

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY REVIEW BOARD

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

Northwest Carpenters Facility
25120 Pacific Highway South
Kent, Washington

Meeting Minutes-Amended

May 26, 2016

Panel Members Present:

John Palewicz, University of Washington
Tom Peterson, Hoffman Construction Company
Rob Warnaca, Mortenson Construction
Steve Crawford, Issaquah School District
Vicki Barron-Sumann, BarSum Consulting LLC
David Beaudine, Heery International
Curt Gimmestad, Absher Construction
Rustin Hall, ALSC Architects, P.S. (Telecon)
Jon Lebo, University of Washington
Darron Pease, Pease & Sons
Joshua Swanson, United National Operating Engineers

Jonathon Hartung, SHKS Architects P.S.
Linneth Riley-Hall, Sound Transit
Ato Apiafi, Ato Apiafi Architects
Mike Shinn, Shinn Mechanical
Chuck Davis, Seattle Central College
Matthew Lane, McGranahan Architects
Jeanne Rynne, The Evergreen State College
Rusty Pritchard, Washington State University
Jim Burt, King County
Kurt Boyd, Valley Electric

Staff, Guests, Presenters

Danelle Bessett, Department of Enterprise Services
Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Ed Lee, Northshore School District #417
Chris Hirst, Pacifica Law Group
Forrest Miller, Lake Washington School District
Brian Buck, Lake Washington School District
Greg Brown, OAC Services
Ned Wendle, Mead School District
Heidi Pierce, MMEC Architecture & Interiors
Dave Flynn, Cornerstone General Contractors

Ryan Fujiwara, Northshore School District #417
Lee Hall, Northshore School District #417
Doug Wilson, Northshore School District #417
Dr. Traci Pierce, Lake Washington School District
Eric Smith, OAC Services
Pat Sprague, Lake Washington School District
Dan Chandler, OAC Services
Wayne Leonard, Mead School District
Doug Mitchell, MMEC Architecture & Interiors
Edward Peters, Edmonds School District

Welcome, Introductions & Rule Review

Chair Curt Gimmestad called the CPARB Capital Project Review Committee meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

Chair Gimmestad reviewed the agenda of one project application and two agency certifications.

All members provided self-introduction.

Chair Gimmestad reported his term as Chair ends at the end of June. John Palewicz, as Vice Chair, assumes the Chair position in July. Members have an opportunity to nominate and elect a Vice Chair.

Linneth Riley-Hall noted that since Mr. Palewicz represents an owner position, the Vice Chair should be a non-owner representative.

Tom Peterson arrived.

John Palewicz nominated Rustin Hall as Vice Chair. Jonathan Hartung seconded the nomination.

Mike Shinn nominated Tom Peterson as Vice Chair.

Chair Gimmestad advised that Mr. Peterson's term is ending and would be ineligible as his position has been filled effective July 1.

Mr. Palewicz advised that he spoke to Mr. Hall about his nomination. He distributed a letter of interest from Mr. Hall. Mr. Hall is attending a conference in San Diego and is participating by telecon. Mr. Hall represents the private sector as the President and CEO of ALSC Architects, as well as serving on the PRC for several years. Mr. Hall practices in eastern Washington. Within the recent past, officer positions have not been represented by individuals from eastern Washington. Mr. Hall has committed to attending PRC meetings.

Mr. Hall thanked Mr. Palewicz for submitting his nomination. As the CEO of ALSC Architects, he has more flexibility in terms of his schedule and is committed to serving the PRC.

By acclamation, Rustin Hall was elected to serve as Vice Chair.

Chair Gimmestad recognized Mr. Peterson for his service on the PRC. He volunteered to serve on the June 9 special panel meeting. Mr. Peterson has dedicated much time and effort to both the PRC as well as to the CPARB. He thanked Mr. Peterson for his service on behalf of PRC and CPARB.

Chair Gimmestad recognized Rusty Pritchard for his service as well. He is also attending the June 9 special panel meeting. Mr. Pritchard often led many of the panels. The thanked Mr. Pritchard on behalf of PRC and CPARB for his contribution and for furthering alternative procurement models.

Chair Gimmestad spoke to prior conversations by PRC members on what qualifies a public institution to become certified as a public agency in terms of internal or external support. At the last CPARB meeting, the opportunity to present information on agency certification for discussion by CPARB members was shortened because of other agenda items. PRC's previous conversations centered on in-house support versus external support when considering an agency's certification. He encouraged a conversation about CPARB's guidance concerning agency certification and experience level. His view for agency certification should be weighed individually by application with consideration as to how well an agency is able to demonstrate its abilities from a public agency position regardless of the level of either internal or external support. It is important to consider whether the agency can deliver alternative procurement models regardless of whether the team is internal or external.

Mr. Peterson commented that external consultants should not automatically preclude an agency from receiving agency certification. Each application represents a different situation.

Mr. Palewicz shared some historical background. In 2007, when RCW 39.10 was nearing expiration, many provisions were added to the legislation to include the addition of the PRC. At that time, the discussion centered on concerns that as projects move forward, they would be successful using alternative public works to avoid any negative backlash against alternative public works, as well as affecting reauthorization of the law. The discussion of the review committee centered on a requirement that all projects should be reviewed by the committee to ensure the project is able to meet the requirements. At that time, he shared how the University of Washington had completed many alternative public works projects, demonstrated the availability of in-house expertise, and that it would not make sense to apply for individual project reviews. That conversation focused on agency certification. At the time, some legislative language did differentiate between project approval and agency certification approval. Language for project approval included the agency having personnel or consultants with the ability to complete the project. Agency certification language only addressed in-house personnel and did not address consultants. It appeared the provisions were geared to ensure an agency understood alternative public works from the leadership to those managing the projects. The intent was to have the experience throughout the agency. Today, situations arising with school districts speak to the difficulty many are facing to retain consistent personnel because districts are subject to levies for construction projects. Many school districts rely on external consultants as part of the project team, and that reality is now the nature of the business. Mr. Palewicz admitted that he might have previously considered situations in a black and white perspective for agency certification. However, after discussions by the CPARB and the PRC, it appears it is important to consider how well information and knowledge of alternative public works is embedded within the organization and how effectively an organization can use external consultants to augment district staff. Understanding the realities of the situation, he now considers the full depth of an organization's capabilities.

Kurt Boyd asked about the ruling from CPARB during its last discussion because he drew a different conclusion. His agency is small and he's appreciative of the need to supplement external expertise. However, that was not the conclusion he derived CPARB's discussion.

Mr. Gimmestad indicated that he's unsure whether he could provide any clarification in terms of the previous CPARB discussion. The Board has discussed the issue in the past. He was hopeful more dialogue would have occurred at the last Board meeting. However, during that short conversation, he shared how PRC members considered each presentation and based the decision on the comfort level of the body to determine whether the public agency should be approved or disapproved for certification regardless of whether the public body supplemented support with consultants. He believes as individual members, it's important for each member to evaluate the application to determine whether the public agency can successfully implement the delivery model.

Ms. Riley-Hall referred to prior minutes from a CPARB meeting as a resource for additional information. Several years ago, the Board conveyed how the PRC should evaluate each application individually and that an agency should not automatically be disqualified if the agency had consultant assistance. Rather, PRC members should consider the structure of the public agency to ensure whether services provided by the consultant team would continue should contract suddenly terminate. It was important to consider the public body's structure to continue with a GC/CM process. For example, if a public owner is only surrounded by consultants with GC/CM or Design-Build knowledge and responsible for the decision-making process, the PRC would evaluate the application differently than if the public owner had both in-house staff with GC/CM knowledge, experience, and consultant support.

Chair Gimmestad recalled that the minutes spoke to Ms. Riley-Hall's recollection. CPARB's conversation did not speak to decisions based on black or white circumstances but rather the application should be evaluated in its entirety and how it is presented in terms of the agency's ability to deliver the alternative procurement in the timeframe of the agency's certification. It was not a yes or no answer relative to in-house or external expertise and support.

Mr. Boyd asked whether CPARB proposed some new language related to the issue that was presented but not approved by the Board.

Ms. Riley-Hall affirmed that new language was proposed; however, CPARB believed PRC did not need the new language and that decisions for each application should be based on each individual PRC member's experience and expertise with the delivery method.

Chuck Davis commented that a similar issue exists for individual project applications. Recently, PRC denied a project application. The agency reapplied and PRC approved the application because the agency had supplemented additional support by a consultant. The concern surrounds agency receiving project approval and deciding that consultant support is no longer needed. The same situation could occur with an agency seeking certification. An agency application could include a team of consultants and after receiving certification, the agency elects not to use consultants. The Legislature enacted legislation to protect citizens of the state in terms of alternative public works. At some point, he assumes GC/CM, DB, and other alternative methods would become accepted as mainstream eliminating the need for PRC reviews. The market will help owners decide what is appropriate. However, at this point, members need to consider what the owners are conveying at face value in terms of the intent to manage an alternative delivery method. It can be difficult for PRC to forecast those actions unless there is prior experience with an agency that indicated one direction and took another.

Mr. Lebo referred to the comment regarding whether CPARB or PRC has an oversight role. He understands the RCW does not provide the PRC with oversight of individual projects after a decision approving an alternative public works project. However, under the provision for certification of an agency, legislation dictates that the PRC based on a public hearing, has the right to revoke the certification of an agency if it finds the agency has not performed in the public's interest. It appears that when the PRC approves an agency certification, the committee has oversight ability when it finds the agency is not performing appropriately or applying the RCW appropriately. In those circumstances, PRC has a greater role to play for the public good than it does on an individual project basis.

Jeanne Rynne commented on the difficulty of many public agencies not maintaining continuous staffing between bond issues. Although those situations often occur, large school districts are able pass bond issues affording those districts more flexibility. As a former applicant to the PRC, she doesn't perceive the project review process as onerous for maintaining or denying certification and is unsure why submittals of project applications would be problematic.

Chair Gimmestad noted that to some degree it involves time and effort. Agencies are often able to prove experience and capability of successfully completing projects utilizing alternative delivery methods.

Mr. Pritchard agreed with Ms. Riley-Hall's interpretation of the conversation by the CPARB. He also is appreciative of what Mr. Palewicz shared.

Mr. Palewicz said that based on the minutes from CPARB meetings, the Board has conveyed its trust to the PRC to make the right decision on projects and agencies through review of applications and discussion rather than issuing a black and white rule with strict guidelines.

Chair Gimmestad thanked members for the opportunity to serve as Chair over the last year. Members thanked and recognized Curt Gimmestad for his service.

Northshore School District #417 – Certification – GC/CM

Chair Gimmestad reviewed the presentation format to consider Northshore School District #417 certification application for GC/CM. A meeting quorum of the PRC is required to consider and render a decision on the application. Members in attendance included Curt Gimmestad, Jonathon Hartung, John Palewicz, Steve Crawford, Tom Peterson, Linneth Riley-Hall, Ato Apiafi, Chuck Davis, Rusty Pritchard, Rob Warnaca, Darron Pease, David Beaudine, Jon Lebo, Mike Shinn, Jeanne Rynne, Vicki Barron-Sumann, Jim Burt, Kurt Boyd, Josh Swanson, and Matt Lane.

Rusty Pritchard excluded himself from participating as he serves as a consultant serving the Northshore School District.

Ed Lee, Planning and Design Administrator, introduced Doug Wilson, Lee Hall, Planning and Design Administrator, and Ryan Fujiwara, Executive Director Support Services, Northshore School District #41.

Mr. Lee thanked the PRC for approval of previous projects. The GC/CM process has been used successfully in the District's capital program.

The Northshore School District serves 20,000 students in 30 schools over a 61-square mile area. The District is surrounded by the Everett School District to the north, Lake Washington School District to the south, Riverview to the east, and Shoreline and Edmonds School Districts to the west. The District covers a large area creating many challenges in terms of demographic growth. The District's newest school nearing completion is North Creek High School located in the north area of the District where much of the growth is occurring. Within the 2018 bond issue, the District is planning a new school on a site acquired by the District, as well as capacity additions to Skyview Junior High School and Canyon Creek Elementary School.

The District's GC/CM history began when the Legislature authorized K-12 to utilize GC/CM for projects. The District was one of the first school districts to complete a GC/CM project with the completion of the Northshore Junior High School followed by other GC/CM projects. The District fast tracked some projects creating an overlap in active projects. The District's bond cycle is every four years. The District has successfully passed bond issues enabling the District to complete design at the front-end followed by construction documents anticipating passage of the bond and then the bidding process and construction. The model has worked well for the District and it demonstrates the community's support of the District's method for building and renovating schools using the GC/CM delivery method.

The District has employed a teaming arrangement with school planners and construction managers. Five team members have worked on the projects over a span of 11 to 21 years. Mr. Lee reported he worked on the Northshore Junior High School with George Bullock, Construction Manager. He and Mr. Bullock are nearing completion of the North Creek High School representing a team of GC/CM experienced personnel. The District leadership began with Dan Vaught

serving as the Executive Director of Support Services and the Capital Projects Director. Mr. Vaught also was a former member of CPARB and a member of PRC. Ryan Fujiwara serves as the Executive Director of Support Services and Karen Mooseker is the Director of Capital Projects. Ms. Mooseker was unable to attend the presentation because of a family emergency. The District has a transition process at the leadership level and stability of the core members working on GC/CM projects.

The District's Enrolling Demographic Task Force is a component of the public process to determine projects to construct. The process was initiated in 2000. Recently, the School Board approved the recommendation to build a phased project for 1,200 students on the Maltby property comprised of a shared common facility for K-5 students and 6th and 8th grade students. The Board also approved capacity additions at Skyview Junior High School and Canyon Creek Elementary School.

The next work by the Task Force is bond planning and consideration of a facilities survey to identify needs. The needs will be prioritized and a recommendation presented to the School Board for approval. If approved, the bond will placed on the ballot in February 2018.

Mr. Lee referred to a letter of support from Dan Vaught, former Executive Director of Support Services.

Three years ago, the District submitted an application for project approval for North Creek High School. The project is the first GC/CM project that included the bidding of ECCM/MCCM, hybrid geo-thermal, as well as fast tracking the project because of the Oso landslide. The approval process in Snohomish County was backed up necessitating a need to keep the project on track. The District was successful in working with the county and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to ensure the project remained on track.

Mr. Lee displayed a timeline demonstrating how a project proceeds from School Board approval through schematic design, construction documents/design development, and RFP. He outlined how the GC/CM process for the North Creek High School project was one of the first ECCM/MCCM projects saving the District one year and \$5-\$7 million in savings.

Northshore Junior High School was the District's first GC/CM demonstration projects authorized by HB 1080 during the 1999 regular session. At that time, John Lynch with General Administration assisted the District, as well as Lake Washington School District.

For the District, GC/CM is an essential tool for producing continuous and successful GC/CM projects. The District has a core group of individuals experienced in GC/CM projects and has successfully completed seven GC/CM projects over 15 years costing \$226 million. Today's complexity is compounded politically with the state reducing class sizes, increasing all day kindergarten, complex permitting, and building complexity increasing to achieve energy efficiency and reducing building envelopes. The GC/CM delivery method is the District's preferred method because it provides more options to the team to solve many challenges and problems inherent in projects.

Mr. Lee thanked the PRC for considering the application and he is hopeful the District receives agency certification.

Chair Gimmestad invited questions from members.

Ato Apiafi asked about the growth in staff with GC/CM experience since the last 10 years.

Mr. Lee reported that George Bulloch is a Civil Engineer and worked with him on the District's first GC/CM project. Both he and Mr. Bulloch have completed numerous GC/CM projects. Shelly Henderson is the Budget Coordinator and has been with the District for 21 years. Ms. Henderson works closely with the State Auditor and provides guidance to the team. Mike Funis is a Project Planner and has been with the District for the last 10 years. He worked on the Woodinville High School GC/CM project. Mr. Funis formerly worked for UPS. Ed Thomson has been with the District for the last 20 years as a Construction Manager. He began his career as a science teacher and transitioned to the construction industry. Lee Hall formerly worked for Amazon and has completed three GC/CM hospital projects as an architect.

Mr. Hall reported that in 2012 he worked as an architect for a design firm and completed two hospital projects in eastern Washington in the Tri-Cities area and one project in Seattle for Virginia Mason. Both facilities were occupied facilities during construction.

Mr. Palewicz said he is impressed with the continuity of GC/CM projects completed over the years. A number of staff members are contract staff members who have been with the District for over 10 years.

Mr. Lee said many of the team members are similar to a family unit. They have been with the District for many years. Because the District operates on a four-year bond cycle, the option of contracting with consultants on an as-needed basis was beneficial to meet the workload. The District has been fortunate in passing all bond measures to enable consultant assistance during the years. Mr. Palewicz commented on the critical nature of the information and experience in terms of how much of the expertise is embedded within the organization and how much is contracted. Contracted expertise could leave at a moment's notice.

Mr. Lee acknowledged the question concerning institutional memory and assured members that because the group has been together for many years, much of the knowledge relies on institutional memory. One of the roles Mr. Hall has is performance specifications whereby the District has developed guidelines and specifications, but needs something more prescriptive for a building envelop and its performance. During construction of the North Creek High School, the team learned how critical a month could be to the schedule. A GC/CM & ECCM/MCCM roundtable process helped the team arrive at the right solution faster, and through that process, the District learned about the importance of being more definitive about what it wanted. That effort will be employed during the next bond cycle of projects.

Mr. Davis asked about the relative percentage of the different delivery methods and whether the District is utilizing GC/CM exclusively. Mr. Lee replied that the 2014 bond issue totaled approximately \$180 million and included two new high schools using the GC/CM delivery method. The upcoming bond forecasts work on occupied campuses and the potential for more GC/CM projects. It is likely a majority of the bond issue would be delivered by the GC/CM delivery method. The District has completed successful Design-Bid-Build projects. However, when a project occurred on an occupied campus, the District preferred to pursue a GC/CM delivery method but did not have the time to complete the process for approval.

Ms. Riley-Hall said that of the five team members with the experience, three members are consultants. She asked how the District transfers that knowledge from the three consultants to District staff members. Mr. Lee advised of a weekly meeting between planners and construction managers with attendance by the Director of Support Services, risk management, and/or technology. The meetings review challenges on job sites, building issues, standards, vendor support, and on-the-ground feedback. The verbal exchange can be lively. During the bond cycle process, changes or addendums were incorporated into the standards. The District uses templates for processes for awards, bidding, and documents. More personnel are learning through the District's process. Most of the information is available on the capital projects server.

Ms. Riley-Hall asked about any lessons learned from the early projects. Mr. Lee said that as the team developed, the type of GC/CM changed. When the first two GC/CM projects were implemented with assistance from two different consulting firms, the District sought assistance from experienced consultants in pre-construction to help the District through the process and answer questions. Today, in the current round of projects and because the funds are bond scheduled, the District is seeking a GC/CM with strong production values and a good network of subcontractors to ensure accurate estimates in an uncertain market. Because the District has obtained sufficient knowledge in the preconstruction process, the District is seeking a grounded K-12 builder responsive to the District's needs because of changing conditions/needs. The District has learned many things with respect to scheduling and how it can be adjusted by working together as a team to solve problems. Because the District has an experienced GC/CM team and trust, the District is able to play offense and can drive the building in terms of what the District wants for increasing energy performance. Those aspects are a game changer for using GC/CM.

Mr. Lebo noted that the District has a long successful history of alternative public works and GC/CM projects. The District also has OAC Services as a consultant with expertise. As the District has gleaned so much knowledge, he asked what the District envisions OAC's role moving forward. Mr. Lee said the District likes working with OAC Services because the firm is very experienced and has a wide range of knowledge, as well as expertise in the market. When the District worked on the North Creek High School project, the District believed the process was becoming somewhat stale and contracted with OAC Services to provide some assistance for advice about the market. OAC served as a review/advisor providing feedback on questions or processes. The role of OAC was to assist the District to ensure the process was current. Mr. Lee said he anticipates relying on OAC for similar assistance in the future through discussions at the beginning of a project and assisting when specific issues arise. Dan Chandler lives within the school district and can be contacted easily when needed.

Mr. Warnaca asked about Ms. Mooseker's abilities and experience relative to her leadership for the organization and the ability to promote and educate others upwards and downward in the organization on GC/CM delivery, best practices, and lessons learned. Prior to joining the District in 2013, it doesn't appear Ms. Mooseker has any GC/CM experience and worked within an unrelated industry. He asked about her training in GC/CM since joining the District. Mr. Lee commented about the differences between the normal routine versus the actual routine. At this time, Ms. Mooseker does not have a formal GC/CM background or experience in GC/CM. Through the GC/CM projects, the team reports directly to Ms. Mooseker weekly and when issues arise. Ms. Mooseker is receiving hands-on GC/CM training from the core group, which is her current knowledge base. Today, the District and School Board are transitioning to 9-12 from a 10-12 system effective 2017, as well as changing high school start times. Many issues are occupying Ms. Mooseker's time. Consequently, she has made good strides in learning about GC/CM and wants to be involved in the process. The team is confident that she can be involved throughout the process.

Kurt Boyd commented that the next bond appears to fund two high schools. He asked whether the three consultants would be hired during each bond cycle or for specific projects. Mr. Lee said he is unsure as to whether the consultants are hired based on the bond cycle or by the project; however, he believes the consultants are hired by the bond as they work on other smaller projects within the District.

Chair Gimmetstad invited public comments. The PRC received a letter from Dan Vaught that was forwarded to all members previously.

Dave Flynn, President, Cornerstone General Contractors, said he lives in the Northshore School District. His business is also located in the District. The company has worked for the District over the past decade for both lump-sum contracts and GC/CM contracts. The company has completed approximately seven projects for the District. During that period, the company has seen a highly qualified and sophisticated team comprised of a blend of both long-term employees and consultants and advisors. The District has a high loyalty rate with its advisors and consultants and is very active in promoting a delivery process that is better for the school district and its taxpayers at large. He supports the application for certification for Northshore School District.

Ryan Fujiwara, Executive Director of Support Services, Northshore School District #417, shared that the presentation team did not effectively convey the knowledge available within the District. Mr. Lee has been with the District for over 15 years as the Capital Coordinator. The consultants employed by the District are not typically consultants but serve as construction managers, which assist in managing construction on sites. The consultants are funded for specific projects or through a bond. The knowledge is in-house and the District has additional support by utilizing OAC and general contractors. In-house consultants have assisted the District and served the District well. They have contributed to creating a good team when managing complicated projects. School districts don't have the luxury of being late on a project because in September when students are preparing to attend school, the district must have school doors open, which speaks to many of the challenges the school district faces when it needs to meet the needs. Another missing aspect of the presentation is some of the challenges faced by schools. The District faces many challenges and must work with five jurisdictions in addition to school regulations that may or may not be in effect. K-3 class size is a discussion underway today. All day kindergarten is another discussion. School districts must be nimble in terms of addressing student needs with facility space. The authority of GC/CM provides the district with more flexibility in providing service to a community that continues to expand. He encouraged the PRC to support agency certification.

Edward Peters, Capital Projects Director, Edmonds School District, reported PRC granted agency certification to the Edmonds School District two years ago. He has worked with the Northshore School District for more than 15 years as its neighbor immediately to the west. Mr. Lee has been invaluable in providing advice to the Edmonds School District and has visited sites to obtain documents. He would like to return the favor and there is no doubt that the School District has the structure and the capability to manage the GC/CM delivery method on an agency basis. Agency certification is a real benefit to the taxpayers because it allows a better use of the resources at the time when needed. For both those reasons, he believes the application is valid.

Chair Gimmestad invited deliberations by members.

Steve Crawford pointed out that school districts operate on two sources of funds. The first source is from state, federal, and local levy identified funds in the State General Fund, which cannot be used for capital projects. Capital project funding must come from bonds and capital levies creating a situation where funding can be difficult. In the Issaquah School District, if an employee is not a certificated or union represented employee, the employee is a classified employee with a one-year contract. While he has been with the District for the last 19 years, it begins to blur the line between a District employee versus a contract employee. When bond funding is exhausted, the contract employee may no longer have a job. However, there is still long employment history. The Issaquah School District has had one-year contract employees for capital projects for over 20 years. It often creates a gray area.

Mr. Apiafi commented on the strengths and weaknesses of the presentation. The strength is 15 years of continuity of delivering GC/CM projects. The second strength is having OAC onboard to help. The weakness is the speaker was not able to articulate convincingly the argument for not hiring GC/CM experienced staff. However, he understands the risk associated with uncertainties in passing a bond and that a decision was made to mitigate that risk. The presentation convinced him that staff is predicated on passage of the bond, and as a business owner, he understands the District mitigated the risk by not hiring fulltime staff. He supports the application as the presentation assured him that the weakness also had a solution.

Ms. Riley-Hall said she appreciated the public comments primarily because Mr. Fujiwara emphasized how the consultants are construction managers and are playing not only the role of OAC, but are also in the field. It is not uncommon for an owner to hire a consultant. It also appears that the role of OAC is decreasing, as the District seems to be building its knowledge base internally.

Mr. Peterson agreed with Ms. Riley-Hall as many agencies use consultants to augment in-house staff to manage projects.

Tom Peterson moved, seconded by Kurt Boyd, to approve the Northshore School District #417 for agency certification for GC/CM. Motion carried unanimously.

Mike Shinn left the meeting

Lake Washington School District – Certification – GC/CM

Chair Chuck Davis reviewed the presentation format to consider Lake Washington School District certification application for GC/CM. A meeting quorum of the PRC is required to consider and render a decision on the application. Members in attendance included Curt Gimmestad, Jonathon Hartung, John Palewicz, Steve Crawford, Tom Peterson, Linneth Riley-Hall, Ato Apiafi, Chuck Davis, Rusty Pritchard, Rob Warnaca, Darron Pease, David Beaudine, Jon Lebo, Jeanne Rynne, Vicki Barron-Sumann, Jim Burt, Kurt Boyd, Josh Swanson, and Matt Lane.

Forrest Miller, Director of Support Services, Lake Washington School District, said his position is responsible for the design and construction program at the School District. Lake Washington School District applied for agency certification in 2014 and did not receive approval by one vote. Since then the agency has learned much and initiated some changes, as well as created a long-term facility plan and passed a bond that included eight projects.

Mr. Miller introduced the team of Dr. Traci Pierce, Superintendent, Lake Washington School District; Eric Smith and Dan Chandler, OAC Services; Brian Buck, Associate Director of Support Services, Lake Washington School District; Pat Sprague, Deputy Program Manager, Lake Washington School District; and Chris Hirst, Pacifica Law Group.

Dr. Pierce thanked members for considering the District's application. Dr. Pierce provided an overview of the School District. Lake Washington School District is a growing and high performing school district serving a diverse community with high expectations. The District's mission and vision are focused on students and graduating student's future-ready. The District has a 92% on-time graduation rate while the state averages 77%. As a District, the agency believes that staying true to the four core values of being student-centered, learning-focused, results-oriented, and community-connected, as well as the five strategic goals will ensure the District is able to accomplish its mission and vision for students.

Agency certification supports the second goal of providing a safe and innovative learning environment and the fourth goal of using resources effectively and being fiscally responsible.

The District covers an area of 76 square miles with 52 schools serving students and families in the cities of Kirkland, Redmond, and Sammamish, and unincorporated King County and a small area of Bellevue. As a result, the District must contend with complex jurisdictional and permitting requirements making GC/CM an important delivery method. Lake Washington School District is the fourth largest school district in the state growing from the sixth largest in the last year.

Dr. Pierce displayed a graphic depicting the growth in student enrollment since 1999 to the present. The school district has experienced significant growth over the past seven years. On average over the last five years, the District enrolled 625 more students each year. The school district student population is 27,830 students, 3,500 employees, 1,700 teachers, 3.7 million square feet of building space with 1,400 classrooms, and a \$300 million General Fund budget with over 21% from local community support.

The District developed a long-term strategy by convening a Long-Term Facility Planning Task Force of community members, parents, and staff members. The task force spent a year developing a long-term recommendation and strategy for the District to meet the needs until 2030 when the District anticipates a population of 32,000 students. The overall recommendation was construction of more schools. The long-term plan includes multiple bond measures. An April 2016 bond measure generated over 66% voter approval. The District is ready to construct and follow through on promises to the community. She has confidence in Mr. Miller and the entire team to implement the plan recommended by the community.

Mr. Miller shared information on the District's experience in construction to demonstrate how the District is qualified for agency certification. The District is a large construction-oriented and successful district. Since 1998, the School District has added \$1.1 billion of construction to the district. He has been with the District for 24 years and in 1998, he initiated the program for school modernization and continues to lead the program. The District has strong stable leadership and because of successful bonds issues in 1996, 2004, 2006, and 2016 the District has replaced over half of its inventory of buildings, as well as adding growth schools to the inventory. Today, the District has insufficient capacity to house all students. The District is considered a preferred owner and recently selected a GC/CM for a recently approved project proposal for Juanita High School. Ten firms requested the RFP and eight firms participated in the pre-proposal meeting with five firms submitting Statement of Qualifications for consideration. All submittals were from quality firms creating a difficult selection process.

The District has completed three GC/CM projects with Juanita High School the fourth GC/CM project. The first project was Benjamin Rush Elementary School on an occupied site. The 9-acre parcel only provided 4-1/4 acres for the building site. Lessons learned from the GC/CM process was the ability to learn through the early design process about the complexities of phasing and nondisruption of the educational process.

Another GC/CM project was Lake Washington High School. The GC/CM process provided value in the constructability process. Through that process and during the early design phase, the District was able to achieve significant savings.

The first GC/CM project completed by the District was a state pilot project in early 2002-2003. The pilot project also served as an opportunity for a small contractor to complete a GC/CM project. The process emphasized the value of partnership with the contractor and the design team, as well as the partnership between the contractor and the City. Had the contractor not worked earlier with the City, the District would not have had an alternative way for the contractor to access and complete the project without disturbing the educational process, which was of critical importance.

The District also has highly qualified personnel. Dr. Pierce has been with the District for 22 years and has been the Superintendent since 2012. Janene Fogard, Deputy Superintendent, who was unable to attend the presentation, has been with the District for 34 years and developed the current bond program, as well as being involved in GC/CM projects.

Mr. Miller said he has been with the District for 24 years and is responsible for all design and construction for the District. Brian Buck, Director of Support Services, has been with the District for three years. Mr. Buck completed AGC GC/CM training. Mr. Buck previously worked for the Boeing Company for 17 years and is a veteran in negotiating contracts.

Mr. Buck reported Barbara Posthumus is the Director of Business Services. She has been with the District for 26 years and serves as a strategic business partner for Support Services. She drives functional excellence with the finance team and purchasing. Scott Emry is the District's Risk, Health and Safety Manager. He has been with the District for 12 years and ensures proper site safety for all construction sites and alignment of contractual insurance contracts with District standards.

Dan Chandler, OAC Services, spoke of behalf of OAC Services and Parametrix team members. His function is as the overall program manager. His office is next to Mr. Miller's office. Pat Sprague recently joined OAC after working for Microsoft. He serves as the Deputy Program Manager. Eric Smith, GC/CM Strategy Advisor, heads the OAC work in Silicon Valley and serves as a resource to OAC Services alternative delivery projects. Key to the success of OAC Services is the partnership with Parametrix, which is serving as the subconsultant to OAC in supporting the District's overall program.

Chris Hirst, Partner, Pacifica Law Group, reported he served on the CPARB for eight years from 2007 through 2015. He has worked with Lake Washington School District on all alternative procurement projects and will continue to do so in the upcoming bond issue, as well as with David Alskog, Livengood Alskog, who has worked with the District for the last 25 years on all capital projects. Together, they provide continuity for legal counsel and documentation for the District.

Mr. Smith reminded members that the initial agency certification application submitted by the District was a close vote. Approval required a 2/3 majority vote with the vote achieving only 64% approval falling short by one vote. Excerpts from the PRC letter describing the reasons for the disapproval included:

1. The Lake Washington School District has very little in house GC/CM experience.
2. The school district is relying too much on the consultant for agency GC/CM certification.

Mr. Smith emphasized how the District has a solid core group of individuals who have completed GC/CM projects over the years. The reason for the success is due to the core group of expert professionals who have guided the program over several bond programs. The District has demonstrated it is fundamentally sound and understands the business and the approach for GC/CM delivery and adopted a model that includes integration of consultants. Both he and Mr. Chandler agree the District strategy could have been stronger if there had been more emphasis on District staff, their capabilities, and professionalism, and less on OAC. Mr. Chandler led the prior agency presentation after having just established a relationship with the District, which has since matured by several years through a successful bond program. As noted in the first presentation, there was precedent for having public agencies or certified public bodies using consultants as an integral part of the business model. One example is Joe Klein at Washington State University who sent a letter to Mr. Chandler expressing how much the University relies on the company even though the University is one of the leaders in the state for the GC/CM procurement method. The City of Seattle's application for certification spoke to Ken Johnson's support over the years and other consultants the City has utilized over the years. Since the application, the City of Seattle utilized the services of Mr. Johnson for Pike Place Market and the City Wall. It is common for certified public agencies

to use consultant assistance. The City of Tacoma also included references to the use of consultants on an as-needed basis. The Spokane Public School District's RFQ outlined the role of the consultant.

Mr. Sprague reported he is overseeing the bond projects for the District. He summarized upcoming projects approved in the 2016 bond and projects planned as part of the 2018 bond measure. Currently, the District is in design for four projects to include Juanita High School. Two projects are planned for due diligence before the end of the year with design initiated in early 2017. Looking forward in 2018, five projects are planned. The District has identified which projects would be completed using the GC/CM delivery method. Each of the five projects will be completed on a constrained and occupied site. The early involvement of a general contractor is important to help inform the design, shape of the design, constructability, sequencing, cost, and having predictable and excellence in execution.

Mr. Chandler said he is hopeful the team has demonstrated that the Lake Washington School District meets and exceeds the requirements. The District has completed three successful GC/CM projects whereby the statute requires only one GC/CM project completion. The team is hopeful that it has demonstrated the necessary experience to determine the appropriate delivery method and the necessary experience to deliver the project. There has been an audit finding, but no recent audit findings.

Mr. Miller thanked members for the opportunity to present the application.

Chair Davis invited questions from members.

Mr. Apiafi said he was impressed about the District being the fourth largest in the state. As the representative of minority and women-owned businesses, he asked Dr. Pierce to review the District's inclusion plan and plans to advance the involvement by minority and women-owned businesses. Dr. Pierce said the District is very diverse with Asians representing 20% of the student population, 10% Latino, 5% African-American, and 5% representing different races. The District serves many families and students whose families work for Microsoft, Goggle, and other high tech companies. In all academic programs, specific programs are offered to help English as a Second Language students and students who might not be achieving at the same level as other students. One of the goals is to recruit, hire, and retain highly effective personnel through recruiting efforts to ensure a diverse work force, as well as a number of Asian and Indian teachers and administration.

Mr. Miller spoke to construction diversity. The District welcomes and desires to work with a diverse group of consultants, architects, and contractors. The District celebrates diversity and welcomes any company to participate in the work. The District has a long relationship with one minority architectural firm, as well as with contractors.

Ms. Riley-Hall referred to the 2014 denial of the agency certification specific to the District relying too much on consultant assistance. She asked what the District has done in the last two years that is different than it was in 2014. Mr. Miller reported Mr. Buck has completed GC/CM training and is involved in all GC/CM contracts. Additionally, the District changed its process for projects in terms of the bond. The District took a step back after losing two bond measures in 2014 and convened a 64-member community task force that worked for nearly a year. During that time, the task force worked with the community to identify what was needed in terms of facilities in the District. The task force also assisted in prioritizing needs. That process has been revamped in terms of how the District delivers projects and completes more design work prior to a bond measure to provide some tangible information to the community. Additionally, the District is considering its communications strategy with the community. The standards have not changed; however, the District instituted a new Design and Construction Advisory Group to work with the District during schematic design, during design development, and through the concept design development at the onset. The group is comprised of five individuals who are very well versed in the design and construction industry. Mr. Miller identified the individuals as several retired individuals experienced in the industry, a representative from Microsoft well versed in construction of Microsoft projects, an educator, and a developer. The group is supportive of the GC/CM delivery method and encourages the District to use GC/CM as the standard model for projects. Unique to the District is the pressure for new construction to occur sooner rather than later. Many other school districts do not have similar pressures. The GC/CM delivery method is important for the District to commence projects immediately to address capacity needs.

Ms. Riley-Hall questioned how the District would respond if OAC wasn't the program manager. Mr. Miller said the District would have a program management position filled either by another consultant firm or by an employee. The District's consultants serve as program managers and/or project managers and colocate with staff on a permanent basis. The District has established long-term relationships with consultants. Project managers are assigned for the duration of the project to ensure internal consistency and are considered members of the Lake Washington School District.

Ms. Rynne remarked that many years ago the District had a model of in-house project managers. She asked what prompted the District to move to a consultant-based model. Mr. Miller said the District does not intend to change the current model because it is the right model for the District for many of the reasons previously stated. During that period, a 2006 bond measure passed and some projects were delivered late by in-house staff. Following those projects, the District pursued a different model to ensure on-time project delivery that included adding expertise able to start immediately to accomplish projects. After receiving consultant assistance in both projects and program management, the District gained two years that had been lost and completed projects earlier. It essentially included a hybrid of both in-house and external resources.

Mr. Lebo asked whether some of the future projects are anticipated to be delivered by the DBB method or whether all the proposed projects are planned as alternative public works. Additionally, if the District is considering DBB, he asked why the team expounded on the value and virtue of alternative public works.

Mr. Miller responded that each project includes a process of review and discussion to determine if the project fits the alternative method. If the projects fit the alternative method, the District would pursue the GC/CM delivery method. To the extent where it is possible, he would prefer to complete all projects using the GC/CM delivery method. However, the community task force communicated the desire for the District to demonstrate effectiveness and efficiency for each program. He does not believe the District could gain effectiveness and efficiency as well as it could if the District did not use GC/CM. GC/CM should enable the District to achieve effectiveness and efficiency. The Juanita High School project with Cornerstone as the selected contractor included a contractor conclave with many firms considering the project. It is important that the District demonstrate how vital the contractor relationship is for cost estimating, constructability, and for value engineering. If the District lacks a GC/CM, the District would likely hire someone early in the process to complete those tasks.

Mr. Palewicz commented that he understands the request to the PRC is to accept that what works best for Lake Washington School District is the work of a consultant who is integrated within the planning team and experience. It appears that the District is anticipating using alternative public works, particularly GC/CM, for many projects. The organizational chart for OAC's participation assigns two OAC staff members currently assigned to the District as having completed GC/CM training. Although Pat Sprague has a strong background with Microsoft, there were no GC/CM project completions. Of the eight currently assigned staff, he questioned whether any of the members have any actual GC/CM experience.

Mr. Chandler replied that between OAC and Parametrix, eight project managers are working on large and small projects. Of those, he has the most GC/CM experience and spends 80% of his time at the District. Andrew Sahl has been GC/CM trained. Howard Hillinger is also assisting, is GC/CM trained, and has GC/CM project experience. Greg Brown is a resource to the District and spends time at the District. Two of the eight project managers have training and direct GC/CM experience. Mr. Sprague and Stacy Shewell are attending GC/CM training in June. The next two likely projects would be Kirk and Mead Elementary Schools and those projects would be staffed with GC/CM experienced personnel. The next project management assignment will occur early next year.

Mr. Palewicz said it seems that OAC would want many of the project managers with solid GC/CM experience. Obviously, as the program manager, Mr. Chandler has the experience. Mr. Chandler assured members that prior to initiating another GC/CM project, the appropriate projects managers would be assigned. The District and the consultant team are weighing options for staffing of the program and likely would assign 12 individuals, dependent upon the number of smaller projects. Half of the staff would be dedicated to smaller projects while the other half would be dedicated to major projects.

Chair Davis invited public comment.

Dave Flynn, President, Cornerstone General Contractors, commented that for the last decade, his company has built schools for Lake Washington School District for some bid projects. Currently, the company is performing in a GC/CM capacity. The company works for many public owners in the area and he is always amazed as to the number of hats school districts must wear. In many ways, school districts are developers and are in the forefront of coming up with solutions to build complex and diverse buildings on occupied campuses. He has found Lake Washington School District to be very sophisticated and very proficient and one of the more qualified owners that the company has worked for over the years. The District has a strong base of advisors, consultants, and in-house capacity. There was a time in his career when he did not have a long list of GC/CM project experience on his resume, but necessary qualifications are available on the team, especially when considering Mr. Sprague's Microsoft experience with many diverse projects. The District is a highly qualified owner.

Greg Brown said that until 2015, he was the Capital Projects Director for Spokane Public Schools for 12 years. One of his proudest moments was before the PRC when the District received agency certification as the first public school district to receive certification in the state. Certification is a tool that the Spokane Public Schools used for several years wisely. That information is pertinent today as he has known Mr. Miller for 12 years and when considering the applicants, Mr. Miller is the program manager. Mr. Miller's experience speaks to his prior work. He worked with Mr. Miller on a technical advisory committee for OSPI. When pilot projects were offered, Mr. Miller was the first one to accept one. Mr. Brown said he joined reluctantly because he believed alternative public works would cost too much, but his supervisor, as a PRC member, spoke to the benefits of alternative public works. Today, he is a believer for alternative public works. During his tenure as a member of the technical advisory committee, the committee worked to modify the state funding formula to reflect a GC/CM and Design-Build process that up to that time, was difficult to complete through the OSPI process. Over the years, he has modeled how he does things after how Mr. Miller's example because he has integrity, professionalism, and is a strong leader. Spokane Public Schools adopted a model where when the District presented proposals, the district had one consultant experienced in GC/CM and one in-house project manager. The remaining personnel had no experience. The district used existing resources of those experienced personnel and passed that knowledge to remaining staff. Today, the District is viable in his absence and is able to complete GC/CM projects. He asked members to support the application because it reflects a high standard model for other school districts.

Edward Peters, Capital Projects Director, Edmonds School District, said he supports the application similar to his comments offered for the Northshore School District. His experience with Mr. Miller goes back to a previous school district many years ago. He has absolute confidence in Mr. Miller's ability to run the program. He has worked on various committees with Mr. Miller. Secondly, as to the benefit to the taxpayers, the program outlined by the District is a multi-year, multi-funding program and ideally suited for agency certification to ensure the District gains the benefit of contractor input as projects are planned. He supports the application.

Chair Davis reported on the receipt of a letter from Ralph Grower, who asked that the letter be read into the record in his absence. However, each member received a copy of the letter and the letter is entered into the record.

Chair Davis invited deliberations by members.

Darron Pease said it appears that a contract is in place to use OAC as a consultant, which satisfies the requirements for GC/CM experience.

Mr. Apiafi said the presentation included three successful projects and he believes the applicant has the necessary experience.

Tom Peterson moved, seconded by Vicki Barron-Sumann, to approve agency certification for the Lake Washington School District for GC/CM. Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was recessed at 11:33 a.m.

The meeting reconvened at 11:42 a.m.

Mead School District – Midway Elementary School Modernization – GC/CM

Chair Curt Gimmestad reviewed the presentation format to consider Mead School District's GC/CM Project Application for the Midway Elementary School Modernization project. Panel members included Curt Gimmestad, Tom Peterson, Chuck Davis, Rob Warnaca, Darron Pease, Jon Lebo, Vicki Barron-Sumann, and Kurt Boyd.

Chair Gimmestad reported no follow-up questions were submitted by members after receipt of the application.

Greg Brown, Program Manager, OAC Services, thanked the panel for considering the application. The team for the project was established for another project the PRC approved last July for the Northwood Middle School GC/CM project. The selection process has been completed with the selection of Garco Construction. The project is the District's first GC/CM project. The District recently released bids for early site packages and anticipates setting the GMP in late June.

Wayne Leonard, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services, Mead School District, reported he is responsible for all fiscal activities of the District, as well as non-education support services, such as food services, transportation, and the facilities department. The project is the second of three flagship projects included in the 2015 bond issue. The first project is proceeding well and has benefitted from the early involvement of the GC/CM. The District has sponsored a number of outreach events within the community. Many in the community took advantage of meeting with the general contractor and the architect prior to initiation of the contract. The community feels that their input was considered.

All three projects are located in growing occupied neighborhoods with the communities heavily involved. The first project has enabled hands-on meetings with the contractor and involved the community early. It has raised the level of awareness in the community about the project and the delivery method. The District plans to pursue another bond issue in 2018.

Ned Wendle, Director of Facilities and Planning, Mead School District, said his role is the day-to-day liaison between the project and the District. Midway Elementary's modernization program is well suited to the GC/CM delivery method for several reasons. The site will be occupied by staff, students, parents, and other community members from surrounding neighborhoods using the fields and facilities. Midway Elementary School is in the middle of one of the fastest growing areas in the District. Single-family residential development has grown in the market. Having a GC/CM onboard during that process for safety would be invaluable for the neighborhood. The project involves complex phasing to accommodate students on the site. The early participation of the contractor provides fiscal and public benefit. The District discovered for the Northwood project that early participation of the GC/CM has maintained the project schedule with the project under budget to date.

The District's experience with the GC/CM delivery method proved to be a valuable resource for design and phasing and it reduced risk, as well as providing multiple value engineering suggestions decreasing the cost of the project and improving the project. Early participation of the contractor afforded an opportunity for the District to present the community with detailed information. The Midway project would benefit from that aspect.

Mr. Wendle said he is responsible for the budget with Mr. Leonard having supervisory oversight. Any decisions outside the established parameters would be a School Board directive or decision.

The project construction costs are projected to be \$13,750,000. The contingency fee is more than 5%. The total projected cost is \$18,903,960.

Mr. Brown said he is serving as the Project Manager for the Midway project and serves as the Program Manager for the District. Over the last year, he has provided guidance and instruction to staff. OAC has a major role in ensuring the projects are successful.

Mr. Brown reported the existing school is approximately 50,000 square feet on an occupied campus. The school is overcrowded. He lives approximately five blocks from the school increasing his convenience in managing the project.

The project includes additions to the school. The District is in early schematic design. He also believes in the importance of the early participation of the contractor as it improves the planning process. Having the contractor early in the process to assist in many of the decisions on schematic design is very important. The intent is to add 10,000 square feet to the school. Currently, the school uses its multipurpose room as a gym. Many activities occur in that space and the model likely includes the addition of a gymnasium to reduce the need for concurrent activities in one space. The project likely will require the addition of portables to enable remodeling of the school one wing at a time. The GC/CM will provide input on the phasing scheme. The project will entail a complicated phased project on an occupied site with elementary students and faculty. The project speaks to the importance of safety on the site.

Doug Mitchell, MMEC Architecture & Interiors, reported he serves as the managing principal for MMEC. The project is the firm's sixth GC/CM project.

Heidi Pierce, MMEC Architecture & Interiors, said she would serve as the project manager for the project. She has served as a project manager on three other GC/CM projects. She outlined the project schedule. The team has completed educational specifications with schematic design recently initiated. The GC/CM RFP is scheduled for release early next week. Selection of the GC/CM is scheduled for mid-July near the end of schematic design. Design development will commence through the end of September with construction documents produced in October through March. MACC negotiation will begin after 90% construction documents. Construction is scheduled to begin in June 2017 with possible early site packages.

Mr. Brown added that the schedule is dependent upon the approval of the application by the PRC. The team believes strongly that all members have much experience to bring to the project for successful completion. The project is an ideal candidate for GC/CM project delivery as the team is qualified and has demonstrated its experience. The District has proven resources and controls in place. The Northwood project has helped the team learn over the last year.

Chair Gimmestad invited questions from panel members.

Mr. Peterson noted that Mr. Brown is supporting the Northwood project as well as the Midway project. He asked whether he would be assigned to other projects. Mr. Brown said he serves in an advisory role for other school districts representing several hours a month. For example, for the Lake Washington School District, he is serving as a resource to the District to calculate the state match percentages for projects. He is currently assigned to the Northwood Middle School. With completion of design, his availability has increased by 50%. He was previously assigned to the City of Spokane projects. However, OAC hired Rusty Pritchard, who is now the Project Manager for those projects allowing him time to handle the Midway project. Most of his time is with the Mead School District with the exception of serving as advisory when required.

Mr. Pease asked Mr. Brown whether he is currently under contract for the duration of the project. Mr. Brown affirmed OAC is under contract as Program Manager for the District's bond issue. Another project, Shiloh Hills Elementary School, is scheduled when Northwood nears completion. The school has the same floor plan as Midway and is expected to begin design next year. OAC is providing most of its support to the Mead School District between the three projects with some minor projects as well, such as security enhancements for different facilities.

Chair Gimmestad said it appears there are some early packages for bidding. He asked about any challenges experienced or lessons learned the team has gained about the release of early packages from incomplete drawings. Mr. Brown responded that the challenges have not been as difficult as one would perceive. Garco Construction is very experienced with accelerated packages and was very helpful in directing the architect who is also very experienced in GC/CM in terms of earlier completion of packages for bidding. The team applied for early permits, which involved earthwork, utilities, and asphalt paving. The biggest challenge for him personally was transitioning from Spokane Public Schools after completing many projects and recognizing that for the Mead School District, GC/CM is a new delivery method. Mr. Leonard was involved in the last bond and oversaw large projects after arriving from the Deer Park School District, which also had completed many large projects. Mr. Wendle, having completed large projects in the private sector, has not completed a large school bond project until the Northwood project. Mr. Brown admitted that part of the education process

is his responsibility because it is important his clients understand what he is doing. It is often a challenge, as he regularly works through the process and sometimes overlooks the importance of instructing his clients as well.

Mr. Peterson asked Mr. Wendle about his day-to-day oversight as the lead decision-maker in terms of a project. Mr. Wendle said he works closely with Mr. Brown and together they meet with the architects and other consultants to ensure the process is heading in the right direction. He has had little public works contracting experience. Approximately 50% of his day is spent on the Northwood project working with contractors, staff, the Maintenance Department, and custodial staff to ensure the project is heading in the right direction.

Mr. Peterson asked for examples of some decisions rendered to date. Mr. Wendle replied that some of the earlier decisions in the site package involved sports programs in the middle schools of football, track, baseball, and softball. Management and use of the sports fields in the fall required decisions on whether to seed or sod the fields. Using sod on the fields entailed a large expense, but it was the right decision. That effort included considering many factors, such as the need to bus teams to other sites and conduct events if the site was not available. The decision was to install sod to enable field play for football and track in fall 2017.

Mr. Leonard added that fields are important to the community in the unincorporated area of the county where there are limited opportunities for Spokane County Parks. The Mead School District has 450 acres of play fields primarily serving as the county's parks department. The site, when not used for school functions, is one of the primary sites for county-wide sports leagues.

Mr. Brown said the team has a weekly site coordination meeting with the contractor and the architect. Mr. Wendle attends the meetings and each design meeting with staff. Mr. Wendle organized, coordinated, and led the community meetings. Mr. Wendle attends all meetings with permitting agencies.

Mr. Davis referred to the last two agency certification presentations. In both cases, the applicants indicated GC/CM has become the preferred method for delivery of public projects. He asked whether the District anticipates the scales tipping away from traditional Design-Bid-Build toward alternative delivery methods as it relates to delivering projects within the Mead School District.

Mr. Leonard replied that his experience centers on Design-Bid-Build projects. He recalled opening bids and holding his breath in hopes that the District received a bid from a good contractor. The GC/CM project has been a different experience in terms of partnering with the general contractor rather than having an adversarial role with the contractor. During meetings, the general contractor has offered good input for the design of the project. The District foresees future projects that likely might not fit the GC/CM delivery method. At some point during the next bond issue, a third middle school could be funded for the District's 68-acre site that is relatively flat and not occupied. That project might not be conducive for GC/CM; however, it has been very helpful from the District's perspective because the GC/CM delivery method affords a partnership with the general contractor.

Ms. Barron-Sumann asked whether there is any anticipation for a design and construction manager to oversee the GC/CM on the site fulltime, as there are several individuals identified on the organizational chart from OAC that were not mentioned during the presentation. Mr. Brown advised that Katharyn Getchell would serve as project control support for tracking budget items to ensure expenditures are tracked correctly. He would serve as the main site person but would welcome an intern or a student from a neighboring college with a construction management program. OAC has hired interns and mentored students. OAC hired one of the interns as a project manager after the individual received his degree. There are opportunities to pass on institutional knowledge to young people.

Mr. Pritchard advised that he also resides in the Mead School District. As a Certified Construction Manager, his role is to provide backup to Mr. Brown. He is also very familiar with the project and with the client and can perform the role as needed to assist in construction issues and supporting Mr. Brown.

Chair Gimmestad invited public comments.

There were no public comments.

Chuck Davis moved, seconded by Kurt Boyd, to approve the GC/CM project application from the Mead School District for the Midway Elementary School Modernization project. Motion carried unanimously.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Chair Gimmestad adjourned the meeting at 12:12 p.m.