

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

June 25, 2020

Minutes

Location: Online via the Zoom Platform

Meeting ID: 980-5091-0999

Attendees:

Jim Dugan, Construction Managers	Ed Peters, School Districts
Mark Ottele, General Contractors	Mike Shinn, Specialty/Subcontractors
John Palewicz, Owner – Higher Education	Kyle Twohig, Owner - Cities

Guests:

Corey Ayers, PM Bellingham School District	Curtis Lawyer, Director of Capital Projects Bellingham SD
Kevin Fromm, OAC	Drew Phillips, FORMA Construction
Zachary Ham, Dykeman Architects	Mike Pellitteri, Pellco Construction (new PRC Member)
Tim Jewett, Principle In Charge, Dykeman Architects	Graehm Wallace, Perkins Coie
Dave Jobs, OAC	

9:00 am

Bellingham School District – Sunnyland Elementary School GC/CM Project

Chair: Jim Dugan

Panel: Mark Ottele, John Palewicz, Ed Peters, Mike Shinn, and Kyle Twohig

Presentation:

Sunnyland Elementary School was originally built in 1926 and replaced in 1976-1978, is one of the smallest school sites in the district, and will be occupied during construction. Site and student safety on such a compressed site, and ongoing proactive community outreach will be paramount to the success of the project. The new school will be designed as a 58,000 sf two-story wood-framed structure for approximately 450 students in grades pre-kindergarten to fifth grade. The new school will be a state-of-the-art facility that fosters innovation and provides flexibility for future growth. They have an experienced project team, the project budget is secured at \$31,750,000, the schedule has seen some minor delays, includes complex phasing sequencing, and occupancy is still planned for September of 2022.

Questions & Answers:

Q: What GC/CM lessons learned from the Sehome High School project can Bellingham School District take forward onto the Sunnyland Elementary project?

A: Number one, procurement is a lot of work. That was a real lesson learned on the Sehome project. Our team will do a much better job of not only being with the contractor through procurement monitoring documentation, but also monitoring construction as we move through the project.

Q: A comment and a question. I'm a little bit concerned about there being only two weeks from when the SOQs are due to in your selective GC/CM. You've got one day to review the SOQs, and though your team is committed to really jumping on to it, it is a pretty short time and it is a very important decision. I am a little bit uncomfortable with that short timeframe. You said the district and Perkins Coie are currently assembling the GC/CM contract. Typically, as I understand the state law, it requires a copy of the contract to go out with the request for qualifications. Which is in the next couple of days, and you have done a number of these GC/CM contracts. I wonder why you're still writing or revising a contract? So my question circles around the contract. How come the contract is not ready, and will it be out in time to go out to the applicants?

A: The statute requires the contract go out with request for proposals. The request for qualification stage is in in design-build, but not in GC/CM. So the School District is going to have it in plenty of time. We wanted to make sure we got PRC approval before moving forward with spending the effort. The contract will be ready and it will be a fairly simple process, given that this group has already worked together on a similar project. So, we will comply with the statute, and we will have the contract, ready to go. The group definitely wants to make sure we get the contractor on as quickly as possible. So we gave ourselves tight deadlines, as opposed to

*giving the contractors tight deadlines, but we are going to be listening to the contractors. If they feel they need a little bit more time, then we will adjust the schedule appropriately. This is definitely going to be a collaborative process where we are listening to the market and making sure that we are giving everybody a sufficient amount of time.*

Q: Did you consider selecting the GC/CM in advance of PRC approval? And, if so, to what extent were you discouraged by the thought that it might prejudice the PRC against you if you went ahead with any part of this process? And/or were there other factors why you did not select the GC/CM earlier? We have heard that some applicants believe the PRC will be upset the process is started in advance of approval.

*A: We have been discussing this process since the end of last year, beginning of this calendar year. The Covid situation obviously has delayed things on our end a little bit. We wanted to be here, about two months ago, but we are committed to making sure that this happens today, and moving forward. We have given ourselves some tight timelines and we do want to give the contractor, the adequate time to respond to our requests. We need your approval before we can move forward with this process. So, no, there was never a consideration to start early.*

Graehm Wallace noted that he had been at a review in the past where the PRC panel members voiced extreme displeasure for starting the GC/CM selection process prior to approval. However, it would be a great idea if the owner is very clear with the contractors that PRC approval has not yet been received.

Q: What is the biggest challenge or obstacle on this project?

*A: The challenge is maintaining the safety of the students. The tight site and the construction zone is immediately adjacent to the existing building, and this is an elementary school with kids that have to get outside to play. So we are going to be taking those kids out and around the construction zone to get them over to the park area so they can run around and be kids. To me one of the greatest challenges of this project is having somebody on board that will listen to those concerns, take safety into consideration, and also execute their work.*

Q: Does Bellingham School District have condemnation powers, if the property owner decides to play real hardball? I am hoping to get a better understanding of your level of confidence. Has the neighborhood weighed in on your vacation? You may have gotten a thumbs up from your Municipality, but if the neighborhood comes unglued you may have a problem if conductivity goes awry. Additionally are there utilities on Maryland Street and will that result in a relocation effort? If something went wrong, can you manage things like your own stormwater on site?

*A: The property owner has been on the property for 25-35 years and has expressed interest in selling the property to us. We have been talking to him for quite a while. They are pretty good incentives for property owners to give possession and use, so we do not anticipate any issues. Regarding the street vacation, we have had one community meeting where we invited community members to give us feedback in terms of building design with no negative feedback. We have also discussed with our design Committee, which is made up of local community members, parents, and staff. We've also expressed the interest in the vacation as well. At this point, we do know there will be another community meeting where we will invite the community at large to get a greater feedback from them in terms of utilities. There shouldn't be any utilities as a right away. There are options for stormwater, but want to work with the GC to determine what is the best solution.*

**Public Comment:**

*Rick Philipovich: I just like to express my support for this project to go GC/CM. I think with the logistical and phasing challenges of the project, and most importantly, the occupied nature of the site, GC/CM lends itself very well to this project. We are currently working with the OAC team right now on another occupied GC/CM project and that project is going very well. So I would vouch for OAC as being the manager of this project. They understand the process and are administering that project very well. I've also personally worked with Tim Jewett in the past on a GC/CM on project, and can say that project went well as well. So just offering our support from being builders.*

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

**PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE**

June 25, 2020

**Minutes**

**Deliberations:**

*This project meets RCW requirements for use of GC/CM. Bellingham School District has a robust and experienced Team and clearly have the capacity to manage the workload for a successful project.*

*Mike Shinn made a motion to approve this application. Ed Peters seconded the motion.*

**Approved 6/6**

**Notes for future Committee Discussion:**

- Gain Committee approval for the Chair to send a letter of recommendation for Curt Gimmetstad to be appointed as the PRC Owner-Hospitals represented as recommended in May 23, 2019 Business meeting.
- Discuss removal of barriers for applicants so they can get the GC/CM onboard in a timely manner to allow enough time for a good selection process.
- Clarification is need in the RCW regarding RFP\RFQ stages and when the draft contract should be available.

**10:00 am      Adjourn**