

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY REVIEW BOARD

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

Northwest Carpenters Facility
25120 Pacific Highway South
Kent, Washington

Special Session Meeting Minutes

June 9, 2016

Panel Members Present:

Curt Gimmestad, Absher Construction	Joe Stowell, City of Oak Harbor
Tom Peterson, Hoffman Construction Company	Rusty Pritchard, Washington State University
Bill Dobyys, Lydig Construction	Mike Shinn, Shinn Mechanical
Steve Crawford, Issaquah School District	Jon Lebo, University of Washington

Staff, Guests, Presenters:

Danelle Bessett, Department of Enterprise Services	Howard Hillinger, Parametrix
Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services	Doug Newell, Central Kitsap School District
Jim Dugan, Parametrix	Robin Shoemaker, Central Kitsap School District
Brian Carter, Integrus Architecture	David McVicker, Central Kitsap School District
Shannon Thompson, Parametrix	Dan Cody, Parametrix
Kevin McCain, Skanska	Dan Miller, Central Kitsap School District
Gladys Ly-au Young, SKL Architects	Rick Sundberg, SKL Architects

Welcome, Introductions & Rule Review:

Chair Curt Gimmestad called the CPARB Project Review Committee meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

Central Kitsap School District – Central Kitsap High School/Middle School Replacement – GC/CM

Chair Gimmestad serving as panel chair, reviewed the presentation format to consider the GC/CM project application from Central Kitsap School District for replacement of Central Kitsap High School/Middle School. Panel members Curt Gimmestad, Tom Peterson, Rusty Pritchard, Mike Shinn, Bill Dobyys, Steve Crawford, and Joe Stowell provided self-introduction. Six affirmative votes are necessary to approve the application.

Jim Dugan, Project Manager for Parametrix, thanked members for agreeing to schedule a special session of the PRC to consider the applications from Central Kitsap School District. He introduced project team members David McVicker, Superintendent, Doug Newell, Executive Director, Business & Operations, and Robin Shoemaker, Director of Capital Projects, Central Kitsap School District; Brian Carter, Integrus Architecture; Howard Hillinger, Dan Cody, and Shannon Thompson, Parametrix. Not in attendance are design team members Doug Holen as an external advisor and Graehm Wallace, Perkins Coie, providing legal and contract services.

The project site is located on 56.1 acres. Approximately 2,100 students attend the existing high school and middle schools. The project entails four phases with many buildings currently not part of the high school or middle school removed or vacated. New buildings will be constructed and others will be demolished. The project requires project sequencing. Construction is scheduled to commence by summer 2017 with early contracting packages.

Mr. Dugan displayed an aerial photograph of the site and identified the location of the existing high school (south end) and the middle school (north end). Four existing buildings serve other functions for the school district and include a teaching/learning educational building, a residential home (*owned by the school district and scheduled for demolition in spring/summer 2017*), a bus barn, and a food service warehouse. The bus barn and food service warehouse would be vacated with future use of the buildings to be determined. The warehouse might be used in the interim as the site for lay down storage or other uses.

The high school's current grass fields and track will be replaced with turf fields and new track and serve as the primary athletic field remaining on campus over the course of the construction project and concurrent with the movement, replacement, or adjustments of other fields. That work is planned for completion by summer 2017.

Two other parcels owned by the district and not used for educational purposes would be used as part of the overall campus.

The first phase includes vacating, demolition of buildings, and installation of construction fencing. The project site includes an existing high school on the south end, a middle school at the north end, and an inaccessible steep slope on the third side of the parcel. Access to the site is near the area of the existing food service warehouse. After selection of the GC/CM, site placements and logistics will be reviewed and adjusted as needed.

After completion of both schools, the third phase begins with intensive site work to demolish an existing gym at the middle school, construction of a large parking lot, and construction of a storm drainage pond.

Project components in the fourth phase have not been determined in terms of decisions surrounding the existing high school comprised of both newer and older historic buildings.

The project's adjacency and phasing is complex.

The project budget includes a 3% risk contingency as part of the MACC, with an ample amount for negotiated support services and pre-con services and fee. The district plans to release the Request for Proposal (RFP) following approval of the application by the PRC on Monday, June 13 with interviews scheduled on July 22. The Request for Final Proposal (RFFP) is scheduled on August 15, with the School Board scheduled to approve selection of the GC/CM on September 14. The timeline is on track to begin pre-construction services on a complicated multi-phased site with pre-work scheduled in the spring and summer of 2017 to prepare for the next several years of construction.

Of the five statutory requirements, the project satisfies four criteria. The project's phasing and coordination and site occupation on two sides with access limited to one side speaks to the complexity of the project. The involvement of the GC/CM is important to provide advice on access to the site, staging the project, and moving different active functions within the site. Today, the only access to the site is a congested road requiring traffic management. The objective is moving forward with the project to avoid additional costs of inflation and to save dollars where possible. Keeping programs active, managing the neighborhood, long lead purchases, and early packages are all important.

Because the project is a multi-year effort, utility work will be complex and would need to be managed. In terms of public benefit, safety is of the utmost importance, as well as managing and minimizing impacts to the neighborhood.

The Central Kitsap School District has never completed a GC/CM project but has completed many traditional Design-Bid-Build projects. The project is timely for the school district to complete as a GC/CM project because it would serve to teach and train, as well as deliver a project. The district has the necessary leadership and is scheduled to send personnel to GC/CM training in June. The project is supported by Parametrix and other consultants providing the necessary experience for the owner.

Mr. Dugan reviewed an organizational chart. His role is an advisor, as well as project management with Ms. Shoemaker sharing duties as lead. Mr. Dayton referred to additional information provided in response to questions about his ability and experience. He is currently involved in three projects. Two of the projects are nearing completion with the third scheduled to conclude by the end of the month. He would have approximately 30 hours a week available for the project.

Ms. Shoemaker's background is extensive and includes GC/CM experience, supplemented by Mr. Hillinger and his experience. Mr. Hillinger will serve as back-up lead. Doug Holen and Brian Carter have extensive backgrounds in GC/CM. Mr. Dugan said that based on the project team, he believes the team has the ample experience to complete a project of this size and complexity.

The project is funded, the team's been established, the project satisfies RCW criteria, and the management plan is in place. The team has the necessary experience, continuity, and capacity primarily through consultants. The project would offer an opportunity for teaching and training while delivering the project for Central Kitsap School District.

Panel Chair Gimmestad invited questions from the panel.

Bill Dobyns asked about the experience level of support-level team members from the school district, Parametrix, and Integrus assigned to the project. Mr. Dugan advised that day-to-day oversight would be provided by the project manager. He serves at the project manager and has the majority of the GC/CM experience for day-to-day activities. Dan Cody and Shannon Thompson both have GC/CM experience and would play varying roles as determined by the project manager. He is partnering his PM role with Ms. Shoemaker, who has some GC/CM experience but more experience in planning, design, engineering, and construction. He will assist in bridging those process components. However, more importantly, and day-to-day, the district decided not to assign a director in the role as a business executive but rather to serve in an operating role. An active working relationship between him and Ms. Shoemaker is planned during the duration of the project. The project will have GC/CM experience, district strength and resources, decisions and budgeting, and any other support that might be required. If needed, the project also has the support of Mr. Hillinger and three other staff members with GC/CM project management experience.

Rusty Pritchard asked for an additional explanation as to how the management plan addresses negotiation and contract change orders and assigned authority to sign change orders. Ms. Shoemaker replied that she and Mr. Dugan, working in tandem, would negotiate any changes to the point of obtaining signature authority. The leads would recommend changes to the leadership team of the Executive Director and the Superintendent to obtain agreement. The lead team has the authority to operate and render decisions on a timely basis while maintaining communications with the executives.

Mr. Dugan added that when the team has encountered decision points, Superintendent McVicker's response has been immediate and timely.

Mr. Pritchard asked how the budget has been factored when the scope of the fourth phase hasn't been determined, and whether that information would be articulated in the RFP. Mr. Dugan replied that the RFP addresses the building of the new high school and middle school and all demolition. Other contracting addresses the outbuildings. Phase 4 is a separate scope and not part of the proposal other than acknowledgment of the need.

Joe Stowell commented that it appears Parametrix is considering another GC/CM project. While one GC/CM project can be an undertaking, two GC/CM projects could be monumental. He asked how Parametrix plans to staff the projects and handle the workload. Ms. Shoemaker responded that when the district considered the projects, the district acknowledged the amount of extensive work and the need to supplement staff. Prior to the bond passage, the district reached out and contacted individuals who could supplement staff, as well as actively seeking to hire individuals. District staff is experienced in Design-Bid-Build, and to some extent, GC/CM with many of years of experience to call upon, as well as K-12 experience. When the district selected Parametrix, the district understood obtaining approval for the GC/CM process required expertise in GC/CM. The district also sought to learn whether the company had adequate bench to supplement the district. The organizational chart for both projects represents an appropriate amount of percentage of assignment to the projects and the right mix of individuals, while acknowledging that if the need arises, supplemental staff would be added to assist. The district also recognized that there are some overlaps in the timelines of the project and sought ways to capitalize and coordinate between the two teams to manage both projects.

Mr. Dugan commented on the benefits received from previous concurrent school projects in terms of common documentation, common filing systems, and common use of tools that didn't require re-creation for each project. Additionally, when Parametrix competed for the contract, the submittal was in conjunction with Hill International as a team submittal. Part of the agency's bench strength includes experience from Hill International should more resources be required.

Ms. Shoemaker said the district's selection of design teams focused on strength of experience in GC/CM to work on the large project. The district's design partner has GC/CM experience as well.

Mike Shinn asked whether mechanical and electrical contracting has been selected. Mr. Dugan replied that the mechanical and electrical teams have been selected, but not contracted. He identified the subcontractors.

Tom Peterson asked about the status of any issues with the two other projects scheduled to conclude by fall 2016. Mr. Dugan reported that the elementary school is ahead schedule and would not open until September. The project is under budget in an inflating market. Stewart Middle School is not scheduled to open until February 2017. The project is on schedule and within budget. The use of the GC/CM delivery method and the contractor's performance are the primary reasons the projects are on time, within budget, and reduced his time on the projects significantly. In addition to the two projects, he is the PM for the Eastside Community Center for Metropolitan Parks Tacoma. His time averages approximately 4-6 hours per week in an advisory role.

Mr. Pritchard asked about lessons learned for GC/CM by the school district in terms of leadership and adding another team member. Mr. Dugan replied that when Design-Bid-Build is used too long it is very difficult to transition to GC/CM mentality in terms of terminology associated with going to bid to negotiated scope and fee as a builder is typically outside the team versus being inside the team. That mentality is the most difficult to change for individuals involved in Bid-Build. However, the Central Kitsap School District has not had many large projects over the years and consequently that difficulty does not exist. Those differences are most apparent when negotiating fees and resolving issues. During the last six major projects, he had trouble learning how to be open, honest, transparent, humble, and vulnerable with his builder partner. Unless it is natural to the person, this is not a natural process. Teaching others how to work in a safe space is one of the greatest lessons that are taught through the GC/CM process. It is also different from a Design-Build environment.

Mr. Pritchard said some PRC members have learned that GC/CM can help with open book accounting for large projects for the community. He encouraged the district to leverage that experience and demonstrate success to the community to enable the district to pass future bonds.

Mr. Gimmestad asked about any community concerns conveyed about the GC/CM delivery method and the proper use of funds. Ms. Shoemaker commented on a discussion acknowledging the need to consider a way to ensure the School Board and the community understands the GC/CM process, as well as providing a contrast comparison between the two delivery methods of Design-Bid-Build and GC/CM and expound on the benefits experienced. The team has received some questions and takes advantage of those opportunities to share information about the benefits of GC/CM. Many people are beginning to understand the methodology. There has not been any reluctance or resistance, but more communication is important so that the community understands the benefits.

Mr. Dobyms asked whether the district views the community as an advocate for the project as the bond passage was close. Ms. Shoemaker said the district views the community as an advocate as the district failed to pass levies for many years. It was not until 2011 when the district passed several project levies. The bond passage is somewhat of a testament to how well the community has been envisioning the 2011 capital budget levy. Some concerns were conveyed about the bond because of the required 60% majority while acknowledgment of the need because of funding impossibility for large projects without a bond.

Mr. Newell added that the district failed to pass a bond in 2003. The 2011 bond received 52% support. Execution of the first phase of the long-range plan over the last five years has increased that support 60%. The district believes it is improving and receiving much more community support.

Dave McVicker added that in 1992, the district did not complete several projects on the capital project list. Over 60 plus presentations throughout the community generated questions about those unfinished projects. Since the 2011 passage of the capital projects levy, the district has continually communicated, "Promises made, promises kept."

Jon Lebo asked the applicants to speak to communicating to the community, the Board's understanding of alternative public works delivery, and the level of support by the Board.

Mr. McVicker responded that when the district prepared for the 2011 bond, the district sought the assistance of several individuals involved in operations at the nearby Naval base and from Mark Gaines from the Washington State Department of Transportation, who were both experienced in Design-Bid-Build, as well as with projects on the base that utilized alternative delivery methods. Mr. Newell added that many members of the Board are Navy engineers or are from Navy disciplines. Mr. McVicker said the district has experienced some very interesting fiscal challenges since 2007 with

several elementary schools, reduction of over \$3 million annually from several budgets, and the temporary loss of impact fee funds. Given the information to understand what was occurring, the Board always asked questions and provided good support. The district also formed a Community Finance Committee and upon completion of the 2011 capital project levy, the group asked the Board to set up a thorough program review group. Each quarter, a review group of facility managers, construction professionals, and developers meet and review activities over the last three months and activities planned for the next three months. The Community Finance Committee has also been involved and was instrumental in pursuing alternative public works.

Mr. Hillinger noted that Mark Gaines is the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Headquarters Construction Alternative Project Delivery Program Manager and serves as the primary contact for Parametrix.

Mr. Lebo acknowledged the size of the project, complexities, and the aggressive schedule given the site challenges. He asked about the level of authority the day-to-day project team would have for change orders and the level requiring approval by the School Board, primarily because of the importance of acting in a timely manner. Mr. Newell reported the program moved decision-making from the central office to the program office. His authority is equal to the Superintendent and the office has the ability to work with the Board within a matter of days for any changes. Any requirement to change the authority level for both he and the Superintendent could occur. The Board has a history of approving project decisions from previous projects. Although, he is not concerned, the process might need to evolve to change the threshold level. However, up to this point, the Board has always supported the decisions made to date.

Mr. Dugan noted the district would also enact a standing Thursday or Friday approval meeting for change orders to ensure the mechanics are in place to handle those issues.

Mr. Lebo asked about the dollar threshold for Board approval for change orders. Mr. Newell said the threshold is currently \$40,000.

Panel Chair Gimmestad invited public comments.

Kevin McCain with Skanska, commented on the role of Parametrix for project management and as a GC/CM advisor. Skanska has constructed four GC/CM K-12 projects with Parametrix and experienced firsthand how Parametrix is a highly capable firm. Parametrix worked with a school district with little GC/CM experience and successfully turned the school district into a successful user of GC/CM. Of importance to the PRC is how Parametrix is a steward of the GC/CM process. The firm is highly qualified.

Shannon Thompson with Parametrix, said he is a member of the community and lives within the Central Kitsap School District. The community supports the projects because of the district's insight to identify the issues that are present on the campuses. The entire community within the district is receiving a benefit and not just one high school over another. All three high schools in the community are benefitting. Delivering the projects successfully is important to ensure the success of the next bond. As a community member, he is extremely excited, and as a member of Parametrix, he is thrilled to be part of the team.

Panel Chair Gimmestad invited the panel's deliberations.

Steve Crawford said he believes the proposal is a good project for the school district because of the importance of the project to the district, to the community, and for future bonds. He also supports the addition of the team members who have the resources and are able to ensure a successful project outcome. It will be important to have the GC/CM onboard early to assist in phasing and working through the complexities of the project.

Mr. Peterson said he believes the project is appropriate for GC/CM.

Tom Peterson moved, seconded by Mike Shinn, to approve the Central Kitsap School District Central Kitsap High School/Middle School Replacement application for GC/CM project delivery.

Mr. Shinn remarked that as the representative for specialty contractors on the PRC, the school district and Parametrix should consider the ECCM/MCCM elements of the project because of the large size of the project. If the goal is to involve the contractor and reduce the budget, it is important to have electrical and mechanical contractors onsite to help the general contractor because once design is completed, any additional ideas/suggestions from mechanical and electrical subcontractors would likely not result in any changes to design at that point.

Motion carried unanimously.

Panel Chair Gimmestad recessed the meeting at 9:45 a.m.

Panel Chair Jon Lebo reconvened the meeting at 10:02 a.m.

Central Kitsap School District – Olympic High School Addition & Renovation – GC/CM

Panel Chair Lebo reviewed the presentation format to consider the GC/CM application from Central Kitsap School District for the Olympic High School Addition & Renovation project. Panel members Curt Gimmestad, Tom Peterson, Rusty Pritchard, Mike Shinn, Bill Dobyns, Steve Crawford, and Joe Stowell provided self-introduction. Six affirmative votes are necessary to approve the application.

Jim Dugan, Project Manager, Parametrix, thanked members for agreeing to schedule a special session of the PRC to consider the applications from Central Kitsap School District. He introduced project team members David McVicker, Superintendent, Doug Newell, Executive Director, Business & Operations, Robin Shoemaker, Director of Capital Projects, and Dan Miller, Project Manager, Central Kitsap School District; Gladys Ly-au Young and Rick Sundberg, SKL Architects; and Howard Hillinger, Dan Cody, and Shannon Thompson, Parametrix. Not in attendance are design team members Doug Holen and Graehm Wallace, Perkins Coie.

Mr. Dugan reviewed the project scope, schedule, budget for the Olympic High School project, and the GC/CM delivery method qualifications of the school district.

Olympic High School (OHS) located between Bremerton and Silverdale was constructed in 1979 with improvements completed in 1989 and 1991. The school sits on 37 acres with the school separated into three sections of Unit 1, Unit 2, and Unit 3. Unit 2 is the middle unit scheduled for removal and replacement while Units 1, 3, and other functions remain in operation. Unit 2 is a two-story structure requiring some additional work around the building in addition to the removal and replacement of the structure.

A bus loop configuration and some site work are necessary on the east side to improve current access and ingress for families, students, visitors, faculty, buses, and emergency vehicles. On the west side of the structure are portables and other site work that would be included in the scope of the project. During the project, stadium improvements are also scheduled. The complication of demolishing and replacing the middle structure while maintaining the operations of the school during construction activities requires phasing. Complexities associated with mechanical and electrical include power from one side feeding through the building to the other units, as well as air handlers that serve multiple buildings in addition to underground and above ground utilities between the three structures. Services will need to be disconnected and relocated.

Mr. Dugan referred to the budget, which closely mirrors the budget information contained in the application. The schedule for this project is on a faster track. The new structure is scheduled to open in September 2018 requiring condensed timeframes. Pending approval of the application, the RFP is scheduled for release on June 13. The primary goal is to begin construction by summer 2017 with the school opening fall 2018.

The RCW requires projects to meet one of the five criteria. The project team believes the project meets four criteria of complex scheduling and phasing to remove, demolish, and replace Unit 2 located on an occupied site in coordination with onsite and offsite traffic and emergency response.

Having the involvement of the GC/CM is important in considering costs of inflation, maintaining onsite programs, participating in the design phase, and overseeing logistics of planning for occupying and implementing the project.

Other factors include storm water management and the continuous operation of district-level facilities. The district is partnering with Kitsap County, which often struggles with timing on permits. The district is actively working with the county to expedite permitting. Other important components include safety, cost controls, and minimizing the impact to the community because of the higher level of sensitivity. The district's leadership and team are playing close attention by ensuring a higher level of community involvement and sensitivity to community concerns.

The project is one of two projects for the Central Kitsap School District that would use the GC/CM project delivery method for the first time. District leadership is scheduled to attend GC/CM on June 13-14. Not all personnel are scheduled to attend because of limited seating. Mr. Miller is scheduled to attend the next GC/CM training. The consultant team comprised of Mr. Holen, Mr. Hillinger, Mr. Dugan, and Mr. Wallace are the heart of the GC/CM experience. SKL Architects has extensive negotiated private sector experience but limited GC/CM experience.

Mr. Dugan reviewed the project organizational chart. Mr. Miller is the Project Manager and has extensive public agency experience and negotiated work. He is well known in the industry.

Mr. Dugan said he would serve as in a program GC/CM advisory role rather than as the PM. Mr. Newell assumes a much larger role on the Olympic project.

Mr. Dugan advised that his time commitment is 8-10 hours a week for advice and counsel. If more project management oversight is required, Mr. Thompson will provide the necessary support. The combination should be sufficient for the project. If not, additional support would include expanded project management by Mr. Hillinger's group.

Mr. Dugan said he serves as the primary GC/CM lead with Mr. Hillinger and Mr. Newell serving as backfill. Mr. Hillinger has a number of years of extensive experience in GC/CM. The experience level, capacity, and availability as needed for the project would be provided by the team.

The project is funded with an appropriate budget. The project has satisfied RCW criteria, project management plan and lines of authority, and the level of managing costs is in place. The experience level of the team meets and exceeds risk management of the project. The team has the capacity, continuity, and the experience. From a program level, the team considered both projects for GC/CM project delivery for master planning at a program level for the support that's needed for both projects.

The component that is still uncertain at this time is the demolition and removal of Unit 2 without affecting Units 1 and 3. The team is currently working on the concept, programming, and transitioning to schematic design.

Panel Chair Lebo invited questions from the panel.

Mr. Gimmestad commented on the uncertainty associated with the project even when issues have been investigated. He asked how comfortable the team is with risk contingencies and other contingencies in the budget to manage those unknowns, as well as at the stage of a negotiated MACC.

Mr. Dugan said the percentage basis of the dollars allocated for risk management against the MACC for the project closely resembles the percentage used for the Stadium High School project, which involved 15 new issues daily. The team is utilizing a model that has been used successfully on previous projects.

Mr. Newell added that while the building's budget is \$38.5 million, other projects on the campus associated with sidewalks and other site improvements are included in a total district budget of \$45 million. The capital fund includes over \$14 million in reserve that would be available. The project includes a contingency line for design and a contingency line for construction totaling a significant dollar amount in addition to reserve dollars available to the district.

Mr. Pritchard asked whether the district has discussed with Parametrix the need for additional support if needed, and if so, in what areas of project management assistance would be required for the projects for GC/CM delivery. Ms. Shoemaker

said the district has discussed the issue but has not addressed the specifics of how that assistance might be manifested. The district acknowledges that additional supplementation might be necessary to support the project. However, the district believes that the necessary resources are assigned correctly to support the project, but is also ready to respond if additional support should be required.

Mr. Dugan added that he is confident that when work commences, there will be as many unknowns as knowns resulting in a construction body observation inspection support role to augment the team during that particular phase of work.

Mr. Pritchard asked Mr. Miller whether his role would serve as the single point of contact for negotiations and change orders with the contractor. Mr. Miller affirmed that would be his role. Mr. Pritchard commented that he wants to ensure that the appropriate contingency line is assigned in terms of the difference between the GC/CM contingency and the owner contingency. Mr. Miller acknowledged his understanding of the difference.

Mr. Dugan said his role during the project is to link closely with Mr. Miller as those steps occur and to use best practices as used in prior GC/CM projects.

Ms. Shoemaker added that she would be working closely with Mr. Miller as the Project Manager similar to her close work with other project managers. Once a majority of the negotiation has been completed and most pieces are place, she would review the information to ensure the contract is ready for recommendation to the leadership.

Mr. Peterson spoke to the project's unknowns. According to the information, the budget for the project is approximately half of the budget on a square foot basis compared to the first project approved previously. He asked why there is such a difference. Mr. Newell replied that the budget per square foot is similar for both projects. The initial budget for the project as approved by the School Board was \$33 million for 60,000 square feet equating to a \$260-\$280 MACC cost per square foot in addition to a 46% premium to support all soft costs. Those same numbers were used for the Central Kitsap campus, which was 325,000 square feet. Olympic High School is approximately 80,000 square feet. Since initial approval of the budget, the district added \$7 million to the budget line and has now qualified for state construction assistance. At the time the budget was developed, the district did not qualify for state construction assistance. The planning numbers use the same basic dollar for square foot costs; however, site work is different with the Central Kitsap campus having \$20 million in site work versus Olympic High School at \$2 million for site work.

Mr. Gimmestad referred to SKL Architects' participation in the project and asked for information on the conversations regarding the challenges of interfacing with the GC/CM. Mr. Dugan spoke to lessons learned working with a design team that hasn't worked with the GC/CM and acknowledgement of the push/pull that occurs as the process moves to GMP and the GC/CM's desire to maintain a higher contingency level while the designers want more programming and a lower contingency. That struggle is critically important and unique to the GC/CM project delivery as opposed to a Bid-Build. He has not seen any evidence of that struggle in terms of the conversations so far.

Mr. Sundberg said much of the work that he's completed has been private, but has always been negotiated. Based on the first briefing with Mr. Dugan, the project appears to be a more encompassing process, which he is looking forward to as the negotiated process has assisted in very complex buildings by having the general contractor and the major subs onboard early when sorting through project details. That kind of process and day-to-day negotiation with the general and the subs to align all the pieces has proved to be a successful model. Those types of projects were a rewarding process after all the pieces aligned.

Mr. Shinn asked whether seismic requirements would be necessary for the remaining units when the middle unit is removed. Ms. Young said no seismic upgrades are planned for Units 1 and 3. Mr. Newell said all the structures are stand-alone buildings connected by hallways. Each building is at a different elevation in terms of placement. Unit 3 is receiving a seismic upgrade this year. The contractor is scheduled to begin work next week. Mr. Thompson has spent 70% of his time on the Olympic campus managing that project.

Mr. Peterson asked whether Mr. Miller is participating in GC/CM training. Mr. Miller affirmed that he plans to attend the next scheduled GC/CM training, but has participated in GC/CM training earlier in his career when he worked for the

Sverdrup Corporation. The City of Bremerton completed a GC/CM process for a museum in the City, as well as for a police station and the Norm Dicks Government Center. He is familiar with the GC/CM process.

Mr. Peterson asked Mr. Miller whether he was the project manager for the projects. Mr. Miller affirmed he was the City of Bremerton's Project Manager.

Panel Chair Lebo said that the schedule for the type of work appears to be aggressive for the size of the project. He asked about any commitments that might affect the project should more problems be encountered that might extend the project schedule. Ms. Shoemaker said the district has conveyed to the community the project schedule and wants to keep the community informed in case shifts cause changes to the schedule. Projects for K-12 evolve around the school calendar and consequently moving people during summers and ramping up the activities at the start of a semester is critical to maintain the schedule. Timing is optimal during the end of summer prior to the start of the next school year. That is a goal the district is striving to achieve while acknowledging the schedule is aggressive. The district is tracking on schedule and knows that the GC/CM partnership supports achieving the schedule and informs the district of any gaps in the schedule to assist the district in informing the community.

Panel Chair Lebo asked whether the design team's subconsultants have any GC/CM experience. Ms. Young advised that another architect assigned to the Central Kitsap High School/Middle School team has GC/CM experience. Quantum Consulting Engineers serving as SKL Architects' structural engineer also has GC/CM experience.

Mr. Pritchard asked whether any early site packages are envisioned for the project. Mr. Newell advised that Mr. Miller recently joined the team. The district had some existing projects for site work on campus and those projects would be tied together under the leadership of SKL Architects with some early executions planned in fall that are preparatory as the project is readied, such as parking improvements and design packages that would be awarded outside the GC/CM. Integration of early work already designed and ready for bid release with the proposed application is anticipated. The intent is to hire the GC/CM as the overall site lead to ensure smooth integration of the different pieces.

Ms. Shoemaker said the district is also considering building occupancy and moving some of the occupants to ready the building for the work to reduce impacts to the overall operation of the site.

Mr. Pritchard commented that it appears there is site work underway by others who are not part of this project. Mr. Newell replied that Sitewise, a civil engineering company, was hired to begin design site work. Sitewise serves as the sub for the project. The integration layer is the civil team across all the projects as a prime on one but as a sub on others.

Ms. Shoemaker said the arrangement was coordinated in that fashion because of site work for the Olympic campus during the 2011 capital project levy. At that time, it was unknown whether the bond would pass as the district was committed to delivering those site improvements. Once the bond passed, the projects were integrated to the extent possible.

Mr. Pritchard expressed appreciation for the clarification.

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

Panel Chair Lebo invited panel deliberation and action.

Mr. Stowell commented on the questions asked previously of the first project about the ability to complete two GC/CM projects. He reiterated his concern as to the ability to complete two GC/CM projects at an appropriate level of staffing to complete the projects concurrently.

Mr. Pritchard said he understands the level of effort that's required. With respect to the term "GC/CM advisor" as stated in the application, he indicated that it speaks more to a "GC/CM Consultant" based on his perspective in terms of fulfilling the roles for advice and advisory. Although he understands Mr. Stowell's concerns, he is comfortable with the application as long as the owner has in-house experience to manage a construction project and receives advice from consultants who have a business plan allowing for any surge.

Mr. Stowell added that he is comfortable with the presentation and the ability of the District to complete the project successfully. He wanted to ensure his concern was on the record since he expressed similar concerns during the first presentation.

Mr. Crawford echoed some of the same concerns, but agreed that overall, the complex project during operation of the school would benefit by having a GC/CM onboard to help ensure success of the project versus a Design-Bid-Build process.

Tom Peterson moved, seconded by Rusty Pritchard, to approve the Central Kitsap School District application for the Olympic High School Addition & Renovation project for GC/CM project delivery. Motion carried unanimously.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Chair Gimmestad adjourned the meeting at 10:36 a.m.