

Applicant responses in Brown

1. RE: Project Funding.
 - a. Please clarify funds availability for payment of GCCM and designer costs during preconstruction. Verbiage within the application seems to infer that bond passage vote verification does not necessarily assure availability of funds for the project.

RESPONSE: As the selection of the GCCM will not occur until after the bond vote, pre-construction services work will not occur until after the bond vote and monies would be available. We won't know if State construction assistance monies are available until receipt of the D10 form from OSPI. We would proceed with design and pre-construction services.

- b. Application outline budget allows \$15.0m for construction, including contingencies. Discounting this by 5% for contingencies, this leaves an average of \$210/SF for the complete construction [or allocating \$170/SF for the renovation and \$275/SF for the new addition]. Is this enough money for construction basically starting in 2017?

RESPONSE: This was the original budget put together by the pre-bond team and we are always evaluating the budgets on the projects to reflect expected costs. However, this is why we are seeking to use the GCCM delivery method and the expertise of a contractor team to guide us with cost and project certainty.

2. Page 4, Section 5 of the completed application, under response to RCW project-qualifying criteria lists the project's complexity as being satisfied . The third point/bullet supporting this status refers to working closely with "the AHJ" in coordinating permitting; please clarify the definition/meaning of AHJ.

RESPONSE: This refers to the Authority Having Jurisdiction and the need for the GCCM to work closely with the design team and the AHJ to proceed smoothly through the process.

3. RE: Schedule. Section 4 within the application outlining the Preliminary Project Schedule indicates a 3+ month lag between selection of GCCM and *start* of design. Please clarify this apparent anomaly.

RESPONSE: We would not begin the GCCM selection until the bond passes. The goal is, and always was, to try to get the most creative, forward thinking, best GCCM teams signed up on the projects as early as possible. With the construction market looking busy in the Spokane region over the next couple of years, the District desires to get the best people locked into the projects early and not lose them to other projects. The design effort depends on the master program schedule and the funding available. The District will manage cash flow and tax collection with

the public, which will affect the engagement of consultants and contractors. All of these issues roll into the start of design.

4. RE: Schedule/Phasing Attachments 2-4 at the rear section of the application seem to indicate (by color ID?) that corridor spaces in completed sections of the remodeled school will be jointly utilized by the school *and* the GCCM during construction of subsequent phase(s). Please clarify.

RESPONSE: This is just the first approach at what the phasing plan could look like. We are looking for the GCCM to provide input into any phasing plan for safety, constructability and costs. Students and staff will have to be able to flow during construction and the best way to achieve that is currently not known.

5. Please clarify the following in conjunction with the Project's Org. Chart within the application:

- a. The communication/reporting relationships are not clearly indicated. As drawn/depicted both the design team and the GCCM are contracted [or report directly to?] Mr. Jurgensen of OAC.

RESPONSE: Mr. Jurgensen is the overall program manager for the district and is key to the GCCM process on the project. He will be heavily involved in the GCCM process of every project using the delivery method in the program. However, the listed project manager(s) will be involved throughout the process as well.

- b. While Mr. Miller's role is described as 100% throughout, it appears on the org. chart that he is 'bypassed' such that both the design team and the GCCM are under Mr. Jurgensen, who is only committed to 20% FTE on the project.

RESPONSE: Ms. Bock and Mr. Jurgensen should be switched in the org chart. Mr. Jurgensen will report directly to Mr. Small and Mr. Rowell at the District. Ms. Bock will have a direct reporting line to Mr. Small as well and will keep Mr. Jurgensen involved throughout. As in most large programs there is a program manager and several project managers for individual projects and that is the case here. Mr. Jurgensen is heavily involved during the GCCM inception and early phases and able to provide just oversight as construction proceeds.

- c. Please expand/clarify the roles of Messrs. Barber, Jurgensen, Miller, and Small in both preconstruction and construction phases of the project. Are there other SD staff involved in the contract/project, or is Mr. Small [the Superintendent of Schools] the only 'go-to' person for the owner, who ostensibly, holds the GCCM contract?

RESPONSE: As Superintendent of the District, Mr. Small will have final decision-making authority. He will decide how to delegate authority to other District representatives and program staff. The District has other staff available that will be associated with the project. Mr. Jay Rowell is Assistant Superintendent/Personnel and is currently signed up to attend the AGC GCCM training in March. Jan Hutton is the Assistant Superintendent/ Business Manager for the District, working with the projects on budgeting and cash flow. Between Ben, Jay and Jan, the District will have people available to make decisions as needed.

Mr. Barber's role will be in oversight and quality control throughout the program. He will be available to assist with program management on an as-needed basis. The roles of Jeff Jurgensen and Beth Bock are described above.