

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY REVIEW BOARD

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

Northwest Carpenters Facility
First Floor Conference Room
25120 Pacific Highway South
Kent, Washington

December 1, 2016

Draft – Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT

Rustin Hall, ALSC Architects (Vice Chair)
Ato Apiafi, Ato Apiafi Architects
Vicki Barron-Sumann, BarSum Consulting
Jim Burt, King County
Steve Crawford, Issaquah School District
Chuck Davis, Seattle Central College
Bill Dobyns, Lydig Construction
Jim Dugan, Parametrix
Howard Hillinger, Parametrix
Matt Lane, McGranahan Architects

Jon Lebo, University of Washington
James Lynch, Ahlers & Cressman
Mark Ottele, Granite Construction
Darron Pease, Shinn Mechanical
Ahmad Qayoumi, City of Pasco
Linneth, Riley-Hall, Sound Transit
Yelena Semenova, Department of Enterprise Services
Rob Warnaca, Mortenson Construction
Janice Zahn, Port of Seattle

STAFF, GUESTS, PRESENTERS

Kristine Anderson, Tacoma Public Schools
Talia Baker, Department of Enterprise Services
Christie Barrie, Tacoma Public Schools
Eric Becker, Seattle Public Schools
Richard Best, Seattle Public Schools
Dan Boettger, Okanogan County PUD No. 1
Brian Carter, Integrus Architecture
John Christensen, Christensen Associates, Inc.
Lori Cloud, Tahoma School District
Dan Cody, Parametrix
Anne Cummings, Tacoma Public Schools
Cindy Darcy, Tahoma School District
Tim DeVries, Okanogan County PUD No. 1
Berry Ellison, City of Spokane
Suzanne Gilbert, Mt. Vernon School District
Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
John Grubich, Okanogan County PUD No. 1
Heather Hocklander, BRA Architecture Inc.
Garrett Jones, City of Spokane

Matt Kastberg, Parametrix
Bobbie Knapp, Tacoma Public Schools
Jennifer Larson, Mt. Vernon School District
Dr. Nathan McCann, Ridgefield School District
Stephen Murakami, Tacoma Public Schools
Julius Pallotta, Tacoma Public Schools
Robynne Parkinson, Thaxton Parkinson PLLC
Paul Popovich, Tacoma Public Schools
Rob Robinson, Skanska
Rob Sawatzky, Tacoma Public Schools
Heidi Smith, Okanogan County PUD No. 1
Brad Tong, Shiels Oblatz Johnsen
Brian Urban, Skanska
Amy Vanderhorst, Integrus Architecture
Matthew Walker, Hill International, Inc.
Kasey Watt, OAC Services
Chris Wright, Spokane Parks Board
Casey Wyckoff, LSW Architects
Rick Yeo, R&C Management

Welcome and Introductions

Vice Chair Rustin Hall called the CPARB Capital Projects Review Committee to order at 9:02 a.m.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Seattle Public Schools, Ingraham High School Addition — GC/CM

Panel Chair Linneth Riley-Hall reviewed the presentation and timing format to consider the GC/CM application from Seattle Public Schools for the Ingraham High School Addition project. Panel members Linneth Riley-Hall, Steve Crawford, Bill Dobyns, Yelena Semenova, Ato Apiafi, Jim Dugan, Rob Warnaca, and Rustin Hall provided self-introduction. A majority vote of the panel is required for approval of the application.

Other PRC members in attendance provided self-introduction and indicated they were not a member of the panel.

Richard Best, Director, Capital Projects and Planning, Seattle Public Schools, introduced project team members, who provided self-introduction. Brian Carter, Integrus Architecture, serves as the Principal-in-Charge. Amy Vanderhorst, Integrus Architecture, serves as the Project Manager. Brad Tong, Shiels Obletz Johnsen (SOJ), is the Principal-in-Charge of school projects and serves as the Construction Manager for the project. Eric Becker is a Senior Project Manager with Seattle Public Schools.

Mr. Best reported Seattle Public Schools has been experiencing growth of approximately 1,000 students each year since 2008. The District expects to begin experiencing capacity problems within the secondary education program beginning in 2019 with 2,000 classroom seats shorts. Previously, the District sought approval of a project to reopen Lincoln High School as a GC/CM project. The proposed project application is to construct an addition to Ingraham High School. The project is a 20-classroom addition to serve an additional 500 students. By 2023, 2,000 more classroom seats will be needed in the District. The District anticipates building a new high school in the downtown core area.

Seattle Public Schools educates 53,000 students with 143 languages spoken in the District. The District always considers the ethnicity of the schools and the communication pattern when considering construction projects and the impact of those projects on students and their families. Additionally, the proposed project is located on an occupied site necessitating the importance of the District engaging with a general contractor to ensure the contractor understands the complexity of working on Seattle Public Schools projects.

Mr. Becker described the context of the project site. The site is located on the north end of Seattle near the Seattle/Shoreline School District boundary. The District is divided into north, central, and south areas. As a project manager for the Seattle Public Schools, Mr. Becker said he is in charge of the north school projects. The existing site is a 28-acre fully developed site located in a Single-Family residential zone (*7,200 square-foot zone*). Existing buildings were built in 1959 with the most recent addition in 2011. The site is occupied and houses several exceptional trees.

The proposed project is a 20-classroom addition to create additional capacity for 500 students. The budget allows for 45,000 gross square feet of new construction. The project also includes some additional funding for seismic retrofitting and re-roofing portions of the existing roof. One restriction on site is a 30-foot height limit. Existing lot coverage is 16% with lot coverage of 19% anticipated for the project. Maximum permitted lot coverage is 35%.

Mr. Carter reviewed some of the site complexities. The south portion of the site includes playfields. As a condition of an addition in 2007, a 12-classroom addition was added to the west side of the site, as well as a reconfiguration of a large parking lot to serve both the school and the fields around the perimeter. The site includes a large stand of habitat trees on the west side and southeast portion of the site. The original 100 Building houses a performing arts facility added approximately 25 years ago. The 200 Building is a science classroom addition, which will remain. No buildings will be demolished on the site. Only the north portion of the site is available for additions as forecasted in the school's master planning completed as part of the 12-classroom addition.

The team has completed the Districts process involving the local community and user groups. The project is at the beginning of schematic design. Some conceptual design ideas were developed to determine potential placement. The project requires accommodation of ADA access at the bus drop-off at the north end of the site, as well as adjacent to the existing building. The site is limited to accommodate all existing needs of the school to maintain operations and a construction lay-down area, which will be challenging. To achieve 20 classrooms, the design calls for a two-story addition with a repetition of the original buildings and a series of courtyards to enable light into the new space. A series of existing classrooms along the north side of the 100 Building creates some challenges. The project includes significant roof and seismic upgrades along the 100 Building.

Mr. Tong reviewed key elements, attributes of the project, and reasons for warranting the GC/CM alternative delivery method. The project has complex phasing with the addition located adjacent to and connecting to the existing 100 and 200 Buildings. The fixed schedule is three years from pre-design to occupancy. The project requires complex coordination because most of the work would be performed while the campus is occupied except for a short period during

the summer of 2018 and during summer 2019. Most existing buildings are circa 1959 with the potential for historic landmark controls. The project would benefit from GC/CM delivery because of construction during occupancy of the site during continuous operations with up to 1,400 students. Other project complexities include a complex technical work environment and site constraints. Five exceptional trees are located in the immediate vicinity of the footprint of the proposed project. The project involves potentially complex regulatory and community processes and a full SEPA analysis, as well as seismic retrofitting, re-roofing, and architectural connections to potential landmark structures in a very tight environment in a surrounding single-family residential neighborhood.

GC/CM involvement is critical to success of the project:

- GC/CM leads phasing, schedule and discrete bid packages for the project
- GC/CM best informs costs and escalation current market volatility
- GC/CM best informs constructability of systems in design phase
- GC/CM as advocate of the owner's interests is critical to success
- GC/CM critical to minimizing conflicts and unforeseen conditions during construction by detection early in pre-construction
- GC/CM participates in cost management during design and construction
- GC/CM participates actively in sustainability strategies
- GC/CM helps forecast and solve challenges, not react to them
- Committed GC/CM can manage traffic, neighborhood relations well.

Mr. Becker reviewed the school district's construction experience. The District has completed 19 major capital projects valued at \$872 million in the last 10 years. The District is currently delivering 10 major capital projects valued at \$462 million. The District has completed seven GC/CM projects with a value of \$500 million and is currently working on six GC/CM projects valued at \$357 million. The District has developed GC/CM RFPs, selection documents, and contract agreement documents for current and previous projects.

District GC/CM projects currently under construction include:

- Wilson Pacific Elementary School and Wilson Pacific Middle School - \$116 million
- Olympic Hills Elementary School - \$42 million
- Loyal Heights Elementary School \$43.9 million
- Webster Elementary School - \$31.7 million
- Daniel Bagley Elementary School - \$30.4 million

Completed GC/CM projects by the District include:

- Denny Middle School/Chief Sealth High School – Project 3 athletic facilities \$6 million
- Denny Middle School/Chief Sealth High School – Project 1+2 Main \$149 million
- Nathan Hale High School Modernization - \$73 million
- Garfield High School - \$88 million
- Cleveland High School - \$67 million
- Roosevelt High School - \$85 million
- Nathan Hale High School Auditorium - \$10 million

Mr. Becker reviewed the experience of owner members. Richard Best has 31 years of experience in K-12 school construction and is currently involved in six GC/CM projects. Mr. Becker reported he has 29 years of project management experience in K-12 and is involved in several GC/CM projects, as well as experience in other completed GC/CM projects. Graehm Wallace is the District's General Council who has 19 years of experience representing multiple public entities on GC/CM projects.

Mr. Tong said the District hired Oblatz Johnsen to serve as the project/construction manager for the project. The firm has delivered and is delivering over \$1 billion in successful GC/CM or CM/GC projects in the region to include both school projects and non-school projects. The team's experience includes his 30 years and seven GC/CM projects. Cheri

Hendricks, Deputy Construction Manager, and two on-site construction managers with GC/CM project management experience.

Mr. Becker reported Integrus Architecture has worked on 20 GC/CM projects of which 15 involved school projects for 10 different school districts. His portfolio includes 17 projects of which two are non-school projects. Most of the work is in the public school environment. Currently, the company is working on three non-GC/CM projects. Ms. Vanderhorst has 15 years of experience in educational, civic, and commercial projects and been involved in five GC/CM projects.

Mr. Carter reviewed the project's organizational chart.

Mr. Tong reviewed the project schedule. The project begins in mid-2016 and ends in September 2019 beginning with pre-planning/pre-construction through turnover of the project. The project budget is \$38.39 million to include design and owner contingencies of 5%, as required under RCW 39.10.

The Ingraham High School Addition project is a large project in a residential neighborhood with technical and schedule risks. The project meets at least four criteria to utilize GC/CM. The owner has a strong history of building capital projects. The team has strong GC/CM experience and a record of successful delivery. Using GC/CM for the Ingraham High School Addition will provide significant public benefit to include the ability to control schedule and meet the mission for delivery of the project on time.

Panel Chair Riley-Hall invited questions from the panel.

Mr. Apiafi said he was impressed with the presentation and the in-depth experience of project members. He understands the complexity of the project for selecting GC/CM. Most public agencies spend ½ of 1% on contracting with women and minority businesses. He asked for information on the District's efforts to bridge the gap. Many agencies are making positive strides to right this wrong.

Mr. Best replied that the District's School Board policies direct how the District reaches out to minorities and women-owned businesses. The District has been engaged in conversations through the District's Procurement Office to reach out to minority organizations. Within the Capital Projects Office, staff meets with architectural, engineering, and professional consultants interested in conducting business with the District. The District also has an active program to reach out to those organizations. The Contracting Procurement representative sits on a procurement panel for minorities and women-owned businesses. The staff member works in contracting services and not in the Capital Projects Department.

Mr. Hillinger spoke in favor of improvements to the school and preserving some of the landmark elements. He asked about the intended staffing plan in terms of personnel commitment, percentage of involvement of the construction managers, and other project commitments by the consultants.

Mr. Best replied that neither he nor Seattle Public Schools have the ability to provide extensive amounts of time to individual projects. Currently, he is in charge of 11 projects under construction and participates on those projects on a monthly basis with a dispute resolution board. Because of the number of projects, the District recognized the need to hire a construction management firm. The District advertised and hired SOJ. SOJ provided a team who can provide the day-to-day attention that a significant project like Ingraham High School requires. Last year, the District was able to open five new schools, one renovated school, and 89 classrooms at 65 other schools on time. During construction, the area experienced 115 days of rain over 150 days between November 1 and March 30. The expectation of the Superintendent was clear that the projects would be completed prior to the opening of the school each year. Seattle Public Schools was the only school district in the state that opened every project on time, which is reflective of the level of involvement by Seattle Public Schools.

Mr. Tong reviewed SOJ team commitments from pre-planning to delivery of the project. Mr. Tong said he serves as the construction manager for the project and is responsible for the entire project and is accountable to the Senior Project Manager, Mr. Becker. His involvement is heavy in design, the design phase, contractor selection phase, contracting negotiations, and bidding. His time fluctuates each month on any given project but for this project, he anticipates

spending 50% of his time with support by Ms. Hendricks. Ms. Hendricks will focus on design and programming and work with Integrus Architecture, program, and instructional staff at the school and at the main office. Ms. Hendricks will devote approximately 30% to 40% of her time on the project during the design phase. After transitioning to construction, the onsite CMs, Ethan Bernau and Mike Tihista, who currently cover multiple projects, would be on-site each day. Mr. Bernau focuses on construction administration paperwork and coordination while Mr. Tihista is involved in relationship building, contract, compliance, and working with the general contractor and subs on the job site to develop relationships and monitoring for issues that might arise specific to schedule, labor, and site personnel.

Panel Chair Riley-Hall said the schedule reflects advertising for the GC/CM in October. She asked about the current procurement schedule and the status as of today.

Mr. Best advised that in order to meet the project schedule, the District believed it was necessary to reach out to the construction community through the GC/CM process, which necessitated advertising. The District received Statements of Qualifications (SOQs) and evaluated the SOQs. No notification to GC/CM contractors has occurred. The District recognizes the need to receive approval from the PRC. The District had some conversations with the District's Steering Committee Chair John Palewicz. Mr. Palewicz advised the District of how other school districts had implemented a similar process as the District was concerned about the schedule. The process is currently in schematic design phase. The District prefers to have the GC/CM contractor onboard to review the schematic design submittal and provide some pricing, which is why the process was initiated. However, the District recognizes the need to receive approval to move forward. All contractors participating in the walk-through were informed of the need to receive approval before the District could initiate a GC/CM project. No interviews were conducted.

Mr. Tong added that the process is partially through step one of a three-step process. The process has not entered step two.

Rob Warnaca said his question is a follow up to Mr. Hillinger's question specifically in terms of Mr. Tong and Mr. Becker. He asked for clarification as to the main point of contact providing clarification or is empowered to provide direction during the design phase when Integrus and the successful GC/CM have questions pertaining to the schedule to ensure the project remains on track. Mr. Becker clarified that he is involved in the discussions and attends the meetings on a weekly basis during design and construction. Any feedback or questions from Mr. Tong or Ms. Hendricks would go through him and Mr. Best for any decision. Mr. Tong added that during the design phase of owner and architect meetings, he and Ms. Hendricks attend them on a weekly basis. Ms. Hendricks also attends the architect's design team meetings on a weekly or greater basis. There is continuity of owner representation of all team members during the design phase. During the construction phase, Mr. Tong said he as the Principle-In-Charge and attends all owner-architect meetings at job sites. Questions are funneled through him. Based on the contract with the District, he is authorized to render fiscal decisions up to \$10,000 for any changes. Beyond that amount, the questions are directed to the District. Mr. Becker attends all OAC meetings through the construction phase.

Mr. Best spoke to his involvement. Generally, he attends the presentations at schematic design and during design development. He reviews construction documents for bidding and is involved in the monthly meeting during construction with the Dispute Resolution Board on the project site. Rather than managing day-to-day activities, his involvement is high level with monitoring of the financials and design to ensure compliance with specifications. Mr. Tong and Mr. Becker are managing the project on a daily basis.

Rustin Hall commented on the robust listing of the District's audit findings. He spoke to the audit in 2010 and findings for establishing best practices and improvements the District has implemented since then that would address concerns surrounding previous audit findings. Mr. Best replied that his employment with the District began in 2014 prior to the audit findings. Many best practices were implemented prior to his employment. The District's internal audit team audits each project. From his perspective, there is much armchair quarterbacking after the fact; however, the District has also learned from those reviews. The department conducts a weekly meeting of all project managers and consultants. Internal audit findings are reviewed on a quarterly basis during those meetings. He was unable to comment on the state audit findings other than he is not aware of any recent audit findings against Capital Projects & Planning.

Panel Chair Riley-Hall remarked that the private sector is not necessarily required to release audit findings; however, the public sector often releases audit findings. She thanked the team for including the information and asked about controls implemented to help ensure against any audit findings related to GC/CM projects. Mr. Becker said the District relies on SOJ to assist the District with any items related to the GC/CM process. Additionally, the District is conscious of its processes with the School Board through its approval processes for funding. The District also reviews and discusses audit findings. Any audit findings pertaining to processes are corrected and incorporated within current processes. He cited an example of early planning for the proposed project to help organize planning and confirm budgets before meeting with the community. That process assisted the District with its projects and was one of the lessons learned that was incorporated into all processes. The District continues with that process as part of early planning for the next set of projects.

Mr. Crawford asked how the process for the project links to the project oversight review committee. Mr. Best said staff meets monthly with the project oversight review committee. The design of the proposed project will be presented to the committee, as well as a review of the budgets with the committee each month. Generally, any budget adjustments are first reviewed by the oversight committee and then by the School Board for approval. All projects receive scrutiny through its oversight committees.

Mr. Tong commented on how the District addresses internal audit commentary or findings. The District brings construction managers together with internal project managers, senior project managers, and other key departmental non-capital staff on a weekly basis to discuss lessons learned both in the field and during design. That process includes some citations of internal audit findings. The discussions are thorough and robust by the entire Capital Project team on a weekly basis led by Mr. Best and senior project managers. The process serves as a good learning tool that is inclusive and assists all upcoming projects.

Mr. Apiafi asked the team to share information on process improvements and lessons learned and how the team plans to use that information for the proposed project. Mr. Carter replied that one process improvement is building into the project schedule how a GC/CM process is not just about milestone cost reconciliation but also about engaging the contractor as early as possible in the project. The contractor should be involved during schematic design to discuss the best approach for the site, the budget, and the ability to make or break a project successfully. The architecture design work plan includes the GC/CM within the process. Additionally, during the bidding process, successful bidding of a project is a collaborate approach to the bid packaging. The design team has an important role in helping the general contractor consider appropriate packaging and appropriate letting of the bids in terms of the scope definition within each bid package. During construction at the end of the day, the GC/CM must bid the work and evaluate bidders. Once on site, the design teams are no less substantial in helping the GC/CM stay ahead of the subcontractors in understanding documents and roles.

Panel Chair Riley-Hall invited public comments.

Chuck Davis said he is surprised that Seattle Public Schools had not sought GC/CM certification as the District has a completed a number of projects.

Panel Chair Riley-Hall invited deliberations by the panel and a recommendation.

Mr. Dugan said he essentially has no questions and supports the application. He noted the statutory requirements in terms of how GC/CM is deployed and pushing the schedule limits as far as possible to obtain as much time to learn about the market is a brilliant idea, and one that he likely would adopt. Secondly, there were many projects that did not open on time last September. Many schools across the Northwest did not open with some Tacoma schools still unopened. The saturation in the bid marketplace is incredible. The ability to have a volume of work that opened on time and on schedule in today's marketplace is one reason why he did not have any other questions. The fact that the District has been successful means all the steps are in place.

Mr. Hillinger said he also supports the application and believes the District has completed a substantial body of work. He was unsure after reviewing the application of the specific assignments and the commitment, but is satisfied with the answers as the system appears to work. He recommended clarifying the responsible entity for questions from the contractor.

Mr. Crawford said the project obviously qualifies for GC/CM. The owner has completed a number of projects using alternative delivery methods and has a strong successful history of project completion. He also questioned why the District has not pursued certification.

Mr. Hall also had the same question. The District's actions and accomplishments have proven that it is fully capable of completing the project successfully. By definition in the RCW, the project is a poster child for GC/CM, and he has no concerns.

Panel Chair Riley-Hall commented that she believes the District potentially avoided an audit finding by delaying the procurement phase until after appearing before the PRC versus continuing with the phase and then seeking approval from the PRC.

Apo Apiafi moved, seconded by Rustin Hall, to approve the GC/CM application from Seattle Public Schools for the Ingraham High School Addition project. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Crawford noted the approval is informal at this time. He asked whether the District could move forward in its process for selection of a GC/CM prior to receiving an approval letter. Panel Chair Riley-Hall affirmed the panel's approval enables the District to move forward with the procurement process for the GC/CM.

Panel Chair Riley-Hall recessed the meeting at 9:56 a.m.

Tahoma School District, Shadow Lake, Rock Creek, Glacier Park Elementary Schools – GC/CM

Panel Chair Steve Crawford reconvened the meeting at 10:07 a.m.

Panel Chair Crawford reviewed the presentation and timing format to consider the GC/CM application from Tahoma School District for the Shadow Lake, Rock Creek, and Glacier Park Elementary Schools project. Panel members provided self-introduction. A majority vote of the panel is required for approval of the application.

Lori Cloud, Assistant Superintendent, Tahoma School District, reported the application is the fourth project presentation to the PRC. The presentation will cover the Tahoma School District, the project, how the project meets the RCW for GC/CM, and funding for the project. Ms. Cloud said she is currently working on the Tahoma High School and Regional Learning Center project. She anticipates completing the project in March. The project is ahead of schedule and under budget. She is also working on the Lake Wilderness Elementary School and Renovations to Tahoma and Cedar River Middle Schools GC/CM projects. Cindy Darcy, Purchasing/Risk Agent, Tahoma School District, has also managed complex renovations at Tahoma and Cedar River Middle Schools, which are on schedule and under budget.

Ms. Darcy said she is in charge of purchasing for the District and is currently engaged in a GC/CM renovation project spanning two years. Much of the construction was completed last summer. A smaller scope of work is scheduled in 2017. She handles the Furniture, Fixtures, and Equipment (FF&E) for the new high school GC/CM project and FF&E purchasing for the Lake Wilderness project.

Kasey Wyatt, Program Manager, OAC Services, said she serves as the Program Manager for the Tahoma School District. Her role is project oversight for the entire 2013 bond program.

Heather Hocklander, Architect, BCRA Architecture, reported she is the Project Manager for the design team and coordinates all design team efforts in coordination with the GC/CM. She is currently working with the District on the approved GC/CM projects and completed some scope of work during the summer with procurement a major part of the success of the work. Additional work is scheduled during summer 2017 in addition to other schools that tie into the overall transition plan for the school district. She has completed four GC/CM projects for seven schools including another building at the Point Defiance Zoo and Aquarium in Tacoma. She has been with BCRA Architecture for the last 16 years specializing in educational projects.

Ms. Cloud commented on the experience and expertise of OAC Services, as well as the depth of the company. The District has often required other expertise for other projects and OAC Services has been flexible in providing needed resources, which has been very helpful to the District. The same experience is also true of BCRA Architecture and other contractors.

The roles and responsibilities assigned to the GC/CM project include:

- Project and Construction Management
- Budget and Contract Negotiations
- Scheduling
- Conduit to Administration, Community, Staff, and Students
- Development of the GC/CM RFQ & RFFP

Ms. Wyatt reported her role on the project would be as the GC/CM advisor supporting the development of the RFP and RFFP, facilitating the evaluation of the contractor submittals, and assisting Ms. Darcy in estimate review and GMP negotiations. Ms. Darcy is a seasoned project manager, and she would serve as a resource. OAC's involvement in the project would be determined if additional resources are needed during the summer of 2017 when the large transition occurs with shifts of every school in the District. OAC Services serves as an advisory for GC/CM procurement and the negotiation of the GMP, as well as a resource as needed on the project.

Ms. Hocklander advised that BCRA Architecture is the design team leading the design and construction documents, development, and communication of the strategy for achieving project goals of aesthetics and the quality of the school project, coordination in moving and transition, scheduling and budget, construction contract administration, review of submittals, quality construction observation, and contract closeout. A major component related to GC/CM is supporting the GC/CM both in the procurement and in scheduling, which led to the success of a previous project of four schools, which required a team effort. Another role of BCRA is permitting through King County and associated agencies, which has been initiated through preliminary reviews.

Ms. Wyatt reported on the involvement of the GC/CM. During preconstruction services, the GC/CM will participate in investigation and destructive testing of the sites. As the projects entail modernization and renovation of existing sites, having the GC/CM onboard provides the opportunity to complete investigations to reduce the risk of unforeseen conditions during construction. The GC/CM will also lead value engineering and constructability reviews as part of best practices. The GC/CM would be responsible for phasing, scheduling, site logistics, and subcontractor bidding and buyout. Important factors during construction of facilities are safety, quality, budget, and schedule. Having a GC/CM onboard provides an opportunity to maximize those factors.

Ms. Darcy addressed site logistics, bidding, and buyout. Site logistics for the three sites are different. Each of the elementary school buildings include summer daycare programs, kindergarten camps, other camps, and signage to help inform the community, students, and parents about construction activities. Additionally, the District is also realigning the entire school district. All three elementary schools involved in the project entail moving and relocating all furniture, equipment, staff, and students to other elementary schools in the District. The 2013 bond program enabled the District to increase the existing four elementary school configuration to a six elementary school configuration.

Having a contractor early in the process is essential for the District to assist in separating bid packages, as well as having an understanding of the bid market to ensure marketability of the bid packages. The District strives to have as many bids as possible. Having a contractor involved early during the preconstruction phase is important to ensure good bid competition.

Ms. Darcy reported the Lake Wilderness Elementary School is a new school under construction as a GC/CM project. Last summer, the District renovated two middle schools to transition to elementary schools opening in fall 2017. The three elementary schools are the last three schools as part of the bond program. At Shadow Elementary School, the building renovation to the administration area includes a District-wide secured vestibule standard for security of the mainstream hallways of classrooms. After the school day begins, visitors enter the first set of doors with the second set of doors locked forcing all visitors to report to a check-in desk. The project adds a secured vestibule area. The project also

includes site circulation improvements through additional wayfinding signage. Shadow Lake Elementary School is comprised of four separate buildings on a rural campus. Many families that are located on the back playgrounds have difficulty locating the main office, which would be part of the circulation improvements. The project includes new playgrounds and play fields. All three buildings would have access control systems of electrified doors and surveillance cameras.

Ms. Darcy reviewed how the project meets criteria for GC/CM delivery. The project is subject to complex scheduling, phasing, and coordination with construction occurring on a site with existing facilities. The project is on a fast track for design with the goal of having a contractor in March with procurement of the HVAC equipment in time for installation in the summer, as well as for the CCTV and access controls, which are critical to procure this spring to meet the summer schedule. GC/CM delivery is critical to minimize the risk of unforeseen conditions during the early design phase.

The issuance of the RFQ is scheduled on Monday, December 5 pending PRC approval of the application. Shortlisting is scheduled on January 4 with interviews scheduled on January 11, 2017. The project is currently in early design/early schematic. Design is scheduled to commence on January 17, 2017, with building construction scheduled in May 2017 and completion by December 2017. Most of the work is scheduled for completion by the summer with some carryover items to December 2017.

Ms. Cloud reported that because of the success of the other projects, the District was able to release some contingency funds. The project is estimated to cost \$7,516,140, which includes a 15% contingency for the District and a 5% contingency for construction.

Panel Chair Crawford invited questions from the panel.

Mr. Dugan requested clarification regarding the timing for submittal of permits to ensure they are timed closely with the hiring of the GC/CM, design, and early bid packages within the next 30 to 60 days, as it appears many activities must occur within a short span of time.

Ms. Hocklander affirmed that many activities occur quickly, which is why the team contacted King County early. It can require up to six weeks to obtain permits. Based on lessons learned, the team met with King County permitting staff to learn about the permitting requirements for each scope of work and the approval duration necessary for King County, as well as other agencies. Because the relationship was established with King County to learn which scope of work triggers permitting, that information will inform and impact the design process. Having the conversation back and forth and understanding what might trigger a permit, such as hollow metal and certain bid packages, helped the team during previous projects, which will provide the selected GC/CM with a knowledge base to identify required timing of items moving forward.

Ms. Darcy added that during the visit to King County, the scope of work at two of the elementary schools was small and only included the cameras and electrified doors. The scope does not require a building permit but the work requires alignment with codes. The only permit required is for the one elementary school.

Mr. Dugan remarked that the traditional goal of wanting to have the GC/CM onboard on or before the end of schematic might not be the case for this project because of time constraints to secure necessary documentation and execution of those documents before summer, which is critical for the project. Ms. Hocklander said the project is similar to the project completed last year. During the review of that project, the PRC questioned whether the hiring of the GC/CM was early enough in the process. That is the reason for the success of the project last year. That concern is less valid because the District experienced the full value of the GC/CM in a more unique way.

Mr. Apiafi asked Ms. Hocklander to share more information on her GC/CM experience and lessons learned. He asked Ms. Darcy for more information about the prior projects and the contingency. He asked Ms. Cloud to speak to the agency's minority and women-owned contracting program.

Ms. Hocklander replied that she has completed four GC/CM school projects at Clover Park School District and one GC/CM project at Point Defiance Zoo and Aquarium in a support role to an architect from California. She also worked on the four school projects in the Tahoma School District last year. In terms of lessons learned, procurement is important from a permitting aspect with the GC/CM proactive in tracking the permits especially since the permits are not for one new school, but for several components at several locations. It is critical the GC/CM understands and tracks all permits, as well as the architect team. It is also important for the packages, in terms of the case work, such as hollow metal, which speaks to the data and experience that BCRA brings forward to the project. Because other GC/CM projects are nearing completion, any lessons learned will be leveraged on the proposed projects.

Ms. Darcy described some elements of the scope of work planned for summer 2017. One school includes the addition of a secured vestibule to one administration/main office area, addition of new wayfinding signage at Shadow Lake Elementary School, and potentially adding a new product, Forever Lawn, to sand and dirt play fields. Other improvements include new playground elements. Shadow Lake Elementary School has an existing small covered area for students. The District has several ideas about improving the area by adding additional covered areas or expanding the existing covered area. Other improvements include expanding access control and electrified doors, and the addition of cameras at the elementary schools.

Ms. Cloud noted a requirement within the RFQ includes information on how the contractor plans to include DBE contractors. Contractors including DBE contractors receive points as part of the interview process.

Ms. Riley-Hall said although the District has indicated the procurement was successful for the last set of projects, she is unsure as to responsibility for the procurement of the GC/CM for the proposed project.

Ms. Hocklander said her comments spoke to the procurement of materials and products rather than the GC/CM.

Ms. Wyatt added that OAC Services would draft the RFQ and work closely with Ms. Cloud and Ms. Darcy. OAC Services will complete the advertising and the RFP. However, OAC Services would not participate in the scoring but would assist in preparation of the documents. Ms. Riley-Hall asked about the stage of the design fee after the GC/CM has been contracted. Ms. Hocklander said it likely would be during early design development, as the process is currently in scoping and feasibility at this time.

Mr. Warnaca remarked that his question pertains to a better understanding of the design phase. According to the project milestone, the GC/CM would be onboard by mid- to late-January with construction beginning in May. The scopes of work appear to be more performance spec-based and less design detailed, and it is likely that work is not as permit-intensive as the overall design documentation. He questioned the intent to start by May if the release of trade bid packages is not until late March or early April with design development beginning in January. He asked for additional clarification as to how the project would be mapped to release bid packages and award packages a month to 90 days prior to construction and how that timing coincides with the design schedule.

Ms. Hocklander pointed out that last year, the process was a month later in selecting the GC/CM. This schedule affords some time as the project is smaller scoped with the selection of the GC/CM scheduled a month earlier. Last year, the GC/CM had to hit the ground running in terms of understanding the scope and preparing bid packages. Although the design was not completed, the design process was underway since the beginning of the process. A large part of the success of the project was the GC/CM's understanding during the bid package process even while engaged in the initial cost estimate and reviewing the project scope. Last year, the GC/CM started identifying very quickly the first bid packages, which resulted in accelerating the design effort. The project is not a typical design process because the process responds to the procurement and the permitting schedules, which is unique.

Ms. Wyatt added that Ms. Hocklander is a seasoned design professional. Several years ago, she designed two elementary schools for Clover Park School District. Carver Lake and Hillside schools were designed in six months. Both projects were 70,000 square foot elementary schools. She is the right person to have on the team to drive what is necessary to meet the schedule.

Mr. Burt said it appears Ms. Darcy is serving a dual role as the District's purchasing and risk agent, as well as the project manager for the project with 100% of her time spent on the projects. He asked how the time would be allocated, as well as interfacing with school officials in the capacity of purchasing/risk agent and in capital projects. Ms. Darcy acknowledged that she is very busy and serves many roles. A purchasing assistant backfills all day-to-day normal risk issues. In terms of procurement for the FF&E elements, she is nearing conclusion of that work with the preparation of a purchase order for a furniture purchase for the new Tahoma High School followed by Lake Wilderness Elementary School. She has a close working relationship with the principals at all renovated schools. Throughout the summer, each principal has attended weekly construction meetings and have been able to receive information firsthand. Throughout the summer, the Superintendent provided support as the escalation contact for many decisions that normally would have waited until a school board meeting. That coordination reduced much of her time. She aligned 100% of her time during the GC/CM procurement process. The existing GC/CM renovation project is stalled and sealed for the rest of the year and is not rescheduled until May. During that timeframe, the proposed project would be underway and organized. Other helpful factors are the District's standard access control systems, which have been installed in four other buildings affording an understanding of the process. Four buildings have been installed with cameras and staff has been trained on the use of the cameras. The secured vestibule is also a standard within the District. The scope at the Shadow Lake Elementary School is not as encompassing as prior projects of converting a middle school into an elementary school.

Ms. Wyatt added that the program is approximately 3½ years old with the bond measure passed in November 2013. Since the beginning, the effort has been a large transitional planning exercise during 2017. OAC is prepared to backfill for Ms. Darcy when needed. The team is integrated and plans are in place to ensure the District has the support when needed during construction. She is comfortable with the amount of time allotted by Ms. Darcy. There have been no impacts to purchasing and procurement from a capital projects perspective.

Ms. Cloud noted that the Finance Department is well experienced and assumes many of Ms. Darcy's duties freeing her time to focus on capital projects. She also supports Ms. Darcy daily.

Ahmad Qayoumi said the RFQ process is on a short timeline. He asked if the District has a list of prequalified candidates. Ms. Wyatt said the RFQ would be publicly advertised to all contractors. The RFQ has been drafted and is ready for release pending approval by the PRC.

Mr. Apiafi said his concern centers on Ms. Darcy. He asked about her GC/CM experience and the ability to handle purchasing responsibilities during prior GC/CM projects.

Mr. Hocklander responded that she worked and observed Ms. Darcy and is impressed with her learning curve. A year ago, the panel had the same concern, which was legitimate because she did not have the GC/CM experience; however, there were other GC/CM projects underway. Ms. Darcy has learned a great deal and Ms. Hocklander said she is both impressed and proud as she has made her job so much easier. She is happy that the District has such an asset.

Yelena Semenova asked why the District elected to pursue GC/CM because the scope includes four separate projects that could be accomplished separately. One of the projects is CCTV and another project is site work for the playgrounds. Combining them does not necessarily make the projects complex. It appears the project was scoped to be a GC/CM project. Additionally, the schedule should allow time for the owner to review submittals and to receive comments. The schedule reflects receipt of the proposals on January 16 with construction scheduled on January 17. Construction cannot commence without a contract. She questioned the timing necessary to execute the documentation. Her questions pertain to the timeline for the selection and design process.

Ms. Wyatt said the project is complex especially when considering the standards for its systems, such as the security system. The District has invested into a system for CCTV, access controls, and fire life safety, which typically includes only one manufacturer or a certain number of vendors.

Ms. Semenova countered that the District already has the standards and specs in place. She questioned why the District could not bid the project to obtain the best price instead of combining the projects. Ms. Wyatt said the intent is to have a general contractor leading the different projects.

Ms. Cloud offered a response from a school district security and student safety perspective. The intent is to complete the projects as the sites are occupied with kindergarteners. The process must be organized based on the experience from last summer to have someone in charge to ensure students are safe. Having different contractors working in the school would be difficult to manage. Ms. Hocklander added that last summer when the simplified and clear projects were underway at four different schools, it was one contractor considering security, safety, and having the responsibility as opposed to Ms. Darcy coordinating with four contractors to help them understand who the contact is and what the expectations were. Having a project coordinator is similar to having a GC/CM. In terms of the project permitting requirements and other issues, to expect a public bid contractor to release packages in a timeframe because of concerns surrounding the schedule would make her job nearly impossible in terms of expectations. That means the public bid contractor could assert that the schedule was not possible and a change order would be required impacting the schedule because of procurement issues. It is critical to the success of the project to have a GC/CM. Additionally it is the responsibility of the District to manage risk. Moving and alignment of the entire school system is inherently a huge risk and one way to mitigate is to have a project as proposed. When adding the other components, the GC/CM delivery method is a way of making a very complex system better, which is why the project is perfect for GC/CM.

Ms. Semenova asked for comments on the proposal schedule. Ms. Wyatt replied that preconstruction is beginning in January. Ms. Semenova said it is not possible to initiate work with a private entity without a contract. Ms. Cloud said the school board is scheduled to approve the contract on January 16 with work scheduled to begin on January 17.

Ms. Wyatt said the assumption is the GC/CM would initiate preconstruction at his or her own risk as approval is obtained from the school board.

Ms. Semenova replied that as a representative of a public agency, the proposal is the wrong approach, as work cannot be initiated without a contract in place. Ms. Wyatt said she understands, but many times GC/CMs offer to initiate work at their own risk and will start with a kick-off meeting. Ms. Semenova said it is not appropriate to force contractors starting early because of the schedule. The schedule should be revised to avoid putting the contractor in that situation because it is not appropriate.

Panel Chair Crawford invited public comments.

Chuck Davis said that although he is a member of the PRC, he is not a member of the panel. However, as a member of the public, he heard many good things in the presentation that resulted in success using a similar process. However, RCW 39.10.360 stipulates that the public body should select general contractor/construction managers early in the life of public works projects and in most situations no later than the completion of schematic design. It appears that this particular public body received comments a year ago indicating the PRC's concern about presenting the proposal late. Information conveyed during the presentation speaks to evidence that the District has been aware of the work for quite some time. The PRC meets on a monthly basis and it appears the District is relying on the good graces of the PRC to once again present a proposal late in the schedule to request permission to use an alternate delivery method.

Panel Chair Crawford invited the panel's deliberation and a recommendation.

Mr. Burt requested clarification as to the rules changing for project dollar limits for GC/CM. He was advised that the dollar limitation has changed.

Mr. Apiafi said that based on Mr. Davis' comments even though he is not a member of the panel, it appears the public body has known about the process and this particular project, yet the schedule is a concern. The person assuming most of the burden of ensuring success of the project is the project manager. In his opinion, he is not comfortable based on the level of experience and the responsibilities that the individual would assume leading to some concern.

Ms. Semenova commented on the scope of the project, which appears to be a series of small parts. The submittal indicates that much of the work will be done during the summer when no students are present. She still believes splitting the work into several projects and pursuing it as a Design-Bid-Build project might lead to a better price. Her main

concern is with the schedule. As a public owner, she does not believe there is appropriate time to review, approve, design, and complete the project appropriately.

Ms. Riley-Hall agreed with Ms. Semenova regarding the schedule. The schedule is too aggressive and does not allow for full compliance with the RCW nor allow time for a protest period or the reviews that are necessary. The schedule in itself is problematic. She is also not quite sure and is struggling with whether or not the abundance of the different projects is to address the issue of workload within the school and the capacity of personnel versus the intent of the RCW, which was not intended to help address staff workload. That is an aspect that she is struggling with as it may have been the reason for bundling the projects.

Mr. Dobyons commented that as a general contractor, he shares some of the concerns, but also sees the value in bringing the small projects together into one because of the complexity of dealing with four different general contractors within the timeframe necessary for construction. There is a lot of value in bridging the projects so that there is only entity to deal with and one person responsible for the issues. He understands the value in that respect. He too, as a general contractor, often proceeds at his own risk and is currently in a similar situation on another GC/CM project for another entity. While the risk is not substantial, it is a choice general contractors make. While not always a substantial risk, continually enabling the practice by agencies across the state would eventually create an unfair situation for general contractors. The practice should be controlled.

Mr. Qayoumi agreed with comments pertaining to the time schedule. As a designer, he is concerned because of the limited time to complete a quality design. The expectation to complete the design in such a limited time could lead to things falling through the cracks.

Mr. Warnaca said he is also struggling somewhat as there are some benefits of GC/CM with student safety, coordination of the work, and potentially bringing additional trade contractor interests by bundling multiple and similar scopes. However, one could also argue that it might be possible to attract more interested subcontractor/trade contractors if it was possible to bid independently in a D-B-B format without having to undergo the GC/CM process to satisfy insurance, bid bonds, performance bonds, and other criteria that can sometimes make it more difficult for smaller scope trade contractors to bid. He is also very concerned about the schedule as it appears to be a risk transfer. Although there is nothing wrong in transferring risk, the GC/CM is coming into the process late with a short timeline and he is unsure as to how the GC/CM would successfully negotiate a MACC that could be maintained assuming design is not complete. His fear is the potential of GC/CM failure from the aspect of the tight schedule, incomplete design detailing, as well as overall resource management. He would have preferred more time allocated by Ms. Wyatt as 5% through design and construction is virtually nonexistent. It appears that Ms. Wyatt serves as advisory answering phone calls, emails, and providing Ms. Darcy with advice. Ms. Darcy is at capacity with her full-time job in purchasing, as well as taking on a full-time project management role.

Ms. Semenova commented that the PRC should not be encouraging the situation of contractors working prior to contracting, as the contractor could potentially be working without being paid.

Mr. Dugan offered different viewpoints. The project is a triage and it is messy and tighter than it should be. It is not a zero to one – there is no question. By the black and white nature of the RCW, it does not fit for GC/CM. However, the scope of work to be completed by summer does not fit a bid process and it definitely is not a Design-Build project. As messy as the project is, as well as difficult, it is not about whether it satisfies all the requirements instead of the other options available to the District (*be it intentionally self-imposed*), but the bid world is not the way to pursue the work in his opinion at all even if the GC/CM method is messy and the Design-Build world is not the application. He believes the project is one of those weird triage projects that sits inside a crack that is hard and messy. He has full confidence that Olympic Associates could fill in the blanks. Additionally, if there is a project manager that operates like a human tornado, Ms. Hocklander is that person. She is perfect for this kind of application. He agreed it is not a dead-centered job, but he supports the application because of the horror of the bid world, project locations, and the District's plan for realignment in the summer. That decision has been rendered and that horse is out the gate and already Board approved and done. Therefore, the tsunami is coming no matter what the PRC decides. He asked members to consider looking at the project through those lenses. He is going to support it for that reason.

Mr. Dobyms said he supports the project.

Panel Chair Crawford agreed that the project is a messy process and that it would have been preferable if the application had been presented earlier. There are potential mechanisms a district could have put in place to have a purchase order completed in short order so that contractors can start without a form of guaranteed payment. He agreed that bidding the project as separate schools and separate packages is risky and the odds of making the gate between the work needed to be in place to enable the District's movements would happen. The project has a better chance of success as a GC/CM project versus a Design-Bid-Build project.

Ms. Riley-Hall advised the District of alternatives should the District not receive approval. The application could be restructured and resubmitted for an interim evaluation to avoid waiting until the next PRC meeting. The applicant could restructure the schedule and the involvement of OAC Services so that the project can be successful. She personally struggles with the application being a success based on the way it was presented without some overhaul of some aspects of the project, which could include more involvement by OAC to provide the support necessary for the project, as well as the schedule to ensure success. Although, a similar project was completed previously, it appears it was completed with struggles. She would feel more comfortable with more structure and having OAC involved more.

Panel Chair Crawford said there have been comments about schedule and some suggestions, but he is uncomfortable with extending the process, which reduces the schedule and creates more problems.

Ms. Riley-Hall said part of the issue is whether the schedule becomes the PRC's problem.

Ms. Semenova disagreed with the Panel Chair as there are other ways to accomplish at least some of the scope rather than as a D-B-B project as Washington State has certain contracts in place for contractors enabling the District to utilize those contractors to shorten the timeline for CCTV, cameras, or HVAC improvements.

Panel Chair Crawford said if the project entails a number of schools, the state process limits contract amounts.

Ms. Semenova said her question is whether the District has considered that option and determined the scope of each school.

Ms. Riley-Hall commented that although she has spoken to the negative sides of the project that lead to her discomfort with the project, the flip side is the possibility of the District contracting with a fantastic GC/CM who could contribute some strength and help the District with the schedule and the complex elements of bundling the projects that might not necessarily warrant bundling. If the right GC/CM were hired, that would help resolve some of her concerns.

Linneth Riley-Hall moved, seconded by Rob Warnaca, to approve the GC/CM application from Tahoma School District for the Shadow Lake, Rock Creek, Glacier Park Elementary Schools project. Motion failed (5-3). Linneth Riley-Hall, Yelena Semenova, and Rob Warnaca opposed.

Ms. Linneth-Riley reminded the applicants that it was possible to resubmit the project and request a special PRC review during a specially scheduled meeting.

Panel Chair Crawford recessed the meeting at 11:14 a.m.

Mount Vernon, Mt. Vernon High School Modernization – GC/CM

Panel Chair Bill Dobyms reviewed the presentation and timing format to consider the GC/CM application for the modernization from the Mt. Vernon School District (MVSD) for a Mt. Vernon High School Modernization project. Panel members Bill Dobyms, Steve Crawford, Linneth Riley-Hall, Yelena Semenova, Ato Apiafi, Rob Warnaca, and Rustin Hall provided self-introduction. A majority vote of the panel is required for approval of the application. Several other PRC members in attendance provided self-introduction.

Jim Dugan, GC/CM Program Advisor, Parametrix, reported the application is for consideration for approval to use the GC/CM delivery method for an old historic modernization and restoration. He referred members to copies of the presentation materials. The presentation covered the project team, budget, and schedule, how the project satisfies the statute, and the qualifications to deliver a GC/CM project.

Jennifer Larson, Executive Director, Finance Department, Mt. Vernon School District, and Suzanne Gilbert, Architect & Capital Facilities Project Manager, Mt. Vernon School District provided self-introduction.

Mr. Dugan reported his role is Program Advisor to Mt. Vernon School District.

Dan Cody, Parametrix, reported he is the Project Manager and construction administration for the project.

Mr. Dugan reported Carl Bruner, Superintendent, Mt. Vernon School District, was unable to attend because of surgery. The Assistant Project Manager, Tom Thiesen, was unable to attend as he is in Europe. Graehm Wallace, Perkins Coie serves at the legal advisor, was also unable to attend. Additionally, not attending but serving in a significant role is the project's design team. The District has not selected the design team on purpose because of the importance of having the GC/CM onboard to help the District select the design team. Lessons learned from Stadium High School, McCarver Elementary School, Stewart Middle School, Jason Lee Middle School, historic modernizations of 1920s circa buildings, and the relationship between the GC/CM and design team are always important, as well as critical for an old historic project. For the first time, the District would hire the GC/CM prior to the design team to participate and help select the design team.

Mt. Vernon School District is located in western Skagit County. The District passed a capital improvement bond in February 2016. The District previously submitted GC/CM proposals for East Division Elementary School and Madison Elementary School. Both projects are moving forward. The next project is the Mt. Vernon High School modernization project. The East Division and Madison Elementary School projects were bundled together because of critical phasing. The East Division Elementary School project is underway. However, because of the rate of inflation and the cost of modernization of an old historic building, the District elected not to delay the project for another year. Consequently, the District moved the modernization project sooner than previously planned.

The MVHS Old Main Building is located on an existing high school campus next to the New Main Building. The site resembles a community college campus and includes the circa 1922 building. The building's systems and equipment are failing. Original equipment is located in the basement, and the project includes Haz-Mat abatement. The existing building is 54,000 square feet. The schedule calls for construction beginning in July 2018 with the building scheduled to open by January 2020. A large building located between the older and newer buildings is an auditorium with fluted columns, a proscenium arch, and a balcony that has been converted to a classroom. The building's use will change when the Old Main Building is restored. The campus serves 1,900 students and a community located to the left of the campus. Another complexity associated with the site are the large arterial infrastructure lines that cut across the main grass area in front of the Old Main Building, as well as a number of challenging infrastructure problems, such as the uncertainty associated with the connection of the sanitary system and the storm system, and locating that connection.

The project budget is traditional. The schedule is not nearly as tight as in the previous presentation and one that works well to secure the GC/CM. Mr. Dugan said that later in the presentation, he would review some lessons learned that speak to some of the reasons for contracting with the GC/CM sooner than under normal conditions. The schedule remains the same as included in the application.

The project complies with all five statutory criteria. The project involves complex scheduling at an occupied facility requiring complex phasing and coordination. The historic modernization is the primary driver for requesting the GC/CM delivery method. The project encompasses complex and technical work elements in an historic building that has terrazzo floors, plaster, and other materials not used during the last century that look better today than the day they were installed. Maintaining those products and materials in a construction environment is a unique nuance of working inside of an old, unreinforced masonry building while removing and replacing internal elements of the structure and protecting and maintaining the building's while completing the program.

Other critical factors are neighborhood communication, compliance with abatement and demolition, possible early procurement of early lead items, and critical compliance to test, document, abate, and monitor hazardous materials. One third to one-half percent of monthly financial escalation for a \$30 million project equates to more cost for each month of project delay. The district does not have the funds to delay the project by more than a year.

The GC/CM delivery method provides benefits of public and District safety, cost and risk management, project completion on schedule and within budget, community relationships, and fiscal accountability. Having a partner to help identify creative solutions to manage inflation is priceless in terms of fiscal risk management.

As previously presented, the East Division and Madison Elementary School projects were the first projects the District pursued for GC/CM delivery. The District is an outstanding partner with critical decisions helping to make the process easier. Ms. Gilbert had no previous GC/CM experience and is managing the two elementary school projects. Parametrix is retained through a master agreement to provide resources as needed and when needed at any level for the program of projects. Parametrix continues to have a warm and friendly relationship with Mr. Wallace.

Mr. Dugan said the application includes the submittal of Mr. Thiesen as the Project Manager. Mr. Thiesen has GC/CM experience and plans to attend AGC's GC/CM training in January. Mr. Thiesen is more than capable of handling a GC/CM project; however, he does not have experience in the nuances of an historic modernization of an unreinforced masonry circa 1922 building. The project is a very different and unique specialty. The team experience is provided by himself and Mr. Cody, who worked on the McCarver and Stewart projects. Mr. Cody has worked closely with him and would serve as the primary while Mr. Dugan would provide support.

Mr. Cody reported Mr. Thiesen is architecturally trained and owns a business. He has committed to serving the District through the entire program. He graduated from Washington State University in the 1970s and has 35 years of experience of K-12 construction with experience in Design-Bid-Build and Design-Build but lacks the GC/CM and historic renovation experience, which is why he and Mr. Thiesen are working together on the project.

Mr. Dugan commented on his availability during the project. He is serving in an advisory role on multiple projects that consumes between 18-22 hours per week and he has ample capacity to assume new work. In this case, he is serving as the Program Manager for Mt. Vernon with no additional hours or additional workload. His role is to review and monitor. The project has ample capacity.

Mr. Dugan reported the specific piece for consideration is Mr. Cody's proficiency and his work with him on other historic buildings, and historic buildings of circa 1920 which offer particular types of challenges.

The experience of the project team is reflected best by what was learned at Stadium High School, which was on time and under budget. The power of GC/CM at Lincoln reduced the schedule by one year with the project concluding slightly over budget. The McCarver project is similar to the Old Main Building in terms of size and type of building. The McCarver building recently opened on time and within budget. The project was very successful. Within the next several weeks, the La Venture Middle School project is scheduled to conclude. The project was another GC/CM for a circa 1920s old historic modernization and addition. The project is running seven months ahead of schedule saving approximately \$750,000.

This project entails the first time, the builder will be on the project to complete the level of investigative digging, drilling, tearing, opening, and examining the old building. Typically, there is never sufficient time for those important tasks. The building lacks drawings and requires an as-built process with some knowledge and management of costs.

Risk includes balancing all contingencies between the owner, contractor, and the design team in a way to maximize spending and minimize risk. The project is funded, the project satisfies the criteria, the project has a proven management plan for the particular type of a project, and for the first time, the GC/CM will be onboard to help with architect selection. The District has the capacity for the project and the team is prepared and ready to start with the release of the RFP in the next several days.

Panel Chair Dobyms invited questions from the panel.

Mr. Hall asked Ms. Gilbert about her perspective of the GC/CM delivery method after achieving some recent GC/CM experience. Ms. Gilbert replied that she is an architect but also serves as the District's Project Manager for Capital Projects. When she started at the District, she reviewed the package of capital projects to determine potential risks for the District. She had approximately three and a half months to identify any shortcomings in the bond while also moving the project schedule forward two years for elementary schools because the District was lagging in facilities for students. Before diving into the work, she was advised of an impending GC/CM project. She was introduced to Mr. Dugan and she has been on track since then. The work is still on track today and tracking closely with budget and the schedule. The bigger issue was the Old Main Building project. She has previously worked on four large historic modernizations in her career of 30 years as an architect. Lessons learned over 30 years were from some of the most sophisticated and difficult projects. She was able to work in the private sector that included a modernization of a classic structure in Bellingham. The project was far more successful by working along with the contractor as the architect than the other three projects that were Design-Bid-Build. Those three projects were problematic and always over budget and never on time. However, during the private sector project with the contractor, the team was able to align the historic structure in Bellingham with the budget and the schedule. The building has been listed on the historic register. She would consider the project one of her successful historic renovations. To be able to have the opportunity to work on a similar project for Mt. Vernon would be amazing. The District does have a tight budget but not any draws. She has toured the building with several groups. The building represents an elephant on the campus and the District is unsure of what to expect. By having the opportunity of the GC/CM onboard early, it provides a better opportunity for the District to manage its risk in the renovation. Essentially, it would dictate how far the District could extend the budget and tasks, which would not be possible under Design-Bid-Build. Not utilizing the GC/CM delivery method puts the District at substantial risk. Her job is to complete the projects while reducing risks for the District.

Ms. Riley-Hall asked about the approval and oversight aspects of her role or whether those functions would transfer to Mr. Dugan. Ms. Gilbert said her position runs in parallel and she is not at the point of turning the project over. Although, she is responsible for managing capital projects, she has been able to focus on five key projects. Her role may not necessarily involve day-to-day construction activities; however, the investigation process over the next year will dictate any budget gaps and the necessity of moving any of the other projects. She will continue to work in the strategic position as the building is analyzed; however, after construction and hiring of the architect, the project would be transferred.

Mr. Dugan added that Ms. Gilbert is in charge and drives the entire program. Parametrix is augmenting Ms. Gilbert as needed and when needed.

Mr. Hall remarked on the interesting schedule and approach, which he believes is the right approach. However, programming is earmarked after the GC/CM is hired and while fascinating, it could be expensive as it is a long time to pay for a GC/CM. He asked whether the GC/CM would be involved in the programming. Ms. Gilbert acknowledged that the question is a good one. The programming in many ways is fairly set because the structure serves a classroom building with 24 classrooms. Usage of the building would not change as the classrooms are required. The question likely pertains more to the theater, which was renovated in 1985 reducing the theater from 400 seats to 140 seats. The renovation was regretful as the campus includes 1,900 students and there is no theater to seat more than 140 students. Although the gym can accommodate more students, it cannot provide sufficient seating for graduation. The question for the District is determining the cost to restore the theater, and if it affects the budget, restoration of the theater would be unlikely with only the building restoration the main focus. The key element is determining whether the theater restoration would impact the budget. The early involvement of the GC/CM can assist the team in determining possibilities.

Mr. Dugan added that preliminary programming is complete. Ms. Gilbert and Mr. Thiesen have substantially completed programming. The program would be vetted by the GC/CM and then by the design team. Secondly, more time is required for the investigative research on the building. That time will pass quickly over the next several months, and although there is some cost, over the long-term it could save costs if unknowns were discovered later in the process.

Panel Chair Dobyms invited public comments.

Howard Hillinger, Parametrix, said his wife is a graduate of Mt. Vernon High School. Mt. Vernon has changed substantially over the years. The Old Main Building represents Mt. Vernon, as it is a very significant building. When discussions occurred about the project, there was a hope that the District did not make a decision that could have detrimentally impacted the building by contracting the work through a low-bid process. When the decision was made to pursue a GC/CM delivery method, Mr. Dugan advised the District to involve the contractor early. The project is the right application for GC/CM as the building is significant for the community, and it is important to restore the building and keep it for what it means to the community.

Chuck Davis said he is amazed at having the GC/CM assist in the selection process for the design team. He has been in the construction business for 40 years and did not believe he could be surprised. He applauded the team.

Panel Chair Dobyms invited the panel's deliberation and a recommendation.

Mr. Apiafi said the comfort level for him is Mr. Dugan. The only concern is the lack of attendance by the project manager, Mr. Thiesen, to enable questions because at the end of the day as a registered architect, some of the failure attributed to projects is the project manager. However, he leans positively to approving the application.

Mr. Crawford said the project is well-suited for GC/CM and is getting an early start. He supports approval of the project for GC/CM.

Ms. Riley-Hall echoed similar comments.

Mr. Hall commented favorably on the proactive nature of the approach as it appears a lot of thought has been given. Additionally, the outcome has developed a better way than normal to execute the project. He supports the project for GC/CM.

Steve Crawford moved, seconded by Ato Apiafi, to approve the GC/CM application from Mt. Vernon School District for the Mt. Vernon High School – Old Main Building Modernization project. Motion carried unanimously.

Panel Chair Dobyms recessed the meeting at 11:51 a.m. for lunch.

PRC Vice Chair Hall reconvened the meeting at 12:12 p.m.

Vice Chair Hall thanked members for their commitment to the PRC and lending their expertise and willingness to work with applicants.

Approve Prior Meeting Minutes May 26, 2016

The minutes were corrected to reflect Darron Pease as not attending the meeting.

Chuck Davis moved, seconded by Jim Dugan, to approve the minutes of the May 26, 2016 meeting as amended. Motion carried unanimously.

Minutes from June 9, 2016

Rob Warnaca moved, seconded by Steve Crawford, to approve the minutes of Jun 9, 2016 as published. Motion carried unanimously.

Committee Recruitment & Meeting Dates for 2017

Committee Admin, Talia Baker, reported on the development of an annual recruitment plan. The plan would identify all expiring positions each year to afford time for the incumbent to submit an application if interested in continuing to serve. She invited members to contact her with any questions or concerns.

The PRC is currently recruiting for seven (7) positions. All members with expiring terms who are interested in serving should send a letter to Ms. Baker by the close of business on January 25, 2017. As there are 14 positions to fill, the CPARB will appoint members at its February and May meetings. The second recruitment will close at the end of April for the CPARB's appointment action in May.

Ms. Baker reported she is revising and updating the PRC website. Files before 2013 will be archived, but will be accessible if needed. She asked members to advise her of any problems with links that are not functioning properly.

Ms. Zahn inquired about meeting dates for 2017. Ms. Baker advised that the meetings dates for 2017 were posted on the website.

Members and staff discussed email notifications to staff for attendance to meetings.

Ms. Riley-Hall commented on the process of the Chair distributing questions to panel members and ensuring the answers are forwarded to panel members or to the PRC for certification applications. She asked whether a process has been established for the process. Mr. Hall advised that the issue likely should be revisited to address developing specific policy. Ms. Baker added that she reviewed the RCW and PRC Bylaws and found no policies addressing how that information is distributed. However, because of the Open Public Meetings Act, it is important to consider communication methods. The information should be forwarded to her for consolidation and transmittal to members. Mr. Hall advised members to forward their respective comments to Ms. Baker. Ms. Baker would then consolidate the information and provide the information to each Panel Chair. Administrative staff also reviews the questions and eliminates duplicate questions after reviewing the questions with Nancy Deakins and Bill Frare.

Vice Chair Hall recessed the business portion of the meeting at 12:22 p.m.

Vice Chair Hall reconvened the meeting at 12:28 p.m.

Tacoma Public Schools – GC/CM Certification

Vice Chair Hall outlined the presentation format to consider the GC/CM Certification Application from Tacoma Public Schools. A PRC meeting quorum is required to consider and render a decision on the application. Members in attendance included Ato Apiafi, Vicki Barron-Sumann, Jim Burt, Steve Crawford, Chuck Davis, Bill Dobyns, Jim Dugan, Rustin Hall, Howard Hillinger, Matthew Lane, Jon Lebo, James Lynch, Mark Ottele, Darron Pease, Ahmad Qayoumi, Linneth Riley-Hall, Yelena Semenova, Rob Warnaca, and Janice Zahn.

Robert Sawatzky, Director, Planning & Construction, Tacoma Public Schools (TPS), thanked guests David Johnson from the City of Tacoma and Brian Urban from Skanska for attending. Mr. Sawatzky introduced agency and support team members Stephen Murakami, Chief Operating Office; Julius Pallotta, Capital Projects Supervisor; Christie Barrie, Capital Projects Supervisor; Paul Popovich, consulting staff with Parametrix; Chris Anderson, Capital Projects Supervisor; Ann Cummings, Senior Financial Analyst; and Bobbie Knapp, Document Control & Administrative Secretary. Alicia Lawver is the Facilities Communication Coordinator and is arriving later in the meeting.

Mr. Sawatzky reviewed the presentation agenda:

- Tacoma Public Schools
- Agency Organization Chart
- Capital Planning & Construction Org Chart
- Visioning Document
- Capital Project History
- GC/CM Experience
- GC/CM Lessons Learned
- Delivery Method Determination
- GC/CM Candidate Projects
- TPS as a Leader – Education and Development

- Business Entity – TPS Community Inclusion Commitment Plan
- Summary

Tacoma Public Schools was founded in 1969 is comprised of 36 elementary schools, 11 middle schools, and 10 high schools. The District offers numerous special programs. TPS is the fourth largest school district in the state and one of the largest employers in Tacoma. The district serves 30,000 students and employs 5,000 people. In 2010, the District had a graduation rate of 58%. The District and the School Board developed a strategic goal to attain an 85% graduation rate by 2020. In 2016, the goal was attained. The next step is establishing a new goal.

Mr. Sawatzky reviewed an organizational chart of the District. The District is designated into several areas of Northeast Tacoma, North Tacoma, West End, Central, South, and East Tacoma. The District works interdepartmentally with teaching and learning, student services, maintenance and operations, nutrition services, staff, and others to avoid working in silos. The Planning and Construction Department must understand the needs of all departments to ensure best construction practices around each building.

The Department is headed by Chief Operating Officer Steve Murakami. Mr. Sawatzky reports to Mr. Murakami and all Capital Projects Supervisors report to him, as well as the Financial Analyst and consultant staff.

The vision for the elementary learning environment was established from multiple conversations by many people representing businesses, educators, administrators, students, and designers to determine how to build schools for the next generation of learners. The next generation of learners include many living in poverty, most are digital natives of social media, many have shorter attention spans, many are multi-racial, and many consider ways to create jobs from their hobbies. Because of those differences, building differently is required.

The exercise also examined facilities and considered partnerships to consider school outside of the workday between 8 a.m. and 3 p.m. and utilizing the buildings for the community after school hours. Part of that exercise included asset mapping to help identify how buildings might be used differently. Another goal is creating spaces for students to think, exchange information, and create. Many schools in Tacoma are innovative that wrap best instructional practices with the building.

In 1983, the District initiated a 30-year plan, which was extended. In 1984, the District issued a capital bond issue. Between 1988 and 1997, six capital levies totaled an aggregate value of \$299 million. In 2001, the voters approved a \$450 million capital bond issue comprised of 19 major projects, to include two GC/CM projects of Stadium High School and Lincoln High School. Both GC/CM projects were successfully completed.

In 2013, the District passed a \$500 million bond for 14 major capital projects of which three were GC/CM:

- McCarver Elementary School
- Stewart Middle School
- Browns Point Elementary School

Mr. Sawatzky reviewed a graph listing of projects under the 2013 Capital Bond Program. Projects highlighted in yellow are GC/CM projects. Projects highlighted in green could potentially be GC/CM project based on the circumstances of each site. Approximately five of the projects are on occupied sites and most would require complex phasing.

Mr. Sawatzky reported that as a public owner, the District has a depth of public works experience. The District is a major capital project builder. The 2013 bond included 14 major projects, as well as 200 smaller capital projects attesting to the amount of work underway by the District.

From 1983 through 2013, approximately \$1.3 billion was completed in capital improvements. Between 2001 and 2016, the District has completed 24 projects with five projects in construction, five in design, and three projects pending.

The District's project delivery, experience, and qualifications include four successful GC/CM project completions with two in the last three years (McCarver & Stewart). Since 2001, the District has successfully delivered 24 large capital projects totaling approximately \$900 million. The District has been augmenting and enhancing the internal team since 1998 with consultant staff. The District has developed a robust internal staff with staff members having GC/CM or other alternative delivery experience. The District believes it has the experience to deliver GC/CM projects successfully.

The District has the ability to properly plan. Currently, the District is three years into a seven-year Capital Facilities Plan funded by the 2013 bond. Work is beginning on a 30-year master plan with six-year increments to continue the projects moving forward, and to lay the groundwork for another bond in February 2019.

Mr. Sawatzky reviewed five projects with project organization, roles and responsibilities, and project information.

The Stadium High School project was initiated in 2004 and was completed in 2006 on-time and within budget. Lincoln High School was completed one year ahead of schedule with construction beginning in 2006 and completed in 2007.

McCarver Elementary School was initiated in 2015 and completed in 2016 on-time and within budget.

Stewart Middle School was seven months ahead of schedule and might open in February rather than September 2017. The project is within 1% of the budget. The project entailed a historic remodel.

Browns Point Elementary School replacement project is currently in design with construction scheduled in May/June with possible early site work.

Mr. Sawatzky reviewed other projects in design and construction.

The District understands the critical importance of extensive due diligence through investigations when designing older buildings. McCarver Elementary School offered a good understanding of the importance of having the GC/CM onboard early to contend with uncertainties. Stewart Middle School offered lessons learned on risk management through risk contingency throughout the process and mitigating remaining risks. For the Browns Point Elementary School project, the GC/CM and the designer were asked to deliver a project affordable for the District. The contractor's estimator and a third party estimator estimate were within \$1,000. The team delivered an estimate for project delivery that the District could afford.

The District's GC/CM project organizational chart defines roles and responsibilities beginning with the Superintendent to vendors.

Mr. Sawatzky outlined how projects are selected for GC/CM alternative delivery. Projects are identified during bond planning with the preliminary delivery method identified. The Project Manager prepares a delivery method recommendation and forwards it to the Director of Planning and Construction, who reviews and approves the delivery method recommendation. The Director of Planning and Construction confirms the use of GC/CM with the Chief Operating Officer. The Project Manager proceeds with GC/CM procurement, according to Tacoma Public Schools standards, and forwards the recommendation to the Board of Directors, which approves the GC/CM contract and future amendments. Mr. Sawatzky displayed a cover page of the recommendation questionnaire that is submitted to the Director of Planning and Construction.

Future GC/CM candidates are the five projects consisting of Birney Elementary School, Downing Elementary School, Hunt Middle School, Grant Elementary School, and Boze Elementary School.

In terms of leadership and education, Tacoma Public Schools has recently presented at a national conference on the Arlington project. Staff has worked with the City of Tacoma to help streamline permitting. TPS is connected to the community through its work with Metro Parks by attending weekly meetings, as well as with the City of Tacoma coordinating off-site improvements through Proposition 3 funding. Staff is involved in many professional associations.

Staff meets frequently with architects and designers from across the state and the world to discuss new trends in teaching, learning, and building new structures to promote teaching and learning. The District's strategic goals of safety, early learning, academic excellence, and partnerships are the fabric of how buildings are designed and constructed.

The District promotes business equity and developed a community inclusion commitment plan to maintain and increase contracts for local businesses from 15% to 30%. The goal has been achieved with the District exceeding 30%. The District adopted the Governor's diverse business goals to include 10% for minority-owned business enterprises, 6% for women-owned business enterprise, and 5% for small businesses. Additionally, the District completes ongoing reporting from contractors. Each month, contractors are asked to provide the percentage of participation of MWBE and small businesses in projects. The District collects prevailing wage information and apprenticeship utilization percentages on an ongoing basis. The District exceeds the 15% for apprenticeship utilization. Currently, the District is developing a process for quarterly compliance review to ensure contractors are accountable for the goals of the District. Although the process is still in progress, the District is making some strides.

Mr. Sawatzky displayed graphs of current small and major projects with business equity participation. Many minority businesses are not certified. The District is exploring ways to assist those enterprises become certified. The McCarver and Steward projects reflect higher participation rates. The District has an opportunity to increase those numbers through contractors using the GC/CM delivery method.

Tacoma Public Schools has proven to be a competent, successful public builder well prepared to use GC/CM delivery in accordance with all statutes. The District's history with five GC/CM projects demonstrates the District's experience required to utilize the GC/CM delivery method when applicable. The GC/CM projects were primarily historic modernizations of significant size and difficulty. All projects were completed on time and on budget. The District currently contracts with Parametrix; one of Washington's experienced GC/CM project leadership teams. The District is ideally positioned to select GC/CM delivery when appropriate and execute future GC/CM projects successfully on time, on budget, and compliant with the requirements of RCW 39.10. Staff experience is comprised primarily of internal employees and augmented with consultant staff with all staff co-located at the Department of Planning and Construction. The District has never received any audit findings on any project previously identified.

Vice Chair Hall invited questions from members.

Vice Chair Hall referred to the District's process for determining a path for alternative delivery decisions on a project-by-project basis. He asked for additional details on the first part of the process when the recommendation is rendered. Mr. Sawatzky said the process was initiated during the next 30 year bond planning. Additionally, for each project identified today, each project is evaluated. For example, the Birney Elementary School is located on a large site. During conversations with the project manager and the team, the site as well as criteria were evaluated to determine whether the project met criteria for an occupied site, complex phasing, and other criteria rendering the project as appropriate for GC/CM delivery. From that point, the project manager makes a recommendation.

Mr. Murakami added that the District has been in a position where it has been fortunate to have two swing sites available. Those swing sites have been patched and repaired and are becoming a liability because of age and are no longer useful alternatives. The 24 projects completed outside of the GC/CM process were possible because the District had extra space to move students from the site and complete construction easier in a low-bid environment. That option is not available in the future because the District is located in a tight and packed urban environment without much surplus property or availability of property to purchase. The District will have to consider more on-site construction projects with complex phasing. One example is the Grant Elementary School project which is located on a limited size campus in a neighborhood area where access is tight, while maintaining a continuous construction site. That project will be very difficult in addition to the historical aspects of the project that have not been studied for possibly retaining and renewal. All five projects fall within the criteria. The determination process entails a review with the design team and owner team to evaluate each site and consider the pros, cons, and the merits, as well as identifying ways to manage risk. Having the sharp focus the GC/CM offers early in the process will help the District make critical decisions because the construction market is taking off and trying to manage costs and process will be difficult. Wilson High School is a good example as the project was continually over budget. Trying to determine how to replace subcontractors that disappeared throughout

the process was a situation that did not occur when the District contracted with Skanska because Skanska builds better continuity throughout the projects. The District was constantly value engineering the low-bid projects to protect the budget.

Mr. Apiafi complimented the District for a well-thought process. The presentation was impressive. His interest is in the inclusion of women and minorities. The District addressed his interest by including information in the presentation about the District's program. He asked about the possibility of receiving District MWBE data. Mr. Sawatzky noted that the District's Planning and Construction website includes all data. Mr. Apiafi asked whether the data is segregated by women, men, ethnicity, and names of entities. Mr. Murakami replied that in 2013 when the District passed the bond, a task force was convened of the North American Minority Contractors Association, City of Tacoma, and other outreach organizations to help bring awareness and strengthen participation. The next quarterly meeting of the task force is next week. The agenda includes a presentation on current data of all contractors participating.

Mr. Sawatzky reported the Document Control Specialist with the state has been working with the District to determine the process for compliance review. A draft proposal of the report has been developed as well as the steps to complete data entry.

Mr. Dobyms said the list of previous Design-Bid-Build projects include a wide variety of contractors from across the region while the GC/CM projects are predominantly performed by one contractor. He asked how the District's process ensures open and fair competition. Mr. Sawatzky responded that the District has completed several project processes and continues to refine the process. The District reviews submittals from contractors that are scored through a matrix. The proposals are then narrowed to a list of two to three contractors who are invited to participate in an interview. During the interview, the scoring becomes a cumulative element of the process followed by the submittal of the RFP. During the last process, the finalists were narrowed to two contractors with one contractor having higher scores in the submittal and the other contractor performing very well in the interview. The difference in scores between the two contractors was 1/10th of a point or essentially tied. At that point, the selection was based on the RFP. The selected contractor had previously worked for the same District team and had the knowledge of the District.

Mr. Davis said GC/CM is listed as one of the alternative delivery methods. He asked whether the District, over time and in anticipation of long-term plans, anticipates using GC/CM as the alternative method or will it become the District's primary method. Mr. Sawatzky responded that the success by the District on GC/CM projects started from the beginning; however, other projects are underway that are highly successful that are low-bid. Arlington is a good example, which was \$1 million less than projected given the market conditions and steel shortages. A number of projects have been successful in the low-bid environment to warrant not using the GC/CM delivery for every project. Each project must be carefully examined to determine the appropriate delivery method. The Arlington project was a single story stick frame construction with many contractors capable of completing the project successfully. However, if the project consists of complicated phasing and it is occupied, the District would evaluate the project in a transparent process to determine the appropriate delivery method.

Mr. Murakami added GC/CM is a higher cost point but it also enables the District to buy down risk. There was recognition with the Arlington project that it was possible to build a one story, wood frame building that could be competitively delivered by many contractors because the site was large. Some of the same options also exist for the five future projects. The team will undertake a pros and cons evaluation. The District also has \$45 million in small capital projects. It may entail clustering some small campus projects to pursue a GC/CM delivery to enable the District to achieve some of the MWBE goals.

Mr. Sawatzky referred to the District's review process to determine project delivery. When the project is identified, the next step is a preliminary review of the delivery method. He meets with Mr. Murakami daily throughout the process. When a project manager recommends GC/CM delivery, there is more discussion between them before any decision is rendered. Others are included in the discussions to include consultant staff to weigh in on the appropriateness of GC/CM.

Ms. Zahn expressed support of the review tool because it creates transparency for the reason GC/CM was selected. She asked whether there have been any situations where staff recommended GC/CM and the determination was against

GC/CM as the delivery method. Mr. Sawatzky said there have been several low-bid projects. The District considered using GC/CM for the Arlington project. Options included locating the building on the lower bench of the site. The location was desirable in many ways, but after further review and discussion, the District agreed the location was not the best placement for the building, which resulted in demolishing the building. Consequently, the project did not meet the criteria for GC/CM. Ms. Zahn asked whether the process was newly created as part of the certification application. Mr. Sawatzky advised that the District created the process to assist the District in rendering transparent decisions.

Ms. Riley-Hall asked whether the review process is specific to GC/CM only and whether the district is considering Design-Build and Design-Bid-Build as well during the first phases of the review process. Mr. Sawatzky responded that the District has not completed a Design-Build project. Design-Build has not been discussed as an alternative delivery method. The method implemented is specific to GC/CM only at this time. Ms. Riley-Hall asked whether the District plans to continue building capacity within the District for alternative delivery. Mr. Sawatzky outlined the professional development efforts by the District. Last year, he, Ms. Barrie, and Ms. Kristine attended the AGC GC/CM training. Ms. Cummings and Mr. Julius are scheduled to attend the next session of AGC GC/CM training. Mr. Pallotta has completed Design-Build projects at Joint Base Lewis McChord. When Ms. Anderson was hired, she was involved in the first GC/CM pilot project. The District plans to add capacity based on the number of projects and staffing needs.

Vice Chair Hall asked about the District's preferred timing for hiring the GC/CM during the design process. Mr. Sawatzky noted that the District prefers bringing the GC/CM onboard during late programming and early schematic design.

Mr. Pease noted that the organizational chart reflects two consultant firms of Parametrix and Green Gasaway. He asked whether Green Gasaway is supporting alternative delivery projects or providing limited support. Mr. Sawatzky said part of the District's need to augment staff is the number of projects with five in design and five in construction. It was necessary to add staff to handle some Design-Bid-Build projects for construction administration support.

Vice Chair Hall invited public comments.

Rob Robinson, Project Executive Skanska USA, said he supports Tacoma Public Schools in its request for certification for GC/CM based on experience in completing two successful projects with the school district. It is clear that the District understands and has demonstrated that it knows how to use the process. During preconstruction, the District leveraged partnership opportunities between the contractor, owner, and the designer and understood that there are times when tough decisions are necessary. During construction, the District staffed the projects appropriately to ensure an efficient and expedient project delivery, and, the very highest levels of leadership supported the projects. The District has demonstrated an understanding of the process and the company supports approval of the certification.

Vice Chair Hall invited deliberations by members and a recommendation.

Mr. Dugan referred to the PRC Bylaws, which require that he disclose Parametrix is currently under contract with Tacoma Public Schools under a master PM/CM agreement as part of the current capital bond program to provide PM/CM services as needed. He understands that because the agreement existed prior to the application there is no conflict of interest.

Mr. Lebo said the District is obviously a committed owner both in terms of education demonstrated by its impressive graduation rate. The increase in just six years is a remarkable achievement. He also recognizes as a committed owner, the importance of supporting MWBE and SBE. The District is committed to increasing their participation. The owner has demonstrated through its experiences that it has the capacity to complete GC/CM projects. The District has quite an impressive list of projects. He supports approval of the application.

Mr. Apiafi echoed similar comments and is impressed at how well the District articulated its presentation and included information on the District's inclusion of minorities and women-owned businesses.

Ms. Zahn agreed the District has the necessary experience and the right organizational structure. She is appreciative that the District completed several GC/CM projects prior to applying for certification. She is also supportive of the District's

selection project for the delivery method. She supports the application. However, she does not believe Mr. Dugan should participate in the voting as his name appears within the application. It would be difficult to convey that there would not be some potential conflict of interest if Mr. Dugan votes.

Ms. Riley-Hall agreed with Ms. Zahn's comments about the potential conflict of interest. She applauded the District for proactively considering agency certification and outlining the flow diagram to determine the process for the appropriate delivery method, as well as the recommendation for project approval by reviewing the RCW criteria to determine if the projects meet the requirements.

Ms. Barron-Sumann also concurred with Ms. Zahn's comments regarding Mr. Dugan as recusal would not necessarily affect the outcome.

Mr. Dugan recused himself from voting.

Ms. Barron-Sumann supported the application but is struggling with the first part of the review process for determining the delivery method. The tool is good for justification of the GC/CM delivery method after it has been determined that it is the most appropriate method, but she would prefer a more robust deliberative process as a first step that demonstrates consideration is among all the delivery methods and only when GC/CM is deemed to be the right answer, should the process proceed for approval.

Mr. Warnaca supported the GC/CM certification. It appears that most of the GC/CM project experience resides at the executive leadership level rather than at the program/project manager level. However, based on the presentation, the District is strategically focused for hiring individuals with alternative delivery experience and proactively supports GC/CM training.

Mr. Hillinger said he worked with the District two years ago when the first GC/CM project was initiated. Since that time, he has not been involved with the District. The District has tried to build capacity. He does not believe participating in voting would be conceived as a conflict of interest as he has not been involved with the District for the last two years. He also discussed his concern with Chair John Palewicz, who concurred there was no appearance of a conflict of interest.

Ms. Semenova commented on the same contractor for three of the last GC/CM projects. She is hopeful that the next five GC/CM projects are not awarded to the contractor. If the contractor is selected because of qualification, it is important the process be documented properly to ensure a transparent process.

Mr. Crawford said the District has a strong presence in the industry and has completed successful projects. He supports certification of the District.

Ms. Semenova said the application is a great representation of an agency with agency staff providing the expertise and managing the projects. Often, many agencies tend to hire consultants for the necessary expertise, which is one more reason why the District should be certified.

Vice Chair Hill said the agency strikes him as an innovative agency that will bring that to the GC/CM process and share the outcomes with the PRC over the next several years.

Ms. Zahn expressed appreciation that the District is not seeking a delivery method that the agency has no experience with and was willing to use alternative delivery to gain some experience.

Darron Pease moved, seconded by Linneth Riley-Hall, to approve the GC/CM Certification application from Tacoma Public Schools.

Mr. Davis commented that the recusal of a member might not affect the meeting quorum. He recommended following up for an interpretation from legal counsel.

Motion carried. Jim Dugan abstained.

Vice Chair Hall recessed the meeting at 1:21 p.m.

Ridgefield Schools, Capital Improvements Projects – GC/CM

Panel Chair Jim Dugan reconvened the meeting at 1:35 p.m.

Panel Chair Dugan outlined the presentation and timing format to consider the GC/CM application for Capital Improvement Projects by the Ridgefield School District. Panel members Ato Apiafi, Vicki Barron-Sumann, Jim Dugan, Matthew Lane, James Lynch, Mark Ottele and Janice Zahn, provided self-introduction. A majority vote of the panel is required for approval of the application. Other PRC members in attendance provided self-introduction and advised that they were not a member of the panel.

Rick Yeo, R&C Management, reported he is a partner with R&C Management and the Ridgefield School District to provide program project management for the District's capital improvements. He served as a general contractor for 34 years building schools in southwest Washington and the Portland area. At that time, he was involved in over 300 schools. Many of the projects were D-B-B and many were GC/CM or CM/GC in Oregon and Washington.

Both Ridgefield School District and R&C Management have presented prior project applications to the PRC. R&C Management presented a proposal for the Washougal School District nearly two years ago, which was approved. Ridgefield School District is hoping for the same outcome of its application.

Mr. Yeo introduced Dr. Nathan McCann, Superintendent, Ridgefield School District; Casey Wyckoff, LSW Architects; and Howard Hillinger, Parametrix, who will be heavily involved through the RFP/RFFP process and the signing of the MACC and then on call from that point forward.

Mr. McCann reported the Ridgefield School District has embarked on a bold goal to pursue capital projects. The District's four legs serve as the foundation with a focus on high quality instruction, educational programming that is expansive to meet the need of each student in the District. Ridgefield School District is a community and a school district that is undergoing some transition with enrollment increased by 13% this year as one of the fastest growing school district in southwest Washington and one of the fastest growing in the state. The vast majority of people moving to Ridgefield are doing so because of the school system. With growth, come challenges with urgency to ensure all students are enrolled in a learning environment that is safe, secure, flexible, and sets students for success in the 21st century. The growth is causing the District to rely on portable classrooms with 22 new portable classrooms added this fall with 16 more planned next year. The classrooms help the District work through a period, but are not the expectation for the Ridgefield community. Families and taxpayers have made it clear that they expect high quality learning environment and the School Board has mandated a high quality learning environment.

The District developed a bond program that is both fiscally responsible and uniquely addresses many, but not all of the short-term needs of the District, but pays heed to phasing and scoping moving forward. The lynchpin for the project is constructing a new intermediate and middle schools built and housed with students in August 2018 to set up future projects. The District is falling behind because of student population growth. The GC/CM process is not a cure-all, but in concert with the funding authorized by the Board for design and management planning for the project and in conjunction with the GC/CM process, will result in a realistic timeline to open the schools in fall 2018.

Mr. Wyckoff provided an overview of the projects and phases. Phase 1 is the construction of new 5-6/7-8 schools with two schools under one roof. The site is under concurrent development by the City of Richfield for an outdoor recreation complex. Phase 2 is the relocation of 800 students to the new schools allowing for portables from View Ridge Middle School to be relocated to the high school to allow Phase 3. Phase 3 is the demolition of on the occupied site of Ridgefield High School and construction of a new addition. Phase 4 is demolition and remodeling of the View Ridge Middle School, as well as security improvements.

Mr. Wyckoff displayed an aerial photograph of the school sites for the 5-6/7-8 school. The scope of the schools project is the construction of the schools, parking, bus loop, and track and field. He pointed out the location of the City's outdoor recreation complex. The site houses several wetlands.

The original high school is an occupied and overcrowded campus. Portables from View Ridge would be relocated to the site to enable the demolition and construction of the addition. The long-term vision is to create a cohesive integrated high school not reflective of distinct pods to provide increased security. The high school is located across the street from the 5-6/7-8 schools.

The View Ridge Middle School would be vacated and converted to a district office and community center. Currently, it is located on a shared campus with Union Ridge Elementary School. After the site is vacated and remodeled, security improvements will be added to provide site security to the entire campus.

Mr. Yeo reported that the proposal is three projects with the intent to link the projects into one main project, which is why the District is seeking approval for GC/CM delivery of a single project encompassing all three projects.

Mr. Hillinger added that during the conversations for determining the phasing and multiple applications, it was determined that the projects were so close that combining the project would be beneficial to the District for student service delivery and cost for hiring a single GC/CM.

Mr. Yeo added that the District also hired one design firm to design all projects and one construction manager for the projects. The three projects include the middle school and high school project, as well as the downtown campus that houses an existing middle school and elementary school. The high school and the downtown camp sites are crowded with buildings and athletic fields from corner to corner. The District is locating portables in athletic fields and reducing usable space for students. No space is available on either site to house construction trailers, lay-down areas, subcontractor parking, or subcontractor offices. Alternatively, at the new middle school site, a command center will be established to house the architect, R&C Management, and the contractor for two and half years as the projects are constructed.

Phase 1 is scheduled for completion in August 2018 and is the largest project. Phase 2 occurs in summer 2018 with the relocation of 800 students from the existing middle school to the new site and relocation of 12 portables to the high school. Construction of the high school is scheduled to begin in summer 2018 with the demolition of existing buildings. The project should be completed by fall 2019. The high school project is 23% of the total construction budget.

Mr. Yeo described why GC/CM is the preferred delivery method. Taken as a whole, the projects comply with four of the five requirements in the RCW. The most important criterion is the schedule of only 14 months to build 140,000 square feet of structures. Schools are complex. The schedule is very tight even with fronting the design and early site and procurement packages. Construction of the high school will occur on an occupied campus.

The public benefit of the GC/CM process is schedule enhancement and reduced costs with inflation savings of approximately \$2.5 million. Additionally, the GC/CM is able to adapt to changing project scopes, as the City's sports complex is still in flux with discussions underway in terms of the GC/CM constructing the fields, which would be considered extra work that could not be accomplished through the D-B-B process. The District has established a management plan (*roles and responsibilities*) comprised of 75 activities up to the signing of the MACC.

Mr. Yeo reviewed the budget. The new 5-6/7-8 school is \$72.5 million. The Ridgefield High School Addition is \$23 million. The two smaller projects are \$1 million and \$2 million, respectively. The budget was expanded for both the middle school and the high school. Contingencies included in the budget are a 3% contractor contingency and 10% owner project contingency, and another 3% owner program contingency.

The District has already issued the RFP and RFFP in draft forms to several contractors to review and provide feedback in anticipation of finalizing the documents ready for release after receiving approval from the PRC. The design work has been initiated with early site package and early bid packages. If the project pursued the D-B-B method, the project would not be completed until the fall of 2019 instead of the fall of 2018. The project will be funded with the appropriate budgets

and meets the qualifying RCW criteria. The project has a management plan that is clear and logical and the team has the experience to manage the project, as well as the capacity. The District is prepared to move forward and answer any questions.

Panel Chair Dugan invited questions from the panel.

Mr. Apiafi said the contingency level is proper given the level of unknowns. He asked what is driving such a tight schedule, as it appears the schedule might negate the objective. Mr. Yeo said the schedule is tight to achieve the objective of completing the school by fall 2018. The school is required in fall 2018 to accommodate 13% growth in student body. The school is overcrowded. Mr. Yeo added that if the project is not completed by the schedule, the District anticipates that 35% of the students would be housed in portables. It is reaching a point where it is untenable as an educational district.

Mr. Lane said he had similar questions about the schedule. It cited the compressed schedule to accomplish programming, schematic design, design, and construction documents. Mr. Wyckoff agreed the schedule is compressed but entirely consistent with the scope of projects completed for the Washougal School District. The design schedule is better than Washougal's timeline. Mr. Yeo added that the programming is running parallel with schematic. Mr. Lane replied that the information was indicative of the GC/CM selection at 90% schematic design. Mr. Hillinger said the schedule for the GC/CM would be at the end of schematic design. Mr. Lane pointed to the potential difficulty of the schedule. Mr. Wyckoff said design development ends in mid-March. Because of the firm's utilization of Revit, the schematic phases are much more robust than previously. The traditional percentage of schematic design versus construction documents has shifted much more towards the front of the project. In terms of the completion of the project, the firm is comfortable with the overall delivery of the package.

Mr. Yeo said Mr. Wyckoff designed a very similar project for Washougal for a K-8 school of 122,000 square feet along the same timeline. Although the schedule is aggressive, he has worked on many projects with Mr. Wyckoff and he is committed to the schedule and has successfully completed similar schedules in the past.

Ms. Zahn noted her questions are similar as the schedule reflects that early site would start with bidding in May but construction documents are not completed until June. That reflects bidding at 90%. Mr. Yeo advised that the District is bidding phases of the work. Discussions have occurred with the civil engineer, as the intent is to bid the civil work early. The civil engineer is prepared to provide early design. Construction will commence at 100% of CD drawings, which are scheduled for completion until the end of June or July; however early site work packages will bid. Additionally, the District contacted the structural engineering with an early steel package ready to bid. At Washougal, the project encompassed up to eight mini-MACCs with packages bid through the process of design completion.

Mr. Wyckoff said the process of issuing packages is common and known within the office in terms of developing the packages.

Ms. Zahn asked whether MC/EC was considered because of the dollar value. Mr. Yeo said there were conversations but no decisions were rendered. The market is active in the Portland and southwest Washington area. The team might consider the option of bringing those packages in earlier. The same discussion also occurred during the Washougal project with the decision to release a hard bid for the package. The same discussion would likely occur for this project.

Mr. Hillinger said it is also likely the option would be discussed with the GC/CMs during the interview to obtain feedback.

Ms. Zahn commented on the extremely compressed schedule for the RFPs, interviews, and sealed proposals. The schedule appears to lack any room to assess management plans and whether the applicant is the best qualified GC/CM for the project. Mr. Yeo reported the RFP and the RFFP drafts were released to the contracting community for review and feedback. Within the southwest area of the state, some general contractors bid school construction exclusively and half are committed and likely would not bid the project. Most answers to the questions are similar to previous project proposals. All information was included in the initial package.

Mr. Hillinger added that releasing the draft earlier offered an opportunity for contractors to comment prior to the formal process.

Mr. Apiafi asked for information on different tools and techniques the architect might use to fast track the schedule. Mr. Wyckoff said integrated design has been completed. The team is engaging the consultant team actively. The District has dedicated ongoing focused communication. The process of engaging the community, stakeholders, and users has been ongoing over the last year and more so over the last several months. The design team is able to proceed in an expedited and coordinated pace because of the confidence in the feedback and direction provided through the outreach process and the core team at the District.

Mr. Yeo said he has worked with LSW Architects for 35 years. If the firm only completed several schools or airports, or high rises, he would be somewhat concerned; however, Mr. Wyckoff and LSW have designed 400 to 500 schools and have a system in place that does not require a learning curve. Although construction may start in May, the design does not have to be completed in May. The team fully expects design to be completed through June and possibly July.

Mr. Hillinger reminded members that the team completed a similar project for the Washougal School District. The owner has experience with GC/CM and understands the process.

Panel Chair Dugan inquired about the reporting structure in terms of the PM and the CM. Mr. Yeo said other team members from R&C Management include Adam Cormack and Tracie Peterson. Ms. Peterson is committed 100% to the project. Mr. Cormack will work closely with him. Mr. Yeo said he reports to Mr. McCann.

Mr. Lynch commented that the schedule is the biggest factor driving the need for the delivery method, as well as the biggest risk of the project. His lawyer instincts for better or worse have witnessed worst case scenarios on many projects and many more that most care to acknowledge exist. The schedule for the project requires firing on all cylinders. He asked about the plan and consequence if one cylinder misfires or the worst case scenario from the team's perspective.

Mr. Yeo replied that the construction schedule begins in May and ends in August for approximately a 16 month schedule, which is doable with all the contingencies included for unknowns. His main concern is during the summer of 2017 and site conditions with soils. The goal is to release an early site package. Plan B is working today with engineers rather than waiting until May.

Mr. McCann added that should the project not meet schedule, move-in of students would be delayed until the winter break. Moving during that period is difficult because it is a compressed window because of the Christmas holiday, and it is disruptive to the education process to the extent of delaying the move to the fall of 2019. However, the District is not comfortable waiting. The GC/CM delivery method is the best course for being the steward of taxpayer dollars. The community has indicated conditions are unacceptable and it is unsustainable. Voters will not approve a bond to purchase portables. The District is spending its capital fund of impact fees, as well as lacking any land to expand. The District is consuming at a rapid pace play space and athletic fields, which is problematic. The District cannot keep pace with growth without the projects being completed on time. The project is a collaborative process and the District is proud of the program that was developed. The program was developed over a year of intensive stakeholder engagement. The District Board authorized the expenditure of \$2 million in front funding to initiate the project.

Ms. Zahn commented that the pre-construction services only reflect \$250,000 for a \$58 million MACC. She questioned the low limit. Additionally, although Washougal was mentioned several times, it is not Ridgefield and it is unclear whether the District has utilized Parametrix and R&C Management before or whether it is a new relationship.

Mr. Yeo said the last project he built for the District was of a similar size. The pre-construction was \$98,000. He believes \$250,000 is more than sufficient for the project. Mr. McCann hired the firm not because of Washougal but because of Washougal and Evergreen and all the other references.

Mr. McCann said he could have hired the last construction management firm but selected R&C Management as he has greater confidence in Mr. Yeo's abilities.

Ms. Zahn noted the substantial cost overrun on one of the projects involving Union Ridge Elementary School.

Panel Chair Dugan invited public comments.

There were no public comments.

Panel Chair Dugan invited the panel's deliberation and a recommendation.

Mr. Ottele said the project warrants a GC/CM delivery method because of the complex scheduling. His main concern is assurance that the team is in place to succeed.

Mr. Apiafi shared similar comments. The positive aspect is the experience level of R&C Management, as well as the knowledge and experience by Mr. Hillinger. His main concern is the schedule.

Panel Chair Dugan said he is often faced with similar challenges. However, the District is using the same design team and the same PC/CM team. The sameness of those three factors answers the question of how the team is able to creatively crunch time and save money.

Ms. Zahn cited particular concerns surrounding the schedule and meeting the completion date. The schedule reflects a lot of risk.

Panel Chair Dugan agreed there are some line item dates that are off. However, from a design standpoint, the schedule allows 10 months to pull off this kind of work is possible and he has successfully completed similar projects. How the line items are immersed in the overall schedule is a best guess; however, the overall schedule is adequate.

Ms. Barron Sumann agreed with the observation because when moving forward in the schedule, there are fewer granularities in the schedule. She also lives in Washougal and is excited to hear about the project.

Mr. Lynch said it seems that the decision by the PRC is the methodology to use for the project. If it is assumed the project will occur, the school district needs these facilities to be in place and they need them as scheduled. The decision is not whether it is a good idea and do they really need, it is considering the best way to allow the District to have the best chance of making it happen. In his view, the GC/CM method using this team of individuals is the only way that is realistic. He also has trust in the team. It is certain that the project would fail if the GC/CM method was not utilized.

Vicki Barron Sumann moved, seconded by Mark Ottele, to approve the GC/CM application from Ridgefield School District for Capital Improvement Projects. Motion carried unanimously.

Okanogan County PUD No. 1, Enloe Hydroelectric Project – Design-Build

Panel Chair Howard Hillinger reconvened the meeting at 2:33 p.m. Panel Chair Hillinger outlined the presentation and timing format to consider the Design-Build application for the Enloe Hydroelectric project from Public Utility District No. 1 of Okanogan County. Panel members Howard Hillinger, Ato Apiafi, Jim Dugan, Janice Zahn, Vicki Barron-Sumann, Matthew Lane, James Lynch, and Mark Ottele provided self-introduction. A majority vote of the panel is required for approval of the application.

John Grubich, General Manager, Okanogan County Public Utility District No. 1, introduced several members of the project team. Tim DeVries, Director of Engineering and Operations, will serve as the Project Manager for the project. Heidi Smith serves as the District's Legal Counsel. Dan Boettger, Director of Regulatory & Environmental Affairs, has been a member of the project team since initiation of the process. John Christensen, Christensen Associates, Inc., serves as the project's Consulting Engineer and has been involved in the project since the beginning. Mr. Christensen has

extensive experience on similar types of installations across the United States. Robynne Parkinson, Thaxton Parkinson PLLC, is serving as the DB contract legal counsel.

Mr. Grubich reported that two years ago, at the direction of the PUD Board, a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) was issued seeking interest in the industry for either owning Enloe Dam, building the dam, financing the dam, operating and maintaining the dam, or any combination of those options. No qualified proposals were received. However, the process offered the opportunity to identify those in the industry having the necessary expertise. The PUD determined Design-Build would be the most efficient and expeditious method to deliver the project.

PUD No. 1 serves the electricity and broadband need of Okanogan County, the largest county in the state of Washington. The PUD was formed by voters in 1939. In 1945, the PUD purchased Enloe Dam and the Power Plant. Today, the District serves 15,700 customers with 20,000 meters. The District owns 104 miles of 115-kV transmission line and 16 substations, 1,373 miles of overhead and 347 miles of underground distribution line. As a regulated dam, the District is required to address dam safety issues and prepare an emergency action plan. The dam does not generate electricity and purchases power from the BPA, Wells Hydro project in Douglas County, and from the Nine Canyon Wind Farm. The District employs 100 employees. The District's bond rating through Standard and Poor's is A. Moody's bond rating is A1.

The location of the project is adjacent to the Canadian border on the Similkameen River near Oroville, Washington. In 2007, the District initiated a FERC licensing process for a 9 megawatt plant. The regulatory licensing process was complicated with many stakeholders taking an extended period of time. A 50-year FERC operating license was issued in July 2013. The license required over 500 prevention, mitigation, and enhancement measures with different agencies and in different areas.

Mr. DeVries reviewed the project boundary on an aerial map. Below the Town of Oroville is a small side-channel project for fish enhancement. The Enloe Dam was constructed in 1919/1920 by Eugene Enloe. The gravity-arched dam is 54 feet tall and 315 feet long. Intake structures are fairly long penstocks extending to the old powerhouse. A second penstock was removed after 1958. Mr. Enloe sold the dam to Washington Water Power in 1923. The PUD purchased the dam in 1945. The power plant was decommissioned in 1958 when low-cost electric power from the Bonneville System became available.

A new powerhouse is proposed to be located on the opposite of the river from the existing structure. The project is considered a run-of-the-river project because of its dependence on water flows. The powerhouse would be able to handle 1,600 cubic feet of water per second (cfs) and generate 9 megawatts. The average flow on the river is 1,200 cfs.

The project adds crest gates across the top of the dam. The devices are able to rise five feet allowing operators to increase the drop distance of water to the turbines below to increase water output of the dam for generating power. The project also modifies an existing intake structure to provide some operational relief. A new intake channel, power intake, and penstocks on the east bank next to the existing dam are other new elements of the project. The project includes installation of a new 9 megawatt hydroelectric power plant and tailrace channel on the east bank of the river downstream of the existing dam. The tailrace channel serves as the exhaust pipe for the structure. The power plant would generate electricity of 1,060 volts with the electric system capable of 13,200 volts requiring a new electric substation to interface the generator with the existing electrical distribution system. Other features include improvements to public recreation facilities and new fish habitat enhancement facilities.

The estimated average electric power generated is 45 Gigawatt hours each year or 5 megawatts. The average load for the District is currently 75 megawatts with the project supplying approximately 67% of the power.

Mr. DeVries reviewed the initial design proposal for the tailrace and intake. The designs have not been finalized as agency interaction is necessary. One of the goals with a design-builder is to help define and determine costs and constructability of different designs.

District goals include:

- Cost – minimize cost of owning Enloe Dam including incremental costs and benefits of hydropower generation.
- Project Finance, Operations and Maintenance – Best fit with District’s ongoing commitments, operations and resources.
- Quality – Meet electric utility quality standards.
- Safety – Maintain safety of human life and property.
- Climate Change – Help reduce carbon emissions.
- Environment – Resource stewardship and enhancement.
- Compliance – Comply with laws, permits, and approvals.
- Collaboration – Partnership with DB Team and Regulators.
- Risk – Best allocation between participants.
- Schedule – Meet milestone dates in FERC License.

Mr. DeVries referred to the organizational chart included within the application. No changes have occurred to the organization. The District has been working with Mr. Boettger and other environmental consultants since the beginning of the project, as well as with Mr. Christensen and his team. Ms. Parkinson recently joined the project.

The project budget information in the application contains an error. Other related project costs should reflect \$4,653,000 rather than \$5,653,000. However, the total cost of the project is correct.

Mr. DeVries reviewed an updated schedule. The schedule in the application was fairly aggressive. Changes in the schedule reflect issuing the RFQ on December 9, 2016 rather than December 1, 2016. The Statement of Qualifications is now due on January 6, 2017 with notification to shortlisted finalists on January 13. The proposal due date has been changed from February 22 to March 3.

Hydro projects are specialized with few projects located throughout the nation with a limited number of qualified firms able to complete the work. The District is interested in the quality of the applicants applying based on its last process.

Ms. Parkinson said the District is pursuing the Progressive Design-Build delivery method because of some unknown issues associated with an existing dam and existing conditions. It is important for the design-builder to assist with construction, constructability, compliance with the PERC license, design, and extensive communications with stakeholders and regulatory agencies. Similar to other progressive Design-Build projects, the team plans to issue RFQs to assess applicants for successful experience with projects of similar scope and complexity, assist in planning the project, as well as identifying potential applicants who might be interested in offering an alternative financial proposal to potentially design-build-operate-maintain, and finance. That option is allowed by statute as a utility project, and the District wants to pursue the option to ascertain interest in the industry. Additionally, the District has the funds to complete the project but also wants to explore external financing options with firms that are capable and interested.

The Design-Build agreement begins with the validation period. The size of the project dictates the validation period and the GMP development period, which occurs concurrently. After establishment of the GMP, an option could be considered to lump-sum the project. After commercial terms are identified, the execution period follows allowing off-ramps for the owner at each phase.

The benefits of DB for this project align with the statute. The project is extremely complex and requires both the installer and the designer working together to comply with all agency approvals. The constructability of the various elements of the project is essential. The project also includes sequencing because of the various components and the way each component is constructed. To comply with PERC licensing requirements, construction must begin early. Many pieces of the project can be initiated early. With a design-builder onboard, early phased construction can commence as other design work is underway.

Ms. Parkinson referred to some questions by the PRC about the benefits of DB for the project. Although the project could be constructed using Design-Bid-Build, it would take too much time. The industry in the local market is very small, as well as the number of contractors willing to complete the project. Additionally, the District is seeking a potential

alternative to examine design-build-finance-operate & maintain, which places the project in the category of being amenable to DB under the statute.

Panel Chair Hillinger invited questions from the panel.

Janice Zahn asked Ms. Parkinson, Mr. Christensen, and Mr. DeVries about their specific type of DB experience. Mr. Christensen replied that his DB experience involved fixed price projects. One project located in Hawaii included procurement of the equipment by the owner with a contractor hired to complete the design and installation of the equipment procured by the owner. The project involved a turbine generator that had self-destructed. To complete the project quickly, the equipment was purchased on the front-end followed by the hiring of a design-builder contractor to design the powerhouse and install the equipment. Other projects were located in California and involved large, complicated equipment projects whereby the contractor purchased the equipment with the goal to have the equipment, design, and installation under one contract to avoid disputes between various parties.

Ms. Zahn said her question pertains to the owner's perspective in terms of the relationship between the consultants because one member has some Progressive Design-Build experience on the contracting side while another member has technical expertise. Because many owners may not understand some of the complexities with Progressive Design-Build, some holes in the process could occur.

Mr. Grubich replied that Mr. Christensen has been involved in the project since the application was initiated. He understands the project as well as any internal employee. While Mr. Christensen is a consultant, he has a vested interest in ensuring the project is designed and built. Mr. DeVries was a project manager for the largest battery energy storage system in the world in Fairbanks, Alaska in 2003. The team is fortunate to have him as a member because of his ability to view the larger picture and understanding the dynamics of developing a project team. The Alaska project included contractors from 11 different countries with the project delivered on time and on budget. Mr. Christensen, Mr. DeVries, and Mr. Boettger's expertise (*lead through the entire process*) speaks to his confidence that the team understands the scope of the project.

Ms. Parkinson added that she has been working with the team on owner preparedness to ensure the owner understands a Progressive Design-Build project and management of the project. Understanding that there can be some hiccups in a Progressive Design-Build process, the team is as sophisticated as any other owner that she worked with.

Ms. Zahn noted that her concerns do not surround understanding the business of power generation but more about the delivery method where a design-builder is working side-by-side as the owner is developing and honing the scope before locking the price. That can be somewhat disconcerting for some owners when there is a level of uncertainty until prices are locked. A good design-builder will be challenging some of the assumptions owners have determined about what the right solution might be versus the actual outcome. From a readiness standpoint, her intent is to gauge how the team is prepared.

Mr. Christensen spoke about the qualifications of Tom McCreedy. Mr. McCreedy began with the project in 2012. He is a senior construction management consultant. Mr. McCreedy has worked on four Progressive Design-Build hydro projects beginning with the development of pricing for both progressive and fixed price. Mr. McCreedy is retired but provides consultant services. He provides the progressive experience to the project.

Vicki Barron-Sumann said she is unclear about the finance piece and whether it would be optional for the RFQs. Ms. Parkinson explained that the RFQ includes an alternate financial proposal for Design-Build-Finance-Operate-Maintain. The RFQs would be scored separately.

Ms. Barron-Sunman referred to the previous outcome and asked whether the owner is prepared if no proposals can meet the budget and the prices are higher. Mr. Christensen replied that the budget is secondary because the owner is committed to completing the project because of the issuance of the PERC license and timelines committed to completing the PERC license. The advantage of the project from a financial standpoint is the state's movement toward no-carbon emission generating facilities. The project is a no-carbon emission generated facility. It would supply electricity to the Town of

Oroville and the north end of the county. The plant would supply 5 average megawatts to the transmission system to provide a cushion when problems arise outside or inside the system. There are other non-economic reasons that provide value, such as reliability and predictability of the line. The District is committed to moving forward regardless of the price. Ms. Barron-Sumann questioned whether the District would move forward at any price. Mr. Christensen said he could not speak for the Board but that the project likely has a cost ceiling. However, if the plant produces no carbon emitting electrons, the cost is between \$100 to \$120 per megawatt hour or 10 to 12 cents per kilowatt. The project has much leeway before reaching \$100 per megawatt hour.

Mr. Apiafi asked for more examples of completed Design-Build projects by the team. He is aware of Ms. Parkinson's experience for the delivery method. Ms. Parkinson said her Progressive Design-Build experience spans 20 years as she also worked in the private sector in utility generation. Within the state, she has completed many Progressive Design-Build projects as well as a \$100 million project in Portland, OR. She is also working on a \$1.6 billion LA County Correctional Facility delivered by Progressive Design-Build. She has completed the Port of Seattle's International Arrival facility and the Grant County PUD facility.

Mr. Christensen advised that he has completed three hydro project retrofits involving a design-build approach. All Design-Build projects are a partnership and none began with an exact pre-defined solution and price. Those parameters were developed with the contractor over time, even though there may have been a fixed price that may not have been available at the beginning of the process. Mr. McCreedy has worked on four Progressive Design-Build projects. At one time in the industry, the delivery method was not termed Progressive Design-Build, rather, it was considered only as Design-Build. The idea was working collaboratively. The problem with hydro projects is the considerable amount of work to define the scope of the project as each project differs and each one is unique. There is always a validation period or a period to develop the scope and firm costs. Asking for a guaranteed price upfront will result in contingencies that are too high. It is important to allow for scope development. A list of seven projects was included in the information to the PRC. All the projects are recent. Mr. McCreedy was involved in four of those recent projects completed in the West. There have only been 8 hydro projects constructed in the last 10 years.

Ms. Zahn asked for additional information on Mr. DeVries experience. The information speaks to his 36 years experience as an electrical experience. However, the projects listed for the PUD include no Design-Build projects and the largest Design-Bid-Build was \$6.6 million while this project is \$45 million. She asked how Mr. Christensen's role compares to the owner's team. Mr. DeVries said the owner's role is to select the best team possible because people either make or break the project. There have been projects that included evaluating the different companies and selecting the company based on the team. Successful projects depend on having the best people. Ms. Parkinson has proposed a vetting process. The owner is willing to work with applicants that meet the Statement of Qualifications to determine if the applicant can work with the team and are the right fit for the team. Ms. Zahn asked about his specific Design-Build experience. Mr. DeVries cited his experience on a project that included not knowing the type of battery technology to use as team members were not experts in the field of converter technology. The owner conveyed the megawatt requirements for a specific amount of time guaranteed over a 20-year span along with other project criteria. The evaluation process was lengthy as the team was attempting to use battery technology not used in other projects. The process was likely not quite like Design-Build, but was based on performance specifications. Ms. Zahn asked about his relationship on the project versus the other team members. Mr. DeVries said he represents the PUD and his goal is to ensure the PUD has the tools and materials and receives timely answers to questions, resolves issues, and ensures agency interactions.

Ms. Parkinson said his role is similar to other public agencies who hire external assistance for project approval. The process is similar to most other public agencies that have minimal Design-Build experience that have hired consultant assistance to deliver a project.

Panel Chair Hillinger noted that the organizational chart reflects that the reporting designations for the Design-Build contractor is split three ways. He asked about the reporting relationship for the Design-Builder contractor and whether there is a single-point contact. Mr. Christensen replied that the Design-Builder would report to Mr. DeVries.

Ms. Parkinson added that contractually, the reporting line would be with the PUD with Mr. DeVries receiving assistance from Mr. Christensen and his team, as well as some interaction by Mr. Boettger because of regulatory requirements.

Mr. Christensen clarified that the relationship is between Mr. DeVries and the Design-Build contractor with support from his team with Mr. Boettger serving as the assistant Project Manager. The primary relationship is between Mr. DeVries and the contractor.

Jim Dugan commented on the saturation of the marketplace because of the different delivery methods and the impact on industry resources. Projects that are more specialized encounter more problems in the market. He asked whether the owner has reached out to solicit interest in the marketplace. Mr. Grubich cited the initial RFQ two years ago to determine interest in the market. As noted by others, the field is limited, which is why it is important to attract interest and attempt to obtain bond financing before the market reacts to the presidential election.

Mr. Dugan encouraged proactive efforts by the PUD. Early interests can disappear overnight because of decisions.

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

Panel Chair Hillinger invited the panel's deliberation and a recommendation.

Mr. Dugan commented about his several-decades of experience working on Design-Build projects. He noted the project with its budget and adherence to the statute is perfect for the Design-Build delivery method. He also believes the team has the experience to accomplish the project. He supports approval of the application.

Matthew Lane supported the project as it is a great fit for Progressive Design-Build. It is a strong application.

Mr. Apiafi remarked that the project type is a special niche. As an architect, he is familiar with different types of buildings and not power-generating facilities. It would be beneficial if the general contractor was fairly experienced in constructing power buildings to assist the team. The PRC has some questions that reflected some concern; however, given the special niche, there are fewer skilled and experienced contractors in the field. He wants to afford the owner an opportunity and wishes the team the best.

James Lynch commented that he does not believe the function of the PRC is determining whether a project should proceed because it is the PRC's responsibility to ensure the vehicle proposed is appropriate under the statute. He offers a unique perspective as he spent several years litigating a small hydro retrofit project. Some of the main lessons learned would steer them towards a Design-Build methodology because most of the risk is what the project produces at the last second or the project encounters environmental concerns. This type of project requires more specialized solutions to problems than any other type of projects. Any other delivery method would be vastly inferior for the project.

Ms. Zahn agreed that the project is appropriate, especially when considering how the owner might specify the right equipment in a Design-Bid-Build method, as well as considering other means, methods, and constructability with only a designer perspective without the supplier and contractor. She questioned whether the project could be successfully delivered under that scenario. The project is specialized. Her questions centered on the how the team functions as the information was unclear. The PUD has no experience with other Design-Build projects and the largest Design-Bid-Build project was less than a \$6 million. However, based on the discussion, it is clear that the owners have hired the right technical subject matter expert on the power side with Mr. McCreedy and Mr. Christensen and from a contractual standpoint understand the nuances of Progressive Design-Build. She is satisfied based on the discussion and the comments that the PUD has the project and the right people.

Mr. Apiafi asked whether members believe the amount of the contingency is adequate to mitigate risk.

Mr. Dugan responded that none of the information presented alarmed him. The amount appears to be adequate for the risk and project size.

Mr. Lynch agreed. His concerns is less about the contingency and more about fixing the price early as it could result in losing control of the process. The Design-Build delivery method affords an opportunity of obtaining all input early in the process.

Panel Chair Hillinger said he supports the application because Progressive Design-Build is a good solution. He disclosed that his son works for a private energy equity firm on Wall Street, which recently purchased many hydro power plants. His son explained how the transactions were considered private but afforded similar options.

Mr. Ottele said his company works on hydro projects and he supports the delivery method for the project.

Janice Zahn moved, seconded by Jim Dugan, to approve the GC/CM application from Okanogan County PUD No. 1 for the Enloe Hydroelectric project. Motion carried unanimously.

Panel Chair Hillinger recessed the meeting at 3:23 p.m.

Spokane Parks & Recreation – Design-Build – Riverfront Park Pavilion

Panel Chair Matthew Lane reconvened the meeting at 3:31 p.m.

Panel Chair Lane outlined the presentation and timing format to consider the Design-Build application from Spokane Parks & Recreation for the Riverfront Park Pavilion project. Panel members Ato Apiafi, Jim Dugan, Janice Zahn, Vicki Barron-Sumann, Matthew Lane, James Lynch, Howard Hillinger, and Mark Ottele provided self-introduction. A majority vote of the panel is required for approval of the application. Other PRC members in attendance provided self-introduction and advised that they were not a member of the panel.

Chris Wright, President, Spokane Park Board, reported he is also a member of the Executive Team overseeing the Riverfront Park redevelopment project. The project encompasses over 100 acres within in an urban setting bisected by the Spokane River in downtown Spokane. The request is for approval for Progressive Design-Build for the pavilion structure. The design is iconic for Spokane and is reminiscent of EXPO 74 in Spokane and it is a major element of the skyline.

Mr. Wright introduced team members Berry Ellison, Project Manager, City of Spokane; Matt Walker, Hill International; Robyn Parkinson, Thaxton Parkinson PLLC; and Garrett Jones, Park Planning Manager, City of Spokane.

Mr. Jones reported he is the Parks Planning and Development Manager for the Parks Division. The pavilion was originally a gift from the U.S. Government as part of EXPO 74. Over the last 40 years, the pavilion has changed in uses from ice skating in the winter to carnival rides in the summer. The site serves as the location of administration offices as well. As part of the master plan process in 2014 and program efforts for the pavilion, the overall vision for the pavilion is to become a large outdoor venue supporting park events for next 40 years. Events at Riverfront Park are projected to be over two times the capable capacity today if utilities and amenities were available. The site also needs maintenance and renovation because of deferred maintenance. Administrative space expansion is necessary for management and Parks staff. Events are growing requiring outdoor venues, as open space is limited in the central core of downtown. A portion of the project is demolition of existing support facilities and Imax theater. Maintenance of the cable structure is included in the scope.

Mr. Jones displayed an aerial photograph of the entire redevelopment project area. The project is located within the south section. The City is working on the Howard Street South Bridge with completion scheduled in fall 2017. The second project is the Ice Ribbon Skyride project currently out for construction bids. The project is scheduled to start in January 2017 and open in fall 2017. The Loeff Carrousel project is in the final stages for specifications with completion of design. The project is scheduled for bidding in February 2017 and is scheduled for completion in early spring 2018.

If approved, the demolition of the existing structures for the Pavilion project could start in fall 2017 with an opening date in summer 2019. The Blue Bridge is considered a sister project in cooperation with the City's Utilities Department to replace the bridge, which is scheduled to commence construction in fall 2018 with completion by fall 2019. Along the

perimeter is the West Havermale project scheduled to begin in spring 2019. Completing the entire redevelopment project are the North Promenade and North Bank projects scheduled to commence in fall 2019 and be completed by late 2020.

Mr. Ellison reported he is the Program Manager and works directly with the Executive Team and manages the procurement and work of various project managers. He also ensures the project dovetails with other City departments and projects. A hydroelectric development is located on the property requiring close coordination to ensure operation of the facility. The primary goal is to meet the vision of the Park Board for the project as well as delivering the project on time and on budget.

Mr. Ellison reviewed the organizational chart. The Park Board is the legal authority for Spokane Park planning and system. The Board is charged with planning, land acquisition, development, and maintenance. The Park Board formed an alliance with the City of Spokane and created the Executive Team. The Executive Team is comprised of two Park Board members, President Chris Wright and Ted McGregor, Riverfront Park Committee Chair, the Parks Director, City of Spokane City Administrator, and the Vista Utilities River License Manager. The Executive Team is intimately involved in the project on a daily basis with weekly meetings with the team to review the status of the project and next steps. The Executive Team is supported by City Attorney, Hunt Whaley. Mr. Whaley advises and offers guidance.

The program management team includes Mr. Ellison who serves as a landscape architect, Mr. Jones, Jo Lynn Brown, Program Coordinator, and a bond compliance auditor to monitor finances.

Earlier in the year, Hill International was retained to assist with project management of different projects. Mr. Hill is supported by Robyn Parkinson.

Mr. Walker said he is supported with assistance from additional Hill International staff to include Robert Mills for project controls and scheduling, Tim Mead, a Senior Construction Manager will assist during construction, and Todd Smith will be involved in estimate reviews as part of the GMP procurement process.

The project budget is approximately \$1.7 million for A&E and legal fees. The construction cost estimate is \$12.9 million with a contingency of \$1.7 million for environmental construction and design contingencies for a total project cost of \$19.7 million.

The published schedule has changed with the issuance of the RFP delayed by a week. After issuance of the RFQ, an informational meeting will be held for design builders to become familiar with the project and participate in a site visit. Statements of Qualifications are due on January 9 followed by a shortlist on January 19. The RFQ would be issued one week later. Proprietary meetings will be held with shortlisted firms. Proposals are due March 6 with selection of the design-builder on March 17. Design is scheduled April through February 2018 with an anticipation date for construction in September. Completion of construction is anticipated in late 2018 or early 2019.

The Request for Qualifications is seeking firms with renovation experience of similar scope and complexity. The project is located within the shoreline setback with many permitting issues. The project has multiple stakeholders with other contractors involved and other design teams for other projects. The design-builder must be able to work well with other stakeholders. Historical resources are involved and will require participation by the Department of Historical Preservation and the Spokane Tribe. Of importance is the team's organizational makeup and experience in developing Design-Build GMP budgets with emphasis on target value design. No more than five finalists will be identified. Within the RFP, a specific management approach to the project is required, as well as innovation and problem-solving skills. Because part of the project includes the eastside of the pavilion structure, the intent is to remove that section located adjacent to a retaining wall. Early contractor involvement will help determine the best approach for either moving or retaining the element. The design honorarium is between \$10,000 and \$15,000. No design submittals will be requested. The intent is seeking a fixed GMG flexible scope project. Hill International has completed some estimates to determine whether the base level scope can be achieved with the addition of enhancements, such as elevated walkways if possible. The design-builder would be responsible for developing the basis of the design documents, schedule, and GMP followed by negotiating a contract to execute.

Ms. Parkinson explained why the project is best for Design-Build delivery. The project fits well as the budget is limited as there are many moving elements, as well as many desired elements to add. The project approach is similar to the Richland Fire Department project that was completed with a fixed GMP and a flexible scope. The design-builder will assist from a constructability standpoint and an existing structure standpoint because of the number of existing pieces within the pavilion. The site includes historic preservation, issues with respect to the tidelands and the existence of other surrounding projects. As the project includes many parts and pieces, phasing will be involved. Integration of the designer and the constructor will save time and costs. The project is Progressive Design-Build because of existing conditions and the City would like the contractor to validate existing conditions to determine possibilities.

Ms. Parkinson reviewed some of the answers previously provided to questions submitted by the PRC.

Panel Chair Lane invited questions from the panel.

Mr. Dugan requested more information on preparation of contract amendments and approval protocol.

Mr. Wright replied that any contract amendment exceeding \$50,000 must be approved by the Park Board. The team recognized that it would create interference with the project. Generally, any amendment under \$20,000 is approved by the project management office without Board approval. Amendments greater than \$20,000 to \$50,000 are approved by the Executive Team. Any amount over \$50,000 is approved by the Board. The Executive Team meets weekly.

Ms. Parkinson said the situation is fairly typical. It is likely the not to exceed will be implemented for the first phase. The team has a great communications plan with the City learning from a recently completed project

Mr. Hillinger asked about the timing of the selection of the contractor. Ms. Parkinson replied that for Progressive Design-Build, the selection of all subcontractors likely would not occur, as the City would like to be involved. However, there is a greater opportunity in Design-Build for outreach. The RFP includes more information on the outreach effort to small businesses. The City has a policy for utilizing small businesses. Utilization of small and minority-owned businesses is easier within Design-Build than in Design-Bid-Build. Typically, Design-Build contractors provide an outreach plan with the proposal. Additionally, having the contractor identify businesses earlier restricts the marketability of small businesses because of assignment to teams earlier.

Mr. Walker added that the RFP is not requiring the contractor to provide different subs and contractors as part of the submittal. Once the design-builder is hired, the team will assist in the selection of subcontractors.

Mr. Lynch said many of the goals described in terms of price flexibility and participation are good candidates for GC/CM or a riskier methodology of Progressive Design-Build. He asked whether GC/CM was considered and whether there were reasons the team believed Progressive Design-Build was preferable or could provide options GC/CM could not provide.

Mr. Walker said the main concerns were the budget and the schedule, as well as avoiding a liability gap between the architect team and the GC/CM, which is one of the reasons for selecting Design-Build, which eliminates that liability, as well as affording a fixed GMP and a flexible design-builder.

Ms. Parkinson described the statutory limitations and differences between GC/CM and Progressive Design-Build.

Mr. Lynch asked whether it would be possible to ask the design team in collaboration with the GC/CM to design to the budget and negotiate the MACC. Ms. Parkinson affirmed the possibility but noted that the MACC is not guaranteed until the designs are 90% complete. Additionally sub-bids must be hard bid. There is little control over what the GC/CM can do. More often, the GC/CM GMP will include much contingency for the hard bids. The intent is fixing the GMP early with the design-builder submitting designs that are consistent with the budget.

Ms. Zahn said it appears Mr. Ellison has Design-Build experience. Mr. Ellison said he spent the last eight years of his career with a Design-Build firm. One of the projects was with Matt Walker on the convention center expansion job. He was on the design side working in a Design-Build firm. The firm also had many personnel working in the field as the drawings were revised in response to architecture and civil changes next to a body of water, similar to this project.

Ms. Zahn asked Mr. Garrett whether his experience involved low bid or Design-Build projects. Mr. Garrett said for the City of Spokane projects, the projects were low bid to include some previous bond measures that were passed in 2008 and completed in 2010 with the aquatic centers and sports complex. Prior to Spokane, he worked in the Design-Build industry for residential and commercial projects. His main role is from a perspective of planning and development of the entire system and how the project contributes to the system.

Panel Chair Lane invited public comments.

Rustin Hall said he has been a resident of Spokane for 24 years and has worked for the last 24 years in a business located 100 yards from the structure. Approximately 500,000 people own the building. Many of them were children and participated in activities in 1974 in the pavilion. Most of them still live in Spokane and have an attitude of ensuring the project is completed properly. There is no better process to ensure the project is not screwed up than Progressive Design-Build. The team's in place as he has worked with Mr. Ellison and Mr. Walker. Together they were the architect for record for the expansion of the convention center along the harbor for the Design-Build highly successful project. There are similar kinds of issues and the team will have it handled. The passion for the Park Board is remarkable, as the Board has received a tongue-lashing from the media that was undeserved. The Park Board is steadfast in its support of the project. Another component of the project is involvement of 500,000 owners. He encouraged the panel's support of the proposal.

Panel Chair Lane invited the panel's deliberation and recommendation.

Ms. Zahn said the project application was the clearest from the standpoint that the project is clear and the decision line of authority was clear as well as the schedule of meetings. The phasing plan spoke to how the team considered how the project aligns with the other projects. It appears there is some timeline coordination with other projects requiring some collaboration. The project is appropriate for Progressive Design-Build versus GC/CM because of the budget limitation.

Mr. Apiafi spoke to the strength of the team.

Mr. Hillinger supported the application as it is well thought out. He believes the team has invested some thought and it is important to see the commitment. He expressed appreciation for the description of the project team in response to earlier questions he submitted.

Mr. Dugan supported the application for similar reasons. For the first time, he was able to listen to the nuances between different delivery methods in terms of fixed price, moving scope, fixed scope, and fixed price, and the differences between the two.

Mr. Lynch said he would like to see an update of the project as it likely is a project that makes the case for Design-Build. A case study on the results could provide needed information to those interested in alternative delivery procurements.

Mr. Apiafi thanked Ms. Parkinson for providing an explanation of the differences between GC/CM and Design-Build.

Howard Hillinger moved, seconded by Ato Apiafi, to approve the Design-Build application from Spokane Parks & Recreation for the Riverfront Park Pavilion project. Motion carried unanimously.

Vice Chair Hall adjourned the meeting at 4:20 p.m.