

Project Review Committee

Chair Report to CPARB

September 12, 2024

Page 1 of 10

May 23, 2024 Hybrid Meeting from Spokane 8:00 – 10:00 am BUSINESS MEETING

Chair/Vice Chair: Kyle Twohig & Jessica Murphy

A Committee quorum of 28 members were in attendance in person and virtually with 5 absences.

- Chair Twohig welcomed the 12 in person members and 16 virtual members to the second PRC Hybrid meeting in Spokane.
- Chair Twohig welcomed new members (Garett Buckingham, Lisa Corcoran, Bret Miche, and Heather Munden)
 - Bret Miche greeted the PRC and voiced his eagerness to serve as the newest General Contractor.
 - Garett Buckingham greeted the PRC, shared that he is a past CPARB member and is eager to serve the PRC as the new Owner Public Hospitals representative.
 - Heather Munden is the new Owner Ports representative and is eager to learn how the PRC functions.
 - Lisa Corcoran is the newest Owner General Public representative and was unavailable but will hopefully be at one of the next 2 meetings.
- The CPARB Board Development Committee has been working on a realignment of the PRC position terms to avoid whole stakeholder groups from being replaced at the same time in the future. This will involve shorter terms initially for some of the members, but once reestablished the position terms will be static like they are with CPARB. If someone leaves before the end of their term, the new representative will complete their term vs. an automatic 3-year appointment. Members can reach out to Talia if they want to see the current alignment or have questions.
- Mentorship Program. Vice Chair Jessica Murphy touched asked for 4 volunteers to cover the incoming new members. She will prioritize getting folks connected. Timothy Buckley, Dave Johnson, Jeannie Natta, and Taine Wilton volunteered to be available as mentors.
- Vice Chair Elections. The new leadership term will start on July 1, 2024.
 - Chair Twohig asked if there were any nominations or other interested parties. No additional interested parties were identified.
 - Dave Johnson submitted a letter of interest which has been posted on the meeting event page. He has been on the PRC for 5 years and is very interested in continuing the forward improvement to improve owner readiness and continuing the good work Kyle and Jessica have done over the last year. Timothy Buckley made the motion to appoint Dave Johnson as the new PRC Vice Chair. Jeff Gonzalez seconded the motion. There was unanimous consent to appoint Dave Johnson.
- CPARB Debrief by CPARB Chair Zahn on the Spokane Public Facilities District Project Appeal Hearing from February 20, 2024.
 - CPARB Chair Zahn shared her appreciation for the quality of work that the PRC does.
 - She asked if the minutes from the February Special Meeting were shared with the PRC, and Talia indicated that she shared the link to the [February 20th event page](#) and the [minutes](#) from that meeting.
 - Chair Zahn shared there were 16 of the 21 voting CPARB members attending the Appeal Hearing. Appeals happen very rarely (this is the 3rd one ever received), so the structure of the hearing needed to be reestablished.
 - CPARB listened to the original 20-minute presentation, the owner was given an additional 10 minutes to address CPARB on why they felt their project needed to be Progressive Design-Build. CPARB then had an opportunity to ask the owner questions and the Board's deliberation was very similar to that of the PRC's original discussion. There were concerns regarding the tight schedule, was there sufficient outreach, and whether the applicant met the 39.10 criteria. The discussion ultimately factored around the timing of the project. The decision to approve the project was 11 in favor and 5 apposed. While the timing could have been better for a relatively small \$2.8M project, those that voted for the project felt it still met the requirements of 39.10.
 - There was some discussion by CPARB around the fact that the owner reached out to Apex to assist with outreach and inclusion efforts, after the project denial by the PRC. With the additional assistance from Hill International supporting the project, concerns were alleviated about adequate outreach.
 - CPARB takes appeals very seriously and tried to be thoughtful about whether or not to overturn the PRC's decision.
 - PRC Members asked if the applicant should have asked for a PRC Special Meeting instead of revising their schedule and hiring on extra staff prior to the CPARB Appeal Hearing. The applicant had originally only showed 5-days from advertising to when SOQs were due. If the 5-days were an error, they should have just asked for a PRC Special Meeting to submit their revised schedule instead of going the appeal route.
 - Chair Zahn additionally pointed out that there were questions about whether the owner received enough opportunity to fully respond to concerns during the Q&A or could have answered if they had been asked during the pre-questions before the review.
 - Vice Chair Murphy asked for clarification regarding an appeal. Is the applicant allowed to bring new information into that appeal or should they be evaluated on what the applicant originally submitted to the PRC? That is the detail that the PRC members are confused about because the applicant added information for the appeal that had not been available during the original review. She asks if CPARB could clarify on those requirements prior to any future potential appeals.
 - Chair Zahn noted PRC's concerns and will roll that information into continuous quality improvement of the appeal process. She agreed it would have been easier for all involved if the applicant had just requested a special meeting with the updated information. She pointed out that according to the CPARB bylaws, once an appeal is filed, there is a short window for response and scheduling a hearing. (*Article VII, Section I (3) as written in collaboration with the AGO and adopted by*

Project Review Committee

Chair Report to CPARB

September 12, 2024

Page 2 of 10

CPARB, May 2018.)

- PRC DBE representative, Vicky Schiantarelli, addressed her concerns as Process and Fact-Finding issues. She had several issues that did not come up and were not discussed at the CPARB Appeal which she felt may have influenced CPARB to support the PRC decision.
 - One example is the Owner had not retained legal counsel, hadn't advertised yet, but the team was intending to move forward with contract development, assemble the RFP, and other elements for publication, all 5 days before the intended advertising date. This led to the belief that the project was not in compliance with the advertisement component of the RCW and the open competitive process. There was discussion on how this impacted the inclusion component and other items as well. The main issue is they were not in compliance with the RCW.
 - Unfortunately, the applicant was allowed to change some of their process in preparation for the appeal. An appeal is intended to be based solely on the original documentation that was submitted, and if there are changes it should be an automatic denial with direction to return to the PRC with their corrections.
 - Vicky stated this is a classic appeal process used by many agencies both public and private. She has served on several appeals committees throughout her career and is concerned with CPARB's process and protocols. Due process was not followed, there was no PRC representation at the hearing, and there were CPARB members speaking as if they were championing the applicant.
 - She believes standard due process should be adopted by CPARB. If the applicant intends to change anything in their application, they should have reapplied with the updated application instead of submitting an appeal.
- Chair Zahn thanked Vicky for her insight. She shared, as part of the Board Development Committee's work they are reviewing the Bylaws, so this is one of the items that they can review and update. She asked if there was an opportunity for the Owner-applicant to make improvements as part of the application process.
- Dave Johnson responded that if an error was made on the application and it is brought up during the review, the applicant can share that there was an error and provide the correction. This has happened for a variety of reasons, and many projects have been approved when this has been identified with the intent to correct the problem.
- Becky Barnhart suggested when there is a denial, the applicant's options are identified in their letter and adding that they can request a special meeting may help them find a better solution.
- Linneth pointed out that acceptance of new information outside of the application, their presentation and their responses to questions are on a case-by-case basis. The panel needs to feel confident that the applicant made an honest error, will make the corrections they claim, and will be successful.
- CPARB's Project Feedback Process Workgroup had some proposed application questions for the PRC to consider. Dave Johnson and Jeff Gonzalez Co-Chair this workgroup.
 - The Workgroup has been evaluating project issues that have been brought to various members' attention regarding issues on projects where the owners or the project itself isn't following RCW, aren't following best practices, or other issues. They have been working to identify preventative measures, identify a formal process on how to evaluate the complaint before elevating to the PRC or CPARB level, and how to educate the owner or errant party on what the issue is and how to address it. Part of the preventative measures considered is the development of some owner training, and possibly adding additional questions to the applications.
 - Workgroup Co-Chair Johnson reviewed the proposed questions and explained the thinking behind them. There was discussion on the benefits of adding the questions to the applications. The goal is to identify who is monitoring the project and assess owner readiness to use the selected delivery method.
 - Vice Chair Murphy voiced her concerns that the questions as proposed may not accomplish the desired result. She appreciates the workgroup's intent, but feels if they are added to the application, the answers will be canned and written by consultant support teams and not internalized by the Owners. She suggested adding the information into the Organizational Chart or spread sheet that outlines the project teams' experience. Possibly asking 'Who in the organization is reviewing the contractor's subcontracting plan?', and 'Who is reviewing the self-performance packages?' Owners need to be educated and don't know what they don't know.
 - Linneth suggested that if the questions are not added to the applications, then they could be asked during the Q&A. One of her favorite questions to ask Owners is, 'What lessons have you learned that will be applied to this project?' Her concern is the response to the questions the PRC asks the applicant because they will reveal more about what the Owner knows or doesn't know about the chosen delivery method. There also needs to be consideration on what can be done if the owner refuses to answer the questions put forward to them.
 - Timothy Buckley asked, 'What are appropriate questions to ask the applicant if they are not strictly related to RCW criteria?' In his opinion, questions that help the panel better understand the client and their approach to the project are completely appropriate even if they are not considered scoring criteria.
 - Workgroup Co-Chair Gonzalez shared part of the intent of the questions proposed is to help better prepare the Owner for a successful project and not to change any of the criteria in the application. PRC vice-chair Murphy supported this and proposed the idea of adding a reference to some required level of training for the owner.
 - Eza Agoes suggested that, based on discussions regarding owner readiness, that the PRC position expectations entail the PRC members to be 'experienced' with the use of alternative delivery not just 'knowledgeable' about them. Otherwise, it is difficult for a non-alternative-delivery-experienced PRC members to evaluate owner readiness.

Project Review Committee

Chair Report to CPARB

September 12, 2024

Page 3 of 10

- Taine Wilton noted the RCW requirements intend for the owner to have the knowledge and experience of using alternative delivery and these questions get to the root of how the applicant obtained that knowledge and experience.
- Chair Twohig stressed how valuable a connection between a new owner and an experience owner can be.
- Workgroup Co-Chair Johnson shared that he and Jeff have been in conversation with CPARB Education Connections Committee Chair, Curt Gimmetad, as well as Tom Peterson and Linneth who have been trainers for the AGC GC/CM training courses, and they agree there is added value of owners connecting with other owners and it is touched on in their training curriculum.
- Mike Pellitteri suggested the option of collecting a list of questions that the review panels can select from to ask during the Q&A vs. adding to the application to avoid the potential of canned answers that an owner representative may plug into the application.
- Chair Twohig supported the conversation as valuable for the PRC as a whole. The whole committee wants owners to be prepared and to have successful projects. There are three primary components of opportunity for evaluation of owner readiness: the application, written pre-questions, and the live Q&A discussion. If gauging owner preparedness, how the applicant responds is just as important as the content.
- Committee members shared concern if there are responses to the panel questions as ‘not relevant’, the PRC may want to determine how they will respond to that before the review comes up. If the PRC determines a question is relevant to determine owner readiness and the owner doesn’t answer it, that appears to say the owner isn’t ready for alternative delivery. PRC Staff, Talia Baker, pointed out that both project applications include an affirmation that 1) the owner will provide any additional information requested by the committee regarding their organization, the organization’s construction history, and the proposed project, and 2) the organization is required to submit the information requested in a timely manner or there may be consequences of delayed action on the application (denial of the application).
- Returning to the PFPW questions, there was discussion and support for the owner’s oversight in the prime contractor’s bidding and subcontracting terms. It was suggested there are some owners that appear to only concern themselves with the prime contractors and are unaware of how subcontractors are affected. PFPW Co-Chair Johnson pointed out the goal is to help owners be prepared for success before they get to the PRC by evaluating training opportunities and other resources that are available.
- Vice Chair Murphy pointed out that she uses the interview hearing as an opportunity for due diligence to evaluate the public body criteria, delivery knowledge and experience. She suggested a review of the score sheets and analyzing exactly what the panelists are looking for with each question during the review of the application, in the responses to the pre-questions, and during the interview. She’d like to run an informal poll to see if there is consensus and to help guide the decision making on potential changes.
- Vice Chair Murphy asked the committee to think about possible revision of questions in the application that can be asked regarding social equity, MWBE, and outreach that usually come up in interviews. Much of it is data and information that could be gathered prior to the application being submitted. She asked Dave & Jeff if their workgroup has considered addressing those issues as well.
- Chair Twohig noted that one of the great administrative functions of the PRC is the body has the ability to make changes to the applications and bylaws as deemed appropriate. Changes to the application can be changed if they don’t elicit the anticipated results.
- Regarding the applicant that didn’t answer all the pre-questions, Chair Twohig advised the review panelists to vote how they deem is most appropriate after the full interview is completed.
- Talia reminded the committee that if changes to the applications are requested, she can have a draft ready for review at the next meeting. Any suggestions not addressed today can be sent to Kyle, Jessica and Talia. Dave & Jeff suggested they wordsmith the questions a bit more and then have Talia send them out to the Committee for consideration.
- GC/CM Best Practices Draft
 - The CPARB GC/CM Committee has provided a draft for public comment. They are specifically wanting the PRC to review and provide comments. Talia has the draft and an Excel feedback form on the [PRC May 23rd event page](#) and the [CPARB Homepage](#) under ‘What’s New with CPARB’. All feedback should be forwarded to the PRC inbox (PRC@des.wa.gov) or CPARB inbox (CPARB@des.wa.gov). Talia will consolidate the feedback (starting June 24th) and forward to Nick Datz to share with his committee to start a final draft for CPARB approval this fall.

10:00 am CITY OF ELLENSBURG – PROGRESSIVE DESIGN-BUILD

– Ellensburg Fieldhouse Project

Panel: *Becky Barnhart, Dave Johnson, Jeff Jurgensen, Jessica Murphy, Jeannie Natta, Catina Patton, Young Song, and Lance Thomas*

- Project Cost: \$28.4M
- Build a 150,000 sq ft replacement indoor recreation and wellness facility at Rotary Park. Facility will include an artificial turf field with a walking/running track, basketball courts, volleyball courts, batting cages, multipurpose room, concessions, and business offices.

Project Review Committee

Chair Report to CPARB

September 12, 2024

Page 4 of 10

- Funding will be collected from several sources including insurance from the prior center (which was lost to fire), sale of the property the prior building was on, as well as state and local grants. The final funding will be collected over 4 years from federal, state, and local grants, naming rights to the facility, private funds and other community contributions.
- The public body has a strong experienced team.
- Project meets RCW requirements.
- Approval 7/8; with Jessica Murphy voting against.

11:00 am WAPATO SCHOOL DISTRICT – PROGRESSIVE DESIGN-BUILD

- PACE Alt School and Camas/Status Replacement Project (2024 Bond Program)

Panel: Garrett Buckingham, Jeff Gonzalez, Gina Hortillosa, Karl Kolb, Jeannie Natta, Kevin Thomas, Anthony Udeagbala, and Taine Wilton

- Project Cost: \$56.2M
- Phase one will be the construction of a 23,000 sq ft replacement PACE Alternative School building that will include a kitchen, new gym, and 10 classrooms.
- Phase two will be an 86,000 sq ft two-story replacement of the Camas/Satus Elementary Schools.
- Funding was secured via capital projects bond measure in February 2024.
- The public body has a strong experienced team.
- Project meets the RCW requirements.
- Unanimous Approval 8/8

12:30 pm SOUTH WHIDBEY SCHOOL DISTRICT – GC/CM (no ASSP)

- Facilities Modernization & Upgrades Bundle Project

Panel: Eza Agoes, Timothy Buckley, Mallorie Davies, Marvin Doster, Thomas Golden, Catina Patton, Mike Pellitteri, and Linneth Riley-Hall

- Project Cost: \$83.8M
- The district has one elementary school and a combined High School/Middle School. Both facilities' systems are at/or beyond the end of their useful life. This project will provide much needed modernizations and upgrades to both facilities and the stadium. These upgrades and modernizations will focus on systems and infrastructure, accessibility and inclusiveness, safety and security, 21st century learning, identity and wayfinding, sustainability and energy efficiency, ease of operation and maintenance, and extending the useful life of the facilities.
- Funding comes from a \$79.8M Capital Bond in November 2023, and anticipated \$\$M SCAP funding from OSPI.
- Project meets all RCW requirements for Design-Build.
- Project team has been augmented with highly qualified consultants.
- Unanimous Approval 8/8

1:30 pm SEATTLE SCHOOL DISTRICT – GC/CM (no ASSP)

- BF Day Elementary School – Exterior Windows Replacement Project

Panel: Alexis Blue, Brian Holecek, Jeff Jurgensen, Art McCluskey, Heather Munden, Vicky Schiantarelli, Kyle Twohig, and Taine Wilton

- Project Cost: \$5.8M
- Project is to replace 212 aluminum-clad wood-framed windows and attendant repairs to jambs, sills and headers on a historic landmark elementary school.
- Funding was partially secured via the Building Excellence V Capital Levy passed in February 2019 for \$2.8M with additional funding to be requested in the District's BEX VI Capital Levy to be submitted to voters in February 2025.
- The project team is qualified and has capacity.
- Project meet RCW criteria.
- Unanimous Approval 8/8

Total Project Approvals for May 23, 2024:

- | | |
|--|----------------------|
| • 2 Design-Build projects totaling | \$ 83,585,000 |
| • 2 GC/CM projects totaling | <u>\$ 89,595,000</u> |
| • Alternative Subcontractor Selection Applications Reviewed: 0 | |
| Total for March: | \$173,180,000 |

Project Review Committee

Chair Report to CPARB

September 12, 2024

Page 5 of 10

June 26, 2024

Virtual Meeting

8:00 am

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair/Vice Chair: Kyle Twohig/Jessica Murphy

A committee of 26 members were in virtual attendance with 7 members absent.

- GC/CM Best Practices Draft
 - The draft and feedback form has been on the PRC webpage for a month. Chair Twohig asked for comments and feedback.
 - Mike Pellitteri has some feedback from his stakeholder group and will get those forwarded to the PRC inbox by next week.
 - The manual reads like a textbook and could use examples or case study-type of real-world references to round out the information. These can be sent either to the PRC inbox or to Nick Datz.
 - Traci Rogstad is on the CPARB GC/CM Committee, and it took 4 years to develop. Any feedback at this point will be appreciated.
- Project Feedback Process Workgroup Pre-Read for Application Modification Discussion
 - This CPARB workgroup made some modifications to the proposed application questions since the May PRC business meeting, and Dave Johnson shared the updates and provided context regarding the intent to assist with Owner Readiness for the chosen delivery method.
 - The recommendation is to add a section called ‘Owner Readiness’ that is to be filled out by the Owner.
 - Concern was expressed and discussed that there is a likelihood of canned answers which wouldn’t serve the intent of these additional questions. One example expressed was the inclusion questions and that the application don’t ask for the name of the responsible party.
 - There was one recommendation of adding owner readiness recommendations and coaching within the best practices documents when they are finalized or updated.
- Owner Readiness Webinar – Robynne Thaxton (from CPARB and the CPARB Education Connections Committee)
 - She shared the Education Connections Committee (ECC) is planning to develop an Owner Readiness Webinar to be sponsored by MRSC with the goal to help owners connect with resources in preparation for using alternative delivery.
 - By the next meeting there should be an outline that can be shared, and the ECC will want to collect PRC input and the names of potential panelists.
- Bylaws Subcommittee did not have anything to report.
- Vice Chair Jessica took a couple of minutes to welcome the newest members from May and starting in July.
- Talia invited training requests for the next year to be sent to the PRC inbox.

9:00 am

CITY OF TACOMA – DESIGN-BUILD RECERTIFICATION

Panel: *Full Committee called; there were 24 members in attendance and 8 members absent and 1 recused.*

- The City of Tacoma’s first certification was approved in 2009 and have maintained their recertification status.
- Recently completed projects include the
 - Fishing Wars Memorial Bridge Replacement Phase 1 (cost \$32M & completed in 2020),
 - Central Wastewater Treatment Plant Energy Management Improvement Project (cost \$13M and completed in 2022),
 - Jefferson and Hood Street Surface Water Interceptor (cost \$38M and completed 2022), and
 - Alder Unit 11 Rebuild (cost \$12M & completed 2024).
- The two DB projects still under way included the Cushman Rebuild Project and the Puyallup Avenue Sewer Utility project.
- The city has 4 DBIA certified personnel with 11 staff pending certification. The city has adopted a Design-Build lunch and learn series to encourage collaboration, and 2 staff have enrolled in the new DBIA Collaborative Delivery Leadership Academy.
- The city regularly participates in several regional outreach events and hosts local workshops and trainings to support small, minority and women-owned business to help aid their path to success.
- Developed the Equity in Contracting Program which offers access to contracting and procurement opportunities, guidance, and technical assistance to historically underutilized businesses interested in providing supplies, services, and public works support to the City of Tacoma.
- Lessons Learned:
 - Start Right-of-Way Process Sooner, Anticipate Delays.
 - Railroads Do Not Contemplate DB.
 - A strong team can overcome difficulties.
 - Conduct proprietary meetings early and upfront to establish collaboration structure.
 - Have an Owner’s Advisor on the City’s team.
 - Have a DB with previous experience in collaborative delivery methods.
 - City staff with DBIA certification and education provide the best support for DB project success.
 - Early involvement for permitting.
- Unanimous Approval 24/24

Project Review Committee

Chair Report to CPARB

September 12, 2024

Page 6 of 10

10:00 am KING COUNTY PUBLIC HEALTH DISTRICT – GC/CM
- Snoqualmie Valley Health Project

Panel: *Becky Barnhart, Garrett Buckingham, Jeff Gonzalez, Brian Holecek, Karl Kolb, Catina Patton, Mike Shinn, and Kevin Thomas*

- Project Cost: \$87M
- An addition to the current facility with 80,000 sf to house expanded health care related services such as, Wellness Enhancement, Pharmacy, Ambulatory Surgery, Advanced Radiology, Infusion Oncology, Birthing Center, Public Restaurant, and associated parking.
- Funding will be sought by evaluating various options including conventional direct loans and municipal revenue bonds.
- Applying for EC/CM and MC/CM
- They have the right team with experience.
- Project meets the RCW requirements.
- Unanimous Approval 8/8

11:00 am CITY OF WASHOUGAL – DESIGN-BUILD
- 32nd Street Underpass Project

WITHDRAWN

12:30 pm SNOHOMISH CONSERVATION DISTRICT – DESIGN-BUILD
- Natural Resources Center Project

Panel: *Mallorie Davies, Dave Johnson, Art McCluskey, Heather Munden, Young Sang Song, Lance Thomas, and Anthony Udeagbala*

- Project Cost: \$11.3M
- This 13,000-sf facility will serve as a multipurpose community center with indoor and outdoor classrooms for environmental education, demonstration practices for homes and farms, nature interpretive trails and a LEED certified building on the district's 12-acre campus.
- Project funding is \$9.3M of secured funds via reserves and an approved loan, additional funding request is pending approval in October 2024.
- Project meets all RCW requirements for Design-Build.
- Project team has been augmented with highly qualified consultants.
- Unanimous Approval 7/7

Total Project Approvals for June 26, 2024:

• 1 Design-Build Recertification	
• 1 Design-Build project totaling	\$ 11,300,000
• 1 GC/CM project totaling	\$ 86,967,000
• 2 Alternative Subcontractor Selection applications totaling	<u>\$ 23,400,000</u>
Total for June:	\$121,667,000

Project Review Committee

Chair Report to CPARB

September 12, 2024

Page 7 of 10

July 25, 2024

Virtual Meeting

8:00 am

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair: Jessica Murphy \ Dave Johnson

- Chair Murphy asked for assistance with last minutes changes in panel assignments. Jim Dugan volunteered to chair the 11 am review to replace Thomas Golden, and Mike Shinn volunteered to step in as a panel member to ensure there is a quorum.
- Welcome new members & Mentorship feedback.
 - New members Bret Miche (General Contractor) and Heather Munden (Owner-Ports) were officially welcomed to the PRC. Lisa Corcoran and Garrett Buckingham were not available.
 - Vice Chair Johnson gave a brief overview of the Mentorship program and its goals.
 - Chair Murphy reminded the whole Committee to frequently review and become very familiar with 39.10.
 - Mr. Dugan advised the mentors to consider meeting with their mentee the same day as each PRC meeting, when possible, to be able to answer questions that may have come up during the meeting.
 - Kyle Twohig recommended reviewing past Q&A that was submitted at past meetings to give new members an idea of what types of pre-questions have been asked before and how to ask them.
- Owner Readiness Webinar
 - Mr. Josh Klika from the [Municipal Research & Services Center \(MRSC\)](#) addressed the Committee on behalf of the [CPARB Education Connections Committee \(ECC\)](#).
 - The ECC has proposed the creation of a facilitated Owner Readiness Webinar which would be sponsored by MRSC for free. This webinar is intended to assist owners in understanding Alternative Project Delivery, how to identify if their project meets the RCW, what resources are available to them, and what they need to do to get PRC approval.
 - Mr. Klika wanted to know if the PRC felt this type of Webinar would have value to the Owners preparing to bring projects before the PRC. Several Members agreed and shared that some time spent on the expectations regarding diversity and inclusion, and receiving input from contractors and subcontractors would add to the value.
 - Mike Pellitteri (Specialty Subcontractors) and Jim Dugan (Construction Managers) expressed interest in volunteering to be part of the Webinar.
 - Mr. Klika will take the PRC's input to the ECC when they meet next week and will send more information and invitations for participation back to the PRC through Talia.
- Project Feedback Process Workgroup Pre-Read for Application Modification Discussion
 - It was determined that the pre-read that was posted as a pre-read did not include the last round of updates. Vice Chair Johnson shared the latest for the Committee to review.
 - After much discussion, Lance Thomas made the motion to approve the updated version of the proposed questions for inclusion into the PRC applications. Bret Miche and Anthony Udeagbala seconded the motion.
 - Talia will update the document on the meeting event page and add the questions to the PRC applications for Committee approval at the September meeting.
 - The Committee also asked to review these additions in 1 year to identify their value.
- Bylaws Subcommittee
 - Mr. Dugan shared that while he does have the subcommittee list, they have not met. He committed to ensuring the subcommittee meets and will provide a report in September.
- GC/CM Best Practices Review
 - Chair Murphy checked in with the PRC regarding the Draft of the GC/CM Best Practices which has been available for review since May. Talia has only received a couple of comments as feedback and the CPARB GC/CM Committee plans to submit a final draft to CPARB at the September 12th meeting.
 - Mike Pellitteri shared that he felt the document was very comprehensive and technical, and he feels some context and examples would help. He will send his comments to Talia to forward to the GC/CM Committee.
- No other business was identified, so Chair Murphy ended the Business meeting at 8:55 am.

9:00 am

PULLMAN REGIONAL HOSPITAL

– Patient Care Expansion Project ASSP Request for EC/DM, MC/CM & Plumbing

Panel: Jim Dugan, Karl Kolb, Bret Miche, Traci Rogstad, Vicky Schiantarelli, Mike Shinn, Young Song

- Alternative Subcontractor Value for Electrical \$5.9M, Mechanical \$4.7M, and Plumbing \$3.1M for a total of \$13.7M out of \$30M of the original project cost.
- Facility has outgrown existing physical space and expansion will provide approximately 40,000 square feet of additional space, medical equipment and renovation of existing space.
- Construction site is an essential facility and must remain in operation during construction.
- Project is fully funded via passage by voters for \$27.5M and remaining funds will come from general funds.
- Alternative Subcontractor meets RCW requirements.
- Unanimous Approval 7/7

Project Review Committee

Chair Report to CPARB

September 12, 2024

Page 8 of 10

9:30 am KITSAP COUNTY

– CKTP Solids & Liquid Hauled Waste Upgrades ASSP Request for MC/CM

Panel: Jeff Jurgensen, Karl Kolb, Jessica Murphy, Mike Pellitteri, Vicky Schiantarelli, Jim Dugan, Tim Thomas, and Tony Udeagbala

- Alternative Subcontractor Value for Mechanical \$14M out of \$80.4M of the original project cost.
- Project scope will include construction of two new digesters, improvement of ancillary solids handling systems, and construction of a replacement maintenance facility. Additionally, the facility must remain in operation during construction. *(This is a Heavy Civil project)*
- Current funding covers the costs for professional services, demolition of the maintenance building, temporary housing of maintenance staff and prepurchase of long lead time equipment. The remainder of the project's funding is anticipated via federal and state grants, and possibly bonds if needed.
- Alternative Subcontractor meets RCW requirements.
- Augmented team has extensive experience with MC/CM.
- Unanimous Approval 8/8

10:00 am BREMERTON SCHOOL DISTRICT – PROGRESSIVE DESIGN-BUILD

- Armin Jahr & View Ridge Elementary School Replacements Project

Panel: Lisa Corcoran, Gina Hortillosa, Karl Kolb, Bret Miche, Heather Munden, Catina Patton, Traci Rogstad, and Tim Thomas

- Project Cost: \$119.7M
- Complete demolition and replacement of the Armin Jahr elementary school on the smaller of 2 sites with restricted access. View Ridge elementary school will have complete minor improvements for repurposing of the original building. This site might be used as swing space during construction.
- Project funding secured by a capital bond passed in February 2024.
- Project meets all RCW requirements for Design-Build.
- Project team has been augmented with highly qualified consultants.
- Unanimous Approval 8/8

11:00 am NORTHEAST PUBLIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY – PROGRESSIVE DESIGN-BUILD

- 3011 Wellesley Mixed Use Development Project

Panel: Alexis Blue, Lisa Corcoran, Jim Dugan, Dave Johnson, Art McCluskey, Mike Shinn, Lance Thomas, and Tony Udeagbala

- Project Cost: \$12.5M
- This Project will be residential over commercial space, approximately 25,000 sq ft. The building will have 30-40 workforce housing, a childcare facility, and the Northeast Public Development Authority Office.
- Project funding is a complicated matrix of self-funding through fundraising activities, and anticipated bond issuance supported by the 2025 Legislature.
- Project meets all RCW requirements for Design-Build.
- Project team has been augmented with highly qualified consultants.
- Unanimous Approval 8/8

12:30 pm LAKE CHELAN HEALTH – GC/CM

– EMS and Administration Building Project

Panel: Eza Agoes, Alexis Blue, Tom Golden, Dave Johnson, Jeff Jurgensen, Young Sang Song, Lance Thomas, and Kyle Twohig

- Project Cost: \$12.3M
- Building will provide 6,000 sf dedicated space for EMS operations and support services to include pull through ambulance bays, staff sleep rooms, documentation/command center, office spaces, team conference space, supply storage crew kitchen and crew day room.
- An additional 11,000 sf is dedicated for hospital administration's executive leadership, human resources, business offices, and supporting functions. This space will include a mix of walled and open office space, small and medium conference rooms, a training room to support large group meetings, and clinical training.
- Project will evaluate the option for covered parking for larger vehicles, busses, equipment, and trailers dependent upon budget.
- Project if fully funded by a WA State Department of Commerce grant.
- Project meets all RCW requirements for GC/CM.
- Qualified Team with GC/CM experience.
- Unanimous Approval 8/8

Project Review Committee

Chair Report to CPARB

September 12, 2024

Page 9 of 10

Total Project Approvals for July 25, 2024:

• 2 Design-Build projects totaling	\$129,700,000
• 1 GC/CM projects totaling	\$ 12,250,000
• 4 Alternative Subcontractor Selection applications totaling	<u>\$ 27,700,000</u>
Total for July:	\$169,650,000

Statistics:

Year to Date Total project Approvals:

DB:	\$2,928,498,205	Traditional DB: 0	Progressive DB: 17		
GC/CM:	\$ 985,256,800	Approved Proj: 10	Heavy Civil: 3	w/ASSP: 3	
Total:	<u>\$3,913,755,005</u>				

Current number of Certified Agencies: 14

Year to Date Alternative Subcontractor Selection Applications approved: 19

Types of ASSP Requested:

• EC/CM	6	Cost: \$92.9M	
• MC/CM	6	Cost: \$13.9M	
• Treatment Process Equipment	1	Cost: \$8M	
• UV Disinfection System	1	Cost: \$15M	
• Civil Subcontractor	1	Cost: \$40M	
• Underground Storage Tank	1	Cost: \$15M	
• Vehicle Lift	1	Cost: \$4M	
• Civil Utilities	1	Cost: \$20M	
• Plumbing	1	Cost: \$3.1M	Total: \$328.9M

Project Review Committee

Chair Report to CPARB

September 12, 2024

Page 10 of 10

PRC Member Attendance 2024:

Member	2024						
	7/25	6/27	5/23	3/28	2/22 SP	1/26	1/25
Agoes, Eza	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Barnhart, Becky		x	x	x		x	x
Blue, Alexis	x	E	x	x			E
Buckingham, Garrett		x	x				
Buckley, Timothy	x	E	x	x		x	x
Corcoran, Lisa	x						
Davies, Mallorie	O	x	x	x		O	O
Doster, Marvin		x	x	E			x
Dugan, Jim	x	E	E	x		x	x
Golden, Thomas	x	x	x	x	x		x
Gonzalez, Jeff	x	x	x	x			x
Holecek, Brian		x	x	x			E
Hortillosa, Gina	x	x	x	x			x
Johnson, Dave	x	x	x	x			x
Jurgensen, Jeff	x	E	x	x		x	x
Kolb, Karl	x	x	x	x		x	x
McCluskey, Art	x	x	x	x		x	x
Miche, Bret	x						
Munden, Heather	x	x	x				
Murphy, Jessica	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Natta, Jeannie		E	x	x			x
Paananen, Ron		x	E	x		x	x
Patton, Catina	x	x	x	x		x	x
Pellitteri, Mike	x	x	x	E	x		x
Riley-Hall, Linneth		x	x	x			x
Rogstad, Traci	x	x	E	E	x	x	x
Schiantarelli, Vicky	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Shinn, Mike	x	x	O	x		O	x
Song, Young-Sang	x	x	x	E		x	x
Thomas, Kevin	O	x	x	x	x	x	x
Thomas, Lance	x	x	x	x		x	x
Thomas, Tim	x	x	E	x		x	x
Twohig, Kyle	x	x	x	x		x	x
Udeagbala, Anthony	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Wilton, Taine	x	x	x	x			x

	Not Scheduled
O	No Show/Unexcused
E	Excused Absence