Chair Datz realized that there was already a graphic onscreen. This graphic showed when to do OPC and the various check-ins.
 - iii. Angela Peterson—Ports noted that she liked that graphic but did not put it in there. She shared her screen to show the graphic that she was thinking about. This graphic showed the designer's responsibilities, consultant's responsibilities, the different milestones throughout preconstruction, and the contractor's responsibilities.
 - iv. Chair Datz said he liked that graphic and that they might be able to find a spot for it, perhaps in the Preconstruction section. He asked Angela Peterson—Ports to add it to the graphics folder and she said she would.
 - d. Chair Datz moved on to the Alternative Subcontractor Selection graphic and noted there was already a table. He noted it may need to be made a bit nicer, but other than that it is done.
 - e. Chair Datz went on to the GCCM Risk Matrix and asked if anyone has put together a risk matrix for GCCM in the past.
 - i. Angela Peterson—Ports said she couldn't picture what that looks like and Chair Datz directed the group to look at the section that covers items that are administered differently during construction in GCCM.
 - ii. Angela Peterson—Ports said she was thinking of cost matrix, which is different. Chair Datz clarified that it's a construction risk matrix developed during Preconstruction.
 - iii. Angela Peterson—Ports pointed out that the contractor would likely have that graphic, and Chair Datz agreed, noting that he would see if Keith Michel—General Contactor might have that graphic.
 - f. Chair Datz moved on to the Subcontracting chapter and said they need a graphic that demonstrates procurement and distribution of work between the prime and subcontractors. He asked if someone would be willing to take that section and turn it into a pie chart graphic.

- i. Alexis Blue—Higher Ed said she could work on creating a pie chart. She asked for additional information to get a sense of what should be included.
 - ii. Chair Datz went over the subcontracting section, noting that the various percentages, including what can be negotiated and how much goes to a subcontractor versus heavy civil, should be taken and presented in a way that is easy to digest.
 - g. Chair Datz went to the Pros and Cons of Subcontracting Packaging section, which he noted needs to be condensed and pulled into a table.
 - i. He asked if anyone would be able to help with that, noting that the timeline to complete this is not immediate.
 - ii. Alexis Blue—Higher Ed said she could help with creating this table as well.
 - iii. Chair Datz pointed out that there is another graphic that is similar to the Subcontracting pie chart and asked if she would be willing to help with that one, and he would work on creating a table for the Pros and Cons of Subcontracting Packaging.
 - h. Chair Datz pointed out the section for Percentage of Work Allowed and Subsidies is the section that would be better represented as a graphic rather than a table.
 - i. Alexis Blue—Higher Ed said she could take that on that one.
 - ii. Chair Datz pointed out that those two graphics should be pretty similar, they are just conveying different information.
 - i. Chair Datz noted that the graphic for the responsible party for receiving subcontractor bids was already completed.
 - j. Chair Datz asked if anyone had any examples of heavy civil bid forms that they could include in an appendix.
 - i. Angela Peterson—Ports said she would check, but noted she has not done one for a few years, and was unsure if it would be a good example.
 - 15. Chair Datz said those were all the graphics that he had flagged, and asked the group if there were any other helpful documents that could be added to the appendix. These could be examples from any other owners contracts.
 - a. He noted that in the Procurement section this group was able to gather some example documents for the appendix.
 - b. Angela Peterson—Ports confirmed that they included the SGC example, noting that it was useful. Chair Datz clarified that this example was a matrix that showed where the money falls.
 - c. Angela Peterson—Ports said that she had taken a GCCM class and asked whether they would be able to use graphics from that training. Chair Datz said that was something he was supposed to look into, whether they were able to use those, and indicated he would look into it.
 - 16. Chair Datz said that they went through everything he wanted to get through. He will set up meetings with Keith Michel—General Contractor and Angela Peterson—Ports to discuss the final two chapters.
 - a. The review and comments will be done electronically.
 - b. They have already discussed the Total Contract Cost chapter as a group, and it now needs to be turned into a narrative. Chair Datz said he does not anticipate too many comments, however he encouraged the group to put in comments if they had them.
 - c. There may be some more back and forth related to the Close Out section, depending on how much detail Chair Datz and Angela Peterson—Ports get with that.
 - 17. They will send that out to the committee to get feedback and comments and reconcile it into one document. After that Chair Datz will send the document to Parametrix.
 - a. Parametrix will confirm the schedule with Chair Datz, but they indicated they would help with the review of the document to ensure consistency and checking for things such as grammar, spelling, and references. Parametrix will need to confirm how much time they need to complete their review.
 - b. Chair Datz noted the revised document will hopefully be sent to them the week of March 18, 2024.
 - c. Chair Datz went over the schedule for review and noted that Parametrix was going to review the document in March, and this committee will gather on April 10 to review their edits. April 17 is

GC/CM Committee

Meeting Notes 2/28/2024 (#42)

Page 6 of 6

the deadline to get it to CPARB so they can ensure it is in their May meeting, which is the last meeting before their summer recess. After that, CPARB's next meeting will not be until September.

- d. After this document goes to CPARB, it will enter into their public comment period and Chair Datz will work with Talia Baker to figure out what that process looks like.
 - e. After the public comment period there will likely be one or two more meetings to address edits, depending on how many comments there are.
 - f. Chair Datz clarified whether the committee was trying to get the final version to CPARB in September. Angela Peterson—Ports said that plan may have changed, and the original plan was to get the final version to CPARB by May but it got moved to September.
 - g. Chair Datz said that the plan is to get the draft to CPARB by their May meeting. The document will be open for public comment for one month, and then this committee will meet at the end of June. They will work on addressing comments and finalizing the document and get it back to CPARB for their final review by their September meeting for either final approval or more work on their part.
18. Aaron Young—DES asked Chair Datz to send him a draft of the current version, noting he had difficulty with accessing the document via SharePoint.
- a. Alexis Blue—Higher Ed and Shelly Henderson—School District also asked for the document to be shared with them via email. Chair Datz indicated he would send it out to them.
19. Chair Datz asked the group if there were any other topics or things they would like to discuss. Hearing none, he called the meeting to an end.

Meeting adjourned at 2:43 p.m.

References\Resources:

One drive

GCCM precon workflow image