

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

CONSULTANT SELECTION
COMBINED CONSENSUS SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Edmonds Community College - Triton Learning Center
Project Number 2022-057
Name of Selection Panel Chair Indra Jain

Phase 1 - SOQ

Date: **9/24/2021**

Number of Submitting Firms: **4**

	Firms	Panelist Names					DIVERSE BUSINESS EQUITY & INCLUSION STRATEGIES	TOTAL PANEL RANKED SCORE	PHASE 1 RANK ORDER
		Indra Jain	Tony Ifie	Chris Szarek	Mushka Rohani	Ko Sugeng Wibowo			
		Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order			
1	Schreiber Starling Whitehead	3	1	2	3	2	Yes	11	2
2	McGranahan Architects	2	2	4	1	3	Yes	12	3
3	Miller Hull Partnership	1	3	1	2	1	Yes	8	1
4	Integrus Architecture	4	4	3	4	4	Yes	19	4
5									
6									
7									
8									
9									
10									
11									
12									
13									
14									
15									
16									
17									
18									
19									
20									

Phase 2 Interview

Date: **10/7/2021**

Number of Firms Interviewed: **3**

	Firms	RANK ORDER OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS					DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN	TOTAL ASSIGNED RANKS	FINAL RANK ORDER
		Indra Jain	Tony Ifie	Chris Szarek	Mushka Rohani	Ko Sugeng Wibowo			
		Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order			
1	Schreiber Starling Whitehead	3	1	3	2	3	X	12	3
2	Miller Hull Partnership	2	3	2	3	1	X	11	2
3	McGranahan Architects	1	2	1	1	2	X	7	1
4									
5									

Indra Jain

Indra Jain

Chris Szarek

Chris Szarek

Ko Sugeng Wibowo

Ko Sugeng Wibowo

Anthony Ifie

Tony Ifie

Mushka Rohani

Mushka Rohani (Oct 11, 2021 09:05 PDT)
Mushka Rohani

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE I SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Edmonds Community College - Triton Learning Center	
Consensus Date 9/24/2021	Project Number 2022-057
Name of Selection Panel Member Indra Jain	

CRITERIA	Scores	Diverse Business Equity & Inclusion Strategies		Qualifications of Key Personnel		Relevant Experience		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		Sustainable Design Experience		Past Performance		TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE	RANK ORDER
		Yes/ No	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score		
1	Schreiber Starling Whitehead	Yes	92.0	27.6	91.0	22.8	95.0	9.5	95.0	9.5	93.0	23.3		92.6	3
2	McGranahan Architects	Yes	94.0	28.2	94.0	23.5	97.0	9.7	97.0	9.7	96.0	24.0		95.1	2
3	Miller Hull Partnership	Yes	96.0	28.8	95.0	23.8	96.0	9.6	99.0	9.9	97.0	24.3		96.3	1
4	Integrus Architecture	Yes	87.0	26.1	84.0	21.0	93.0	9.3	94.0	9.4	89.0	22.3		88.1	4
5															
6															
7															
8															
9															
10															
11															
12															
13															
14															
15															
16															
17															
18															
19															
20															

COMMENTS:

Indra Jain

Indra Jain

9/24/2021

Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE I SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Edmonds Community College - Triton Learning Center	
Consensus Date 9/24/2021	Project Number 2022-057
Name of Selection Panel Member Tony Ifie	

CRITERIA	Qualifications of Key Personnel		Relevant Experience		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		Sustainable Design Experience		Past Performance		TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE	RANK ORDER
	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	25%		
1 Schreiber Starling Whitehead	90.0	27.0	90.0	22.5	90.0	9.0	95.0	9.5	90.0	22.5	90.5	1
2 McGranahan Architects	90.0	27.0	90.0	22.5	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0	90.0	22.5	90.0	2
3 Miller Hull Partnership	85.0	25.5	85.0	21.3	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0	85.0	21.3	86.0	3
4 Integrus Architecture	80.0	24.0	80.0	20.0	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0	80.0	20.0	82.0	4
5												
6												
7												
8												
9												
10												
11												
12												
13												
14												
15												
16												
17												
18												
19												
20												

COMMENTS:

Anthony Ifie

Tony Ifie

9/24/2021
Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE I SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Edmonds Community College - Triton Learning Center	
Consensus Date 9/24/2021	Project Number 2022-057
Name of Selection Panel Member Chris Szarek	

CRITERIA	Qualifications of Key Personnel		Relevant Experience		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		Sustainable Design Experience		Past Performance		TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE	RANK ORDER
	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	25%		
1 Schreiber Starling Whitehead	80.0	24.0	83.0	20.8	83.0	8.3	100.0	10.0	100.0	25.0	88.1	2
2 McGranahan Architects	87.0	26.1	91.0	22.8	83.0	8.3	66.0	6.6	75.0	18.8	82.5	4
3 Miller Hull Partnership	100.0	30.0	100.0	25.0	100.0	10.0	83.0	8.3	87.0	21.8	95.1	1
4 Integrus Architecture	75.0	22.5	91.0	22.8	83.0	8.3	66.0	6.6	100.0	25.0	85.2	3
5												
6												
7												
8												
9												
10												
11												
12												
13												
14												
15												
16												
17												
18												
19												
20												

COMMENTS:

Chris Szarek

Chris Szarek

9/24/2021
Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE I SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Edmonds Community College - Triton Learning Center	
Consensus Date 9/24/2021	Project Number 2022-057
Name of Selection Panel Member Mushka Rohani	

CRITERIA	Qualifications of Key Personnel		Relevant Experience		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		Sustainable Design Experience		Past Performance		TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE	RANK ORDER
	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	25%		
1 Schreiber Starling Whitehead	82.0	24.6	89.0	22.3	85.0	8.5	90.0	9.0	85.0	21.3	85.6	3
2 McGranahan Architects	92.0	27.6	95.0	23.8	92.0	9.2	95.0	9.5	92.0	23.0	93.1	1
3 Miller Hull Partnership	90.0	27.0	93.0	23.3	90.0	9.0	92.0	9.2	90.0	22.5	91.0	2
4 Integrus Architecture	80.0	24.0	82.0	20.5	80.0	8.0	83.0	8.3	83.0	20.8	81.6	4
5												
6												
7												
8												
9												
10												
11												
12												
13												
14												
15												
16												
17												
18												
19												
20												

COMMENTS:

Mushka Rohani
Mushka Rohani (Oct 11, 2021 09:05 PDT)

9/24/2021
Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE I SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Edmonds Community College - Triton Learning Center	
Consensus Date 9/24/2021	Project Number 2022-057
Name of Selection Panel Member Ko Sugeng Wibowo	

CRITERIA	Qualifications of Key Personnel		Relevant Experience		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		Sustainable Design Experience		Past Performance		TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE	RANK ORDER
	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	25%		
1 Schreiber Starling Whitehead	98.0	29.4	95.0	23.8	98.0	9.8	95.0	9.5	97.0	24.3	96.7	2
2 McGranahan Architects	95.0	28.5	98.0	24.5	95.0	9.5	95.0	9.5	92.0	23.0	95.0	3
3 Miller Hull Partnership	98.0	29.4	98.0	24.5	95.0	9.5	98.0	9.8	95.0	23.8	97.0	1
4 Integrus Architecture	93.0	27.9	95.0	23.8	92.0	9.2	90.0	9.0	92.0	23.0	92.9	4
5												
6												
7												
8												
9												
10												
11												
12												
13												
14												
15												
16												
17												
18												
19												
20												
COMMENTS:												



Ko Sugeng Wibowo

9/24/2021
Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Edmonds Community College - Triton Learning Center	
Date of Evaluation 10/7/2021	Project Number 2022-057
Name of Selection Panel Member Indra Jain	

CRITERIA	Weighting	Schreiber Starling Whitehead		Miller Hull Partnership		McGranahan Architects		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score				
ORGANIZATION	30%	92.0	27.6	98.0	29.4	99.0	29.7				
95											
<u>Team Member Qualifications:</u> Are the relevant team members present and what role are they assuming in the discussion											
<u>Capacity/Production Capabilities:</u> Does the firm explain their workload for the duration of the project and how this project fits into the firm's overall planning											
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	95.0	19.0	98.0	19.6	99.0	19.8				
<u>Scope Management:</u> Based on the information provided and the Finalist's experience, how well has the team ascertained basic project requirements and how well have they managed development of project scope in the past.											
<u>Budgeting & Cost Control:</u> What strategies does the firm use to establish and manage project budgets. How successful have they been with past projects											
<u>Project Scheduling:</u> How does this finalist team develop schedules. How well do they listen to client schedule needs and then meet client schedule needs.											
PROJECT APPROACH	15%	96.0	14.4	97.0	14.6	98.0	14.7				
<u>Understanding of this project:</u> Has the Finalist demonstrated that they have reviewed available project information, attended informational meeting, or done independent research to better understand the project and the project requirements											
<u>Challenges & Opportunities:</u> Has the Finalist attempted to define challenges and/or opportunities they see for the project?											
EXPERIENCE	20%	94.0	18.8	98.0	19.6	98.0	19.6				
<u>Relevant Past Projects (firm):</u> Does the Finalist team discuss past work the firm has done and how that relates or provides guidance for this project?											
<u>Relevant Past Projects (key team members):</u> Do the individual team members have experience that relates to the project type or complexity?											
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	8%	94.0	7.5	97.0	7.8	98.0	7.8				
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive Life Cycle Cost exercise in decision making? Are they familiar with the OFM requirements? Are they differentiating between LCCA and ELCCA?											
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	7%	94.0	6.6	98.0	6.9	98.0	6.9				
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate for this project. How can the sustainability strategies mesh with the project budget.											
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored	X		X		X					
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	565.0		586.0		590.0					
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			93.9		97.8		98.5				
FINAL RANK ORDER			3		2		1				
COMMENTS:											

Indra Jain
Indra Jain

Oct 8, 2021
Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description		
Edmonds Community College - Triton Learning Center		
Date of Evaluation	Project Number	
10/7/2021	2022-057	
Name of Selection Panel Member		
Tony Ifie		

CRITERIA	Weighting	Schreiber Starling Whitehead		Miller Hull Partnership		McGranahan Architects		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score				
ORGANIZATION	30%	90.0	27.0	87.0	26.1	88.0	26.4				
95											
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevant team members present and what role are they assuming in the discussion											
Capacity/Production Capabilities: Does the firm explain their workload for the duration of the project and how this project fits into the firm's overall planning											
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	90.0	18.0	91.0	18.2	90.0	18.0				
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the Finalist's experience, how well has the team ascertained basic project requirements and how well have they managed development of project scope in the past.											
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to establish and manage project budgets. How successful have they been with past projects											
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedules. How well do they listen to client schedule needs and then meet client schedule needs.											
PROJECT APPROACH	15%	90.0	13.5	88.0	13.2	91.0	13.7				
Understanding of this project: Has the Finalist demonstrated that they have reviewed available project information, attended informational meeting, or done independent research to better understand the project and the project requirements											
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define challenges and/or opportunities they see for the project?											
EXPERIENCE	20%	90.0	18.0	90.0	18.0	90.0	18.0				
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past work the firm has done and how that relates or provides guidance for this project?											
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual team members have experience that relates to the project type or complexity?											
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	8%	90.0	7.2	90.0	7.2	87.0	7.0				
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive Life Cycle Cost exercise in decision making? Are they familiar with the OFM requirements? Are they differentiating between LCCA and ELCCA?											
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	7%	85.0	6.0	87.0	6.1	87.0	6.1				
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate for this project. How can the sustainability strategies mesh with the project budget.											
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	535.0		533.0		533.0					
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			89.7		88.8		89.1				
FINAL RANK ORDER			1		3		2				
COMMENTS:											

Anthony Ifie

Tony Ifie

Oct 11, 2021

Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Edmonds Community College - Triton Learning Center	
Date of Evaluation 10/7/2021	Project Number 2022-057
Name of Selection Panel Member Chris Szarek	

CRITERIA	Weighting	Schreiber Starling Whitehead		Miller Hull Partnership		McGranahan Architects		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score				
ORGANIZATION	30%	85.0	25.5	90.0	27.0	90.0	27.0				
95											
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevant team members present and what role are they assuming in the discussion											
Capacity/Production Capabilities: Does the firm explain their workload for the duration of the project and how this project fits into the firm's overall planning											
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	85.0	17.0	90.0	18.0	95.0	19.0				
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the Finalist's experience, how well has the team ascertained basic project requirements and how well have they managed development of project scope in the past.											
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to establish and manage project budgets. How successful have they been with past projects											
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedules. How well do they listen to client schedule needs and then meet client schedule needs.											
PROJECT APPROACH	15%	100.0	15.0	85.0	12.8	85.0	12.8				
Understanding of this project: Has the Finalist demonstrated that they have reviewed available project information, attended informational meeting, or done independent research to better understand the project and the project requirements											
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define challenges and/or opportunities they see for the project?											
EXPERIENCE	20%	90.0	18.0	90.0	18.0	90.0	18.0				
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past work the firm has done and how that relates or provides guidance for this project?											
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual team members have experience that relates to the project type or complexity?											
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	8%	85.0	6.8	85.0	6.8	90.0	7.2				
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive Life Cycle Cost exercise in decision making? Are they familiar with the OFM requirements? Are they differentiating between LCCA and ELCCA?											
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	7%	90.0	6.3	90.0	6.3	95.0	6.7				
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate for this project. How can the sustainability strategies mesh with the project budget.											
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	535.0		530.0		545.0					
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			88.6		88.9		90.6				
FINAL RANK ORDER			3		2		1				
COMMENTS:											

Chris Szarek
Chris Szarek

Oct 8, 2021
Date

FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Edmonds Community College - Triton Learning Center	
Date of Evaluation 10/7/2021	Project Number 2022-057
Name of Selection Panel Member Mushka Rohani	

CRITERIA	Weighting	Schreiber Starling Whitehead		Miller Hull Partnership		McGranahan Architects		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score				
ORGANIZATION	30%	90.0	27.0	86.0	25.8	92.0	27.6				
95											
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevant team members present and what role are they assuming in the discussion											
Capacity/Production Capabilities: Does the firm explain their workload for the duration of the project and how this project fits into the firm's overall planning											
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	91.0	18.2	89.0	17.8	93.0	18.6				
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the Finalist's experience, how well has the team ascertained basic project requirements and how well have they managed development of project scope in the past.											
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to establish and manage project budgets. How successful have they been with past projects											
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedules. How well do they listen to client schedule needs and then meet client schedule needs.											
PROJECT APPROACH	15%	89.0	13.4	88.0	13.2	92.0	13.8				
Understanding of this project: Has the Finalist demonstrated that they have reviewed available project information, attended informational meeting, or done independent research to better understand the project and the project requirements											
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define challenges and/or opportunities they see for the project?											
EXPERIENCE	20%	88.0	17.6	91.0	18.2	93.0	18.6				
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past work the firm has done and how that relates or provides guidance for this project?											
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual team members have experience that relates to the project type or complexity?											
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	8%	87.0	7.0	88.0	7.0	89.0	7.1				
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive Life Cycle Cost exercise in decision making? Are they familiar with the OFM requirements? Are they differentiating between LCCA and ELCCA?											
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	7%	90.0	6.3	90.0	6.3	92.0	6.4				
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate for this project. How can the sustainability strategies mesh with the project budget.											
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	535.0		532.0		551.0					
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			89.4		88.3		92.2				
FINAL RANK ORDER			2		3		1				
COMMENTS:											

Mushka Rohani
Mushka Rohani (Oct 11, 2021 09:05 PDT)
Mushka Rohani

Oct 11, 2021
Date


FACILITY PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

CONSULTANT SELECTION
PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description Edmonds Community College - Triton Learning Center	
Date of Evaluation 10/7/2021	Project Number 2022-057
Name of Selection Panel Member Ko Sugeng Wibowo	

CRITERIA	Weighting	Schreiber Starling Whitehead		Miller Hull Partnership		McGranahan Architects		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score				
ORGANIZATION	30%	96.0	28.8	96.0	28.8	95.0	28.5				
95											
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevant team members present and what role are they assuming in the discussion											
Capacity/Production Capabilities: Does the firm explain their workload for the duration of the project and how this project fits into the firm's overall planning											
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	97.0	19.4	98.0	19.6	97.0	19.4				
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the Finalist's experience, how well has the team ascertained basic project requirements and how well have they managed development of project scope in the past.											
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to establish and manage project budgets. How successful have they been with past projects											
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedules. How well do they listen to client schedule needs and then meet client schedule needs.											
PROJECT APPROACH	15%	96.0	14.4	98.0	14.7	97.0	14.6				
Understanding of this project: Has the Finalist demonstrated that they have reviewed available project information, attended informational meeting, or done independent research to better understand the project and the project requirements											
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define challenges and/or opportunities they see for the project?											
EXPERIENCE	20%	93.0	18.6	92.0	18.4	95.0	19.0				
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past work the firm has done and how that relates or provides guidance for this project?											
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual team members have experience that relates to the project type or complexity?											
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	8%	92.0	7.4	96.0	7.7	94.0	7.5				
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive Life Cycle Cost exercise in decision making? Are they familiar with the OFM requirements? Are they differentiating between LCCA and ELCCA?											
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	7%	92.0	6.4	98.0	6.9	96.0	6.7				
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate for this project. How can the sustainability strategies mesh with the project budget.											
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	566.0		578.0		574.0					
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			95.0		96.0		95.7				
FINAL RANK ORDER			3		1		2				
COMMENTS:											


Ko Sugeng Wibowo

Oct 8, 2021
Date

22-057-ScoresheetSummary

Final Audit Report

2021-10-11


Created:	2021-10-08
By:	Angeline Ernst (angeline.ernst@des.wa.gov)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAXETsX2CPqpbuKA78VHzdxbRFVxFind0x

"22-057-ScoresheetSummary" History


-  Document created by Angeline Ernst (angeline.ernst@des.wa.gov)
2021-10-08 - 9:25:18 PM GMT- IP address: 198.238.242.30
-  Document emailed to Indra Jain (indra.jain@des.wa.gov) for signature
2021-10-08 - 9:27:44 PM GMT
-  Document emailed to Tony Ifie (tony.ifie@des.wa.gov) for signature
2021-10-08 - 9:27:45 PM GMT
-  Document emailed to Mushka Rohani (mushka.rohani@email.edcc.edu) for signature
2021-10-08 - 9:27:45 PM GMT
-  Document emailed to Chris Szarek (chris.szarek@email.edcc.edu) for signature
2021-10-08 - 9:27:45 PM GMT
-  Document emailed to Ko Wibowo (ko@architectureforeveryone.org) for signature
2021-10-08 - 9:27:46 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Ko Wibowo (ko@architectureforeveryone.org)
2021-10-08 - 9:30:53 PM GMT- IP address: 172.226.3.196
-  Document e-signed by Ko Wibowo (ko@architectureforeveryone.org)
Signature Date: 2021-10-08 - 9:45:23 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 73.157.94.239
-  Email viewed by Mushka Rohani (mushka.rohani@email.edcc.edu)
2021-10-08 - 9:58:57 PM GMT- IP address: 66.249.84.207
-  Email viewed by Indra Jain (indra.jain@des.wa.gov)
2021-10-08 - 10:15:54 PM GMT- IP address: 198.238.242.30
-  Document e-signed by Indra Jain (indra.jain@des.wa.gov)
Signature Date: 2021-10-08 - 10:26:50 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 198.238.242.30

 Email viewed by Chris Szarek (chris.szarek@email.edcc.edu)


2021-10-08 - 10:57:06 PM GMT- IP address: 66.249.84.201

 Document e-signed by Chris Szarek (chris.szarek@email.edcc.edu)

Signature Date: 2021-10-08 - 10:57:56 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 168.156.251.64

 Email viewed by Mushka Rohani (mushka.rohani@email.edcc.edu)

2021-10-11 - 3:23:03 AM GMT- IP address: 66.249.84.201

 Email viewed by Tony Ifie (tony.ifie@des.wa.gov)

2021-10-11 - 3:49:12 PM GMT- IP address: 104.47.65.254

 Document e-signed by Tony Ifie (tony.ifie@des.wa.gov)

Signature Date: 2021-10-11 - 3:50:26 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 198.238.242.30

 Document e-signed by Mushka Rohani (mushka.rohani@email.edcc.edu)

Signature Date: 2021-10-11 - 4:05:09 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 71.231.157.179

 Agreement completed.

2021-10-11 - 4:05:09 PM GMT