Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	Department of Enterprise Services	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Eza Agoes	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	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.	X	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
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 RCW 39.10.	X	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	X	
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. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Observations/Concerns:

Eza Agoes Digitally signed by Eza Agoes Date: 2025.09.25 10:07:28-07'00'

Signature

Revised 7/27/2023

Criteria extracted from RCW 39.10.270

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM		Approved	x
Public Agency:	WA State Department of Enterprise Services	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 projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.	x	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	x	
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 RCW 39.10.	x	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	x	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	x	
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. 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

Observations/Concerns:

Garett Buckingham

Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	WA STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENTERPRISE SERVICES	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Joshua Cheatham	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	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.	X	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
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 RCW 39.10.	X	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	X	
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. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Presentation meets the RCW 39.10 Criteria.

Observations/Concerns:

Present a process that is above standard and should be a model for other agencies.

Joshua A. Cheatham Digitally signed by Joshua Cheatham
Date: 2025.09.26 14:23:07-07'00'

Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM		Approved	x
Public Agency:	WA State DES	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	B. Colyar	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	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.	x	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	x	
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 RCW 39.10.	x	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	x	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	x	
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. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	x	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

-Meets recertification requirements

- Demonstrated program knowledge and team experience w/commitment to mentor new hires.

Observations/Concerns:

-Good list of lessons learned considerations

Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	DES	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Lisa Corcoran	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	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.	X	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	x	
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 RCW 39.10.	X	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	x	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	x	
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. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

DES showed they had a good understanding of alternative delivery methods and how to implement GC/CM and DB, given types of project scopes.

Observations/Concerns:

Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)

Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM		Approved	
Public Agency:	WA State DES	DB		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 projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.	X	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
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 RCW 39.10.	X	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	X	
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. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member

Reason for Determination:

The applicant has demonstrated a good stewardship for the requirements and goals of the RCW.

Observations/Concerns:

Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

→ ENTERPRISE SERVICES

Date:	✓ September 25, 2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	WA STATE DEPT OF	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	JIM DUGAN	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	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.	X	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
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 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 certification.	X	
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. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

STRONG CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM. HISTORY OF SUCCESSFUL PERFORMANCE. ACTIVE PARTICIPATION W/ PRC & CPARB. GOOD LESSONS LEARNED.

Observations/Concerns:

J R Dugan
Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	September 25th 2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	WA State Dept. of Enterprise Services	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Brian Jewett	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	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.	X	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
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 RCW 39.10.	X	
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.	X	
D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:
Thorough understanding of RCW 39.10, no audit finding from previous projects.

Observations/Concerns:

None.

Brian J Ewett
Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	DES	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	DAVE JOHNSON	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	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.		
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:

DES HAS DEMONSTRATED SUCCESS IN DELIVERING BOTH GC/CM+DB PROJECTS, THEY HAVE PERSONNEL WITH EXPERIENCE IN BOTH DELIVERY METHODS AND A GOOD DECISION MAKING PROCESS

Observations/Concerns:

Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	DES	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Art McCluskey	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	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.	X	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
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 RCW 39.10.	X	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	X	
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. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Applicant meets RCW requirements

Observations/Concerns:

Applicant has extensive experience in alternative delivery, good discussion of risk allocation

Art McCluskey
Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	9-25-25	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	Department Enterprise Services	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Bret Miche	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	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.	X	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
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 RCW 39.10.	X	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	X	
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. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Applicant has a long history of both GC/CM and PDB project delivery (successful). Applicant has a robust set of systems and processes for ongoing training and improvement of processes for continued successful delivery of GC/CM and PDB projects

Observations/Concerns:

Presentation felt disconnected and siloed. Large agencies such as DES need to be aware of bureaucracy and process getting in the way of efficiency.

Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)

Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	9/25/25	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	WA State DES	DB		Denied	
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 projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.	X	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
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 RCW 39.10.	X	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	X	
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. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Great layout of the application. Very thorough presentation. Very robust Business Diversity program.

Observations/Concerns:

Great internal and external training for your team members as well as continual learning/training opportunities.

Heather Munden
Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)

Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	WA State DES	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Jessica Murphy	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

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

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member

Reason for Determination:

Observations/Concerns:

None.

Signature Jessica Murphy

Revised 7/27/2023

Criteria extracted from RCW 39.10.270

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

XDate:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	WA STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENTERPRISE SERVICES	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Jeannie Natta	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	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.	X	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
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 RCW 39.10.	X	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	X	
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. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

DES has a strong training program. They demonstrate thoughtful consideration when selecting delivery methods. They are also making efforts to expand opportunities for small business through a training program.

Observations/Concerns:

Jeannie Natta Digitally signed by Jeannie Natta DN: C=US, E=jnatta@uw.edu, O=UW Facilities, OU=" Project Delivery Group", CN=Jeannie Natta Date: 2025.09.25 09:44:11-07'00'

Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	Department of Enterprise Services	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Ron Paananen	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	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.		
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
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 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 certification.	X	
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. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

ery well prepared application and presentation. DE has a large program and has implemented a program approach to alternative delivery. They are constantly evaluating improvements that can be made to how they evaluate. delivery options and implementation of GC/CM or DB. They are active with industry organizations (DBIA and AGC)

Observations/Concerns:

No concerns.

Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	WA State Department of Enterprise Services	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Catina Patton	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	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.		
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
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 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 certification.	X	
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. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Meets application criteria.

Observations/Concerns:

Great presentation, wonderful training program put into place for staffing and applauded the EDGE Program's success for subcontractor outreach and development.

Catina Patton
Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	DES	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Mike Pellitteri	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	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.	✓	
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:

DES has the qualified staff and experience to effectively use DB & GCCM

Observations/Concerns:

Signature

Criteria extracted from RCW 39.10.270

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date: September 25, 2025
Public Agency: DES
PRC Member: Traci Rogstad

GC/CM ____
DB ____
Both X

Approved ✓
Denied ____

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	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.		
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:

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	X
Public Agency:	Dept of Enterprise Services	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Yuki Seda-Kane	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	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.	X	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
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 RCW 39.10.	X	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since the previous certification.	X	
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. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Application was complete in describing the experience, history of projects, and list of trained personnel to deliver GC/CM and DB projects. Maintaining a Lessons Learned program was described to continually improve their process. Answered questions regarding how projects are selected for DB vs GC/CM. Met the RCW 39.10 requirements.

Observations/Concerns:

I appreciated the robust Outreach to encourage SBE and DBE firms to bid on their projects, along with training programs to elevate subcontractors into prime contractors.

Yuki Seda-Kane

Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	WA State Department of Enterprise Servies	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Mike D Shinn	Both			

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	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.	X	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
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 RCW 39.10.	X	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	X	
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. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

MEETS RCW

Observations/Concerns:

NONE

Mike D Shinn
Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	WA. ST. DES	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Kevin Thomas	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	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.		
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
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 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 certification.	X	
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. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

DES IS AN INDUSTRY LEADER IN ALTERNATIVE DELIVERY METHODS FOR PUBLIC WORK PROJECTS. GOOD EXAMPLE OF INTERNAL COMMUNICATION & RISK MANAGEMENT. MEETS OR EXCEEDS DBE GOALS

Observations/Concerns:

ACCORDING TO THE ANSWER TO DAVES QUESTION, IT DOESN'T SEE LIKE DES HAS A GOOD MENTORING PROGRAM.

K M Thomas
Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM		Approved	x
Public Agency:	WA State Dept. of Enterprise Services	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Lance Thomas	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	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.	x	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	x	
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 RCW 39.10.	x	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	x	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	x	
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. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	x	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Presentation was thorough

Observations/Concerns:

It would be very informative to see how many of the Alternative Delivery Method projects are awarded to contractors and subcontractors that have not done this type of contract before, those transitioning from DBB to GC/CM or DB markets

Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	WA State DES	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	T. Thomas	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	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.		
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
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 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 certification.	X	
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. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

DES demonstrated they have ample experience and knowledge to continue to lead GCCM and DB projects moving forward.

Observations/Concerns:

Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	09/25/2025	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENTERPRISE SERVICES	DB	X	Denied	
PRC Member:	ANTHONY UDEAGBALA, AIA	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

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

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Great presentation, fantastic team structure and understanding of project needs. I find the team to have a good understanding of RCW requirements.

Observations/Concerns:

Exemplary.

Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	September 25, 2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	Dept of Enterprise Services	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Taine Wilton	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	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.	X	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
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 RCW 39.10.	X	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	X	
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. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Large organization, has planning tools to assist with project delivery selection. lessons learned applied. Identify risks and provide client education to reduce risk and increase stakeholder engagement. Provide contingency funding, refines project documents, flexibility to scale project with MACC. Committed to small diverse businesses, robust approach to diversity and inclusion to benefit all.

Observations/Concerns:

Project delivery identification early on, integrated throughout project. Refine documents with lessons learned, assesses risks and benefits for process improvement and improved diverse hiring.

Wilton, Taine E. (ESC) Digitally signed by Wilton, Taine E. (ESC)
DN: CN="Wilton, Taine E. (ESC)", O=Edmonds School District
Date: 2025.09.25 13:19:09-07'00'

Signature