

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY REVIEW BOARD
PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

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

Meeting Notes
January 25, 2018

MEMBERS PRESENT

David Beaudine, Construction Manager	Mark Ottele, General Contractors
David Ernevad, Higher Education	Ed Peters, School Districts
Matt Lane, Design Industry Architects	Janice Zahn, Vice Chair; Port of Seattle
Jason Nakamura, OMWBE	

STAFF, GUEST, AND PRESENTERS

Talia Baker, Department of Enterprise Services	Jeff Jurgensens, OAC
Rebecca Barback, Integrus Architects	Debbie Massaro, Issaquah School District
Dan Chandler, OAC	David McBride, Tahoma School District
Lori Cloud, Tahoma School District	Tom Mullins, Issaquah School District
Tom Cole, Cornerstone GC	Royce Nourigat, Issaquah School District
Steve Crawford, Issaquah School District	Randy Barber, Proficio Partners
Cindy Darcy, Tahoma School District	Carrie Risebman Nagkyn
Dave Flynn, Cornerstone GC	Rob Robinson, Skauska
Heather Hocklander, Tahoma School District	Katie Trimpe, Turner Construction
Lora Janssen, Inici Group	Jeff Whitechurch, Hill International
David Jobs, OAC	Kasey Wyatt, Tahoma School District

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Vice Chair Janet Zahn called the Project Review Committee panel to order at 9:00 am.

TAHOMA SCHOOL DISTRICT – SHADOW LAKE ELEMENTARY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS – GC/CM

Panel Chair, Janice Zahn reviewed the timing and the presentation format to consider the GC/CM project application from the Tahoma School District for the Shadow Lake Elementary Schools Capital Improvements project. Panel members David Beaudine, David Ernevad, Matthew Lane, Jason Nakamura, Mark Ottele, and Ed Peters provided self-introduction. No panel member was recused from participating in the discussion and vote.

Project Presentation Summary:

Applicants introduced themselves: Lori Cloud, Assistant Superintendent; Cindy Darcy, Construction Manager; Heather Hocklander, Architect Project Manager; David McBride, Project Manager; and Kasey Wyatt, Principal-In-Charge.

This is a reapplication from December 2016 with improvements based on feedback on the last application with concerns regarding aggressive scheduling and staffing levels. The School District decided to change their approach to include a more expansive schedule, supplemented the budget, and increased the project management support.

Kasey Wyatt, Principal-In-Charge introduced her team to include Lori Cloud, providing co-leadership for GMP, estimate review and procurement, introduced her team. David McBride is Project Manager heavily involved in the GC/CM procurement review, Cindy Darcy is Capital Projects Construction Manager, Heather Hocklander and her team are the Design Professionals.

Since 2013 the Tahoma School District has successfully completed 3 large GC/CM Projects worth \$240M in Capital Projects, on time and under budget as a direct result of the GC/CM process, a successful collaboration process and a great team. The School District has received 2 awards since completion of these projects to include the CMAA National Education Award for collaboration and project of the year, and the EMR Magazine's PNW Education Award for

collaboration. These awards resulted in the additional funding supporting today's Shadow Lake Elementary School Capital Improvements Project.

The scope of this project focuses on 3 areas: 1) Remodel of Administrative offices, the Library and kindergarten areas; 2) Security access control and fire alarm systems upgrades to the throughout the campus; and 3) Finish upgrades throughout the campus including exterior and site improvements.

Schedule, pending approval by the PRC, includes an 8 week procurement process starting in January for the GC/CM, near the end of March begin preconstruction services for construction to begin at the beginning of the summer once the school year is complete and Substantial Completion scheduled for May 2019.

The budget for this project is estimated total cost of \$3,900,000 broken down to \$2.6M for construction costs including 3% risk contingency and an additional 15% for the overall design and escalation contingency.

This project meets 3\6 GC/CM criteria; Complex phasing, Occupied site, and Involvement of the GC/CM is critical.

Panel Questions:

David Beaudine asked, based on the complexity of the schedule, what the status is of design in relation to the current schedule. The answer is that they are at 25% of schematic design.

Ed Peters asked how the School District plans to get through permitting in time to start construction this summer. The School District acknowledges that permitting can be a challenge especially with the canopy, they will minimize the exterior improvements and will be filed as a TI which has a different permitting schedule. But will need to keep a close eye on it and have consideration. King County has jurisdiction so the schedule has been extended through May of 2019 just in case there is a delay in the construction permits past July and into the fall.

Matt Lane asked, if the Tahoma School District is bringing on the GC/CM early with anticipated construction starting in July, where would they be in design and pre construction services be come April. The School District responded that they are waiting for GC/CM to be in place before progressing further with schematic design. May be 30-35% when the GC/CM contract is signed. The intent is to fully utilize the preconstruction duration with the GC/CM on board. Will be opening proposals in early March, going to the Board on the 27th of March, and should have a contract in place directly after that. May need to phase documents to get them out earlier to prioritize and expedite different parts of the project instead of packaging the whole project together.

Mark Ottele inquired on the level of outreach with contractors to gauge interest level in this project. Yes, the School District sees this as a unique opportunity to do GC/CM work with the smaller construction companies who have difficulty competing in the K-12 market. Will continue to market to all General Contractors. Have worked with Bond program with about 5 GCs on prior GC/CM projects which were primarily 2 GCs.

Dave Ernevad asked if the scope included occupancy sensitivity to start construction. The answer is no, the work could happen during occupation, but some phases would understandably have to be scheduled around the school day or scheduled to occur over a weekend. The amount of float available in the schedule is about 8 weeks in recognition of King County's back log on permit approvals.

Ms. Zahn asked if construction is scheduled to start in of July, how does scheduling the distribution of sub-packages fit in with implementation of the GC/CM contract in March? How many sub-package bids do you envision? The School District anticipates about 8 bid packs specifically focusing on Systems (HVAC, etc). Bids for finishes will come later as they wish to negotiate with the GC, and they do not envision having the whole project bought out by the start of construction.

Janice inquired about the lessons learned from the prior 3 GC/CM projects the School District recently completed. Specifically, what would they do differently and incorporate into this current project? Ms. Cloud responded that she had a lot of positive experiences with the current processes in place and the team collaboration were very successful. Lessons Learned come from experience and time. Developing relationships early, helping educate the community and keeping parents informed, and good communication on how to best work around the impacts of construction on an occupied site.

Kasey Wyatt responded that with the Tahoma High School and Regional Learning Center project their lessons learning were schedule specific. They completed the project 2 months early which enabled them to do some finishing touches, put furnishing in the building, get their punch lists in order, etc., but when it comes to training the users on the new equipment, they could have been more efficient in training on the new systems. They did not originally catch that lag.

Ed Peters asked if they could talk about the process for setting GMP. The process includes the expectation that they will have sub-bids in ahead of time. May not have GMP done by start of construction in July, but will have minimax along the way and expect have a GMP in place by early fall.

Mr. Ernevard inquired on the School District's expectation on receiving the construction permits. What is the typical timeframe for Maple Valley from intake to receiving their permits?

Ms. Wyatt pointed out that this project is not within the Maple Valley jurisdiction but King County, and TI permits are much faster. Working with King County jurisdiction has taught us how to work through the system on how to package the project to receive the needed permits more timely.

Public Comments:

Panel Chair opened the floor for Public Comments, and reminded attendees that this time is for comments and not questions.

Rob Robinson, with Skanka commented in support of this project. Having worked with both the Tahoma School District and OAC and Desharay. Tahoma are very seasoned, have great connections with King County, they have the management structure in place, and the fact that they are seeking to include smaller contractors to be involved. He encourages the panel to support this project.

Drew Phillips with Forma Construction commented in support for the project. He has worked with members of this team extensively, and strongly supports Lori's ability as an owner. Lori stays involved, knows what her district needs, how to put a team together that stays focused, gets the work done, makes decisions and keeps the project moving, which is the key is to successfully complete the project and stay on budget. He has faith in the success of this project.

Panel Deliberation and Determination:

The panel discussed the schedule and potential permitting hang ups that could interfere with it. The panel voiced appreciation of the public comments and having the support of smaller contractors is a bonus.

Ed Peters moved to accept the application. David Beaudine seconded the motion.

The panel voted unanimously to approve the project.

10:00 am

ISSAQUAH SCHOOL DISTRICT – NEW HIGH SCHOOL - DB

Panel Chair, David Beaudine reviewed the timing and the presentation format to consider the progressive Design-Build project application from the Issaquah School District for the New High School project. Panel members David Ernevad, Matthew Lane, Jason Nakamura, Mark Ottele, Ed Peters, and Janice Zahn provided self-introduction. Ms. Zahn stated that she is a liaison between Bellevue City Council and the Issaquah School District, but she does not have any authority in that role that could impact any decisions made here today. No panel member was recused from participating in the discussion and vote.

Project Presentation Summary:

Project Presenters introduced themselves. Steve Crawford, Director of Capital Projects; Royce Nourigat, Construction Coordinator; Debbie Massaro, Construction Coordinator; Dave Jobs, OAC Services & certified DBIA Program Manager; Dan Chandler, OAC Principal Advisor.

The Issaquah School District feels that progressive DB is best method for this project. The new high school is critical for our rapidly growing district (*there has been an increase of 500 students each year over the last 2 years*), and will be planning to accommodate a new elementary school on the same site at a future date as well as an all-weather track & field. The current district high schools have just over 2,400 students each and School District targets accommodating 1,800 students per high school. Appropriate school sites have limited space, so schools are compact and need a level of creativity to maximize the land usage.

Dave Jobs presented on the project schedule. Anticipated completion date is by Fall 2021. The District expects to work with the DB partner to fine tune the design. They have made an effort to send out two pre-advertisements within the community because progressive DB is a new delivery method for K-12. There have been two meetings (*an informational meeting and a pre-proposal meeting*) where community input has been collected and then incorporated within the draft RFQ which will be officially advertised on January 29th pending project approval from the PRC.

Steve Crawford spoke to the project budget which is fully funded locally from a \$533.5M capital bond approved in 2016 by 75% of the voting community. The line items are based upon previous projects and include sufficient contingencies. By bringing on the DB Team early on will help confirm the scope and budget.

Steve helped develop the initial concept plans so the District can feel confident that the buildings will fit appropriately on the selected construction site. There will likely be changes once the Design Team is onboard. The site is about 40 acres and the District will need to be extremely efficient with their land use. Part of this site will be put aside for a future elementary school which is not part of this project. The overall plan is compact, and the City of Issaquah requires 25% of all school parking to be in structures. The football, track & field will be on top of vehicle and bus parking. Another challenging fact is that the property is in the City of Issaquah with access to parking in the City of Sammamish without any current inter-local agreement in place between them. It will be the City's responsibility to put an agreement in place.

The Project Team consists of the capable Issaquah School District team and then have included OAC who is here to support with DB experience and help incorporate the predesign and design. The group has met as a Team and put together a roles and responsibilities matrix together which will help identify who does what with this project. OAC will flex ebb and flow as needed as the Issaquah School District requires. The School District team has worked together for the better part of 15-20 years and have a very good understanding of what is needed for project development and delivery. Project Management staff is assigned and in place from the start of planning to substantial completion, occupancy and closeout.

Mr. Chandler feels this project is ideally suited for DB and meets all 3 of the required criteria for DB delivery. The depth of experience and continuity of the Issaquah School District staff with the stability from the Superintendent on down to Steve and his staff is strong and committed. They brought on OAC to support and compliment their experience. They can provide strategic advice, guidance and tactical support when needed.

Progressive DB provides huge opportunities for innovation and efficiency, Flexibility of subcontractor procurement, flexibility of consultant procurement, integration of design and construction is much greater that with GC/CM, significant savings in project delivery time can also be realized.

Panel Questions:

Janice Zahn wanted to know what were some of the things the School District learned when they reached out to the contracting community. Mr. Crawford stated that there is strong interest and involvement in DB projects. With DB projects, the team likes to have as much time to prepare as possible. This team elected to get the information regarding the intent of project as soon as possible. The RFQ draft is already on the street looking for more feedback. Mr. Jobs added that they already have 7-9 great teams interested in bidding on the project so far and we have incorporated the comments into the final RFQ so when it officially goes out on the street, those items are clarified.

Ms. Zahn asked Mr. Jobs about his experience specifically with progressive. He responded that his projects were mostly energy ESCO delivery which is similar to Progressive. He was Senior Program Manager for those projects. Dan Chandler added that the Children & Family Justice Center project was a design competition project. They fixed the maximum price and the competitors competed to offer the most they could for the contract price. Once it was awarded the scope changed, the market place changed significantly and now that it is under construction, Dave's time has been lifted and other people are handling the day-to-day construction tasks. While the project was not strictly progressive, it has turned out to require the same skills.

Owner readiness is a huge part of the success of Progressive DB. From the stand point of the School District, how does the team get the School Districts ready for the speed needed with DB for decisions, and the fact that the designer is working under the Design-Builder and not the Owner like with a GC/CM? Mr. Crawford recognized that it is a different process. He has a close working relationship with the CFO and Superintendent, and they communicate regularly. They are aware of the advantages and disadvantages of the use of DB. They moved to utilization of GC/CM a few years ago, which was a successful implementation. They are onboard with this practice and are particularly interested in the fact that DB offers a) a high level of certainty of cost early on in the project; and b) the potential to deliver a project earlier than in a DBB situation. The certainty of cost early in the project is an important factor not only in cost, but also to the schedule. The team has been preparing for this for some time and staff have attend the CPARB training and signed up for DBIA Certification,

Jason Nakamura wanted to know why Issaquah School District choose Progressive DB vs. Traditional DB? Is this Issaquah's first DB project? The answer is Yes. Steve Crawford stated that there are a lot of similarities between the two. Currently the team only has a conceptional plan and will sit down with the DB team first. They are not looking for Design competition as they want to sit down with the Designer to finalize the design, match the scope and budget, develop a project that is going to get started early with early cost estimates, and have a very good chance of meeting the opening dates that were put out for the public.

David Beaudine noticed that the budget included in the application and what was in the presentation were different. What happened to cause the difference? The School District removed some of the money allocated for early professional services which was drafted by OAC. Funding for the School District staff is not part of the project costs so they took that money and rolled it back into the construction amount.

Ms. Zahn requested more information about the design management component, especially with cost certainty without design evolution that does not match project costs. Mr. Crawford stated the School District assigns staff at the beginning of a project so they know what the processes are, what the decisions are, and so there is no gap or lack in project decisions. Royce has been involved and is very active and hands-on throughout the whole process, and he is committed to the success of this project.

Mr. Jobs stated that DB requires a little 'letting go' by the Owner, because it brings the Contractor and the Architect to the table at the same time which will ultimately help control costs and set expectations from the start. The School District has threaded this component through the RFQ because they want details included in the Design Management.

Ed Peters asked if they could talk about how they plan to structure the process so the School District will be happy with the end product, since a lot of lessons learned come to light after occupancy. Steve Crawford replied that they will have staff involvement in the design review process, there will be a planning principal onboard as well as key staff members and maintenance staff all involved in the project development to minimize surprises through the evolution of the project. The maintenance staff become more involved as those systems are developed and they can review them prior to installation. Their information is incorporated into the feedback which is taken back to the development team.

Mr. Peters inquired on how this works in the case of a Progressive Design-Build? Mr. Crawford replied that there is not much of a difference between them. There is an opportunity for earlier involvement and they want that feedback. As part of this process, a series of compromises are expected. They need to have the right people available to make decisions when it is time to make those compromises. Royce plans to sit in on all meetings with all of the staff, he has the experience and resources to get quick feedback when it is needed. He also follows the warranty on all systems for the 1st year and goes in to identify and improve any problems that come up as soon as they come up. The hope is to eliminate fatal flaws as soon as possible.

Dan Chandler noted that they made very clear from the beginning that they expect the key designers to be part of the whole process and meetings from the start. The procurement will include extended interviews and questions designed to get to know the people while asking the tough questions.

Matt Lane asked if the preparations have included a program or inspection document? Mr. Crawford responded that it will be part of the final pre-design RFQ.

Ms. Zahn asked if the School District expects to have a validation period? From a contract management standpoint, how does the School District envision this process working? Steve Crawford stated that he understands the value of getting to a validation period and will be spending time to make sure they get there. It will depend largely how the process comes together. If it all comes together well and they feel confident with the design and costs, it will be successful. It should be an on-going process all the way through.

Jason Nakamura asked if this is Dan's first Progressive DB project? Mr. Chandler responded in regards to a formal progressive DB this would be his second. Most of OAC's listed 21 projects are cost-reimbursable as opposed to lump-sum design competition, so the collaboration, negotiation, and validation that is inherent in Progressive DB is inherent in all of the projects listed except 1, which was a federal GSA project.

Public Comments:

Panel Chair opened the floor for Public Comments, requested that they try to keep comments to 2 minutes, and reminded attendees that this time is for comments and not questions.

Dave Flynn with Cornerstone General Contractors. He supports this project as he has worked with the Issaquah School District for the last 10 years on multiple projects both on lump sum and GC/CM delivery. They are hands-on and efficient Owners who are sophisticated and know what they are doing with excellent project management in the field. Of all the Owners he has worked with in the northwest, he feels they will do an excellent project with DB delivery. The overall market readiness for K-12 to go into DB delivery has evolved. Even though DB is relatively new, the Contractor, Subcontractor, and Supplier community has matured over the last 10 years to the point where they are ready to support K-12 to get into Design-Build delivery. He has talked to a number of prime subs who are excited about this possibility to get some DB experience with the flexibility it gives them to support the Owner's needs. He encourages the panel to fully support this project.

Randy Barber, Proficio Partners recommend the Committee support this project. A lot of eyes will be on this project and this smart and experienced team have a vested interest in this project's success. They have a lot of challenges, but this gives Issaquah School District an opportunity to be creative, flexible, and to be responsible stewards of the public funds they have been entrusted with. This is really the next step in giving Owners the opportunity to really look at what the best delivery method will be towards maximizing and optimizing on their investment.

Determination:

The Panel discussed the details of this project and how it meets the DB criteria. The team may not have extensive DB experience, but they have been off-setting that with their resourcefulness. It is good to have a school taking on Progressive DB, which provides a different pace from GC/CM, and those relationships. From a District standpoint, it is important to point out in Owner Readiness more than the project team is needed to be successful. It also includes facilities, maintenance staff, teachers, etc. who all need to be ready for this delivery method. There is more of a push to get to the scope, the validation and cost certainty which can make people uncomfortable. It is important to note that adhering to District standards may be a challenge, but the OAC support has been well thought out. There is some concern about the interlocal agreement, but the panel is confident the Issaquah School District will work through it successfully.

***Matt Lane moved to approve this application. Mark Ottele seconded the motion.
The panel unanimously approved this project.***

11:00 am

ISSAQUAH SCHOOL DISTRICT – NEW MIDDLE SCHOOL - DB

Summary:

Panel Chair, Matthew Lane reviewed the timing and the presentation format to consider the progressive Design-Build project application from the Issaquah School District for the New Middle School project. Panel members David Beaudine, David Ernevad, Jason Nakamura, Mark Ottele, Ed Peters, and Janice Zahn provided self-introduction. Ms. Zahn stated that she is a liaison between Bellevue City Council and the Issaquah School District, but she does not have any authority in that role that could impact any decisions made here today. No panel member was recused from participating in the discussion and vote.

Project Presentation Summary:

Project Presenters introduced themselves. Steve Crawford, Director of Capital Projects; Tom Mullins, Construction Coordinator; Debbie Massaro, Construction Coordinator; Dave Jobs, OAC Services & certified DBIA Program Manager; Dan Chandler, OAC Strategic Advisor

Steve Crawford started the presentation. The School District has seen a growing interest in DB and feel it is the most appropriate method for this project. The new middle school is a critical need as the School District has seen growth of over 500 students a year, and all 5 current middle schools are over capacity. The target is to have only 900 students in each school with students in grades 6-8. They are looking at a building that is about 130,000 sq ft. which will meet WSSP requirements for a high performance building, will include all the usual district requirements, and will be built on a site adjacent to an existing elementary school which will remain in operation during construction. The site is compact, and will look at an all-weather turf athletic field that will be built over the top of the parking and bus drop-off areas.

Dave Jobs presented the project schedule. Conceptual milestones with reasonable duration for each have been included starting January 2018 with completion fall of 2020. The district expects to work closely with the Design Builder to fine tune the schedule as they move forward. The preparation the current team has done is key to the success of this project moving forward through procurement. They have pre-advertised in the DJC, drafted RFQs, had an introduction meeting as well as a pre-proposal meeting which has garnered questions from the DB community and which have been incorporated to the RFQ to make it as tight as possible. This is a single RFQ for both projects (HS & MS), competitors can choose one project or the other, however contractors must submit separate bids for each project if they wish to

contract for both. One bid will put them in the running for either project. The School District will select the contractors for the High School first and then move on to selection for the Middle School.

Budget for this project is \$74 Million. The Project is 100% locally funded by a bond that was approved for in 2016 for \$533.5M. The Community saw the need for additional school capacity and received approval of over 70% of the voters. Bringing the Design-Build team on early will help confirm scope and budget.

Land availability is limited, which has pushed the district to be creative. They purchased a vacant office building to house the current Administrative Services and free up the new site for construction. Geographically, this site is in a good core location to support future enrollment.

Mr. Jobs explained the Project Team's nuances pointing out that while Royce Nourigat will be the lead on the High School Project, Tom Mullins will take the lead on the Middle School Project. The School District an OAC sat down and developed a list of Roles and Responsibilities for the High School and a separate one for the Middle School. So while they may be similar, there will be separate teams for each project with the resources distributed accordingly. They feel the structure is appropriate at this stage and will evolve as the needs become apparent through procurement. Dan Chandler pointed out that regarding Team Readiness, Tom will be the primary responsible contact for transportation, food service, ID, security, etc. They are looking forward to having the Design-Builder engaged directly with those people as well.

Project Management staff are assigned to a project and are involved from the beginning and work together through completion, occupancy, closeout and the warranty periods. This continuing long-term sense of pride in their accomplishments is important to continue to enhance the quality of their projects and the education within the School District. All their projects are assessed once they are completed, and lessons learned used to enhance future projects. They have an ongoing relationship with the Superintendent and the CFO which include bi-weekly meetings to keep them apprised of the current status of all current projects. This project meets all 3 RCW criteria for Design-Build delivery, especially the opportunities for innovation and efficiencies, and feel there are significant savings in project delivery time as subject to the jurisdiction and permitting process.

Questions:

David Beaudine asked about the selection process. Once the School District makes a selection from the RFQ, do all of the other applicants just move over to the other project opportunity, or if one team is selected do they just choose different team members for the second project?

Dan Chandler responded that there was a lot of discussion on how to structure the single RFQ for the 2 projects. There is essentially one RFQ that could be for either job, or both jobs. So a competitor interested in both jobs, will need to submit an application for both with two different teams. If the competitor is interested in either project, they just submit one bid. If they happen to be interested in just one of the projects, they will need to identify which one in the application.

Mark Ottele inquired if all the applications are due at the same time. Mr. Chandler responded that the SOQ is requiring all bids be due at the same time. There is a fee proposal component which is delivered individually in confidence until final selection of both projects.

Mark Ottele ask if there was any strategy from the District perspective or thoughts about the efficiency between having one contractor for both vs. separate contractors for each project. Steve Crawford responded this is a whole new process and will need to make a determination on each team as to who will be the best choice for each project. Mr. Chandler stated that they are expecting joint meetings and a lot of collaboration between all teams when it comes to subcontractor procurement. We do not want to be competing with ourselves, in the same jurisdiction, and want to avoid conflict over permits. There will be a lot of coordination and communication between teams.

Mr. Beaudine inquired if 60-days is enough time to start the process for one and then 1/3 of the way through starting the second one? Is there enough time built into the schedule for that? Mr. Crawford stated that the Middle School selection will take place immediately after the High School selection.

Janice Zahn stated the timeline between both phases of the project look like there is only a month of lag between them. This team will need to make sure they do not stack their resources because an important part of progressive DB is getting to that GMP. Although the Middle School starts after the High School, it is expected to finish 1 year sooner. Please confirm that this has been thought about since these projects are concurrent. Steve Crawford answered that the start of each phase is similar, but the overall scope is different. The design process will start out on a similar track with some overlap between the two, the construction timelines will be different, and he anticipates there will be a lot of coordination to make sure they meet their deadlines for both projects.

Ms. Zahn further inquired regarding the facilities and operations side, are there different sets of people interfacing because they are different schools? Mr. Crawford explained, that there are there different staff between the design teams such as a planning principal that will represent each school, but the maintenance staff are the same.

In the Q&A there was a question about OMWBE goals. Is the School District intending to have as part of the selection some discussion about bringing on OMWBE selection even though there is not a required minimum? Mr. Crawford explained there may not be a required minimum, but there are points that will be awarded in the selection process. They ask questions about prior implementation and encouragement as part of the selection process. DB offers a greater flexibility to enhance minority participation which is an advantage of DB.

Dave Ernavad asked if the School District ends up with 2 different design teams, are there any provisions for collaboration? They responded that they are anticipating some cross communication at least through the District. How that evolves is yet to be determined. Coordination will be key.

Matt Lane with separate construction coordinators for each project, but OAC has the same staff. How with that balance out for OAC? Mr. Jobs stated each staff starts with about 20% responsibility for each project. About 40% of Dave Jobs' time will be the high end of his involvement and will fluctuate from there as needed. Once through Procurement and Pre-design processes, they will set up some systematic meetings and the communications will become more rhythmic.

Janice Zahn wants to understand what systems, plans or structure has been put in place for the Owner to be ready for contractual, cultural, and structural differences? What type of Owner Readiness has been put in place? Steve Crawford responded that the CFO is next in line. He is very involved with all of the Capital Projects. They have regular ongoing meetings with the whole department. Maintenance is another group they have a long term relationship with as well as regular meetings. The School District has a habit of incorporating a lot of their input.

Ed Peters wanted to know how the teachers will be involved. Since this is a new school, when will the teachers be identified and how will that relate to the design process? The School District has a planning principal, and will have some key personnel from the Middle school involved, predominantly the department chairs since the district was developed as a department organization, so that will carry through to the design committee. There are current on-going projects and some of those people may be involved in this project to provide feedback and guidance. Staff are involved with every opportunity to ensure needs are met.

Jason Nakamura asked if there are there Prompt Pay policies. (*i.e. With some businesses the subcontractors must be paid within 5-days of the prime being paid.*) Mr. Crawford responded that the School District has a policy to pay the general contractors quickly and are timely in their payments. He does not think there is language in the current contract, but it is something they will consider in the future because it makes sense.

Public Comments:

Panel Chair opened the floor for Public Comments, requested that they try to keep comments to 2 minutes, and reminded attendees that this time is for comments and not questions.

Tom Coleman, Chief Estimator with Cornerstone Construction. He has worked with the District, the market conditions are ideal. Has worked with Steve, Tom, and Royce, over the last 4 years on GC/CM projects and feels they are very knowledgeable on what they need to uphold the District's standards. The Contractors and Design teams appreciate that they get expedited clear and concise collaborative instruction and direction throughout the preconstruction process. They have put themselves in a positive position for a successful DB project.

Determination:

The Panel discussed the details of this project and how this project meets the DB criteria. With these two large collaborative projects, the School District has built the right team, have seen the importance of when the GMP is established and staggered the two projects so the resources are available, and they appear to have really thought out the whole process. There is a good team in place and have additional staff available between both teams and staffing levels. It will be nice if they can incorporate language to support MWBE subcontractors.

***David Beaudine motioned to approve this project; Ed Peters seconded the motion.
The panel unanimously voted to approve this project.***