

**CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY REVIEW BOARD
PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Northwest Carpenters Facility
25120 Pacific Highway South**

Kent, Washington

May 28, 2015

9:00 AM

Draft Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT

Ato Apiafi, Ato Apiafi Architects
Vicki Barron-Sumann, Minority/Women Businesses
Rick Benner, Western Washington University
Rodger Benson, MA Mortenson Company
John Boknecht, Stacy and Witbeck, Inc.
Kurt Boyd, Valley Electric
Jim Burt, King County
Steve Crawford, Issaquah School District
Chuck Davis, Seattle Central College
Tim Graybeal, Integrus Architecture
Curt Gimmestad, (Chair), Absher Construction

Rustin Hall, ALSC Architects
Jonathan Hartung, SHKS Architects
Howard Hillinger, Parametrix
Ian Kell, Seneca Group
Jon Lebo, University of Washington (UW)
Phil Lovell, Turner Construction NW
John Palewicz, University of Washington
Darron Pease, Pease & Sons, Inc.
Rusty Pritchard, Washington State University
Linneth Riley-Hall (Chair), Sound Transit
Yelena Semenova, Department of Enterprise Svcs
Mike Shinn, Shinn Mechanical

MEMBERS ABSENT

Darrin Gillis, Skagit Regional Health
Shasta McKinley, Civil & Environmental Consultants LLC
Miriam Israel Moses, Rebound

Timm Ormsby, Rebound
Tom Peterson, Hoffman Construction Co of WA
Paul Powell Jr., CPO Construction

STAFF, GUESTS, PRESENTERS

Robyn Hofstad, GA
Michael Finnegan, Heery International
Mark Gaines, WSDOT
Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Neil Hartman, WSBCTC
Miles Haupt, Sound Transit
Hunt Whaley, City of Spokane
Preston Potratz, Spokane Park Board
Marvin Doster, Mortenson Construction
Carrie Whitten, Sound Transit
Brian Barson, Sound Transit
Jill Davies, Sound Transit
Stan Chapin, Metro Parks Tacoma
Stuart Young, BCRA
Joe Steinbrenner, Washougal School District
Ralph Wilson, RSD Architects

Thuy Hong, Sound Transit
Rod Kempkes, Sound Transit
Ron Lewis, Sound Transit
Leroy Eadie, City of Spokane
Juliet Sinisterra, City of Spokane
David Beaudine, City of Spokane
Chris Wright, Spokane Park Board
David Mahalko, King County
Laura DeGooyer, Vanir
Nina Rohuch, Sound Transit
Ina Holzer, Vanir
Lester _____, OAC Services
Ethel Vural, OAC Services
Dan Chandler, OAC Services
Adam Cormack, R& C Management
Casey Wyckoff, LSW Architects

Welcome & Introductions

Chair Linneth Riley-Hall called the Capital Projects Advisory Review Board (CPARB) Project Review Committee (PRC) meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Chair Riley-Hall announced that her term as Chair has expired. She thanked members for their service and support during her tenure as Chair.

Members provided self-introductions.

Ms. Riley-Hall recognized Rodger Benson and thanked him for his many years of service. Mr. Benson's term on the PRC has ended.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Meeting Minutes for March 26, 2015

Jonathan Hartung moved, seconded by John Boknecht, to approve the minutes of March 26, 2015, as published. Motion carried unanimously.

CPARB Discussion on PRC Proposed Changes to Bylaws

Chair Riley-Hall updated members on the outcome of the Capital Projects Advisory Board's (CPARB) discussion on recommended changes to the PRC Bylaws pertaining to agency certification and the use of in-house versus consultants to meet RCW requirements. The issue was generated by Lake Washington School District's agency certification. During the CPARB meeting, Senator Hasegawa questioned why an amendment to the bylaws was necessary and whether the amendment might change the underlying statutory authority. Some members indicated the proposal could modify the intent of the RCW, as well as expanding the realm of the legislation for agency certification. There was disagreement between several CPARB members. Several members believed the amendment was warranted because it provided direction and clarification to the PRC. However, CPARB's motion failed with no changes to the PRC Bylaws, no change to the evaluation and application forms, and no administrative clean-up of the bylaws to update some RCW references.

Tim Graybeal asked whether there was any discussion about the content of the issue as opposed to the proposed amendment. Chair Riley-Hall replied that the Board thoroughly discussed the reason for the amendment; however, there were various opinions with several members voting against the amendment.

Rodger Benson explained that the Board discussed whether addressing the issue prescriptively might not necessarily support the evaluation process, as the PRC should have the latitude to render independent judgment as to whether the management plan is appropriate to support certification, as well as considering each project on a case-by-case basis rather than implementing a prescribed process by the CPARB.

Steve Crawford agreed as some Boardmembers directly involved in crafting the original legislation indicated that the intent was for the PRC to analyze each project on its merits regardless of whether consultants or staff were part of the project management team. The number of members in attendance met the minimum requirement to achieve a quorum and when Senator Hasegawa questioned future impacts, several members voted against the amendment.

Howard Hillinger asked whether the PRC has the flexibility to evaluate the accessibility of personnel in those cases where the applicant is utilizing a contracted professional. Chair Riley-Hall affirmed the PRC has the flexibility in the realm of considering the entire application and meeting RCW requirements. There is no clear yes/no answer as it would be factored on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Hillinger asked for additional clarification

as to whether the PRC as a body has the ability to determine how to interpret “personnel.” Chair Riley-Hall said PRC members cannot individually, but as a body could determine how to interpret “personnel.”

John Palewicz asked whether the amendment only pertained to agency certification. Chair Riley-Hall affirmed that the issue pertained only to agency certification and the utilization of in-house staff versus consultants.

Chuck Davis asked about the timeline for updated references within the bylaws to correct references to outdated RCWs and other minor updates. Chair Riley-Hall said the bylaws would be updated under the new Chair’s leadership. DES staff is working on updating language in the bylaws as well.

Jon Lebo arrived at 9:15 a.m.

Vice Chair Election

Chair Riley-Hall reported PRC officer positions are represented by private sector and public agency/owner members. Curt Gimmestad, representing private industry and serving as Vice Chair, automatically advances to the Chair position leaving the Vice Chair position vacant. She invited nominations from public owners/agency members for Vice Chair. Rusty Pritchard and John Palewicz volunteered to serve as Vice Chair.

Mr. Pritchard commented on the professional opportunity membership on the PRC has afforded to him personally. Next July, his term ends on the PRC and he would be honored to serve as Vice Chair.

Mr. Palewicz expressed interest in serving as Vice Chair. He has served on the PRC for three years with his second term recently renewed by the CPARB. He’s also impressed with the PRC and the professionalism and quality of members representing all facets of the construction industry. When he speaks to others in the industry about the PRC, great respect is conveyed about what the PRC achieves and the responsibility the PRC has assumed to ensure alternate public works projects are delivered successfully.

Members voted for Vice Chair by ballot.

Chair Gimmestad thanked Ms. Riley-Hall for her time and service as Chair of the PRC.

The meeting was recessed while ballots were counted.

Chair Gimmestad introduced Mr. Palewicz as the new Vice Chair.

Chair Gimmestad recognized the support and efforts of Robyn Hofstad.

Agency Certification Review – Sound Transit for Design-Build (D-B)

Chair Gimmestad reviewed the presentation format and timeline. Approval of the certification requires a super majority vote. The applicant receives written confirmation of the decision.

PRC members provided self-introductions.

Ms. Riley-Hall recused herself from the PRC to present Sound Transit’s application for Design-Build Agency Certification. She introduced members of the project team: Ron Lewis, Executive Project Director East Link; Miles Haupt, Project Director South Link; Thuy Hong, Design & Construction Supervisor; and Miles Haupt, Systems Corridor Design Manager South Link.

Ms. Riley-Hall outlined the presentation agenda and the 11 questions received from PRC members, which will be addressed during the presentation.

Mr. Lewis described the evolution of the light rail project. The initial segment opened in 2009 providing service from downtown Seattle to south Tukwila. Sound Transit extended the system 1.6 miles to Sea-Tac Airport and providing service in December 2009. Sound Transit is under construction with the University Link twin bored tunnels project extending to downtown Seattle to Capitol Hill, Seattle Central, and to the University of Washington at Husky Stadium for a total of 3.15 miles scheduled to open in 2016. The South 200th Link Extension extends from Sea-Tac Airport to South 200th and is scheduled to open in 2016. Under construction is the Northgate Link 4.3 mile extension from Husky Stadium to Northgate with a scheduled opening in 2021. The East Link is a 14 mile 10-station project from the International District Station to downtown Seattle, Mercer Island, Bellevue, Overlake, and Redmond. Currently, the project is in design and right-of-way acquisition and scheduled for completion in 2023. The Lynnwood Link Extension project is an 8 mile, 4-station extension north to Northgate and Lynnwood. The project is nearing final design with service targeted in 2023. The Federal Way Link Extension is approximately 7.5 miles extending south from 200th in Federal Way. The project is undergoing environment review. In total, the projects represent over \$12 billion of investment in the regional transit system.

Within the current capital program, Sound Transit continues to utilize D-B as a delivery model. The South 200th project includes two contracts to include the station and the guideway contract. The PRC approved the project in 2010 and the second is a parking garage completed under D-B. Other projects include the Maintenance of Way Facility, a 26,000 square foot pre-engineered building for maintenance for some of the agency's systems. The building is under construction at the agency's existing operations and maintenance facility in the Soto area and is scheduled to open in February 2016.

The East Link project includes one contract package for D-B for the Redmond corridor SR520. The Sound Yard Expansion project expands the layover track and an improved boarding facility.

In response to questions #3 and #8 on what Sound Transit envisions on the horizon for potential projects that might benefit from D-B delivery, Mr. Haupt will review the process Sound Transit employs to vet each project to ensure the appropriate project delivery model is selected. The list of projects are included in the application for D-B delivery including the Tacoma Link Expansion and the Federal Way to Sumner/Puyallup access improvements (parking garage) to provide additional access to Sounder service. The Sounder Yard Expansion is a maintenance facility and the Operations and Maintenance Satellite facility will support the light rail system.

Ms. Riley-Hall reviewed the contract packaging and delivery method determination process. A similar process was recently completed for the Lynnwood Link project. During an outreach event, the team presented the packages selected to contractors and consultants.

The first task is a risk management workshop to identify major risks related to the selection of the various procurement strategies. A constructability review and value engineering workshop is presented by Sound Transit's Controls Division. A contract packaging workshop follows with the assistance of consultants to include a review of the various contract packages, as well as the delivery methods that will be used. Following that workshop, a smaller committee was established to identify risks, barriers, and various procurement methods. For example, for the Lynnwood Link, the procurement methods of Design-Bid-Build, D-B, Progressive Design-Build, GC/CM, and Heavy Civil were considered and examined in pro and con scenarios related to risks of the project. Following that process, contract packages were identified that would help address various risks and challenges. The committee is comprised of employees from the Design, Engineering

and Construction Management Department (DECM), Planning and Development, Procurement and Contracts, Risk Management, and other stakeholders. For the Lynnwood Link, a series of meetings were held weekly to determine the best delivery method. That process is completed in the early stages.

A recommendation is then submitted to the Director of DECM for consideration, which is then submitted to Procurement and Contracts to review the delivery method to ensure the selected method is following the requirements and meets the intent of the RCW. The evaluation is either approved or declined. If declined, more information is requested or additional staffing with experience is included.

In response to PRC questions #5 and #10, Sound Transit has employees with specific D-B experience in addition to the members previously introduced. Mr. Haupt, for example, has excessive D-B experience, as well as Christy Sanders. Sound Transit recently hired two construction managers. One employee was hired as a Deputy Construction Manager and was with the Washington State Department of Transportation as the Construction Director on the Alaska Way Viaduct project. He has extensive D-B experience. The second employee has extensive D-B experience, as well. As the agency continues to grow, Sound Transit continues to seek experienced staff. Additionally, the agency contracts with project management consultants to supplement staff. Consultants are utilized on all major projects to supplement current staffing.

Sound Transit is committed to training and all employees are required to complete 16 hours of training related to their respective position. Last year, the agency earned the DBIA designation for employee participation in the DBIA workshop for certification. The agency holds internal quarterly roundtables similar to the GC/CM roundtable meetings whereby staff members share current experiences on various projects. During the meetings, challenges and lessons learned are shared, as well as ensuring standardization and consistency is employed throughout the agency for all projects. The agency actively participates in the DBIA Northwest Region and the newly formed owners group related to DBIA.

Mr. Haupt reported he has been with Sound Transit for six years. His first assignment was Construction Manager on the University Link project with tunnels and a station. Since 2012, he's served as the Project Director for the South 200th Link Extension delivered through the D-B method. Prior to his employment with Sound Transit, he worked in Canada on the Vancouver line as the Contracts and Project Manager for a portion of a D-B Operations and Maintenance contract of \$1.4 billion. The project delivered a segment of light rail, a tunnel, and four stations. Mr. Haupt said he is a Certified Construction Manager and a DBIA professional as well.

Mr. Haupt reported he would cover the following PRC questions in more detail:

- Questions #1 and #9 regarding the level of design prior to procuring D-B contracts.
- Questions #4, #7, #8 on lessons learned.
- Question #6 on the schedule status for the South 200th project.

Mr. Haupt reviewed the details of the South 200th Link Extension Elevated Guideway and Station project. The project is a 1.6 mile extension from the existing airport station on an elevated guideway traveling south along 28th Avenue to a new Angle Lake Station at 200th Street. The new station includes a 1,050 stall parking garage in addition to a plaza development. The project includes a small contract for roadway improvements. Final design work was completed in 2013 for the main D-B contract. Construction commenced in 2013 and the agency anticipates pre-revenue testing and system activation to be completed by spring 2016 with service offered by fall 2016. The goal is activating the South 200th Link Extension shortly after the 1st quarter in 2016.

The project includes two D-B contracts within the South 200th project. In terms of progress on the contracts, the S440 D-B contract is a turnkey project encompassing all of the agency's facilities with respect to extensions that include guideways, stations, track work, overhead power systems for the trains, and communications systems. In addition to the South 200th Link project being Sound Transit's first D-B delivery method, it has enabled the agency to consider a holistic and integrated approach within one contract. The scope includes utility relocations, guideway structure, elevated station, track work, and communications systems. The elevated structure is scheduled for completion by the end of June with only four spans remaining to complete the guideway structure. In the fall, the agency will complete the Angle Lake Station. Pre-revenue testing is scheduled in spring 2016. For the S445 contract for the 1,050 stall parking garage, the project includes a plaza and small retail area to serve patrons using the station. The construction was delayed because of weather and some unknown hazmat conditions on site. The project is on track for completion by February 2016.

Mr. Haupt displayed pictures of track work installation, station platform, a corner of the parking garage, and the station and canopy. The particular method and contract was selected because it created less impact on traffic and access to the property. He displayed a rendering of the station. Approximately 60% design of the station was necessary for inclusion within the Request for Proposal (RFP) to obtain approval from the City of Sea Tac. Once the RFP was released, all proposers provided much better designs than what was included within the RFP. He displayed the design selected for the project, which preserves the major theme of interest by the City of Sea Tac.

Mr. Haupt reviewed the details of the parking garage. The contractor was selected during the procurement phase at approximately 3-5% design.

Co-location is one of D-B's recommended practices. It was embraced by the S440 contract by successfully co-locating with the contractor in a project office adjacent to the site. Task force meetings were held weekly on different disciplines and nearly 40 design packages were developed. Over the course of one year, the final design was completed. Another advantage of D-B is the accelerated schedule by commencing construction prior to completing design. Six months into the design process, the agency completed a sufficient number of packages to enable commencement of construction. D-B has also accelerated the design schedule. In other forms of procurement, up to two to three years can be spent in final design before packages can be released.

With respect to changes and claims, another benefit of D-B is that the owner is not responsible for design errors. However, there is some question as to whether the agency pays for that risk transfer through the contract. Typically, D-B projects require lower contingencies. For the South 200th contract, the project is over 70% complete and the agency has expended approximately one-third of the contingency with most for owner directed changes. Approximately two-thirds of the contingency has been expended for the parking garage. Both projects should be completed on time and within budget.

Safety and quality have been successful for both projects. Of all Sound Transit projects, the South 200th project has the best safety record. In terms of quality assurance, that function is transferred to the design builder. In some areas where corrective repairs have been required, the contractor offered to extend the warranty to guarantee the work was completed right.

Mr. Haupt shared information on lessons learned. Prior to receiving proposals, it's important to ensure that each proposal team has a clear understanding of what will be accepted. The only way to fact check the proposals is to ensure an understanding of the concept and provide feedback. One of the lessons from the S440 contract was a fatal flaw in one of the proposals giving the applicant a low technical score. Final negotiations concept validation is another important lesson. After selection of the contract but before award of

the contract, a provision in the RCW enables the commencement of final negotiations. The agency's approval period is approximately two to three months for the Authority's approval. That time could be used to pursue a concept validation submittal to ensure everyone is on the same page. For the S440 garage, the design was at 5% with additional embellishment from the selected proposer making it possible to present the design to the City of Sea Tac and obtaining a letter approving a conditional use permit prior to awarding the contract, which lowered everyone's risk level on the project while providing a better understanding and contract.

The agency is also embracing the idea of basis of design and change management as the result of its work with DBIA as an integral tool to manage the scope of the design process. In some of the design package reviews, the agency discovered that obtaining a commitment from the design builder when submitting a package was important. It's important for design builders to understand the scope of work to identify any potential changes that might impact the budget, as well as affording an opportunity to address issues in a timely manner.

Chair Gimmetstad invited questions from members.

Mr. Palewicz said the validation period appears to be a good idea. He asked whether, during that two-month period, the agency had the firm under contract. Mr. Haupt said in the event the agency was unable to proceed with the contract, the agency afforded a second stipend for the design work associated with the process. Mr. Palewicz asked whether all teams received a stipend. Mr. Haupt said the S445 parking garage contract included two levels of stipends. The typical stipend was paid to unsuccessful proposers. The second stipend was afforded to the selected applicant in the event the contract was unable to move forward and the proposer provided additional design work.

Mr. Benson asked about the amount of the stipends. Mr. Haupt said the S440 contract stipend was approximately \$400,000 each. The intent is covering at least 50% of what the design teams expend on their submissions.

Mr. Benson asked about the pricing component for the garage project. Mr. Haupt said approximately 20% was priced along with a price-related component for the number of parking stalls. The minimum number of stalls was 700 with a maximum of 1,050 with points awarded based on the number of stalls provided above 700.

Mr. Hillinger asked about any DBIA practices that might not have applied. Mr. Haupt said the agency considers all practices, especially during the compilation of lessons learned. For the most part, the agency is in compliance. Some elements of the project much follow prescriptive processes because the project extends an existing system and standards are in place for track work and other systems for compatibility. There's no benefit for the D-B to expend design energy on those areas where standards are defined.

Mr. Haupt spoke to recent legislation for Progressive Design-Build. The UW is pursuing several Progressive D-B projects, as well as the Port of Seattle's International Terminal project. The agency contacted both agencies to obtain feedback. The agency is interested in Progressive D-B because it offers an opportunity for projects where it's difficult to define adequate performance requirements. It's possible to engage a D-B team to pursue the design to a point where the agency could finalize the scope and negotiate a traditional D-B contract. Although the agency completes many GC/CM projects, Progressive D-B is different because the design builder entity works with the agency on a preconstruction services arrangement under the initial contract. The second phase includes award of a construction contract after the scope, budget, and costs are mutually negotiated. For large turnkey projects, there are elements in the project that are conducive to D-B. For example, the guideway in the South 200th project included a variety of input from the proposers, as well as design flexibility. The long linear component of the project would be an excellent best value D-B. However, pairing the station project might not afford obtaining the jurisdiction's approval for the station. That portion of

the D-B contract could be pursued through a Progressive D-B contract. That could entail a hybrid D-B for some of the agency's linear extensions.

Mr. Palewicz said it appears the agency utilizes bridging design for certain components of the system with specific requirements. Because of the agency's approval process, the design must be completed to a certain point, such as 30% or 60%. He asked about the information conveyed to the design teams as it appears some elements are subject to different ideas while other options are standardized. Mr. Haupt explained that in the instructions to proposers, the agency identifies which components are subject to alternative technical concepts. For prescriptive elements, the proposers have the opportunity to offer ideas. The one-on-one meetings are very expensive and included 10 to 11 weeks of weekly meetings with each proposer on the S440 project. The agency spends much time but values the process.

Mr. Lewis added that other efforts include working with local jurisdictions who may not be experienced with the D-B delivery model. There is also much time spent working with local jurisdictions to increase comfort levels with the process by engaging them early in the process.

Mr. Palewicz said bridging documents haven't received good press from the DBIA and the architectural industry if the teams are directed not to move away from a preferred design. It appears Sound Transit has an open approach in terms of bridging documents. Mr. Haupt pointed out that not all designs are approved. However, progressing from the S440 project, which was the agency's first D-B contract to the S445 project, enabled the agency to add the City to the procurement team as a voting member for the selection process. The City was heavily engaged because of the City's experience with the S440 project. Inclusion of jurisdictions is helpful for D-B.

Mr. Benson said it appears the agency has a number of proprietary meetings during the development of the design. He asked how the agency handles information from one competitor to another in terms of protecting the proprietary of design ideas. Ms. Riley-Hall explained that Procurement and Contracts personnel are always involved in the meetings. Personnel attending the one-on-one meetings sign confidentiality statements. The role of the contract specialist is ensuring those conversations are not crossing between one-on-one meetings.

Chair Gimmestad closed panel questions and invited public comment. There were no public comments. Chair Gimmestad opened panel deliberations.

Mr. Benson said Sound Transit invests heavily in training personnel. He's impressed with the stringent program in place to help determine whether D-B is the appropriate delivery method for individual projects. Based on previous D-B project completions, all projects have been successful. He supports approval of certification for the agency.

Jonathon Hartung said he's served on the PRC for more than six years and has considered a number of agency certifications. Sound Transit's presentation was impressive in terms of its favorable application on the intent of the RCW and responding to the criteria.

Tim Graybeal remarked that agency certification is an assessment by the PRC that the agency has established open processes and the experience to make the decisions necessary about the initial delivery method and how it's implemented. The presentation indicates that Sound Transit has a well thought out process for sorting out what's appropriate for specific projects. After the decision is made, the agency educates staff. The presenters are knowledgeable about the application of fine details within D-B and the melding of Progressive D-B with traditional D-B and understanding bridging documents. The agency's presentation is one of the best ones he's

participated in specific to D-B. The presentation represents a level of preparation and education within the organization that communicates the ability the agency has in making responsible decisions.

Mr. Palewicz supported the certification application based on his personal experience and his appreciation of how the agency considers alternative public works. The presentation represents a good model in terms of how the PRC considers agency certification. Sound Transit benefits from the large volume of work. The number of projects completed has demonstrated its knowledge about alternative public works.

Rustin Hall said his initial concern was the agency's limited exposure to the D-B delivery method. The presentation addressed his concerns in terms of the amount of detail because it demonstrated that the agency has considered and invested much thought, training, and consideration, as well as understanding that a one-size-fit-all approach doesn't necessarily fit all circumstances in terms of delivery methods. Many agencies tend to force a delivery method on a project that's not appropriate for that specific delivery method. The agency has a process in place. The diligence the agency considers in making the decision on the appropriate delivery method is impressive.

Mr. Crawford said the RCW only requires successful management of D-B projects. The RCW doesn't require completion of a project. It's clear Sound Transit has demonstrated successful management of a number of D-B projects and has clearly established a well developed process for project management. He doesn't believe that too many Sound Transit projects would fit within the RCW parameters of \$2 million to \$10 million. However, agency certification would add to the tools available to manage successful projects. He supports the application for certification.

Mike Shinn echoed similar comments. He spoke in support of the agency providing stipends because as a specialty contractor, the company spends much money on the preparation of proposals.

Ato Apiafi spoke in support of the information conveyed during the presentation, and most importantly, the agency's history on previous D-B projects. He supports agency certification.

Mr. Hillinger reported the presentation was thorough. He commended the agency's willingness to invest in the development and the advancement of the practice and sharing knowledge with other agencies.

Mr. Lebo expressed support for the certification. He's impressed with the thoughtfulness the agency applies to its process to determine project delivery. The amount of time and effort, training of staff, as well as taking advantage of lessons learned from each project to extend knowledge to future projects is impressive.

Chair Gimmestad closed the panel deliberation.

By acclamation, the PRC voted unanimously to approve D-B agency certification for Sound Transit.

Point Defiance Zoo GC/CM – New Aquarium

Panel Chair Jonathan Hartung and panel members Curt Gimmestad, Jon Lebo, Ruston Hall, Rick Benner, Vicki Barron-Sumann, Tim Graybeal, and Jim Burt provided self-introductions. Panel Chair Hartung reviewed the presentation format.

Stan Chapin, Point Defiance Zoo & Aquarium (PDZA) Project Manager, Metro Parks Tacoma, reported the agency is seeking project approval for the GC/CM delivery method for the construction of the Pacific Rim Aquarium at PDZA. He introduced team members Phoebe Schenker, Designer and Project Manager at EHDD

(scheduled to join by telephone); Ethel Vural, Senior Project Manager, OAC Services; Stuart Young, Principal, BCRA; Lester _____, Project Manager, OAC Services; and Dan Chandler, Principal, OAC Services.

Mr. Chapin reported the project replaces a 51-year old aquarium. Point Defiance participated with Metro Parks Tacoma in a bond measure approved by voters to fund the project. The bond provides \$65.5 million to PDZA with \$48 million allocated to the aquarium project. Project elements include the Sea of Cortez, a 250,000 thousand gallon tank housing various fish species to include hammerhead sharks and sea turtles. The tank is a warm water exhibit. The Puget Sound Community tank is a 90,000 gallon tank housing fish and animals from an existing tank. The tank houses local species. Currently, the aquarium has one animal life support system. The new aquarium is designed to have six independent life support systems to feed the different tanks in the exhibit primarily because of the species, temperature of water, and quality of water. The zoo also has a pump house located on the Sound with sea water supplied directly from the Sound. That operation would continue with the new aquarium. The pumping station is the same age as the aquarium and is scheduled for replacement in the summer of 2016 prior to the commencement of the aquarium project. Once the pump house is operational, connections are necessary in a manner prohibiting any flow of water to other exhibits on site.

The new aquarium facility features environmental education space to continue the good working relationship with the Tacoma School District. Currently, the aquarium offers a Science and Math Institute Program for students. When not in use during the summer, the facility houses the Citizens Science Program for local community groups to conduct different type of science programs, such as frog and animal collections from the Sound.

Flexible design is important because of changing exhibits. The tanks are constructed to afford removal of animals and fish to holding areas and replacement with different species or rotating the species among the various tanks. The facility offers the opportunity for special events, such as weddings and catered events. "Snoozes" is a kids' event whereby children can set up camps with sleeping bags and sleep over night.

Mr. Young reported the new aquarium would be located at the perimeter of the 750-acre zoo. The team spent a year working with EHDD to select the proper site from three sites evaluated. The site is located on a hillside between Wild Wonders and Rocky Shores exhibits to the north. A parking area will serve as the project staging area.

Two large tanks will be featured in the center of the building with the remaining tanks placed ramp style around the center aquarium. The aquariums are large and integral to the architecture of the building requiring close coordination with the contractor. The project entails placement of large walls for the tanks, which requires delivery and onsite coordination for installation within the building. Surrounding the perimeter of the large tanks are smaller jewel tanks.

Mr. Young displayed an illustration of a section of one of the large tanks featuring curved glass of approximately 50' in length and 15' high. The illustrations document the complexity of the coordination required for both the acrylic and the animals and fish placed in the tanks. Some of the challenges are the limitation of the hillside affording limited room for staging and project mobilization during the open hours of the zoo. The project will entail working around the public emphasizing the importance of safety.

BCRA has worked with the zoo for 15 years on three prior projects. During those projects, the intent was to enable public access through the site during the construction. It's important to coordinate with the contractor for delivery and placement of materials and other factors involved in the construction of the project. Having a

contractor ensures a smoother operation. The complexity of the filtration systems and connection to the Sound would benefit by having a GC/CM on site.

Ms. Vural reported on the project schedule. The sea water supply system is currently a separate project; however, near the end of the project, it's necessary to interface the infrastructure to utilize the new sea water supply system for the Pacific Rim Aquarium. That interaction is scheduled to occur during the third quarter of 2016. Construction of the aquarium begins in June with the procurement process initiated as soon as possible to afford a full project package to potential bidders. Project completion is estimated to take 19 months.

Mr. Chapin commented on the Tacoma community support for the bond measure of \$198 million with voter passage over 70%. Voters passed the bond because they know the zoo will spend the money wisely. Completing the project through the GC/CM project delivery will assist in ensuring the funds are expended wisely resulting in a new aquarium that will have a "wow" factor. The zoo has contracted for design services with EHDD. The maximum allowed construction cost (MACC) for the project is currently \$33 million. Equipment, graphics, and furnishings are estimated at \$4.9 million. The amount is based on the team's experience with nine different projects since the early 2000s. The contingency is 7%. Under the GC/CM delivery method, many individuals have indicated that it's possible to lower the contingency to 5%. The total budget is \$48 million+. The community expects completion of a great facility within budget.

Metro Parks Tacoma is directed by a Parks Board and the Director, Gary Geddes, who will be involved in the project. Mr. Chapin said he is devoting 100% of his time on the project. He hired a great team comprised of OAC Services, which has a well defined resume of GC/CM projects. He has worked with BCRA on four other projects. The company has experience in the GC/CM delivery method. EHDD has completed \$1.2 billion in GC/CM projects over the last ten years with most of the projects involving aquariums. He is confident the team will be able to complete the project well and within the budget.

Mr. Young said BCRA has worked with EHDD for the last 15 years. EHDD is a nationally recognized firm.

Mr. Chapin reported he's new to the GC/CM delivery method but has been exposed to the GC/CM delivery method through his position as President of the Bothell Scholl District Board. The district has completed some GC/CM projects and the Board received regular briefings on the status of prior GC/CM projects and participated in visits to project sites. Knowing his weaknesses, Mr. Chapin said he's hired a team to help guide him through the process. Once the construction phase kicks off his experience will contribute significantly to the project. He plans to visit the site daily and work closely with the contractor. Additionally, Jennifer Devlin-Herbert, Principal, EHDD, has been the lead architect on most of the \$1.2 billion in GC/CM projects, and Ms. Schenker completed a GC/CM project on a new \$100 million aquarium last year.

Ms. Vural reported that as the project manager she is supporting Mr. Chapin in addition to support from Mr. Chandler. OAC Services is providing GC/CM oversight for the project. She has over 15 years of industry experience and is GC/CM trained. She worked on the Washington State Convention Center procurement process.

Mr. Young reported that Heather Hocklander, Project Architect, BCRA, is the project architect and project manager for the project. She just completed four GC/CM projects for the Clover Park School District.

BCRA spent time with EHDD discussing the division of labor. EHDD will be heavily involved in the schematic up to 80%-90% design. As the process proceeds to construction documents, BCRA will assume more of the production of documents. A matrix was developed of roles and responsibilities for each phase of the project. EHDD is very experienced in working with architects.

Ms. Vural reviewed reasons for pursuing the GC/CM delivery method for the aquarium project. The project entails complex spacing and scheduling as well as a complex design. The location is within an occupied site. GC/CM involvement in design is critical, as it's important to have the GC/CM early in the process to help guide the logistics, as well as planning for the project and construction review. The project involves a complex and technical environment with inhabitants from the zoo, employees, workers, visitors to the zoo and public park. Safety is an important factor for everyone. The public benefits by improved predictability of outcome without the need for large contingencies by working closely with the GC/CM on the construction costs and in tracking budgets and schedules. The GC/CM delivery method improves opportunities for early site work reducing the risk of schedule delays and lowering overall impact on zoo inhabitants and visitors.

Mr. Chapin thanked panel members for their time. He outlined the points of the presentation to include the schedule, budget, funding, and the team assembled to ensure a successful result. He mentioned the attendance of four Metro Parks employees to observe the presentation because it might be the first project under the GC/CM delivery method affording an opportunity for everyone to learn more and enabling the agency to pursue more projects under the GC/CM method. He is hopeful the approval of the application establishes the groundwork for the institution to move forward with other long-term projects. He shared that he is also attending AGC's GC/CM training in June.

Mr. Chapin added that he is hopeful the team has demonstrated its capabilities to complete the project under the GC/CM delivery method, as well as having the team help guide him and Metro Parks through the process.

Panel Chair Hartung invited questions from panel members.

Mr. Benner asked whether the GC/CM contingency component and the owner's contingency are rolled into the overall contingency figure. Mr. Chapin said the amount is the total contingency. As a novice to GC/CM, he didn't realize until recently that a GC/CM contingency is also included. The budget affords some room in the other categories to increase the amount to include a GC/CM contingency. The additional funds wouldn't come from the MACC, as it's important to build a quality building.

Mr. Burt asked about the decision-making process for the GC/CM contract and the Board's participation during that process. Mr. Chapin reported his decision-making authority is up to \$100,000. Any decision over \$100,000 must receive the Board's approval. Since it's a new process for the Board, there may be an opportunity to change decision-making processes. The Board required three presentations before allowing the proposal to be submitted to the PRC. One Boardmember, Larry Dahl, has been involved in construction and has completed projects utilizing the GC/CM delivery method. Other Boardmembers are new to the process.

Mr. Burt asked whether the team considered the time sequence required for decision-making in those instances where the cost is over \$100,000. Mr. Chandler advised that a contingency would be included within the GMP contract to address those situations without the need to seek approval from the Board. Unspent contingency would be rolled into the GC/CM contract as the risk reduces. Change orders for enhancing the project would likely require Board approval. However, spending down the contingency would not require Board approval.

Mr. Burt asked about OAC's role in terms of the 20% involvement designated throughout the process. Ms. Vural described OAC's personnel structure enabling GC/CM-experienced resources to work on the project as needed.

Mr. Chapin shared that during discussions with OAC on the service contract, he was confident in his ability to manage the construction phase of the project especially with the assistance of BCRA, as its project management team is outstanding. The initial contract with OAC includes only a minimal amount of

construction-related support with permission from the Board and the Director to increase the contract as needed at whatever level, as well as considering the possibility of adding another GC/CM-experienced project manager. The funds to increase OAC services are available.

Ms. Barron-Sumann questioned whether the budget number for contract administration within the application includes Mr. Chapin's time or the OAC allocation. Her concern is with underestimating the level of effort involved in administering a GC/CM contract. Mr. Chapin advised that the amount is for external services only and doesn't include his time, which is budgeted separately by PDZA.

Mr. Graybeal asked Ms. Vural to describe the single biggest benefit of using GC/CM for this project and the largest challenge. Ms. Vural said the biggest advantage is conservation of dollars to ensure the appropriate expenditure of public funds. The disadvantage is the timing because the GC/CM process entails time for each element because some actions may need additional time while other elements might need to be expedited.

Mr. Hall asked about the factors delaying the selection of the GC/CM when design is approaching 30%. Mr. Chapin replied that he wasn't entirely convinced the GC/CM was the right process. His experience has been in Design-Bid-Build. After speaking to several PRC members about the GC/CM method he became convinced the GC/CM method would be the right process for this project. However, he delayed the process to vet the process, as well as obtaining approval by the Board. EHDD has indicated it's important to have the GC/CM contracted at the time of completion of schematic design or at the beginning of design development. The team is in place for reviewing the GC/CM submittal packages with interviews scheduled within the next two weeks with the goal of contracting by mid-June to ensure the GC/CM is part of the design development in early July. He hopes the selected GC/CM is ready to step in and aggressively assist in the design process.

Panel Chair Hartung closed questions and answers and invited public comments.

Mr. Apiafi expressed concerns with the limited GC/CM experience as OAC's time only represents 20%.

Mr. Benson spoke to the challenges associated with the zoo site with significant access problems, many visitors, and ensuring adjoining facilities remain operational.

Panel Chair Hartung closed public comments and invited the panel's deliberations.

Mr. Graybeal said he believes the project qualifies because of the complexities on the site. However, his concern is the lack of GC/CM experience by the owner with experts hired to provide the experience, which appears to be limited. He's uncertain if the experience included in the resumes represents the true GC/CM experience he believes is necessary. During discussions with others who have negotiated the GMP on the GC/CM contract, that issue is the biggest challenge in the process. When he asks others about the benefits of the GC/CM process, most of the feedback has indicated that early input by the GC/CM on a project is very important. That's the type of information he was seeking within his questions to the applicants based on their level of GC/CM experience. However, similar feedback was lacking, which is concerning. There is no question that OAC is qualified; however, OAC like many other companies is over extended. The question is whether the owner who needs advice is able to obtain that advice.

Mr. Benner agreed the project fits the criteria for GC/CM project delivery. He also has confidence that OAC has the sufficient resources for assisting the owner, but is concerned that the project manager has sufficient knowledge or the strength to challenge the owner or the consultant team when needed.

Mr. Lebo said the project meets the requirements for GC/CM. His children spend much time at the zoo and it really warrants a contractor during the design phase to ensure the project is successful. Based on the assembled team, he's satisfied they have the understanding and pursued efforts to speak to a number of people about the challenges associated with a GC/CM project. The agency has reached out and secured the assistance from experienced resources and is willing to reach out to obtain the experience necessary to ensure a successful project. The project provides a good opportunity for the owner to develop the experience necessary for future GC/CM projects.

Mr. Gimmestad affirmed the project fits the criteria for project complexity. There's also a third leg to the stool for a successful team in the GC/CM process. It involves the owner, consultants, and the GC/CM. Although he understands some of the concerns surrounding experience versus the time commitment, the approach the agency is pursuing for this type of project appears to ensure the project's success and he's satisfied the owner is committed to accomplishing a successful GC/CM project.

Mr. Hall echoed similar comments about the project being a good GC/CM candidate based on the criteria in the RCW. The project meets several criteria. It's also critical that the contractor is involved. He suggested considering whether the siting process could be reinitiated because the site is so critical to this type of project. Construction access amongst parents with strollers is scary while at the same time the project would be a fantastic experience for the agency to gain experience. Hopefully the schedule allows some time to rethink and enable the GC/CM to complete some of the preconstruction services from the beginning to validate decisions already rendered. He's also concerned and disappointed that the prime architect wasn't present especially when claiming 100% participation in design. He supports approval of the application.

Mr. Burt expressed concerns about the lack of involvement of OAC Services, especially during construction. The project manager has the requisite construction experience and knowledge, but more involvement is warranted to provide assistance. He is concerned about that aspect of the proposal. Although the budget manager is receiving some training, having practical experience is important.

Panel Chair Hartung offered that part of the concern likely surrounds a presentation issue because the project meets all the criteria for GC/CM. OAC has the capability and would likely be more involved. The owner's project manager will quickly learn the difference of managing a hard bid project versus a GC/CM project. The skills of OAC in that environment will be essential to negotiate the contract. Although the owner doesn't have GC/CM experience, the owner presented information on how they would approach its first GC/CM project. That hasn't been the case for prior panels where the owners did not have the experience or the consultants. Although he shares some of the same concerns, he is also confident that the project is right for GC/CM and that the team structure would be responsive. He agreed EHDD should have been represented; however, the firm has an incredible legacy of work. He supports approval of the application.

Tim Graybeal moved, seconded by Jim Burt, to approve Metro Parks Tacoma Point Defiance Zoo & Aquarium's project for the GC/CM contracting procedure. Motion carried. Rick Benner and Tim Graybeal voted against.

Project Application Review - City of Spokane – River Front Park GC/CM

Panel Chair Rusty Pritchard and panel members Linneth Riley-Hall, Kurt Boyd, Yelena Semenova, John Boknecht, Phil Lovell, Ato Apiafi, and Darron Pease provided self-introductions. Panel Chair Pritchard reviewed the presentation format.

Leroy Eadie, Director of Parks and Recreation, City of Spokane, led the self-introductions of Juliet Sinisterra, Project Manager, City of Spokane; Hunt Whaley, Attorney, City of Spokane; David Beaudine, Consultant

GC/CM Advisory (Senior Project Manager); Michael Finnegan, Consultant Project Director (Executive Associate); Chris Wright, President, City of Spokane Parks Board; and Preston Potratz, Boardmember, City of Spokane Parks Board.

Mr. Eadie said the presentation focuses on responding to the panel's prior questions and why GC/CM is the most appropriate delivery method for the River Front Park project.

The PRC asked for additional clarification of the owner strategy and hiring multiple AE firms. The City of Spokane is very passionate about parks and recreation and has worked on improvements to the River Front Park for many years. It's important to ensure good control over the design process as the City only has one opportunity for a major investment in River Front Park. Design is important to the City as an owner. It was important to select a design strategy that makes sense.

Ms. Sinisterra commented on the complexity of the project with a variety of different project elements ranging from substantial parks grounds and infrastructure scope of work to four unique building types. As the department moved forward to develop a program and scope for each element, the team realized that each element required a unique set of design and technical expertise. As the project is high profile, it was important to have high quality sophisticated design, as well as the ability to have design input throughout the process. The team identified five different architectural and engineering scopes of work largely because the City didn't believe there was one single architectural entity or team that could adequately deliver on all the different programs within the project. It was possible to find a good team to design an ice rink but it didn't necessarily mean the team would complete a fantastic design for a regional destination playground.

In terms of the GC/CM question, the City wanted to include a GC/CM early in the project to enable early integration between the design teams and the GC/CM and to seek efficiencies in design and minimize risks of design gaps moving forward related to cost and schedule. It's the City's responsibility to manage that process. The City team will manage the meetings between the GC/CM and each architectural and engineering team, as well as scheduling joint team meetings when necessary.

Mr. Eadie referred to the questions about management specifically around reporting between him and Ms. Sinisterra and the participation levels of team members. He displayed an organizational chart of participation levels. He is heavily involved in pre-design with 30% of his schedule devoted to the effort, which tapers as the effort moves into design and further into construction. Ms. Sinisterra, as the project manager, is heavily involved through the design phase with time tapering as the project moves into construction. Mr. Beaudine begins ramping up time with consistent support provided by Mr. Finnegan throughout the process.

Mr. Eadie reported he manages a \$23.5 million annual department budget with expenditures authorized up to \$50,000. Expenditures exceeding his authority are approved by the Park Board. The Park Board can convene within a 48-hour notice and make decisions, which have occurred throughout the years. The Board meets monthly and has six active committees. The Board has the ability to move quickly if required. Ms. Sinisterra reports to Mr. Eadie and is responsible for initiating many of the expenditures. He typically doesn't approve expenditures without Ms. Sinisterra's input. Currently, Mr. Beaudine works with Ms. Sinisterra as the Project Manager. As the project moves into and beyond preconstruction, and into hiring the GC/CM, Mr. Beaudine will work as the owner rep with the GC/CM. Additionally, Heery has the capacity to add more staff if required, as well as the department should the need arise. The department has previously added expertise and skill sets as needed for other projects.

Ms. Sinisterra responded to the question about the design steering committee. The committee is an advisory committee responsible for providing recommendations on the architectural and engineering team selections to

the Park Board, as well as participating in some design presentation meetings throughout the year. The committee is scheduled to begin its work in June and conclude in June 2016. The committee affords an opportunity to provide public feedback and initiate the process to condense much of the schematic work in the first year of the project. She will oversee the committee and coordinate and gathers information from the committee to provide feedback to staff and the Park Board.

Mr. Beaudine reported that managing the scope through the design phase is the responsibility of all team members. Estimate reconciliations will be completed for each phase of the design process. The department also requires the GC/CM to maintain a tracking log of changes between each design submission to track costs associated with those changes. Post construction cost of the GC/CM is 95% followed by a review by the owner and if necessary adjustments as necessary.

Mr. Whaley responded to a question about the City's intent to utilize the assistance of a dispute resolution board on the project. The intent by the City for the project is to start at the executive level with Mr. Eadie and Mr. Finnegan's involvement. If the dispute is not resolved, the City intends to utilize the services of a board. The City has a policy of utilizing alternative dispute resolution to initiate any process. The board would be comprised of two selected parties and a third independently selected party.

Mr. Finnegan commented on his role. He is reviewing the RFP document for the GC/CM selection actively involved in the development of the GC/CM contract documents. He would be involved in the GC/CM selection and the negotiation of the MACC. In terms of dispute resolution, he would assist in identifying disputes with the goal to reach a quick resolution. Mr. Finnegan spoke to lessons learned on previous projects. Many GC/CM's indicated that their services wouldn't change regardless if shared savings were included. It's also important that all sub work packages are similar to traditional lump sum low bid to ensure the project receives the best qualified and best pricing. In terms of packages for GC/CM self-performance, the preference is more traditional lump sum low bids to promote competition, which may mean detaching steel from concrete as separate bids.

Mr. Beaudine addressed the GC/CM selection process and the weighting of proposals versus interviews. The team is working with the owner on what's the most important value regarding qualifications versus fee. It's also important to ensure the specifications include a tight schedule framed to issues without the need for recovery schedules, baselines, and specs to help minimize the risk. During the negotiation of support services, it might be difficult because of uncertainties, such as events occurring in the park that require temporary power. Those types of issues are included as allowances for the contractor to utilize with owner approval.

In terms of the how the owner intends to comply with the RCW in terms of addressing the GC/CM selection summary process, the owner has established a committee comprised of him as the advisor, the Park Board, and parks staff to review proposals and participate on the interview selection committee. Oversight of the process is provided by the Purchasing Department to ensure adherence to the RCWs. Fee opening will occur in a public setting and all scores revealed at that time.

Ms. Sinisterra addressed questions about the construction cost budget. During the master plan process, a conceptual plan was developed and the City contracted with a variety of regional and local landscape architects and architects to develop imagery and concepts for the master plan. She worked closely with the team to develop cost per square foot based on the proposed designs at that time, as well as checking market rates. That information informed the basis for the construction cost budget.

Mr. Beaudine said there were also concerns about the ground as the project location is an old rail yard. The project includes a budget of \$300,000 for soils testing throughout the park. The City will work with the

GC/CM and the architects to ensure building footprints are tested. As far as contingencies, 5% of the construction cost is allocated for the projects for the owner, as well as a program-level contingency for the entire program to utilize. The plan for investigation and any findings will be included in the contractor scope for removal, as well as possibly including an allowance for removal of unsuitable soils.

The MACC for the projects will be determined at 95% for each individual project with projects treated as stand-alone projects. The budgets have been established for the projects with design to adhere to the budgets with continual monitoring of the budgets at the end of phases. The preconstruction period is scheduled soon to include securing architects as soon as possible. The preconstruction phase should be approximately one to 18 months depending upon the project. In the original master plan budget, the initial amount was \$300,000 for preconstruction, which has since been increased to \$500,000. Timing of the MACC negotiation includes multiple MACCs at each phase at the 95% design point and each one will have specified GC/CM for negotiation for services and risk contingencies. The process for distinguishing between preconstruction and construction is identified within the owner/GC/CM agreement.

Ms. Sinisterra addressed the status of the design process. Currently, no design has achieved 30%. A small contract has been initiated for the Howard Street Bridge South Channel for a type, size, and location study not to exceed 30% by this fall. The City anticipates contracting with all architects and engineering consultants by the end of the year. It's likely 30% schematics should be completed in the next year to 18 months with a goal to provide early integration with the GC/CM and the design teams to allow for public input. The intent is not extending design over a three to four year period. The design and public spaces team are setting design guidelines to inform the process, which is one reason why the schedule has been adjusted for the carousel design to ensure consistency with all schematic designs. That construction may move forward and occur sooner than 2018. By coordinating designs, it provides the option to start the project when optimal.

Mr. Beaudine reported the City believes the project is well-suited for GC/CM matching five of the five criteria not including non-civil work. The schedule is complex with phasing and coordination with items between the multiple projects within the park and relocation of staff from the existing administration area, as well as coordinating all park events. The park is occupied 24/7/365 by citizens. The GC/CM is required during the design phase for scheduling and phasing issues, locating the lay down location, delivery coordination, and other project coordination. The work is a complex environment located within a public park next to city hall in the heart of downtown Spokane. Historically, it's important the building around the carousel is constructed properly and the carousel is protected.

Mr. Eadie reported the team is passionate, smart, motivated, and wants to be engaged in the project. The team conducted much research to reach the conclusion that GC/CM is the right tool for the River Front Park project. Many different options were evaluated. A great team has been assembled and the team is optimistic that it will be successful.

Panel Chair Pritchard invited questions from the panel.

Mr. Apiafi asked about the plan to avoid disputes. Mr. Beaudine said the team plans to address issues at the field level by teaming early in the process and helping team members understand processes and solutions and by working together. The plan is executing mitigation at the field level before issues escalate to the executive level.

Ms. Riley-Hall referred to the research to determine that GC/CM is the appropriate tool. She asked about the extent of the research and the process. Mr. Eadie said the department worked on a master plan for several years that was eventually adopted by the Park Board and the City Council last summer. Voters approved a

\$63.5 park bond in November. Prior to the pond passage, research was pursued into the approach for design and construction. The team was fascinated early in the process by D-B and believed there were many advantages; however, one element that was troubling was the lack of control over design and the idea of design reporting through a general contractor. The City wanted to be involved in the quality of the design. The team explored similar projects in other communities ranging from city to school district projects and projects of complexity, especially those projects where the site was occupied. It was important for the City to maintain revenue generated from the park during the entire project. At that point, members began attending training to understand the complexity of GC/CM and to ensure a knowledge base when the City pursued hiring a GC/CM advisor. The effort included many phone calls to many individuals who were forthcoming with good advice. After working through the process with the Park Board, it was determined that the GC/CM delivery method was the appropriate model for the park project.

Ms. Sinisterra added that there were many one-on-one interviews. She met with many Spokane area PRC members and a CPARB Boardmember to obtain feedback. The department worked with Mike Purdy, a consultant in the Seattle area who led a Park Board retreat and a training session for staff.

Ms. Riley-Hall referred to the team's reference on oversight of the RCW by purchasing staff. However, the application doesn't speak to staff having GC/CM experience. She asked about the oversight and the experience level. Mr. Eadie said training was provided to purchasing staff. Mike Purdy conducted an all-day training session. Some staff members have some experience with other alternative delivery methods through the department's other projects in the City. The all-day training was the primary tool used.

Mr. Boknecht referred to the multiple MACCs envisioned and asked whether the team has contemplated affording an "out" in the event the team is not successful in later MACC negotiations. Mr. Finnegan said the team expects that the GC/CM would be able to have key input and avoid unrealistic numbers at the time of schematic design review. As the process moves to construction documents, the team would likely know early whether an issue exists in trying to achieve the MACC. Early involvement of the GC/CM is important, as well as understanding the market conditions in the Spokane area and ensuring issues surrounding escalation and the unavailability of specific contractors are identified early in the process to find alternatives to resolve issues. There essentially is no failsafe process other than the process includes phased projects. Some matters are beyond the control of anyone. If some factor substantially increases construction costs, it may require reducing the scope of work to remain within the original budget. That would be explored through the risk management process early in the program.

Mr. Lovell mentioned that some information reflects that the anticipated preconstruction budget covers a period of three years and the team indicated the original amount was \$300,000 and subsequently increased to \$500,000. He asked whether the team believes the amount is sufficient as the math reveals a conservative rate of \$110 an hour, which represents a two-thirds FTE over that period. He questioned whether the amount is sufficient for preconstruction. Mr. Beaudine replied that he spoke to three GC/CMs in the Spokane market. Each one believed that it would be possible to set the amount at \$300,000 but suggested increasing the amount to \$400,000. He determined that because of the project scope and the desire for quality work, the amount was increased to \$500,000 based on previous experience with other projects.

Mr. Lovell asked whether the team has determined a way to pretest the amount at the time of award. Mr. Beaudine said the team anticipates executing the contract provisions based on time and materials with tracking of costs. If the amount should increase and the City is receiving top level service, the team can explore increasing the amount to maintain the level of service if necessary.

Ms. Semenova referred to the involvement of several architectural firms working with one contractor. As a result, the design steering committee becomes an important team member because of the oversight of overall design. She asked about the experience of the members of the committee and their extent of involvement. The application indicates the committee will help to finalize the selection. She asked about the committee's involvement after the selections are completed. If not, what is the plan for oversight of the design process? Mr. Eadie said the format of the steering committee was developed as an attempt to create some efficiency in the process. The Park Board is extremely busy with many issues to address. It was important to identify a group that could focus on the design element. Some design expertise is represented on the design steering committee as well as others not involved in design. The committee includes Park Board members, City Administrator, and several members of the master plan advisory committee who participated in the development of the master plan. Some of those members have good background and experience in both design and in process and are focused on moving solutions forward for action. The structure was successfully implemented through the master plan process. The committee will assist in the recommendations to the Park Board on the selection of the five design firms followed by reviewing the key designs that are submitted by the firms for recommendations to the Park Board. The committee's role enables the Park Board to continue to function while receiving information from the design steering committee.

Ms. Sinisterra added that the first A&E contract for the design of public spaces and park grounds has been crafted and the project looks to the committee to establish the overall design guidelines for the park.

Panel Chair Pritchard asked about the specific working alignment with the GC/CM and whether that includes working closely with the master plan architect, subs, or other firms. He asked about the experience required of A&Es as it relates to the RCW. Mr. Eadie replied that the GC/CM would work with the master plan architect as well as with each designer of the other park elements. The intent is to help massage the process by working between the designers and the GC/CM by affording time in the process. During the last year, the Parks and Recreation Department hired an Executive Officer in part to ensure that someone in the department was available to help with day-tot-day activities to free his time for involvement in the project. The department is aware of the challenges associated with five design teams rather than one design team; however, the department did not believe there would be only firm that had all the specialties and sophistication to cover all design needs. The master plan architect will work closely with the GC/CM, as well as with the other designers.

Mr. Beaudine spoke to the question of the A&Es experience level with respect to the RCW. For the design of public spaces, the contract stipulates qualifications of the architecture team and experience with GC/CM. Ms. Sinisterra added that the three A&E finalists have experience in GC/CM for the design of public spaces.

Mr. Boyd asked about the contingencies within the projected budget for possible contamination from the old rail yard. Ms. Sinisterra described her close work with the architectural and design teams to develop the architectural capital cost estimates. She also is working with Mr. Beaudine on many of the contingency budgets.

Mr. Beaudine referred to the \$300,000 budget for geotechnical borings, testing the site, and identifying the footprint. That information will be incorporated within the contractor's MACC, as well as establishing an allowance in the MACC to account for unforeseen costs. The budget includes a 5% owner contingency and an 8% construction contingency for the program level contingency.

Mr. Pease asked whether inflation has been factored within the budget. Mr. Beaudine affirmed the budget includes a 3.5% inflation factor per year. Mr. Pease asked whether the team is aware of any other GC/CM projects with five different designers. Mr. Beaudine said he is not aware of any GC/CM project with five

designers. He added that each project is treated as an individual project. Mr. Eadie added that the team encountered difficulty in researching like projects within the state. There weren't other park projects similar to Spokane's project, which is located on a river with unique ties to the community and housing important buildings and structures.

Mr. Boknecht said given the multiple MACCs, he asked whether the team has contemplated the administration required by the GC/CM for buyout, review, and development of the packages especially if contracts are separated for concrete, steel, and other project components. Mr. Beaudine affirmed the team is seeking a high level of expertise by the GC/CM because of the degree of ongoing and multiple projects. Internally, his time increases into construction and Ms. Sinisterra will play a role in addition to other resources from the City as needed. He acknowledged that it is a concern, which is why the qualifications for the GC/CM will consider the ability to handle the size of the project.

Mr. Apiafi asked about the percentage of the contingency budget allocated for risk. Mr. Beaudine said the budget includes a 5% owner contingency and an 8% contingency for construction programs. The risk contingency is approximately 3%-3.5% for each individual project.

Ms. Riley-Hall acknowledged the project's need for numerous design professionals. She asked whether any discussions considered contracting with one prime A&E firm and subcontracting with other A&E specialty firms. Mr. Eadie reported the discussions were extensive and included the opportunity for one master architect in charge of the entire site. However, after review of site needs and the extensive degree of landscape and design needs, the team leaned toward the master landscape architect to complete the design work to the edge of buildings. Another piece was providing local opportunities to the local design community to participate in the project.

Panel Chair Pritchard said the application speaks to five projects while the application is for one project. He asked whether the request is for approval of one or five projects. Mr. Eadie affirmed the request is to approve one project.

Panel Chair Pritchard invited public comment.

Mr. Hall said he is a resident of the Spokane area. Although he's observed the process on the periphery, he's watched department staff employ extensive due diligence. The decision did not come quickly or lightly. In fact, there were instances of moving away from D-B based on conversations with several PRC members from the Spokane area. The project is a legacy project and is the site of Expo 74, one of the critical milestones in the history of Spokane. Everyone is watching this project. He also understands that there were 10 GC/CM submittals. There doesn't appear to be great deal concern from the GC/CM community in terms of the project proposal including multiple design firms. At least six of the proposals are fully qualified GC/CMs. He also cannot think of any other steps that should have been pursued for ensuring the successful conclusion of the project.

Panel Chair Pritchard closed public comment and invited the panel's deliberations and recommendation.

Panel members deliberated on a recommendation. Additional comments are summarized below.

- One of the main concerns is the logistics of the project relative to RCW 39.10 logistical parameters. It appears from the project submittal that the program structure places Heery International as the program manager and that the GC/CM would report to Heery. It also appears there could be the possibility of a firm or entity acting as the construction manager and then hiring another construction manager in the form of a

GC/CM to manage multiple projects all with individual MACCs rather than different MACCs creating a myriad of problems. There are provisions in the RCW pertaining to the negotiation of the MACC, time of establishing the MACC, and parameters if the MACC overruns a certain percentage with contract provisions authorizing the fee to be renegotiated. The total contract cost is not contracted until the last contract is finalized, which essentially entails a project with multiple design elements and fees, as well as a series of change orders leading up to a prime MACC.

- Concerns regarding cost overruns of multiple projects occurring simultaneously.
- The contingency fee should be higher as the project is so complex. However, it's likely the project would be successful even though there are many unknowns because of the team and participation by Heery.
- The project has many logistical challenges in implementing RCW 39.10 for the GC/CM contractor. However, the team provided the right answers to questions and appears to have the right attitude.
- The answers appeared to be appropriate and the project falls within the RCW criteria. However, the team downplays the complexity of the GC/CM involvement, the complexity of five different phases, and undervaluing preconstruction, as it's likely not possible for one FTE to complete preconstruction work and activities and achieve the MACC. However, the team revealed a level of energy but should also re-evaluate some of the issues.
- The project application includes other projects that do not meet GC/CM requirements. Previously, RCW provisions included language not allowing the bundling of packages. Those provisions are no longer in RCW 39.10. The project encompassing multiple designers will be extremely difficult to accomplish.
- The complexity of the scheduling, phasing, as maintaining operations of the venue speak to the value of a GC/CM. However, there are concerns for establishing the MACC. If the MACC is exceeded, the issue is the responsibility for redesign and whether it's the master architect or subs. Those are contractual concerns.
- Appreciative of the energy of the team and the research completed, but concerns still exist with the number of projects, as well as with the management plan to manage the multiple pieces.
- A member commented on the possibility on bidding some of the other projects under D-B contracts or other lump sum contracts. Although there are many risks involved, the team appears to be strong and much of the research has been completed. Although supportive of the project, the effort will not be easy.
- Mr. Apiafi questioned concerns on why five different projects under one umbrella would be problematic. Several members said the concerns evolve around project approval of one project versus five individual projects. The application speaks to criteria for GC/CM project delivery. The plan needs to address the criteria and the issue is likely how the proposal was packaged.

Kurt Boyd moved, seconded by Linneth Riley-Hall, to approve the City of Spokane's GC/CM Project Application for the River Front Park project. Motion failed. Linneth Riley-Hall, Yelena Semenova, and Rusty Pritchard opposed.

Chair Prichard noted approval was dependent on six affirmative votes. He recommended reapplying in July. The team should consider the comments by PRC members. He thanked the team for their time and effort.

Project Application Review – Washougal School District GC/CM – Jemtegaard Middle School, Excelsior High School and new Elementary School

Panel Chair Chuck Davis and panel members John Palewicz, Phil Lovell, Howard Hillinger, Rusty Pritchard, Ian Kell, Rodger Benson, and Rustin Hall provided self-introductions. Panel Chair Davis reviewed the presentation format and panel review process.

Panel Chair Davis disclosed that his nephew is employed by the City of Washougal. He has not discussed the project with his nephew.

Joe Steinbrenner, Facilities Director, Washougal School District, reported the school district is building three new schools. In November 2014, the district convened an 18-member long-range facility planning committee tasked with identifying facility needs and constraints. Criteria utilized by the committee included student safety, enrollment capacity, and facility condition. The study identified 300 items further refined to seven major items leading to the proposal for three new schools

In February 2015, the district passed a ballot bond measure by a super majority of 61%. The presentation will support the application for GC/CM alternative project delivery. The team plans to highlight the complexities associated with the project, as well as the strengths of team members.

To qualify for the GC/CM project delivery, the project must meet at least one criterion in RCW 39.10. The project meets many of the criteria. Construction would occur around occupied sites during the school year. The project includes an unusual technical complexity as one of the first properties in the Sand Columbia River Gorge area requiring another layer of environment review and permitting. The project includes schedule complexity evolving the school year, which begins in the first week of September each year requiring the project to meet that deadline. Commencing construction too late would delay the start of the new school year. Winter weather contributes to other complexities for the region along with the presence of poor soils. The fiscal benefit includes a prediction of a 5% construction escalation rate. However, because of the permitting process, construction time could be extended. The intent is reducing the timeline to save escalation costs.

Mr. Steinbreener described his experience. He graduated from the University of Washington Construction Management Program in 1985. Over the last 30 years, he has worked in or near the construction industry. He's been at the district for the last three years and during the prior six years, he worked for the Washington State University in Vancouver as the Project Officer. Prior to that position, he worked for a project construction company. He has completed many negotiated projects and GC/CM projects for both public and private sectors in Oregon and Washington. His time on the project is allocated at 20%.

Adam Cormack, R&C Management, said his background is in construction management with the last ten years focused on educational K-12 projects. He's completed GC/CM, CMGC, and traditional D-B-B projects, has managed budgets, scopes, and schedules from prior bond measures to close out of the bond. Unfortunately, Rick Yeo, Partner, Project Manager, who founded R&C Management, LLC, was unable to attend the meeting because of a prior commitment. His experience encompasses over 35 years as a general contractor for a large general contractor who completed many K-12 schools. He was president of that company for 12 years. In the last ten years of his career, he has completed construction management projects for numerous school districts.

Ralph Wilson, RSD Architects, reported he's been a licensed architect for over 30 years focusing on educational architecture. Over those years, he's been involved in numerous GC/CM, CM/CG, D-B, and Negotiated projects. Three years ago, he presented a project proposal to the PRC seeking GC/CM approval for a similar project. That project is nearing completion of a \$49 billion bond issue. He spoke on behalf of Mr. Yeo, who he has known for decades.

Casey Wyckoff, Principal, LSW Architects, described his 19 years of experience practicing educational architecture. He's designed and managed numerous early learning, K-12, and community college projects throughout Washington and Oregon. His most recent GC/CM experience includes the Ridgeway school projects and replacement of the Crestline Elementary School and the Evergreen High School addition and renovation project. The team of R&C Management and LSW Architects has a long and successful record.

Mr. Steinbreener reported another member of the team is the Dick Prentke, Perkins Coie, serving as legal counsel for the bond projects. Mr. Prentke's construction law experience encompasses more than three decades. His role is ensuring the district's adherence to the RCWs and contract reviews.

Mr. Cormack described the district's processes to ensure the success of the bond. He is committed to 40% time up through preconstruction and thereafter 100% once construction commences. He will be on site daily with Mr. Yeo committed to 100% participation up to construction and thereafter at 70%. The process for procuring the architects has been completed with the selection of LSW Architects as the AC/CM. BB&L Architects is involved in all D-B-B scoping. Currently, the team is securing professional service procurement with the receipt of many proposals for review later in the week. The RFQ for the GC/CM is currently under review by the District's legal counsel. The application includes the schedule dates to meet the intent of the RCW. In terms of fiscal management of the budget, he's well versed in program project budgets. Each project will have a separate budget incorporating soft and hard costs and contingencies (contractor and owner at 5% each). The team also is supported through planning assistance from the Washougal School District through a program contingency. Schedule management is accomplished through a program or preconstruction schedule. Those schedules are in place and the team is tracking and meeting deadlines. Each individual project will include project schedules for all phases of design, permitting, and construction. Any slips in schedules prompts notification to contractors to supply a proposed recovery schedule.

Mr. Wyckoff reported his firm manages the Washington State Sustainability Schools Protocols for the project. Additionally, LSW Architects through its capacity has developed a rigorous design phased quality control review process for third parties.

Mr. Wyckoff reviewed the project sites and described existing conditions, locations of existing buildings, and the geography of the sites. The initial project concept has been developed but will be finalized through the collaboration of the design team, GC/CM, and feedback from the Gorge Commission to arrive at a solution that works for the sites.

Mr. Wilson spoke to issues of student and staff safety, ingress and egress, and working in an overcrowded environment. Having a contractor on board early is essential for integration into the process to ensure safety. As the middle school site is limited, some preliminary design concepts were developed, which speaks to the importance of the early involvement of the GC/CM to test design ideas early.

Mr. Steinbrenner said the major concerns of the school district is student and staff safety, egress, and neighborhood impacts, which speaks to the importance of involving the GC/CM early in the process to develop the logistics plans on how to accomplish the project with limited impact to the district and to the neighborhood.

Mr. Cormack said the GC/CM will coordinate and support the circulation of the site ensuring construction is retained in the construction zone to ensure safety.

Mr. Wyckoff added that one of the key complexities is the technical component of the Gorge Commission. Early involvement in the design phase will allow feedback to determine adjustments in schedules and accommodating and understanding possible complications through the subjective process with the Gorge Commission.

Mr. Wilson said the GC/CM is critical for the design phase and having the GC/CM integrated early at the onset provides the project with realistic schedules and costs and will serve as a good checkpoint as the project progresses. The project includes many complexities, which speaks to the need of GC/CM project delivery.

Panel Chair Davis invited questions from the panel.

Mr. Benson asked for additional information on the team's specific experience delivering projects under RCW 39.10. Mr. Cormack advised that most of his experience is with CM/CG in Oregon projects, as well as participating in the Crestline Elementary School GC/CM project.

Mr. Benson asked Mr. Cormack to describe the main differences between CM/CG and GC/CM. Mr. Cormack said some of the differences pertain to terminology, legal issues, and how contingencies are managed in terms of an open book process. Mr. Steinbrenner said there are some phases of the contracting methods that are similar. Globally, both methods are similar with subtle differences between the two methods. Mr. Cormack added that Perkins Coie is heavily involved in the contractual items and assuring adherence to RCW requirements. Mr. Benson asked about any prescriptive differences in how the work is procured or limitations on procurement. Mr. Cormack expressed some uncertainty in terms of his response and apologized for Mr. Yeo's absence to such an important presentation.

Mr. Palewicz asked about the selection process for the GC/CM and whether the process includes a sealed bid for general conditions at the time of interviews. Mr. Steinbrenner described how the RFP is released to advertise for qualifications. Once the qualifications are received, a short list is developed with the proposers invited to submit an RFP. The submitters will be invited to participate in an interview and would provide the GC/CM fee proposal at that time. The submitter would be scored on three factors of the GC/CM fee, RFQ, and the interview. Mr. Palewicz advised that the RCW requires an open public bid opening and all proposers must be advised of their respective scores. He questioned the process and how the interview is factored in the score. Mr. Cormack said the interview produces a short list of proposers from the original submittals. Those interviews are scored and then at the short list interview the general conditions and proposals are submitted. Mr. Steinbrenner acknowledged the reference to "sealed bid" is confusing language and that the process shouldn't be considered a concealed bid. The final interviews are scored. The selection team would review the combined scores and render a recommendation on selection of the GC/CM.

Mr. Pritchard asked about the status of design. Mr. Steinbrenner said schematic design has been initiated. A design symposium is scheduled with the public on Thursday, June 4. Mr. Pritchard questioned whether the schedule of four days is sufficient time given the complexity of the project for notification for proposals and the actual interviews. Mr. Steinbrenner agreed the timeline is tight. Mr. Pritchard asked about the driver for the short timeline and if flexibility is possible to enable sufficient time for proposers to submit proposals. Mr. Cormack said the team is willing to adjust the timeline for the procurement of the GC/CM. The main reason for the short timeframe is to include the GC/CM early in the process. Mr. Steinbrenner added that when the schedule was developed, the team understood the PRC presentation was scheduled on May 21 rather than May 28.

Mr. Lovell referred to line 49 within the application submittal pertaining to the procurement of the GC/CM. The information indicates interviews will be conducted on July 10 with sealed proposals with the district scheduled to review and select on the following Monday. The question pertained to the timing for scoring of interviews to the public opening of the bids. Mr. Steinbrenner replied that the public opening and announcements of the selection would occur on Monday. There have been discussions about extending the timeframes. The proposals would be opened on the day of the interviews. Mr. Cormack apologized for the inclusion of "sealed bids" within the application submittal.

Mr. Benson said the documentation reveals a contractor's construction contingency of \$1.3 million of a \$35.5 construction budget. That appears to be less than 5%. He asked how the amount was determined. Mr. Cormack said the GC/CM's contingency is 5% and 5% for the owner. Other contingencies are included for

program contingencies. The building construction cost was through the preliminary work with LSW and other professional firms to develop draft estimates, which serves as the basis for the proposed contingencies. The intent is to allocate 5% for the contractor, 5% for the owner, and other contingencies separate from the budget should the construction contingency need to be increased.

Mr. Hillinger asked about the type of services expected and the level of service given the complexity of the project for the \$35,000 preconstruction budget. Mr. Steinbrenner said cost estimating is included in the budget with constructability and scheduling not included in preconstruction budget. Mr. Hillinger asked about the plan for acquiring knowledge of RCW 39.10. Mr. Cormack said the process includes completing some training and working closely with Mr. Yeo and the team. R&C is committed to ensuring the project is successful and will pursue training.

Mr. Kell asked for additional information on the nature of the Gorge Commission's approval and whether the GC/CM will have a role in mitigating the risks of not obtaining approval from the Commission. Mr. Wyckoff said a member of the firm served on the Gorge Commission for eight years. He is an integral part of the project team. The process to success is early engagement with the Gorge Commission prior to any work on siting the project and design configuration. The GC/CM contribution is informing the design team in terms of cost or schedule implications of the negotiations. Unlike traditional conditional use processes with prescriptive conditions, the Gorge Commission is much more subjective.

Mr. Benson asked for a specific response in terms of where the bid opening occurs and who is present. Mr. Steinbrenner replied that the GC/CM fee proposals would be opened on the day of the interview. The proposals will be opened by the selection committee prior to the commencement of the interviews.

Panel Chair Davis invited public comments. There were no public comments.

Panel members deliberated on a recommendation. Additional comments are summarized below.

- The projects appear to be appropriate for the application of GC/CM. However, it's confusing as to why the team is bundling the smaller high school with the other two school projects. The smaller project could have been separated by a different bid. The main concern with the application is the team's understanding of RCW 39.10 because there is a difference in what's allowed in the State of Oregon versus the State of Washington. The explanation for the bid opening wasn't consistent with the RCW. Bids are supposed to be publicly open. Best practices dictate that scoring of the proposals and presentation is completed prior to opening the bids and provided to all participants in a transparent process.
- Mr. Palewicz cited the provisions within RCW 39.10 for bid openings. Additionally, based on experience, the preconstruction services budget of \$35,000 is not adequate for cost estimating. The project is likely appropriate for the GC/CM delivery method; however, the knowledge base for application of the RCW 39.10 is lacking.
- Some additional adjustments in the budget should occur as well as including more information in the management plan about the knowledge required for the GC/CM delivery method.
- Similar concerns were conveyed about the bid opening, as the process is inconsistent with the intent of selecting the most qualified firms for submittal of proposals. Additionally, there is concern about the level of preconstruction services. Although the projects meet the criteria for GC/CM and it's a good candidate, more changes are necessary to address the concerns to qualify for GC/CM.
- The proposal appears to reflect a fundamental misunderstanding of the advantages of GC/CM, as the budget of \$35,000 for preconstruction doesn't speak to the full value of the GC/CM process. Early

involvement of the GC/CM appears to be appropriately scheduled. The sense of the presentation doesn't convey a thorough understanding of the GC/CM process.

- The basic concern pertains to the difference between CM/GC in Oregon and GC/CM in Washington. Research indicates that in 2013 the Oregon Legislature passed new legislation setting forth new requirements for all public agencies and contractors for public contracting that is not subject to competitive bidding. Three major changes included: (1) have a thorough analysis to determine if the CM/GC delivery method is appropriate for the project; (2) the entire process is more transparent; (3) and subcontractors are now much more able to understand when trade packages are selected. Contractors are required as part of the prime selection process to tell agencies how they intend to select subs whether by competitive bids or some other competitive selection process, and they are also required to notify subs of non-selection, and primes must provide reasonable opportunity for subs to receive feedback.

There is no requirement in spite of the legislation for the prime contractor to select a particular subcontractor nor do the new requirements provide an opportunity for subs to protest non-selection to an agency. The team appears to be unfamiliar with RCW 30.10 as opposed to having more familiarity with Oregon statutes, which is concerning.

- Based on the PRC scoring sheets, the project qualifies for GC/CM. However, the necessary public body experience through the team speaks to the lack of clarity among the team members in terms of knowledge and responsibilities. Although Mr. Yeo has the knowledge base, it's not possible to evaluate the presentation when the individual is not present.

Rusty Pritchard moved, seconded by Howard Hillinger, to approve the GC/CM Application for the Washougal School District. Motion failed. All panel members opposed the motion.

Panel Chair Davis encouraged the team to consider the comments from panel members. Although the project is appropriate for the GC/CM delivery method, the team is encouraged to resubmit and be prepared to address concerns addressed by panel members.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is on July 23.

Mr. Hillinger reported on some interest by CNA to sponsor a best practices forum next year during its annual seminar.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Chair Gimmestad adjourned the meeting at 1:49 p.m.