Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	2/28/25	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	WSU	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Alexis Blue	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	Pass	Fail
A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.	X	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.	X	
B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.	X	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	X	
C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification.	X	
D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Met Criteria

Observations/Concerns:

Great presentation and work!

Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	2/27/2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	Washington State University	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Garett Buckingham, Public Hospital Dist	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	Pass	Fail
A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.	X	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.	X	
B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.	X	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	X	
C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification.	X	
D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

WSU is the gold standard for alternative delivery method.

Observations/Concerns:

Garett Buckingham
Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	02/27/2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	Washington State University	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Timothy Buckley, Private Sector	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	Pass	Fail
A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.	x	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	x	
2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.	x	
B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.	x	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	x	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	x	
C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification.	x	
D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	x	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Although it would appear there have been no projects recently selected for GC/CM, and no projects anticipated, PM staff do have healthy past GC/CM experience, and the institution is highly organized and experienced in alternative delivery processes and projects.

Observations/Concerns:

Great lessons learned, and reducing barriers to Small and WMBE businesses by allowing reduced insurance/bonding for sub-contractors for the smaller portions of the work.

Tim Buckley

Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	2/27/2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	WSU	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Jeff Gonzalez	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	Pass	Fail
A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.	X	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.	X	
B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.	X	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	X	
C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification.	X	
D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Applicant met the requirements.

Observations/Concerns:

Excellent presentation. A true leader in the industry.

Jeff Gonzalez
Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	2/27/25	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	Washington State University	DB	X	Denied	
PRC Member:	Gina M. Hortillosa	Both			

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	Pass	Fail
A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.		
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.	X	
B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.		
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	X	
C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification.	X	
D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Observations/Concerns:

Well experienced staff.

G. M. Hortillosa
Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	2/27/25	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	WSU	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	DAVE JOHNSON	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	Pass	Fail
A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.	X	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.	X	
B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.	X	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	X	
C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification.	X	
D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

WSU HAS SUCCESSFULLY DELIVERED ALT DELIVERY PROJECTS, HAS BEEN A LEADER AS AN OWNER AND HAS SUFFICIENT EXPERTISE TO CONTINUE CERTIFICATION

Observations/Concerns:

Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	February 27, 2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	Washington State University	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Art McCluskey	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	Pass	Fail
A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.	X	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.	X	
B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.	X	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	X	
C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification.	X	
D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Applicant meets RCW requirements and all recertification criteria

Observations/Concerns:

Good use of alternative contracting methods

Art McCluskey
Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	2-27-25	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	Washington State University	DB	X	Denied	
PRC Member:	Bret Miche	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	Pass	Fail
A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.		X
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.	X	
B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.	X	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	X	
C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification.	X	
D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Although they did not discuss changes made to their determination process they clearly demonstrated their expertise in application of the alternative delivery process.

Observations/Concerns:

Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	2/27/25	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	WSU	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Heather Munden	Both			

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	Pass	Fail
A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.	X	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.	X	
B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.	X	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	X	
C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification.	X	
D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Nice proposal and presentation. Really appreciate your thoughtfulness in addressing some of the unique issues faced in a more rural settings for alternative delivery.

Observations/Concerns:

No concerns.

Heather Munden
Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	February 27, 2025	GC/CM		Approved	x
Public Agency:	Washington State University	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Jessica Murphy	Both	x		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	Pass	Fail
A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.	x	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.		
2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.		
B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.	x	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.		
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.		
C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification.	x	
D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	x	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Meets and exceeds criteria

Observations/Concerns:

Great work at recruiting first time alternative delivery prime contractors.

Jessica Murphy (Feb 27, 2025 12:[illegible] PST)

Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	February 27,2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	Washington State University	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Jeannie Natta	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	Pass	Fail
A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.	x	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	x	
2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.	x	
B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.	x	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	x	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	x	
C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification.	x	
D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	x	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Demonstrated sophistication and leadership with both delivery models.

Observations/Concerns:

Jeannie Natta Digitally signed by Jeannie Natta DN: C=US, E=jnatta@uw.edu, O=UW Facilities, OU=Project Delivery Group, CN=Jeannie Natta Date: 2025.02.27 09:56:05-08'00'

Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	2/27/2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	Washington State University	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Ron Paananen	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	Pass	Fail
A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.	X	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.		
B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.	X	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.		
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	X	
C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification.	X	
D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

The University has shown the necessary experience and performance for recertification. They have have a proven track record of successful project delivery and established staffing to continue utilizing GCCM and DB delivery.

Observations/Concerns:

WSU is active with a number of industry organizations and forums. They continue to make sure they are incorporating best practices in delivery of projects through alternative delivery.

Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	February 27,2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	Washington State University	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Catina Patton	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	Pass	Fail
A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.		
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.	X	
B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.		
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	X	
C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification.	X	
D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Presentation was extremely informative and well thought out. I appreciate the dedication to continued improvement and the growth that was shown.

Observations/Concerns:

Great Presentation!

Catina M Patton
Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date: 2/27/25 GC/CM ____ Approved X
Public Agency: WSU DB ____ Denied ____
PRC Member: Mike Pellitteri Both X

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	Pass	Fail
A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.	✓	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	✓	
2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.	✓	
B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.	✓	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	✓	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	✓	
C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification.	✓	
D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	✓	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

WSU is well qualified to utilize DB/GCCM contracting methods.

Observations/Concerns:

Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	02/27/2025	GC/CM		Approved	x
Public Agency:	WSU	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Traci Rogstad	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	Pass	Fail
A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.		
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.	X	
B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.		
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	X	
C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification.	X	
D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Observations/Concerns:

Traci Rogstad 2/27/225 – electronic signature 11:49 am
Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date: 27FEB2025
Public Agency: WSU
PRC Member: YOUNG SANG SONG

GC/CM ____
DB ____
Both X

Approved X
Denied ____

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	Pass	Fail
A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.	X	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.	X	
B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.	X	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	X	
C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification.	X	
D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

GREAT ANSWERS ON THE APPLICATION – THEY WERE DIRECT AND TO THE POINT.

Observations/Concerns:

WSU HAS A STRONG GROUP OF LEADERSHIP WITH A LOGICAL PLAN. GREAT PRESENTATION + Q/A.

Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	2/27/2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	Washington State University	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Kevin Thomas	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	Pass	Fail
A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.	X	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.	X	
B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.		
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	X	
C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification.	X	
D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

I liked how they have training included in their DEI policy, they have a willingness to discuss apprenticeship aspiration goals

Observations/Concerns:

None

Kevin M Thomas
Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	February 27, 2025	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	Washington State University	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Lance Thomas	Both	X		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	Pass	Fail
A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.	X	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	X	
2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.	X	
B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.	X	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	X	
C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification.	X	
D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Observations/Concerns:

I appreciate them reaching out to contractors that may not usually use alternative delivery method

Lance Thomas
Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)
Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	2/27/25	GC/CM		Approved	x
Public Agency:	Washington State University	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Kyle Twohig	Both	x		

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

	Pass	Fail
A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.	x	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	x	
2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.	x	
B. Applicant described their experience in delivering projects under Alternative Public Works in the past three years and summarized how these projects met the statutes in RCW 39.10.	x	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	x	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	x	
C. Applicant provided an updated organization chart with personnel possessing management and construction experience using the GC/CM and/or DB since the previous certification.	x	
D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	x	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

WSU is a leader in alternative delivery and plays a large role in education and advancement of methods.

Observations/Concerns:

Deep bench with continued dedication to training and educating. Very successful outcomes in alternative delivery projects.

Digitally signed by Twohig, Kyle
Date: 2025.02.27 09:25:52-08'00'

Signature