

**CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY REVIEW BOARD
PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE (PANEL REVIEW)**

**Northwest Carpenters Facility
25120 Pacific Highway South
Kent, Washington
December 3, 2015
9:00 AM**

Draft Minutes

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT

Curt Gimmestad, (Chair), Absher Construction
Ato Apiafi, ATO Apiafi Architects
Kurt Boyd, Valley Electric
Rustin Hall, ALSC Architects, P.S.
Darron Pease, Shinn Mechanical
Linneth Riley-Hall, Sound Transit
Mike Shinn, Shinn Mechanical
Phil Lovell, Turner Construction NW
Steve Crawford, Issaquah School District
Bill Dobyns, Lydig Construction, Inc.

Tim Graybeal, Integrus Architecture
Ian Kell, Seneca Group
Jim Burt, King County
John Palewicz, University of Washington
Tom Peterson, Hoffman Construction Company
Yelena Semenova, Department of Enterprise Services
Jon Lebo, University of Washington
Rick Benner, Western Washington University
Chuck Davis, Seattle Central College
Howard Hillinger, Parametrix

STAFF, GUESTS, PRESENTERS

Kasey Wyatt, OAC Services Inc.
Elliot Traweek, Tahoma School District
Heather Hocklander, BCRA Architecture
Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Graehm Wallace, Perkins Coie
Dave Jobs, OAC Services Inc.
Dan Chandler, OAC Services Inc.
Andrew Staples, City of Liberty Lake
Robynne Parkinson, Thaxton & Parkinson
Debbie Terwilleger, Metro Parks Tacoma
Dave Lewis, Metro Parks Tacoma
Stan Looting, ARC
Howard Hillinger, Parametrix
Dan Cody, Parametrix

Lori Cloud, Tahoma School District
Cindy Darcy, Tahoma School District
Danelle Bessett, Department of Enterprise Services
Ron Cowan, Bellingham Public Schools
Curtis Lawyer, Bellingham Public Schools
Jim Jewett, Dykeman Architects
Katy Allen, City of Liberty Lake
Jeff Jurgensen, OAC Services
Jeremy Woolley, Metro Parks Tacoma
Doug Fraser, Metro Parks Tacoma
Rob Sawatzky, Tacoma Public Schools
Paul Curtis, ARC
Jim Dugan, Parametrix

Welcome & Introductions

Chair Curt Gimmestad called the CPARB Capital Projects Review Committee panel meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. Panel members provided self-introductions.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Panel Review – Tahoma School District – GC/CM

Panel Chair John Palewicz reviewed the presentation format. Panel members included Jim Burt, Kurt Boyd, Ian Kell, Rustin Hall, Tim Graybeal, Ato Apiafi, and Tom Peterson.

Lori Cloud, Assistant Superintendent, Director of Finance and Operations, Tahoma School District, reported the application is for conversion of the Cedar River Middle School and Tahoma Middle School into elementary schools as part of the district's realignment implementation. Ms. Cloud reported she has been with the school district for 15 years and has project experience in both low bid projects and two GC/CM projects.

Ms. Cloud introduced team members Cindy Darcy, Capital Projects Manager and Purchasing Procurement Agent, who has 15 years of experience in other project management. Elliot Traweek, Maintenance Supervisor, has been with the school district for three years, has 20 years experience in HVAC systems, and is a licensed journeyman responsible for overseeing the district's Maintenance Department. Kasey Wyatt, Program Manager, OAC Services, Inc. has worked with the district for the last three years and assists the District with GC/CM projects. Heather Hocklander, Architect, BCRA Architecture, has extensive GC/CM experience.

Ms. Cloud displayed an organizational chart of the project team, representing project experience within the school district comprised of two previous low bid projects and the Tahoma High School Learning Center and the Lake Wilderness Elementary School GC/CM projects.

Ms. Wyatt has been involved in the projects in addition to other OAC employees. Ms. Wyatt is assisting the school district in the proposed project providing oversight and other assistance. Mr. Traweek is very familiar with the school's systems and is an integral member of the project. Ms. Darcy is dedicated to the project full-time responsible for handling project management of the project. Ms. Hocklander is the project architect.

Ms. Cloud added that she, Mr. Traweek, and Ms. Darcy would oversee the budget, administration, and community, staff, and student involvement. Ms. Darcy was responsible for the development of the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and will be responsible for the development of the Request for Proposal (RFP) and will lead the procurement process. She is responsible for the liaison between all external parties and community members, staff, and students.

Mr. Traweek is the resource for all school systems and provides the knowledge base for school facility infrastructure, as well as being involved in inspections, observation of the project, and quality control and assurance throughout the process to ensure all district standards are achieved.

Ms. Wyatt reported OAC is providing a support role in the project. She meets with the project team on Mondays to review different processes specific to the project to include development of the RFQ and the PRC application. OAC will facilitate the addition of support staff during the project and is involved in the estimate reviews from the GC/CM contractor, all phases of design development, and general project management. Ms. Cloud is the Project Manager with OAC providing support and GC/CM expertise to ensure the project conforms to RCW 39.10.

Ms. Hocklander said that as the design team project manager, she would lead the design through the development of construction documents and the administration of the construction documents during construction. She will provide the collaboration between the Tahoma School District, GC/CM, and the design team to ensure team cohesiveness and alignment with the intent of the GC/CM delivery method, as well as supporting the strategy of the realignment of the schools. She would be responsible for construction administration in terms of submittals, observations, and assistance with close-out.

Ms. Cloud reported that if the project is approved by the PRC, the District plans to select a GC/CM by January. The GC/CM will be involved in pre-construction services, monitoring the budget, reviewing constructability and the phasing schedule, bidding, and buy-out. The GC/CM is responsible for facilities construction, safety of students and staff on site, quality of the project, adherence to the budget, and meeting the project schedule.

The Tahoma School District is undertaking a significant reorganization/restructuring and is currently constructing a Tahoma High School and Regional Learning Center to house all 9-12K students. The Lake Wilderness Elementary School renovation project will reduce the size of the school. The existing high school and junior high school would convert to middle schools. The project proposal converts the Tahoma Middle School and Cedar Ridge Middle School to two elementary schools. Tahoma Middle School is a historic site and would be converted to Tahoma Elementary School for grades K-5. The Cedar River Middle School would convert to Cedar River Elementary School for grades K-5. Some of the changes include classroom conversions, modification of administration areas, modification of the cafeteria and restrooms, installation of playgrounds and covered play areas, landscaping, signage, and site circulation changes from a middle school to an elementary school environment.

The proposed project qualifies for GC/CM because of the project's complexity in scheduling, phasing, and coordination. Construction activities occur during the school year with conversion of the schools scheduled during the summer requiring coordination with staff, students, and parents. Middle school students would be housed in both schools until spring 2017 with the schools reopening in the fall 2017 as elementary schools. The GC/CM delivery method is critical to the design phase of the projects as the schools are older and have undergone multiple renovations in the past.

The project schedule is an aggressive timeline. If the project were approved, the School District would issue the GC/CM RFQ on December 7 and shortlist candidates by the beginning of 2016 with interviews scheduled during the second week in January. Preconstruction and design is scheduled for completion by mid-January with construction commencing by June 2016. The project is scheduled for completion by August 2017.

The project budget of \$8.3 million includes the GC/CM contingency of 15% for design escalation, owner changes, and programming changes for a total budget of \$13.8 million. Another contingency is included as a District-wide project contingency of \$10 million. Current District projects are ahead of schedule and below budget. The District anticipates allocating some of those project funds to the proposed project contingency.

Panel Chair Palewicz invited questions from the panel.

Kurt Boyd referred to the project schedule and questioned whether the intent is to award the GC/CM contract directly following GC/CM interviews. Ms. Cloud replied that the intent is to award the contract following completion of the interviews as design has already been initiated on the project. The objective is briefing the GC/CM on the status of the design to begin initiating the contractor's involvement.

Ms. Wyatt added that the interviews would be conducted on Monday, January 11 with the proposals opened on January 13. After selection of the GC/CM following the review of proposals, the District would issue a letter of intent to award on January 14.

Mr. Boyd asked about Ms. Darcy's full-time commitment to the project. Ms. Darcy affirmed she is committing 100% of her time to the project. Mr. Boyd noted that according to information in the application, some purchasing responsibility is allocated for Tahoma High School. Ms. Darcy described her involvement in the purchasing process at the high school and planned support by the OAC team and school staff. After contracting with the GC/CM and during the early stages of procurement for furniture, furnishings, and equipment (FF&E), the GC/CM should be fully engaged and working with team members affording her additional time. Ms. Cloud added that she has confidence in Ms. Darcy's capabilities. The team reviewed the schedule in terms of time required for procurement activities, as well as discussing with OAC the need for

extra support should the need arise. Ms. Darcy has overseen procurement for the District for several years with several employees reporting to her and who would be assuming some of those duties during the project.

Ato Apiafi asked about the basis for allocating a 15% contingency for the project. Ms. Cloud advised that although the contingency is 15%, an additional amount is included. The District conservatively budgets its projects. Ms. Wyatt explained that within the construction costs, the risk contingency is included at no less than 3% (possibly 5%), and the project contingency is estimated to include a 7.5% design contingency, 2% for escalation, with the remaining amount allocated to owner and project contingencies.

Rustin Hall asked about the status of the design on the project when the GC/CM is contracted. Mr. Hocklander replied that schematic design should be completed with some areas requiring input from the GC/CM. A pre-application meeting is scheduled with King County to review some of the issues to ensure no triggers exist and that the proposal is reasonable. At that time, design development should be 50% completed when the contractor is hired. The schedule includes working with the contractor on strategic areas that require the expertise of the GC/CM. The major component of the GC/CM's contribution is in scheduling and phasing of the project. The project was accelerated to assist the District in understanding its needs and the permitting process through King County.

Ms. Wyatt noted a third party schematic estimate was recently completed and the intent is to have the GC/CM review the documents to receive another schematic estimate to ensure the project is on track.

Mr. Hall said PRC typically considers 30% design, but it's not necessarily cast in stone. Thirty percent typically represents the end of schematic design. Ms. Wyatt said the process is nearing the end of schematic with Ms. Hocklander scheduled to move forward with some of the details as much as possible acknowledging that it's important to have the plans reviewed by the GC/CM to receive an estimate.

Mr. Rustin said it appears the process is somewhat out of sequence, but for the right reasons. He noted that Ms. Darcy is listed as the primary project manager but hasn't completed the two GC/CM projects currently in progress.

Tom Peterson asked about the estimated date the GC/CM is expected to begin working. Ms. Wyatt said the GC/CM would have an executed contract in February because of required School Board approvals. The team has the ability to issue an intent to award. Based on her experience, she doesn't know of any GC/CM contractor that isn't willing to provide preconstruction service pending contract execution. Ms. Cloud added that it was a process followed in the District's other GC/CM projects. The School Board has been updated and is ready to take the necessary steps to implement the contract. Mr. Peterson asked whether the design would be on hold until February. Ms. Wyatt replied that once the intent to award is issued, the team could move forward as the intent to award assures contractor the contract will be presented to the School Board for approval.

Ian Kell asked about other OAC projects. Ms. Wyatt responded that she is responsible for program management for capital projects. All projects from the School District's 2013 bond have been managed by OAC. OAC is also in charge of construction management for Tahoma High School and Lake Wilderness with staff assigned to each of the projects.

Panel Chair Palewicz asked for additional information with respect to Ms. Darcy's GC/CM experience, as it appears the last two GC/CM projects involved purchasing responsibilities rather than as the project manager. Ms. Darcy said she served in a purchasing role and attended the meetings with Ms. Wyatt to learn about the

GC/CM process from current projects in progress. Panel Chair Palewicz asked about the amount of time she spent on the projects. Ms. Darcy said she spent approximately two to three hours a week on the projects.

Jim Burt questioned whether both projects would be under construction concurrently. Ms. Cloud replied that the projects would be phased and could be under construction simultaneously, which is why contracting with the GC/CM is so important to help the District determine phasing of the projects. Mr. Burt said it appears much of the work involves tenant improvements. He asked for clarification on the complicated phasing aspect within the TI work at each of the sites. Ms. Cloud replied that the schools are occupied by sixth, seventh, and eighth grade students through spring of 2017. The work prior to that must be approached with caution, as those students will continue to occupy the schools as some areas will not be possible to renovate because of the difference in ages between the outgoing and incoming students, which is why involvement by the GC/CM is so integral to the success of the project.

Mr. Burt asked Ms. Darcy whether she plans to participate in the GC/CM class. Ms. Darcy affirmed she plans to attend the next GC/CM class. Panel Chair Palewicz noted that the January class is currently full.

Mr. Apiafi commented on some of the trepidation by the panel, as Ms. Darcy has never assumed the role of a project manager for a GC/CM project. He asked for assurance that Ms. Darcy is capable of assuming the role and completing the project successfully. Ms. Darcy spoke to her project management experience and her recent efforts to learn about the GC/CM process. The project has an experienced consultant who she meets with weekly. Ms. Cloud is very familiar with the GC/CM process and has backfilled her current position to free her time to devote as project manager for the project. She is confident that she can successfully manage the project based on her organizational skills and prior management experience.

Ms. Hocklander referred to her working relationship with other project managers and clients. Ms. Darcy responds quickly to issues. She is dedicated and committed and has assisted and contributed to facilitating the design process.

Mr. Hall spoke to the project's occupied sites. He envisions that much of the work would occur during the summer months, which negates some of the issues in terms of students occupying the site with some of the exterior work occurring in the fall. The project is primarily a TI summer project with some adjustments with systems. He asked whether his summarization of the project is accurate. Ms. Cloud said it's the team's expectation; however, much of the coordination and timing includes working with King County to secure the necessary approvals to move forward during the summer. If those approvals are not received, the team anticipates Plan B, which is why the GC/CM is so important to assist the School District in moving forward with the project.

Ms. Hocklander cited the Cedar River Middle School and reassigning administration space as classrooms. Having a GC/CM contractor to ensure timing and logistics is successful is important because prior to that work, it's important to have those conversations with the GC/CM in terms of converting the space to ensure the September opening date is achieved. There are many strategy decisions by the GC/CM that will enhance the successful completion of the project providing more value and a better layout of space and ensuring safety and continuity to students and staff.

Panel Chair Palewicz asked why the School District didn't contract with a contractor earlier in the process. Ms. Wyatt said the PRC's meeting schedule was a major factor. There were some inquiries about scheduling a special meeting; however, it would have created some pressure for the PRC and the team preferred to wait until the schedule permitted.

Mr. Kell asked about any incentives for attracting a GC/CM. Ms. Wyatt said no incentives are included.

Panel Chair Palewicz invited comments from the public. There were no public comments. He invited the panel's deliberation.

Mr. Boyd referred to comments and concerns about having sufficient management resources for the GC/CM process. It appears the project meets other criteria under the RCW.

Mr. Kell said the project, although smaller, appears to be complex. He foresees an incredible amount of work occurring over the summer with limited activity in the off months followed by more work during the second summer on two different sites with one building designated as an historic building. For those reasons, it would be beneficial to have a GC/CM on board to work through scheduling and phasing to manage those different components. To the extent that the project manager doesn't have a lot of project management construction experience, having OAC supporting the effort as a program manager will assist the School District to manage the two projects.

Mr. Graybeal spoke to the purview of the PRC in terms of project compliance with the statute. The main issue is whether staffing is at the right experience level and resourced adequately to manage the project. The question the School District must ask is determining the appropriate level for particular projects. Determining the right resourcing level for TI-type projects may be creating some of the uneasiness; however, he does have confidence that there are experienced personnel on the team and adequate budget resources to make changes as necessary. Based on those factors, the School District has exhibited the wisdom necessary to achieve success. He's supportive of the project.

Mr. Apiafi spoke to the team members and consultant experience contributing to the project. He supports the project's contingency rate. However, the PRC doesn't know if the general contractor is GC/CM experienced.

Mr. Hall said there appears to be a high level of judgment within the presentation and the budget numbers but it's lacking in other areas, such as the schedule while understanding that there are external forces impacting the schedule. The budget appears to be conservative. He agreed a 15% contingency is necessary for a remodel because of the many uncertainties. He supports the project acknowledging that more experience would be desirable for the project manager while acknowledging the consultant support. He would prefer more percentage of OAC's time beyond two hours a week to ensure success.

Mr. Burt commented on his conflicts in terms of the experience of the project manager especially since the project essentially entails two projects managed by one person on two different sites, which can lead to complications for a person who is also assuming the role of a purchasing agent. He's not entirely convinced that the project would entail complicated phasing, as the construction would occur during two seasons.

Mr. Peterson commented on his experience working with other agencies involving OAC support. He's supportive of approving the project.

Tom Peterson moved, seconded by Ian Kell, to approve the project application for GC/CM for Renovation of Tahoma & Cedar River Middle Schools for Elementary School Realignment. Motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Panel Review – Bellingham Public Schools – Sehome High School – GC/CM

Panel Chair Ian Kell reviewed the presentation format. Panel members included Rustin Hall, Jim Burt, Tim Graybeal, Tom Peterson, John Palewicz, Howard Hillinger, and Linneth Riley-Hall.

Ron Cowan, Executive Director, Capital Projects & School Facilities, Bellingham Public Schools, reported the Sehome High School project is perfectly suited for the GC/CM delivery method as well as the team. At the conclusion of the presentation, the PRC will be asked to approve the project application. Mr. Cowan reviewed the presentation agenda.

The team assembled represents competence and character of personnel who are skilled in their craft and principled in their respective actions. Their experience and commitment to hard work and success for all will ensure a successful project at Sehome. The School Board is committed to the GC/CM process. Bellingham Public Schools believe in a collaborative team approach with team members who are competent in their work as a way to solve complex problems. The project includes some complexities.

Mr. Cowan indicated that he would provide the overall project leadership for the project and would be heavily involved in the planning with his involvement reducing as the project moves to construction while continuing to attend weekly project meetings. As the project moves to construction, Curtis Lawyer, Facilities Project Manager, Bellingham Public Schools, will assume more of the leadership role. Other members include Tim Jewett, Principal-in-Charge, Dykeman Architects, who has worked with staff since 2007 on a number of projects including some seismic retrofits, rebuilding of Whatcom Middle School after the fire in 2009, and rebuilding Lowell and Birchwood Elementary Schools. The architects are gifted and talented designers and are committed to a collaborative approach in solving problems.

Bellingham Public Schools assembled a team to assist the district in its first GC/CM project to include Dave Jobs and Dan Chandler with OAC Services. OAC Services has completed more GC/CM projects than any other firm in the state. The team also includes long-term partner, Graehm Wallace, Attorney, Perkins Coie, to ensure all regulatory requirements are met. If the application is approved, the GC/CM contractor will be added to the team.

Mr. Cowen described his professional background of 37 years in public education with 27 years experience in capital projects and school facilities in both the Bellingham and Ferndale School Districts. His experience includes small renovation projects, full school construction, and rebuilding Whatcom Middle School, a 100-year old historic middle school that experienced a fire in 2009 and reopened in 2011. He recently transitioned from other responsibilities in the district to devote all his time to the construction of school facilities.

Mr. Lawyer reported he has over 15 years of construction experience including educational projects for the Bellingham School District, U.C. Berkeley, and San Francisco Unified School District. He's worked on multiple alternative delivery projects. His last project was a hospital complex in California as a project manager for five simultaneous negotiated projects with different timelines and GMP totaling \$55 million. He completed two of the projects to 95% completion and initiated the procurement process for the fourth and fifth projects. As the general contractor, he worked closely with the owner and the architect through the procurement process to develop work packages for all required work. Additionally, he worked on several federal GSA projects totaling approximately \$400 million using the Construction Manager at Risk (CM-at-Risk) delivery model similar to GC/CM delivery method. The project for the University of California Berkeley was a new 285,000 square-foot lab science building totaling \$162 million. The project was delivered by the CM-at-Risk delivery model. He is scheduled to attend GC/CM training in January to learn more about the state's GC/CM delivery method.

Tim Jewett reported his company has a strong resume of completed Washington State GC/CM projects. Currently, the company is completing the North Creek High School project totaling \$100 million for the Northshore School District. He was involved in two GC/CM projects for the Northshore School District

located on the Bothell High School campus. Additionally, Trish Sherman, Project Manager, Dykeman Architects, will contribute her GC/CM experience. Both members have prior GC/CM project experience.

Dave Jobs, GC/CM Consultant, OAC Services, said he is a certified construction manager with GC/CM experience in Snohomish County for the courthouse project initiated in 2013. He assisted the county with GC/CM procurement, as well as MC/CM procurement and is fully integrated in the project to include budgeting and scheduling. He's been with OAC Services for 18 years.

Dan Chandler advised that his role is to contribute whatever resources are required by the project sponsor. He represents 60 employees. The project would be the 34th GC/CM project for the firm with a combined value over \$3 billion. That collective experience will be part of the project team. The project is the 23rd project in cooperation with Perkins Coie.

Mr. Lawyer reviewed the project site map. The school is located on 40 acres off Bill McDonald Parkway.

Mr. Jewett described the proposed phasing of the project developed to demonstrate some of the issues and potential solutions. The school site has three main entry points along Bill McDonald Parkway. The phasing approach includes construction of a commons/gym complex to the south of the existing gym to enable operation of an area that would be impacted leaving the soccer fields for athletic practice and PE uses with construction of a baseball field and soccer/football track. That area of the site is located away from the main campus. Temporary facilities include using the existing Administration building and moving it as a temporary administration location while also moving the music and robotics spaces to another area in a temporary facility, which is currently an outdoor basketball pad.

Mr. Lawyer spoke to the complications of students on site during the different phases of the project. The plan is using some of the existing parking area for the contractor staging area.

Mr. Jewett said the new classroom would be three stories to reserve space on the site. Student traffic would have access to both sides of the campus. Phase 3 includes completion of the classroom wing and the other buildings. Tennis courts would be added. The plan reserves future development pads for the district. The new parking location provides additional capacity for future development.

Mr. Lawyer advised that if the PRC approves the project, the next step is proceeding to advertising and soliciting bids for the GC/CM contractor and awarding a contract in February. Design and engineering has been initiated and will continue through April 2017 with input from the GC/CM. Construction would begin in early 2017 through August 2019 with occupancy in late August 2019 for the start of the new school year.

The cost for professional services is estimated at \$6.5 million with construction costs estimated at \$52 million to include contingencies. Approximately \$3 million is allocated for FF&E and move-in. No offsite costs are anticipated at this time. The contingency is estimated at \$5 million. Other related project costs, such as temporary classrooms are estimated at \$2 million with sales tax totaling \$4.8 million with a total project budget of \$73 million.

Mr. Cowan reported the Bellingham community in November 2013 approved a \$160 million bond issue. Of that amount, \$73 million is allocated to this project. The bond issue was sized based on projections that the District would not receive any state school construction funds. Any funds received from the state would be allocated for project contingencies. This project is estimated to receive another \$10 million in state funding.

Mr. Jobs reported the project meets three of the six criteria in RCW 39.10. The new school will be built on the site of an existing school. Complexities are associated with scheduling and phasing to include staging and demolition of existing structures and constructing new temporary buildings and scheduling student circulation. Having the GC/CM involved in the planning is critical to the success of the project when construction commences. He emphasized the readiness of the team to move forward.

Mr. Cowan thanked the PRC for considering the project and for reviewing the materials. The team has demonstrated that it's ready to take the next step in the project. The District has a good financing plan and completed initial planning. The project is complex and requires a GC/CM to assist the District in moving forward on the difficult project. Inclusion of a GC/CM provides greater value to the community, more predictability of costs, greater information on constructability, and ongoing value engineering. Mr. Cowan requested the PRC's approval of the project application.

Panel Chair Kell invited questions from panel members.

Mr. Hall referred to the schedule and the status of design work. He asked about the status of the design when the GC/CM contract is awarded in February. Mr. Jewett replied that the District is undergoing a visioning process with schematic design not initiated at this point. The team anticipates developing the architectural specifications over the next several months with schematic design scheduled at the end of January or early February.

Mr. Peterson asked Mr. Lawyer about his involvement in a prior GC/CM project. Mr. Lawyer said the project was a hospital complex in Oakland, California. The project was a negotiated project with a GMP. Mr. Peterson asked about his length of employment with Bellingham Public Schools. Mr. Lawyer replied that he's been with the District for approximately two years. He's worked on eight Design-Bid-Build projects. Two have been completed and two are under construction. The projects are all on time and within budget. He affirmed he is scheduled to attend the January GC/CM class.

Howard Hillinger asked Mr. Cowan about his experience involving the rebuilding of Whatcom Middle School as the connection of that project helping to inform the decision on pursuing a GC/CM delivery method for this particular project is unclear. Additionally, he asked how the project helped to define the overall risks and whether that would be reflected in the contract with the GC/CM. Mr. Cowan replied that approximately 24 hours after the school fire, the School Board passed an emergency resolution authorizing emergency and stabilization work. Working through the emergency process was similar to a GC/CM process because it entailed having the contractor on board with other team members to determine next steps to rebuild the school for approximately 600 students on an accelerated schedule. The experience of working with the general contractor as part of the emergency work made sense and was the right course of action at that particular time. It speaks to similarities of this proposal for pursuing the GC/CM delivery method.

Mr. Wallace added that when the school burned, the shell of the building still existed. The interior was destroyed leaving the 100-year shell. The project rebuilt the interior of the shell. The project was one of the most complex D-B-B school projects based on his experience. Early bid packages were prepared for long-lead items that were bid prior to the general contractor bid. The actual construction period was only eight months and was delivered as specified perfectly. The proposal is the first GC/CM project for Bellingham Public Schools. For a District that has never completed a GC/CM project, the team has the most experience in very complex projects.

Mr. Hillinger asked what Mr. Cowen foresees as the major risks and how those risks would be reflected in the GC/CM contract. Mr. Cowen said the major risks are time and money. His school district experience expands

37 years. He is committing a promise to the community of a new Sehome High School scheduled to open in August 2019. It's important to mitigate a budget and schedule by assembling the best team, which speaks to the need for a GC/CM. As the process moves forward, more information will be revealed in terms of cost predictability prior to a bid date.

Linneth Riley-Hall referred to project experience of OAC and Perkin Coie under the GC/CM delivery method. She asked about key lessons learned from those projects that would contribute to this project. Mr. Chandler said the improvements are incremental. One of the main issues specific to this proposal is the best method for applying incentives, when and how to establish the GMP, and where and when the fee is applied. Mr. Wallace noted the experience also speaks to the volume of completed public projects. Each new project generates different comments providing additional clarity and improving the process. In many aspects, there is no right or wrong answer. One example is incentives and whether to include them as a savings percentage or based on subjectivity. Combined experience is contributed to the process through sharing ideas with the team to render good decisions.

Mr. Palewicz commented on other GC/CM project proposals that included experienced firms, such as OAC Services to assist in delivering the project. He asked how the team plans to work effectively with OAC. He asked for some examples from the Snohomish County Courthouse project. According to the project application, OAC is designated as developing the RFP, RFQ, and providing procurements services; however, the resume indicates OAC will serve in an advisory role. He asked for clarification as to how the consultants and team members will work together to leverage the consultant's knowledge.

Mr. Cowan commented that in terms of the big picture – there are uncertainties and unknowns, which speaks to the need to surround the process with people who do know. The District believes it has hired the best to ensure the project follows statutory requirements. The District hired an experienced designer through Dykeman Architects. All the consultants will advise and assist the team because the final decision is the responsibility of the District. The experts will assist in that process and provide good advice knowing that the team is tasked with the charge of delivering the project to the community.

Mr. Chandler outlined the process. It entails communicating constantly about roles and responsibilities through conference calls and meetings. At the onset, it begins with procurement. Mr. Jobs will author the RFQ and the RFQ with Mr. Lawyer serving as the editor. Mr. Jobs would likely facilitate short-list meetings with the selection committee. Mr. Jobs would also facilitate the interviews with the contractors. Up to this point, the team has engaged in weekly conference calls to discuss the details of the PRC project application, procurement, and the contract. After the design process begins, Mr. Jobs will attend meetings as required, participate in conference calls, and receive meeting minutes regularly. As the process proceeds, advising becomes an important element to review ideas, issues, and situations.

Mr. Jobs said that during the development of the roles and responsibilities matrix, communication would be ongoing between the parties on lead and support assignments based on best estimates at that time. As the process proceeds, OAC will serve as a resource as needed and will assume the leading role even when not anticipated. OAC understands the GC/CM RCW requirements and would assume a leading role because of its experience and knowledge. The roles and responsibilities matrix outlines those resources to the best extent possible.

Mr. Chandler reported that when OAC serves in an advisory role, OAC strives to ensure the client is learning by providing the client with templates for RFQs, RFPs, and cost responsibility matrices.

Panel Chair Kell inquired about Mr. Lawyer's role in the California project. Mr. Lawyer said he served as the general contractor and worked for a general contractor for the San Francisco Unified School District as the construction manager for the District's projects.

Panel Chair Kell invited public comments.

Phil Lovell commented on response by the team to the question about improvements made by OAC Services over the years. He cited the responses as how to handle incentives, where and how to apply fees, and when to establish the GMP. Based on his awareness and experience, those aspects of the business are nibbling around the edges of what occurs in private industry. The RCW is rigid in terms of how some of the requirements are applied.

Panel Chair Kell invited panel deliberations to render a decision.

Mr. Peterson said the project and team meets the requirements for approval for the GC/CM delivery method.

Panel Chair Kell agreed and cited Mr. Lovell's comments and assurance that Mr. Wallace would ensure all aspects of the project comply with RCW 39.10.

Mr. Hillinger said he believes the application is complete. The additional clarification of roles and responsibilities was helpful; however, he is somewhat concerned about the level of involvement but is satisfied with the response.

Mr. Palewicz agreed the project is appropriate for GC/CM. The owner has hired qualified consultants to help shore up the experience that is lacking by the team. However, his long-term concern is whether the public owner will avail itself of the expertise of the firms it has contracted. He would like a better way for the PRC to monitor how well those relationships work during the life of the project to ensure expertise is gained by the public owner.

Mr. Peterson cited his experience with OAC Services and with other public agencies. He personally has never experienced any problems as the consultants always offered their expertise in different areas.

Mr. Hall said in terms of qualifying for GC/CM under the statute, Phase 2 will be difficult in terms of the work by the GC/CM. His only concern is that the majority of the PM experience is carried by the consultant. That responsibility should reside within the team with the appropriate amount of experience whereas this project appears to be a learning opportunity as OAC Services is serving in an advisory role. One of the main advisors has completed only one GC/CM project. However, with the addition of Perkins Coie, Dykeman Architects, and the involvement of Mr. Chandler the project would likely be okay. Having construction experience spanning a 30-year career doesn't necessarily speak to the difficulties associated with a GC/CM project.

Ms. Riley-Hall echoed Mr. Hall's comments. She is still concerned about the advisory role of Mr. Jobs in terms of weekly conference calls with a project manager who has limited experience. However, because the team is surrounded by a consultant team that can influence the process, she's satisfied but cautioned that the ongoing challenge is to ensure the team utilizes the resources. The project will be successful if the team uses the resources.

Mr. Palewicz said he would have preferred an answer that spoke to meetings every week and spending the day with team members to ensure all opportunities are available to the owner. In his role at the University, his

project managers and contract managers work under his direction. However, standing meetings are scheduled to ensure face-to-face meetings to discuss issues and solve problems.

Mr. Burt agreed with many of the comments by the panel. As one of the agencies that utilized the services of OAC Services, the consultants were always available when needed.

Mr. Palewicz said his concerns do not center on OAC Services, but rather ensuring the owner taps into the knowledge and experience of the GC/CM consultants.

Tom Peterson moved, seconded by Tim Graybeal, to approve the project application for GC/CM for the Sehome High School project. Motion carried by a unanimous vote.

The meeting was recessed for lunch for approximately 45 minutes.

City of Liberty Lake – Pool/Community Center – Design Build

Panel Chair Steve Crawford reviewed the presentation format. Panel members included Yelena Semenova, Jon Lebo, Phil Lovell, Bill Dobyns, Linneth Riley-Hall, Mike Shinn, and Rick Benner.

Katy Allen, City Administrator, City of Liberty Lake, outlined the presentation agenda and introduced several members of the project team.

The City of Liberty Lake has never completed a Design-Build (D-B) project or any other capital project involving construction of a new building. The presentation's goal is to answer the panel's questions and provide members with the confidence that the City's team is solid and that the approach to the project is strategic and all risks have been anticipated for this type of project.

The City of Liberty Lake is located off the last exit of I-90 in the state. The City incorporated in 2001 and has a population of 9,000 people, three golf courses, trails, and open space. Ninety percent of homeowners belong to homeowner associations. Ms. Allen said she's been the City Administrator for over three years. The City purchased 6.5 acres of property for the new facility. As an engineer, she previously worked for the City of Spokane for 25 years leaving in 2002 as the City's Engineer and the Director of Engineering Services and with experience in capital projects. After leaving the City of Spokane in 2002, she worked for the City of San Jose as the Public Works Director and City Engineer during the City's "Decade of Investment" involving three bond measures, an airport project, an array of capital projects, and a new City Hall project totaling approximately \$4 billion in capital projects during her nine-year tenure. The projects were delivered on time and within budget with no litigation. The City of Jose's projects included community centers, swimming pools, City Hall, airport, runways, bridges, streets, state park, and a veterinary clinic. The City's metric-driven organization experienced pressure to deliver on time and on budget within a collaborative process. The number one criterion was to ensure no D-B litigation occurred. Ms. Allen said she has experience in D-B. San Jose was a charter city with the mayor passing a measure that included a procurement process for a qualification-based selection that was used to rebuild the Terminal Area Improvement Program at San Jose International Airport at a cost of \$1.3 billion. After the selection, negotiation, and design of the project, she was honored with DBIA's national award. The project was completed three months ahead of schedule and \$150 million under budget.

The City of Liberty Lake has 30 employees of which 10 are police officers.

Andrew Staples, City Engineer, City of Liberty Lake, reported he has been with the City for over seven years. His professional background includes heavy civil projects. Prior to working for the City, he was involved in

site and reserve development, as well as consulting for municipalities. He oversees all capital projects for the City ranging from new parks, new streets, and facility renovations. He manages the projects from concept through closeout. He is serving as the project manager for the proposed project.

Ms. Allen reported the City purchased the 6.5 acres in 2005. The property was vacant until the Town Square Park was developed. She displayed an illustration of the site. The proposed project is a simple project within a defined site. The area surrounding Town Square is developed with the vacant property remaining the last undeveloped parcel. The project is critical for the community because the City does not have much indoor covered space serving the community during times of emergencies and inclement weather. The City requires indoor space for a variety of reasons.

Through a community survey a year ago, respondents ranked indoor space as a high priority. Many respondents want a swimming facility, a place to socialize and gather, and play toys. The project includes a swimming facility with water play equipment and supporting amenities. Progressive D-B would be most valuable in terms of the facility. Currently, the City has a 9,000 square-foot library that serves as a defacto community center. However, during story times or during training sessions, the parking lot is filled to capacity, as well as the facility exceeding its capacity. The new facility is required to meet community needs affording flexible space, covered areas, and a swimming pool.

A community steering committee assisted in developing the scope of the project. The City Council approved the scope, approved funding design development, and approved issuing a bond measure in August 2016. The new facility would be approximately 16,000 square feet with a swimming facility, parking, and other site development totaling \$11.2 million. The budget was increased to \$12 million to include a design contingency.

Ms. Allen spoke to her accountability to the community to deliver a project that the community has envisioned and supports. Her experience in D-B includes placing more of the project dollars into the project and less into the D-B-B process in terms of biddable documents. D-B offers predictability that a low cost bid wouldn't be able to provide because of the uncertainties associated with the cost of commodities at any given time. Additionally, the intent for the team is to work with a D-B architect and a D-B firm to help the City in maximizing project dollars and providing more design options that might otherwise be overlooked. The innovation and efficiencies of Progressive D-B within the state are attractive to the City.

If the community supports the bond measure in August 2016, approval of the proposal would entail moving forward to completion of the design and construction. The project is important to the community and simple in design containing a swimming pool, meeting rooms, flexible space, building systems, and restrooms. It's important for the City to maximize taxpayer dollars in the construction of the facility.

In terms of managing risks in a D-B project, the project risks include the selection process because of the importance of a flawless selection process.

Robynne Parkinson, Thaxton & Parkinson, said she has 20 years of experience with D-B projects. The project meets the criteria in RCW 39.10 because the City is seeking assistance from the D-B contractor to assist the City in defining and configuring spaces and establishing the project budget prior to the bond measure.

Jeff Jurgensen, Project Manager, OAC Services, commented that the schedule is aggressive. The important information is that the schedule and RFQ have been released in draft form to the construction and design community during an earlier meeting. The meeting resulted in good attendance. Participants were encouraged to voice concerns early in the process. To date, the City has received positive feedback on the proposed

schedule. If there are concerns about the schedule, the team is flexible and can change the schedule to ensure the project is reasonable and attainable.

Ms. Parkinson noted that she challenged the City in terms of the schedule and recommended expanding the schedule. Of importance are the few deliverables in this project. Prior to approving the schedule, she recommended releasing the schedule to the construction community to review the project and schedule. She encouraged the City to afford more time if the construction community indicated a need for more time. The City is still willing to extend the schedule. Additionally, Thaxton and Parkinson will provide a draft RFP early to the industry to afford adequate time to prepare.

Mr. Crawford invited public comments.

Rustin Hall commented about his attendance to the industry meeting. The draft RFQ was shared with participants. The meeting was heavily attended for such a simple project. There was no resistance in terms of the schedule. His company doesn't foresee any issues with the schedule.

Mr. Crawford invited questions from panel members.

Mr. Lovell asked whether more than one building is included in the project because the project calls for 16,000 square feet, a programmatic demanding library utilizing approximately 9,000 square feet, a swimming pool, and a fairly well developed program based on public input. His overall concern in bringing the D-B contractor on board is whether the intent and the budget are sufficient to build the entire program, and what might be penalized should the budget fall short. It appears the two programming elements are the swimming pool and the library, which are not simple buildings. Pools can be complex and demanding, particularly mechanically and electrically. A library has its own demands as well from a programmatic aspect in terms of sight lines and clearances. Ms. Allen explained that during her employment with the City of San Jose, the City built 26 libraries and community centers. Those buildings transitioned to multiuse facilities for a variety of reasons. The proposal is for one community center building. The intent is not to construct a library used only Monday through Friday or a community center used only on weekends. The goal is maximizing square footage enabling activity daily with one parking lot and shared resources. A similar model was completed in San Jose totaling 10 combined facilities. The library of yesterday is not today's library. Libraries are gathering places, where people can apply for jobs, where people participate in classes, and in other activities. Because today's library is similar to a community center, the proposal is for one building. The community center is a place for the community to congregate, celebrate, debate, or a place hosting different kinds and sizes of events in flexible spaces. The community center would likely include a commercial kitchen, office space, and storage. During the preliminary stage, the City retained an architect who completed a pricing estimate based on three similar centers. The estimate was between \$11 million and \$13 million. The community pool is not an Olympic indoor facility but rather it's a lap swim with no entry, a play area, and a concession area. The estimate for the pool is approximately \$4.6 million.

Ms. Allen commented on the importance of contingencies within the budget. The budget includes \$1 million in contingency that would be allocated to the D-B team, to the owner, and to the contract manager.

Mr. Jurgensen added that he spoke with several contractors in the community. Typically, the first questions are the budget and the square footage costs. The contracting community reviewed the costs and did not express any concerns with the projected budget. Contractors had some reservations if the pool building and pool was only budgeted at \$200 a square foot. The actual budget is \$300-\$350 per square foot for the equipment center.

Mr. Benner remarked that the answer has created more confusion for him personally.

Mr. Lovell said it appears the applicant has a total program at a cost of approximately \$11 million with a million dollar contingency included within the \$11 million. Mr. Jurgensen noted that the two buildings are not part of the program.

Mr. Benner questioned the architect's cost estimate for the community building of \$11 to \$13 million. Ms. Allen apologized for the confusion. The steering committee developed four project elements of a swimming theme, community building, parking lot, and site development. That concept was reviewed by an architect, who estimated the price between \$11.2 and \$13 million. That cost included \$1 million in contingency. The base project is a 16,000 square-foot building, swimming pool, shower area, concession stand, parking lot, and site landscaping. She is confident that the base project is well within the budget and that there could be other items that could be included.

Mike Shinn asked whether a stipend is planned for submittals by unsuccessful D-B contractors. Ms. Allen said the stipend for contractors submitting a bid and not selected is \$1,000. The City's 2016 budget includes \$100,000 for the successful D-B team for work on preparing the bond measure for August.

Ms. Parkinson explained that the structure of the contract includes several phases of pre-bond and post-bond. The pre-bond phase is budgeted at \$100,000. If not sufficient, the team will negotiate the amount with the design builder. Following the bond measure, the process includes further validation followed by development of the GMP with construction commencing after development of the GMP. Funds are allocated for the scoping to ensure good pricing and solid schematics for preparation of the bond measures.

Yelena Semenova questioned the timing for the release of the draft RFP. Ms. Parkinson replied that the RFP is nearly completed, as well as the contract. During the drafting of the RFQ, the RFP was drafted to ensure both documents are completed concurrently. The RFP hasn't been finalized at this time but the intent is to finalize the RFP to afford time for contractors to prepare proposals. The deliverables for the RFP will be minimal and programmed-based or project management-based with no design required.

Panel Chair Crawford asked about the status of the draft RFQ that was released. Ms. Parkinson affirmed that the draft RFQ was published followed by a public meeting to answer questions. The final RFQ is scheduled for release following approval by the PRC of the project application.

Ms. Riley-Hall asked whether any changes incorporated within the final RFQ might invoke any requests for information (RFI) on the RFQ. Mr. Jurgensen said there have been no RFIs received to date. Ms. Parkinson said the RFQ schedule includes a deadline date for RFIs. The intent by the City was to afford the design-builder as much time as possible prior to the bond to develop the program, which is why the schedule is shorter. Communications to the design-builder community in Spokane acknowledged that if more time is required, it would shorten the timeline for the contract. Additionally, although the RFQ hasn't been issued, there are no anticipated changes. Ms. Riley-Hall said that after issuance of the RFQ, an opportunity is provided for submittal of RFIs. The schedule reflects seven days for submittal of Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) but no time allocated in the event RFIs are submitted. Ms. Allen acknowledged that the timeline is aggressive; however, when the draft RFQ was published, design-builders were asked to provide feedback on the timeline if more time would be required. No feedback was received. After release of the final RFQ and should the design build community indicate more time is necessary to prepare proposals, the City is willing to adjust the deliverables on the RFP if needed. The only challenge is a two-month requirement to engage the community during June and July. The more time allocated on the front end could impact the deliverables on

the back end. The project could encounter some longer lead times on some of the deliverables or materials. The only date of focus is the bond measure deadline in August 2016.

Panel Chair Crawford pointed out that ballot language must be submitted by March. According to the schedule, it appears price confirmation will not occur by that date. Additionally, the Council must approve moving forward. It's unclear as to how those deadlines could be achieved. Ms. Allen replied that according to the City's bond counsel, ballot language is due in April. The bond counsel and underwriter have been selected. That process will be concurrent with the RFQ process. The measure will ask voters to support a \$12 million voted bond measure to construct a Town Square project. The definition of the project will follow.

Jon Lebo asked whether it's fair to assume that the schedule is compressed because the City's process was delayed and the August 16 election is the deadline. He asked whether the schedule would be the same if the election date wasn't factored. The issue is about judgment about project delivery and applying the appropriate amount of effort and time to ensure adequate time. The question is whether the City would pursue the same schedule if timing of other factors didn't exist. Ms. Allen affirmed that the schedule would remain the same because of the frustration by the community. Many in the community do not understand why the project is taking so long. She acknowledged that public agency contracting entails responsibilities by the City. Additionally, if more time was available, it likely would be expended through architectural services and the value of that is uncertain. Since November 2016 is a presidential election, there are concerns about pursuing a voted bond after a presidential election.

Ms. Parkinson commented that the questions point to concerns that the process was initiated too late. However, Ms. Allen has completed many projects. The timeline is also consistent with many of the projects completed by Ms. Allen in San Jose using qualifications-based procurement.

Mr. Lebo said the concerns center on the short time between issuing the RFQ and the response due dates. The issue is judgment and whether the team is affording adequate time. Ms. Parkinson pointed out Ms. Allen's experience in qualifications-based procurement and that the timeline was similar to many San Jose projects. Ms. Allen affirmed that she is willing to adjust the schedule. Should the interviews produce a common theme that the schedule is not doable, the team could adjust the schedule or delay the bond measure if deemed necessary. Up to this point, no negative feedback has been received about the schedule. Additionally, the question is whether more time would add more value to the project or perhaps create more costs to the D-B contractor.

Ms. Semenova reiterated that the schedule only affords 10 days for the D-B contractor to prepare the proposal. Ms. Allen said that's why the RFP was scheduled for an earlier release. Ms. Parkinson said the final date for the formal release of the RFP hasn't been determined. However, the intent is to afford the same amount of time that was afforded for the RFQ. Ms. Allen added that the draft RFP could be released in the next week. However, the City needs approval by the PRC prior to releasing the RFQ.

Panel Chair Crawford invited deliberations by the panel.

Ms. Riley-Hall expressed concerns about the schedule; however, the schedule alone shouldn't prevent the project from moving forward. Her concern centers on the aggressive schedule and the due date for RFPs on January 15. It also appears the proprietary meetings are after the submittal date of the RFP.

Mr. Dobyms spoke from the perspective of a design-builder. The aggressive schedule adds value and increases the attractiveness of the project to the market. Extending the time would only add costs and doesn't add value to the process. In a Progressive Design-Build project, Ms. Allen is right that the proposers would use the time

to refine and advance proposals while increasing costs that don't add value or could even delay the process. The aggressive schedule for a project of this size is more attractive to the market.

Mr. Benner asked whether there are projects that fit within the traditional delivery mode, as he doesn't believe there are compelling reasons for the project to pursue D-B as opposed to traditional methods. According to the presenters, the construction schedule could include some flexibility as well as the development schedule. Based on his observations, he doesn't understand why the project couldn't be pursued traditionally.

Mr. Lovell said that based on the presentation, there are efficiencies to be gained by pursuing the D-B delivery method. However, the concern is whether the budget is sufficient as opposed to the schedule because the public will push back if the project scope changes because of the lack of funds. The projects appear to be suitable for D-B assuming the program has been established that the D-B contractor could successfully complete. If the team finds that the design-builder is varying from the program significantly, the application's answers indicate the City would terminate and pursue another program, add some contingency, or change the schedule. It appears there is a significant commitment to ensure D-B will work for the project.

Mr. Lebo said that as a representative of a public owner, there is value in Progressive D-B. In terms of traditional project delivery, the current statute places value on the D-B delivery method for public owners. D-B affords the ability to hire a contractor based on qualifications and price and developing the program to fit the owner's budget, as well as potentially adding some project enhancements or scaling the project to meet the budget. He supports the project as it meets the requirements of providing value to the owner as defined in the RCW. Although the team has varying levels of experience, overall, there are high levels of qualification. Although other members expressed concerns about the schedule, his concern is minimal based on his experience, as the RFP is the easiest piece. Identifying the qualifications is what takes time.

Ms. Semenova affirmed her concerns about the schedule although the issues have been addressed. She also is concerned about the budget because the inclusion of sales tax and contingencies leaves a remaining budget of approximately \$9 million for the building, swimming pool, parking lot, and site development. She is hopeful that the D-B team is careful in determining the budget. However, the project is a good fit for D-B and the schedule could be adjusted if required.

Ms. Riley-Hall conveyed her support for the project acknowledging her concerns about the schedule. The experience Ms. Parkinson brings to the team related to D-B and Progressive D-B provides a team with a body of knowledge that the project will need as it relates to both the schedule and the budget. The budget affords some flexibility in terms of adding or removing components.

Panel Chair Crawford acknowledged initial concerns with the application because of the aggressive schedule. However, based on the qualifications of the team members, the project is appropriate for Progressive D-B. His scheduling concerns centered on the compressed schedule and the upcoming holidays. He acknowledged the City's outreach to the construction community and the lack of any concerns about the schedule. The project is suited for D-B and it's reassuring to a public owner to work with a D-B contractor to define the program and costs prior to moving forward on the project.

Phil Lovell moved, seconded by Yelena Semenova, to approve the project application for Design-Build for the City of Liberty Lake Town Square Project. Motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Metro Parks Tacoma – Eastside Community Center – GC/CM

Panel Chair Darron Pease reviewed the presentation format. Panel members included Jon Lebo, Rick Benner, Phil Lovell, Steve Crawford, Bill Dobyns, Mike Shinn, and Chuck Davis.

Jeremy Woolley, Project Manager, Metro Parks Tacoma, reported that the team was recently notified that the panel may not have been afforded adequate time to review the answers to initial questions submitted by the panel. Those questions will be covered during the presentation.

In 2011, a young person became the victim of gun violence. The Eastside Community rallied around the event and was the impetus for the collaboration of four public entities within the City of Tacoma. The four partners include the City of Tacoma (COT), Tacoma Public Schools (TPS), Tacoma Housing Authority (THA), and Metro Parks Tacoma (MPT). The partners joined efforts to build a community center geared for youth development and youth services, as well as providing other services at the site, which historically has been neglected and overlooked.

In 2014, the four agencies hired the design team of ARC to develop a feasibility study and identify potential Eastside locations. The study produced some budgets and identified a site. The site is located on property housing the First Creek Middle School. Three sides of the parcel include dense urban environments of THA's housing neighborhood and the 380-acre Swan Creek Park. All the entities are the driving force for the project because of the connection to the neighborhood, to the school, and to the park. The overall advantage of the site also presents some challenges that sets the stage for pursuing the GC/CM delivery method for constructing the project.

Mr. Woolley referred to a question about the specific GC/CM experience of the design team. The design team of ARC has completed a GC/CM project. The team has negotiated work experience and minor GC/CM experience; however, the consultants have direct GC/CM experience. Team members plan to attend GC/CM training in January.

Mr. Woolley introduced the project team members: Debbie Terwilleger, Director, MPT; Doug Fraser, Chief Planning Manager, MPT; Dave Lewis, Director of Recreation, MPT; Rob Sawatzky, Director, Planning & Construction, TPS; and Stan Lokting and Paul Curtis, ARC. Additionally, because of the lack of GC/CM management experience, Parametrix was contracted to provide assistance at various stages, as well as being an integral team member in the management process.

One of the questions pertained to the allocation of Jim Dugan's time (Parametrix). Initially, the budget allocated 10% of Mr. Dugan's time. That percentage has since been adjusted with Mr. Dugan participating in weekly meetings of the design team and if the project is approved, the GC/CM will be a member of the team.

Mr. Dugan reported he is the project director for the project. Howard Hillinger, Parametrix, will manage the GC/CM selection process and Dan Cody, Parametrix, is the project manager.

Mr. Hillinger referred to the site map. While the site is ideal in terms of its location to other services, the site presents some challenges. The site includes an active water transmission line serving as the primary water line for the City of Tacoma. The proposed building would be collocated with an active school and recreation site. The site contains wetlands and buffers and rights-of ways. Scheduling and phasing will be complicated in addition to potential phased funding. Access to the play fields must be maintained during construction.

The site is occupied by students and is used by the public. The transmission line represents a significant piece of infrastructure that would impact construction activities.

Given the complexity of the project, phasing is a potential affording the ability to work around the school to assist in the development of an early site package by next summer enabling later construction. Several active

intersections are located at the entrance of the site. Having early access to the site by the contractor to help plan the aquatic center and identifying the cost, scope, and quality control is important. The work environment is complex involving four owners. The permitting process will be difficult because of critical areas. The most complicated aspect of the project is permitting.

Mr. Dugan spoke to the permitting process. In coordination with the City of Tacoma and Tacoma Public Schools to identify the permitting processes in the City, one of the components is included within the 30% building design. The City of Tacoma has a work order for site permitting that is separate from a building permit. To compile the necessary documents, the site package must be prepared. During the management of site permitting with the City of Tacoma, other challenges include percentage increases in permit applications weekly and the need to publish early packages. The GC/CM process allows the team to manipulate the process affording some flexibility within the process. Additionally, time is essential for managing costs in an inflationary market. Managing the process with the City is fundamental to managing the scope, schedule, and budget.

Mr. Dugan referred to the project's public benefit. The project site is flanked on all sides by dense urban uses. The site is actively used during the evenings and weekends with a school in operation. Complexities are numerous and safety is paramount. Some adjustment in phasing is necessary for funding. A great plan has been developed that is transparent. Managing time and costs during an inflationary market while managing the phasing of funding contributes to the complexity of the projects. Design-Bid-Build is not the appropriate delivery method for this particular project, and it doesn't satisfy the requirements of D-B. The team believes GC/CM delivery is the best chance to manage all the moving parts.

Mr. Hillinger reviewed the project schedule. The RFP is scheduled for release in December, which may slide to January to enable more review. However, the selection process essentially begins in December through February with award of the preconstruction services contract in March tying with the conclusion of the schematic design phase. One item to be reevaluated relating to completion of schematic design is a funding and phasing decision. However, it's important to complete the GC/CM selection process to secure input to the phasing approach.

Mr. Hillinger noted the roles and responsibilities matrix has changed since the initial application was submitted. The matrix reflects the roles between the owner and Parametrix, as well increasing Mr. Dugan's time to assume a lead role in advising MTP in terms of the elements in managing the GC/CM project. Parametrix anticipates a very active role in managing the process.

Mr. Woolley referred to the project organization chart. The chart speaks to the management plan for the project. One of the concerns was the lack of GC/CM experience in the design and owner side. Based on the time adjustment by Parametrix, the team believes the addition is sufficient to address project needs.

In terms of the industry standard contracts, MTP has contacted the University of Washington for the GC/CM contract. In the initial application, schematic design was scheduled to end in December; however, because of several unknowns and the collaboration of a GC/CM, the team extended the schematic design phase to the first quarter of 2016.

Other questions pertained to secured funds versus anticipated funds. The estimated budget based on the feasibility study identified \$31 million for a 60,000 square-foot center with a dry and wet side. Today, approximately \$12.4 million has been committed to the project of \$6 million from the parks bond, \$5 million from the City of Tacoma, and \$1.4 million from RCO state grants, which is sufficient to fund design and preconstruction services with decisions pending on project scope and phasing. Many personnel from the four

partners are traveling to Washington D.C. to petition for federal funding to help fill the funding gap. In March, the schedule identifies a decision point on the funds identified and funds that are required to move the process forward to determine the project scope that could include only the dry side of the community center with phasing of the pool later. The project meets four of the five criteria as set forth in RCW 39.10. With the addition of Parametrix, the team has the experience and the right team to complete the project for the community that deserves a high quality community center. Finally, the team is aware of most issues but not all issues, which is why the GC/CM is so valuable for the process to assist in phasing, funding strategies, and other project issues. Metro Parks Tacoma has two other GC/CM projects underway to include a heavy civil project currently in the phase of preconstruction services.

Panel Chair Pease invited questions from the panel.

Panel Chair Pease asked whether the estimated cost of the pool has been identified. Mr. Woolley said the feasibility study identified \$15 million for the aquatics and \$15 million for the dry side, to include soft costs as well. The design team is working on a schematic design cost estimate. A draft of the schematic is anticipated before the end of the year.

Mr. Dugan added that the design of the facility includes both functions side-by-side under one roof with a main corridor between the uses to afford options for phasing if necessary.

Mr. Lovell indicated the application refers to the possibility of deferring the pool if there is a shortage of funds. He questioned how construction of the pool area would resume inside an existing building. Mr. Woolley said ARC is designing the planning strategy of the floor plan with only the dry side and a phased approach for the pool.

Mr. Dugan commented on the numerous design options that could be pursued. It's important to make those decisions with the GC/CM. It's also important to make the right decisions with limited time and funds, which is why the schematic has been delayed to ensure good decisions are rendered in partnership with the GC/CM.

Mr. Lovell asked whether the pool would be utilized competitively. Mr. Woolley advised that Tacoma swimming clubs and other swimming organizations have used other facilities for competition. The Eastside community currently lacks that opportunity for indoor competition.

Panel Chair Pease pointed out that the preconstruction services contract is not scheduled until March, which appears to conflict with schematic design in March. If the intent is involvement of the GC/CM, the date likely would need to be reconsidered. Mr. Woolley said the timeline for the RFQ/RFP is conservative affording ample time for interviews and aligning internally with the Board and the capital improvements review process. Under the best case scenario, the GC/CM could be contracted by February affording time to review documentation from the earlier schematic design.

Mr. Dugan added that the schedule could be adjusted as needed, as there are no pending deadlines. Additionally, Doug Holen, Parametrix, is assigned to support the process.

Mr. Davis said the project meets the RCW criteria for GC/CM. The next issue is whether the appropriate expertise is available to utilize the GC/CM delivery method, as well as sufficient resources. He is currently involved in a major GC/CM project that was underfunded creating an 18 month delay in some portions of the project. That delay adds complexity and additional costs. In terms of the struggles with the budget, the issue is whether the project can be successful. The team should be aware of additional complexities associated with the budget shortfall. Secondly, the organizational chart reflecting Mr. Woolley's time of 80% during

construction as the project manager leaves 20% with only 10% assumed by Mr. Dugan resulting in a gap. Mr. Woolley replied that when PRC's comments were received, MPT met with Parametrix and realigned time commitments by Mr. Dugan as the point person for Parametrix. Since then, the time has been increased to reflect between 30% and 40%.

Mr. Dugan said there are two components involving the GC/CM selection whereby a combination of Mr. Hillinger and Mr. Cody's time augments his time. During design and construction, his time is allocated at 30% to 40%. He is not serving as project manager for any other project and is delaying commitment to other projects until mid-2016.

Mr. Davis stressed the importance of the PRC to ensure the pieces are in place. The entire purpose of the PRC review is to protect the delivery method. All PRC members are committed to the alternative delivery method afforded by the Legislature. When a project fails, it creates a risk for alternative delivery methods, which is why the PRC drills down to the details.

Mr. Hillinger added that Mr. Dugan lives in Tacoma and has completed four GC/CM projects. One was with the City of Tacoma and three projects were for Tacoma Public Schools. The level of commitment is based on his level of experience running two GC/CM projects concurrently with Tacoma Public Schools. Parametrix believes the time allocation is sufficient. The contract is in place and if required, Parametrix would ensure resources are available. Mr. Dugan added that failure is not an option. While anything is possible, no design or contract is perfect. The company has a 38-year project history of no failures.

Dan Cody commented on the commitment by Mr. Dugan and his work ethic.

Mr. Benner asked why the selection of the architect consultant firm didn't require GC/CM experience. Mr. Woolley replied that MPT as a public agency was new to the GC/CM process and alternative construction methods. The first time the agency submitted a proposal to PRC was in May. When ARC was contracted, MPT was not familiar with the delivery method. Later the requirements were reviewed to determine the best delivery method. Mr. Dugan added that the project was originally designed and planned as a D-B-B project. It soon became apparent that D-B-B wasn't the best delivery method, which led to the decision to pursue GC/CM.

Mr. Hillinger said during the initial discussions, Parametrix offered to assist in mentoring the agency through a GC/CM project because of the firm's experience in GC/CM.

Mr. Lovell commented that some of the answers to the questions speak to strategies addressing the potential of Mini-Multiple Award Construction Contracts (MINI-MACC), phasing, or the lack of sufficient funding. Each stage involving a MINI-MACC requires documentation from the architect at 90% design completion requiring constant communication and an understanding throughout the process to ensure a successful conclusion with a MINI-MACC approach, particularly with an architect that hasn't been involved in alternative delivery method projects. Mr. Dugan said that currently, the team is negotiating the DD (Design Development) and the CD (Construction Documents) remaining design. Had the project been initiated as a D-B-B and eventually transitioning to a GC/CM delivery project, a variety of different contingencies and allowances would have been involved to satisfy MINI-MACC requirements.

Panel Chair Pease invited public comments.

An unidentified individual reported he is currently working with Parametrix on two GC/CM projects. There is no better group that could lead the project, particularly with phasing and in the permitting requirements. Mr. Dugan is well experienced in working through the City of Tacoma's permitting process.

Panel Chair Pease opened panel deliberations.

Mr. Dobyms expressed support for the project.

Mr. Crawford reported his initial concerns surrounded scheduling, which have been addressed. The involvement of Parametrix provides the strongest level of experience for GC/CM. The project is also suited for GC/CM.

Mr. Lovell agreed the project is appropriate for GC/CM and the team is adequate. No project is perfect in terms of all components. The funding issue may pose some challenges. Assuming that the team is committed to a successful project, he's supportive of the proposal.

Mr. Lebo said the project meets the RCW criteria for GC/CM delivery. He supports more involvement by Parametrix.

Mr. Shinn offered no comments.

Mr. Davis expressed support for the project delivery method but cautioned the team about the complexities that will evolve because of funding issues.

Mr. Benner said the project satisfies the criteria. The challenge will be during the permitting phases, especially if permitting is extended. There may be times when 80% by the project manager is insufficient. It's important to have the flexibility to expand the time regardless of the involvement by Parametrix because the owner must be committed and involved.

Panel Chair Pease agreed the project is well suited for GC/CM, but he is concerned about the funding aspect. He suspects that MTP likely has many resources and would be able to identify more sources of funds. However, it will cost more if the project is only partially completed.

Phil Lovell moved, seconded by Steve Crawford, to approve the GC/CM application from Metro Parks Tacoma for the Eastside Community Center. Motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Next Meeting Date

The next PRC meeting is scheduled on Thursday, January 28, 2016.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Chair Gimmestad adjourned the meeting at 1:45 p.m.