Da	ate:	September 25, 2025 GC/CM Approve		d	X		
Pι	ublic Agency:	City of Seattle	DB		Denied		
PF	RC Member:	Eza Agoes	Both	Χ		-	
		Recertifica	ation Evaluation (Criteria			
Α.	Applicant expl	lained any process changes	it made, if any, on how	it determ	ines which	Pass	Fail
	1. Explained	ppropriate for use of alterna what steps are taken to det e for a proposed project.			nd/or DB are	X	
		the steps that are taken in a	approving this determin	ation.		X	12
B.	B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.						
	Included the status of each alternative delivery project.					Х	
	Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.						
C.		rided an updated organization and construction experience ication.				х	
D.	Applicant has	resolved any audit findings	relative to previous proj	ects.		х	
	erall Evaluation Ison for Determ	n by Committee Member ination:				3	
-							and the second second
)bs	ervations/Conc	erns:					
		3.					
Eza	Digitally signed Eza Agoes Date: 2025.09.2 11:09:15-07:00'						

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM	GC/CM		d	X
Public Agency:	City of Seattle	DB		Denied	-	7
PRC Member:	Becky Barnhart	Both	Χ		2A	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		ï			
	Recertificatio	n Evaluation (Criteria			
			i i		Pass	Fail
	lained any process changes it m ppropriate for use of alternative of			nines which	X	
appropria	what steps are taken to determine for a proposed project.			nd/or DB are	Х	8
2. Described		X				
B. Applicant des Works in the p RCW 39.10.	x	12 m				
 Included t 		Х				
certification					X	
	vided an updated organization ch and construction experience usir fication.				X	
D. Applicant has	resolved any audit findings relat	ive to previous pro	jects.		Х	
Overall Evaluatio Reason for Determ	n by Committee Member nination:					
Observations/Cond	corne:					
Complies with requ	uirements of RCW 39.10.				444	
				at so		
(X	INC					

Project Review Committee (PRC) Application Evaluation Sheet **Public Agency Recertification** Date: September 25, 2025 GC/CM Approved X Public Agency: City of Seattle DB Denied PRC Member: Garett Buckingham, Public Hospitals Both X Recertification Evaluation Criteria **Pass** Fail A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which X projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures. 1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are X appropriate for a proposed project. 2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination. X B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in X RCW 39.10. 1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project. X 2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous X certification. C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the X previous certification. D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects. X Overall Evaluation by Committee Member Reason for Determination: Team presented their process and status well and met the RCW requirements

Reason for Determination: Team presented their process and status well and met the RCW requirements Observations/Concerns: Garett Buckingham

Project Review Committee (PRC)

Application Evaluation Sheet Public Agency Recertification

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM Approved			Х
Public Agency:	City of Seattle	DB	Denied	-	
PRC Member:	Joshua Cheatham	Both	X	·	
	Recertification	Evaluation Cr	iteria		
				Pass	Fail
Applicant explipation projects are applicant.	ained any process changes it ma opropriate for use of alternative co	de, if any, on how it ontracting procedure	determines which	Х	
appropriate	what steps are taken to determine e for a proposed project.			Х	
2. Described		Х			
	cribed their experience in delivering east three years and summarized			x	
 Included th 	ne status of each alternative delive	ery project.	· ·	Х	
Described certification	nce previous	х			
C. Applicant prov	ided an updated organization cha and construction experience using			х	
	resolved any audit findings relativ	e to previous projec	ts.	Х	
Overall Evaluation Reason for Determi	n by Committee Member ination:				
Presentation meets th	ne RCW 39.10 Criteria.				
Observations/Conc	arns:				
Very well put togeth	ner presentation that demonstrate	S			
Johns A. Chan	Digitally signed by Joshua Cheatham Date: 2025.09.26 14:21:26-07'00'				

Date: September 25, 2025 GC/CM		Approved	x			
Public Agency:	City of Seattle	DB	Denied	170		
PRC Member:	B. Colyar	Both X		· ·		
	Recertifica	tion Evaluation Crite	ria			
			Pas	s Fail		
projects are a	ained any process changes i opropriate for use of alternati	ve contracting procedures.	X			
appropriate	what steps are taken to dete e for a proposed project. the stops that are taken in a			K		
2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public						
	ast three years and summar					
Included the status of each alternative delivery project.						
Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.						
	ided an updated organization and construction experience ication.					
D. Applicant has	resolved any audit findings re	elative to previous projects.	X			
Reason for Determ	n by Committee Member ination: mplementation sets internal of	checks for the large agency	with various divisions.			
Observations/Conc						
Examps Colyon Signature						

Project Review Committee (PRC)

Application Evaluation Sheet Public Agency Recertification

Da	Date: September 25, 2025 GC/CM Approv			Approved	d	X		
Public Agency:		Agency:	City of Seattle	DB		Denied		
PF	RC N	lember:	Lisa Corcoran	Both	Χ			5
			-					
			Recertifica	tion Evaluation	Criteria	ĺ		
							Pass	Fail
A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.							х	
	 Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project. 						х	
	Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.						х	
B.	B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.							
	 Included the status of each alternative delivery project. 						х	
	Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.						х	
C.	 Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification. 						x	
D.	App	olicant has	resolved any audit findings r	elative to previous pro	jects.		Х	
Rea	son	for Determ	n by Committee Member ination:	tanding of alternative o	deliverv m	nethods and how	to imple	ement
			ven types of project scopes.					
			aff on these methods.					
Obs	erva	tions/Conc	erns:					
	11 17		The second secon					11-2-2-2-1
	Lisa	46-						

Project Review Committee (PRC) **Application Evaluation Sheet Public Agency Recertification** Date: September 25, 2025 GC/CM Approved City of Seattle DB Public Agency: Denied PRC Member: Mallorie Davies Both X **Recertification Evaluation Criteria Pass** Fail A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which X projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures. 1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are X appropriate for a proposed project. 2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination. X B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in X RCW 39.10.

are X X X In X X X

X

D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member

1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.

2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous

management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the

C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing

Reason for Determination:

certification.

previous certification.

rates among other goals.	
	_
Observations/Concerns:	
	_
100 (1)	_

Date: September 25, 2025			GC/CM		Approve	d	X
Public Agency:	CITY OF SI	EATTLE	DB		Denied	-	
PRC Member:	JIM DUGA	tW .	(Both)	X			weight continues on the same and an another same and another same and an another same
	Rece	rtification E	valuation	Criteria			
A Applicant expla	ained any process ch	anges it made	if any on how	v it determ	ines which	Pass	Fail
	propriate for use of		THE RESIDENCE OF THE PROPERTY OF A PARTY OF		ines winer	A	
appropriate	what steps are taken for a proposed proje the steps that are tal	ect.			id/or DB are	*	
B. Applicant desc	ribed their experience ast three years and s	e in delivering	orojects under	Alternative		<u> </u>	
Included the status of each alternative delivery project.							
certification C. Applicant provi	ded an updated orga	anization chart v	with personnel	possessir	 ng	X	-
	esolved any audit fir	idings relative t	o previous pro	jects.		X	
Overall Evaluation Reason for Determi QUALIFIE THOROUG	D & com	nber FETENT	. Good	FRES	ENTAMON		
TAULUUG	<i>~</i>				***************************************		
Observations/Conce	erns: E READY.						
Signature	uzu						

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM		Approved	d	Χ
Public Agency:	City of Seattle	DB	G T	Denied		2
PRC Member:	Tom Golden	Both	Χ			
	Recertificat	tion Evaluation (Criteria			
					Pass	Fail
	plained any process changes i appropriate for use of alternati			ines which	X	ı an
appropria	I what steps are taken to dete te for a proposed project.			nd/or DB are	X	
	2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public					
	past three years and summar				x	
 Included to 	the status of each alternative	delivery project.		-	Х	
Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.						
	vided an updated organizatior and construction experience fication.				X	
D. Applicant has	resolved any audit findings re	elative to previous pro	ects.		Χ	
Óverall Evaluatio Reason for Deterr	on by Committee Member nination:					
Very thorough and	l organized internal process for	or determining the app	ropriaten	ess of alternative	deliver	y. The
	ommittee appears to not just b					
						· ·
Observations/Con	cerns:					
None.						
			186			
U. C.	in					

Date	:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM	GC/CM App		d	X	
Public Agency:		City of Seattle	DB	DB Denie		-	·	
PRC Member:		Jeff Gonzalez	Both	Х		_		
		Recertific	ation Evaluation	Criteria	l			
						Pass	Fail	
		ained any process change opropriate for use of alterna			nines which	Х		
	appropriate	what steps are taken to de e for a proposed project.			nd/or DB are	х		
		the steps that are taken in	7		Dublis	Х		
V	B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.							
1.	. Included th	ne status of each alternativ	e delivery project.			Х		
2	Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.							
m	C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification.							
D. A	pplicant has	resolved any audit findings	relative to previous pro	jects.		X		
Reaso	II Evaluation on for Determant met the c							
Obser	vations/Conc	erns:						
Great	presentation.	I appreciate the Internal I	Review Committee and	the comm	itment to succes	SS.		
		2						
	71-1	0						

Date:	September 25th 2025	GC/CM		Approved	1	Χ
Public Agency:	City of Seattle Recertification	DB		Denied		
PRC Member:	Brian Jewett	Both	X			
	Recertification	ո Evaluation	Criteria			
	11.0				Pass	Fail
	ained any process changes it ma ppropriate for use of alternative c			es which	X	
	what steps are taken to determir e for a proposed project.	ne that the use of	GC/CM and/o	or DB are	X	
Described	Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.					
3. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.						
Included the status of each alternative delivery project.					X	
Described certificatio	any litigation or significant dispu n.	tes on any projec	t since previo	us	X	
	rided an updated organization ch and construction experience usin ication.			the	X	
A WAR AND	resolved any audit findings relati	ve to previous pr	ojects.		Х	
Reason for Det	ntion by Committee Member ermination: n internal Review Committee alor	ngside PRC. Suc	cessful projec	et examples		_
Observations/C	Concerns:					
None.						
Brigg C	Engt					

Date: Public Agency:		September 25, 2025 GC/CM Approx		Approve	d	Х	
		City of Seattle	DB	DB		170000	
PF	RC Member:	Jeff Jurgensen	Both	Х			
		Recertificat	tion Evaluation	Criteria		Bass	E-II
A.	Applicant expl	ained any process changes i	t made, if any, on hov	v it determ ures.	ines which	Pass	Fail
 Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project. 							
	Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.						
B.	B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.						
	1. Included th	ne status of each alternative	delivery project.		1	х	
	 Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification. 						
C.	C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification.						
D.	The first of the contract of t	resolved any audit findings re	elative to previous pro	jects.		х	
Rea <u>Ver</u>	son for Determ y well understo	n by Committee Member ination: od processes and process by eir Alt Delivery teams and it si		sica has a	and continues to	lead the	2
	servations/Cond	perns: they have a well developed p	rocess.			-	
	A	1					

Project Review Committee (PRC)

Application Evaluation Sheet Public Agency Recertification

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM Appro-		Approve	d	X
Public Agency:	City of Seattle	DB		Denied		
PRC Member:	Karl Kolb	Both	Х			***************************************
	Recertifica	ation Evaluation (Criteria			
					Pass	Fail
	ained any process changes opropriate for use of alterna			nines which	Х	
appropriat	what steps are taken to det e for a proposed project.			nd/or DB are	х	
	the steps that are taken in				X	
B. Applicant desc Works in the p RCW 39.10.		x				
 Included the 	Included the status of each alternative delivery project.					
Described certification		х				
management	C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification.					
D. Applicant has	resolved any audit findings	relative to previous pro	jects.		Х	
Overall Evaluation Reason for Determ	n by Committee Member ination:					
Observations/Cond	erns:					
1/ 11	1/ 10					

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM Approved			d	Χ
Public Agency:	City of Seattle	DB		Denied		
PRC Member:	Art McCluskey	Both	Х		2/	
	Recertificat	ion Evaluation (Criteria			
					Pass	Fail
projects are ap	ained any process changes it opropriate for use of alternativ	ve contracting proced	ures.		Х	
appropriate	what steps are taken to deter e for a proposed project. the steps that are taken in ap			nd/or DB are	X	
B. Applicant desc	cribed their experience in deli ast three years and summari	vering projects under	Alternativ		X	
1. Included th	ne status of each alternative of	delivery project.			X	
certification					Х	
	ided an updated organization and construction experience lication.				x	
The same of the sa	resolved any audit findings re	elative to previous pro	jects.		Х	
Overall Evaluation Reason for Determ Applicant meets RO						
Observations/Conc	erns: body, great method for deter	mining alternative deli	ivery meth	nods		
Art McClus,	ksy					

Project Review Committee (PRC) **Application Evaluation Sheet Public Agency Recertification** GC/CM 9/25/25 X Date: Approved DB Denied Public Agency: City of Seattle PRC Member: Heather Munden Both X **Recertification Evaluation Criteria Pass** Fail A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which X projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures. 1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are X appropriate for a proposed project. 2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination. X B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in X RCW 39.10. 1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project. X 2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous X certification. C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the X previous certification. D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects. X

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member Reason for Determination:	
Good application and presentation.	
Observations/Concerns:	
Appreciated the response to the question regarding training and	developing staff that doesn't have alternantive
delivery experience.	
Heather Munden	

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM	*	Approved	b	Χ
Public Agency:	City of Seattle	DB		Denied	***************************************	
PRC Member:	Jeannie Natta	Both	Χ			
	Recertification	n Evaluation	Criteria			
					Pass	Fail
	ained any process changes it ma opropriate for use of alternative o			ines which	X	
appropriate	what steps are taken to determine for a proposed project.			id/or DB are	Х	
	the steps that are taken in appropriate their experience in deliver			e Public	Х	
	past three years and summarized				X	
 Included th 	ne status of each alternative deliv	very project.			Х	
certification					Х	
	ided an updated organization ch and construction experience usir ication.				x	
	resolved any audit findings relati	ve to previous pro	jects.		Х	
Reason for Determ				_		- L
	demonstrated a thorough proces	ss for selectin deli	very metho	ods. They also h	nave a s	trong
mentoring and train	ning program for staff.					
Observations/Conc	erns:					
1 8 3						
						Sac .
Jeannie Natta	**Digitally signed by Jeannie Natta DNCC-US, E-jeants@vv edu, O-UW Facilities, OU=* Project Digitally Signed by Jeannie Natta Digitally Signed Signed Not On Order Digitally Signed Signed Not On Order Digitally Signed Signed Not Order Digitally Signed Signed Not Order Digitally signed by Jeannie Natta					
Signature						

Date: September 25, 2025 GC/CM Approve			d	Х		
Public Agency:	City of Seattle	DB		Denied	-	
PRC Member:	Catina Patton	Both	Χ		7	
	Recertificat	ion Evaluation	Criteria			
9					Pass	Fail
projects are a	ained any process changes it opropriate for use of alternative	e contracting proced	lures.	F	8	
appropriat	what steps are taken to deter e for a proposed project.			d/or DB are	X	
	the steps that are taken in ap				X	
B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.						
 Included the 	Included the status of each alternative delivery project.				Х	V
Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.					X	
	ided an updated organization and construction experience ι ication.				X	
D. Applicant has	resolved any audit findings re	lative to previous pro	ojects.		Х	
Overall Evaluation Reason for Determ Meets criteria for re						
Observations/Conc	erns:					
Great Presentation						
			4			
Catina Pattor	ı					
Signature						

Date:		September 25, 2025	GC/CM	Approved	d ,	7
Public Ag	ency:	City of Samuel	∠ DB	Denied	***************************************	1
PRC Men	nber:	Mike Pavition	Both X			
		Recertifica	ation Evaluation Crite	eria		
					Pass	Fail
		lained any process changes ppropriate for use of alterna		termines which	1	
app	propriat	what steps are taken to dete e for a proposed project.		1	0	
		the steps that are taken in a		L.		
	in the p	cribed their experience in de past three years and summa			V	
1. Inc	luded ti	he status of each alternative	delivery project.		V	
cer	tificatio			i	V	
manag	ement	rided an updated organization and construction experience fication.			V	
D. Applica	ant has	resolved any audit findings	relative to previous projects.			*
Overall Eva Reason for The Over		n by Committee Member nination: Shas Demons me Auswar to Effe	The Asy how por	& For Expense	ence	d
Observation	Nev					
		1				
-		11.4				

Date:

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM	Approved	./
Public A	gency:	The DB	_ Approved Denied	
PRC Me	mber: Trace Rosstas	A Both X	_ Defiled	•
	The pegg			
	Recertification	Evaluation Criteri	ia	
			Pas	ss Fail
projec	ant explained any process changes it made ts are appropriate for use of alternative con	ntracting procedures.		
ap	plained what steps are taken to determine propriate for a proposed project. scribed the steps that are taken in approving		and/or DB are	
B. Applic	ant described their experience in delivering	projects under Alternat	tive Public	
RCW	in the past three years and summarized ho 39.10.	ow these projects met the	ne statutes in	
	luded the status of each alternative deliver			/
ce	scribed any litigation or significant disputes tification.			
mana	ant provided an updated organization chart pement and construction experience using t us certification.	with personnel possess the GC/CM and/or DB s	sing ince the	
D. Applic	ant has resolved any audit findings relative	to previous projects.		7
Overall Ev Reason for	aluation by Committee Member Determination:			
Observatio	ns/Concerns:			

***************************************	1			-
	Just Ka			
Signature —				

Revised 7/27/2023

Criteria extracted from RCW 39.10.270

Project Review Committee (PRC) **Application Evaluation Sheet Public Agency Recertification** Date: 09.25.25 GC/CM Approved Public Agency: City of Seattle DB Denied

PI	RC Member:	Yuki Seda-Kane	Both	X	e 8 11	
		Recertific	cation Evaluation	Criteria		
					Pass	Fail
A.		ained any process change opropriate for use of altern	되면 있는데, 그렇게 그는 사람이 없어요요요 하게 하게 하는데 사람이 없어요요 하게 되었다. 그리지만 없다는 그리지만 하다.		hich X	
	appropriate	what steps are taken to de e for a proposed project.			B are X	
	Described	the steps that are taken in	approving this determ	ination.	X	
В.		cribed their experience in coast three years and summ				
	 Included th 	ne status of each alternativ	e delivery project.		X	
	Described certification	any litigation or significant า.	disputes on any proje	ct since previous	X	
C.		ided an updated organizat and construction experiend ication.			X	
D.	Applicant has	resolved any audit findings	s relative to previous pr	rojects.	X	
	erall Evaluation ason for Determ	n by Committee Member ination:				
Ove	erall, thorough a	pplication and presentatio	n to meet RCW 39.10.	What was notabl	e was the IRC pro	ocess
that	describes the	evaluation of whether proje	ects shall be chosen for	Alt Delivery and	what method, and	I how a
pro	ect is monitored	d for success. The Overloo	ok, WS Bridge and Me	taline Falls were o	ood examples of	projects
V-Chief		was implemented.				

Observations/Concerns:

Excellent program for WMBE outreach events, hosting several events a year with different focuses such as Reverse Vendor, Consultant Connection, IT vendors and Regional Contracting forum for businesses to engage not just with the City of Seattle, but other public agencies as well. The requirement for all projects over \$300k to have WMBE Inclusion Plan is also commendable.

Yok Sida-Kene

Signature

X

Date: September 25, 2025 GC/CM X Approved					d	Χ
Public Agency:	City of Seattle	DB		Denied	-	
PRC Member:	Mike D Shinn	Both			-	3000-100
	Recertification !	Evaluation	Criteria			
					Pass	Fail
	ained any process changes it made opropriate for use of alternative con			ines which	Х	
appropriate	Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.					
2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in					X	
	RCW 39.10. 1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.					
Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.					X	
	rided an updated organization chart and construction experience using ication.				х	
A second	resolved any audit findings relative	to previous pr	ojects.		Х	
Overall Evaluation Reason for Determ	n by Committee Member ination:					
Mters	2cw			The state of the s	_	
	•		5.436.100.000			
Observations/Cond	erns:					
NONE			ere		N. 72	
Mily 1	Mus			- Annahulum dan		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,

Application Evaluation Sheet Public Agency Recertification Date: September 25, 2025 GC/CM Approved Public Agency:

DB

Both

Denied

Pass

Fail

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

- A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.
 - 1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.
 - 2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.
- B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.
 - 1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.
 - 2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.
- C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification.
- D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member

Reason for Determination:

Observations/Concerns:

Project Review Committee (PRC)

Kevin Thomas

PRC Member:

HIGH VOLUME OF ALT WORKS PROJECTS CHERENTLY DEMONSTRATES PROPER DELIVERY METHODS.

Da	te:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM	Ap	proved	Х
Pu	blic Agency:	City of Seattle	DB	De	enied	
PF	C Member:	Lance Thomas	Both	X		
						X.
		Decertifie	tion Evaluation Cr	dtorio		
		Recertifica	ation Evaluation Cr	iteria		
8 0				% W	Pass	Fail
A.		ained any process changes opropriate for use of alterna			ch x	4_
	appropriate	what steps are taken to det e for a proposed project.			are x	8
		the steps that are taken in			X	
B.		ribed their experience in de ast three years and summa			in x	
	1. Included th	e status of each alternative	delivery project.		х	
Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.						
C.		ided an updated organization and construction experience ication.			x	
D.	The second secon	resolved any audit findings	relative to previous projec	cts.	X	
Rea	son for Determ	n by Committee Member ination: and well composed presenta	ation.			
				•		
Obs	ervations/Conc	erns:		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
l rea	lly appreciated	the explanation on the Alte	rnative Delivery Service s	selection. This is	a great examp	le for
othe	r to follow and	for training of PRC member	S.	X E PROPERTIES		
Ö	Jan / kau					

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM		Approve	ed	Χ
Public Agency:	City of Seattle	DB		Denied	****	
PRC Member:	T. Thomas	Both	X		********	
,	Recertificati	on Evaluation	Criteria			
					Pass	Fail
Applicant expl projects are applicant expl	ained any process changes it r opropriate for use of alternative	made, if any, on ho e contracting proce	w it determ dures.	ines which		
appropriate	what steps are taken to detern e for a proposed project.			d/or DB are	Х	
	the steps that are taken in app				Х	
	cribed their experience in deliver east three years and summarize					
	ne status of each alternative de			[X	
certification					Х	
	ided an updated organization or and construction experience us cation.				Х	
D. Applicant has r	resolved any audit findings rela	ative to previous pr	ojects.		X	
Reason for Dete	tion by Committee Member ermination: Seattle demonstrated it continuents successfully.	ues to have ample o	experience	at managing bo	oth GCCI	M
Observations/Co	oncerns:					

Da	te:	09/25/2025	GC/CM	Χ	Approve	d	Χ
Pu	blic Agency:	CITY OF SEATTLE	_ DB	X	Denied	-	
PR	C Member:	ANTHONY UDEAGBALA, AIA	Both X				
		Recertification	Evaluation	Criteria			
A.		ained any process changes it mad opropriate for use of alternative co			nes which	Pass	Fail
	appropriate	what steps are taken to determine e for a proposed project. the steps that are taken in approvi			d/or DB are		
B.	Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.					х	
	1. Included th	ne status of each alternative delive	ry project.				
	Described certification	any litigation or significant dispute า.	s on any project	since prev	ious		
C.		ided an updated organization char and construction experience using ication.				х	
D.	Applicant has	resolved any audit findings relative	to previous pro	jects.		Х	
	Overall Evalua Reason for Dete	tion by Committee Member ermination:					
-	Great prese	ntation, fantastic team structure ar	nd understandin	g of project	needs. I find th	<u>ne team</u>	
-	to have a go	ood understanding of RCW require	ements.				_
C	Observations/C	oncerns:					
_	Exemplary.						_
<u></u>							-
_				(A)			_

Project Review Committee (PRC)

Application Evaluation Sheet Public Agency Recertification

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	City of Seattle	DB		Denied	1
PRC Member:	Taine Wilton	Both	X		19*

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

- A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.
 - 1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.
 - 2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.
- B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.
 - Included the status of each alternative delivery project.
 - 2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.
- C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification.
- D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.

-		
	X	2
	Х	
	X	
ei l	X	
	X	
	X	
	X	
	X	

Pass

Fail

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member

Reason for Determination:

Have created an Internal Review Committee to initiate alternative delivery. Use the team to train others and partake in mini-PRC internally before presenting to actual PRC. It has robust project management and brings on consultants to ensure meet their diversity goals. Provides training for new hires, have stable leadership across capital departments.

Observations/Concerns:

Focus efforts on selection of right partnership for the project, craft documents to reflect true needs of preconstruction. Integrates equity and diversity in all aspects of work from outreach to completing a study to improve equity in City Contracting.

Wilton, Taine E. (ESC)

Digitally signed by Wilton, Taine E. (ESC)

Div. CN='Wilton, Taine E. (ESC)', 0=Edmonds School District
Date: 2025.09.25 13:33:54-07'00'

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY REVIEW BOARD PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

QUESTIONS RE: DUAL RECERTIFICATION APPLICATION

Meeting Date: September 25, 2025

CITY OF SEATTLE

- DESIGN-BUILD & GC/CM RECERTIFICATION

1. The City of Seattle demonstrates a process that evaluates the use of alternative delivery that is in compliance with the RCW. Some of the criteria for GC/CM and DB are similar. Because you are requesting a joint certification, please share the factors and criteria considered when weighing a decision between GC/CM and DB.

RESPONSE:

Projects are not allowed to apply for a "general" alternative delivery approval. Per best practices, the applicant City department is required to conduct a detailed evaluation of project-specific issues to determine the desired delivery method prior to initiating the application process with the Contracting Type Assessment (CTA). The CTA (application Exhibit A) then requires the applicant to specifically identify whether they are applying for DB or GC/CM delivery.

After the Contracting Type Assessment is approved, and the applicant project is referred to the Internal Review Committee (IRC), the project team is required to prepare and submit a separate written application for <a href="either-nc-ei