

**GC/CM Committee**

Meeting Summary January 26, 2022 (Meeting #29)

1. **Chair Datz called the Teams meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. A quorum was established.**
2. **Administrative**
  - a. Introductions
    - i. Committee members in attendance: Nick Datz (Sound Transit), Todd Mitchell (Construction Trades Labor), Penny Koal (DES), John Palewicz (Private Industry), Santosh Kuruvilla (Engineers), Scott Middleton (Specialty Contractors), Shannon Gustine (General Contractors) Janice Zahn (Ports), Sam Miller (Architects), Alexis Blue (Higher Ed), Shelly Henderson, in for Traci Rogstad (Schools), Mark Nakagawara (Cities)
    - ii. Stakeholders in attendance: Keith Michel (Construction Trades Labor), Brian Sweet (Ports), Olivia Yang (Higher Ed), Angela Peterson (Ports)
  - b. Approval of December 8, 2021, meeting summary– M/S/P to approve meeting summary.
  - c. Remaining draft chapter review schedule and updates.
3. **Review DRAFT Preconstruction Services Chapter**
  - a. General Contractors:
    - b. *Introductory discussion*
      - i. Chair Datz: We'll be having an open conversation today to provide input on the outline for this chapter; we don't yet have a narrative, so we won't be making any decisions today on the meat of the chapter on preconstruction. Should we just push our discussion of the full chapter until next meeting?
      - ii. Architects: Yes, I'm hoping the discussions we have today will get us aligned on the outline and we'll be prepared with a narrative by next meeting.
      - iii. Chair Datz: After we finish the last chapter in May, we'll be compiling and reviewing the rest of the chapters and putting the manual together. We'll really be looking to identify visual aids, so keep that in mind as you're going through the chapters. Please flag things that would be a good opportunity for a visual aid—tables, charts, whatever it is.
      - iv. Architects: Apologies for not having a more complete document, but we did develop a thorough outline and thought we could step through these and get everyone's input to identify key points through all these items and ensure we have the right things covered. Based on that, we'll write a more complete narrative for the group to review at our next meeting. Others in the group, please feel free to chime in—we certainly welcome all your input.
  - c. *Section 1: Intent*
    - i. Architects: For this section, we identified two key themes: maximizing the benefit of early involvement and providing support to the owners in the decision-making and risk management process.
    - ii. Specialty Contractors: I think that's really good. The only other thing we might want to add is "what about alternative subs." Rather than just referencing GCCM, maybe we add a sub-bullet. There might be some nuance down a level, but we're still looking at the same general idea with bringing on preconstruction services.
    - iii. Architects: That's a good point and it will probably fit throughout the document. There are lots of places where we reference GCCM, and it really should be more the CM team, if you will.
    - iv. Specialty Contractors: I think especially since we've expanded 385 to include all trades now.
    - v. Chair Datz: It might be good to capture another sub-bullet on why that's important—what we're trying to get out of expanding to other contractors or subconsultants.

**GC/CM Committee**

Meeting Summary January 26, 2022 (Meeting #29)

- vi. Private Industry: The thing to keep in mind is the \$300,000 threshold for that; it's very limiting, but that's the law right now. I'd like to see it lowered, so you can really take advantage of that process.
- vii. Chair Datz: That's where we could highlight the benefit of opening it up to other firms, then maybe you can bring that back to the legislature to show the benefit of removing barriers to smaller businesses.
- viii. General Contractors: Sometimes we find people trying to focus on drop-price, and what we really want focus on is the continuous involvement and engagement on both sides.
- ix. Chair Datz: The design contract is going to help facilitate that engagement. If you don't set it up that way in the beginning, you won't have a foundation for a collaborative design process—the designer won't want to make changes, or it will end up costing you more money. That relationship starts with that design contract.
- x. General Contractors: Sometimes there can be a perception that we'd slow the design process down. Setting that expectation for involvement throughout, especially for smaller firms with less experience, it can help you avoid the underutilizing and rework that come from an inefficient design process.
- xi. Ports: Would that be something we might look at in the DEI/DBI committee, the \$300,000 threshold?
- xii. Higher Ed: It might; I think we want to look at all the options available to us in 39-10 procurement as well as in low-bid, before we focus on any one thing. This is about getting the firm at the table and involved in design. It's not limiting involvement per se. The owner side of me wants as few restrictions as possible.
- xiii. Architects: I know it's contractually different, but how is it different to bring them on as an ECCM or an MCCM or something like that vs. getting contractor involvement through the GC input, but not being contracted for the project at that point? Is that a way to bring smaller subcontractors into the process without having them go through the alternative delivery method?
- xiv. Specialty Contractors: I have heard that consultants might be informally brought on board to weigh in, but typically that's outweighed in these large contracts by bringing in an actual firm through the process.
- xv. Construction Trades Labor: The difference in my mind is that in preconstruction, subcontracting is a courtesy, and maybe there's a "marketing the project" component with outreach that GCs will do as part of cost validation and shoring up the budget and approach, vs. a formal integration to the team, where you're entering a contractual agreement with a partner to actually perform the work with, assuming you get through preconstruction and you can negotiate the alternative subcontracting contract. Then the delivery is different, it's effectively TNM with a GMP, and it's audited, so the delivery method is different than lump sum, if you hadn't gone with alternative subcontracting. So, it's difficult to rely on the free information that relationships can help generate, as compared to the formal process.
- xvi. Specialty Contractors: I agree with that, I think there's also the aspect of shifting responsibility or risk for any design issues onto the sub, when you can't do that if you bring on a consultant to weigh in informally.
- xvii. General Contractors: I'd say it's more relevant to price certainty than design risk.

**GC/CM Committee**

Meeting Summary January 26, 2022 (Meeting #29)

- xviii. Construction Trades Labor: Three years ago, it was about resource commitment, whereas now the vibe is a little different in the market in terms of participation. These are external factors that relate to the decision to use alternative subcontracting or not.
  - xix. Specialty Contractors: As a placeholder in the intent section, we don't want to be limiting, given this is a best practices document, but do we want to throw in some bullets for why we would bring folks on board for preconstruction services. I get that we're trying to be broad in this group, but it might be helpful to itemize some considerations for preconstruction services.
  - xx. Chair Datz: That's good, like "what are your objectives out of preconstruction"—not just the selection method, but with the GCCM, "why are you going through this whole effort, is it better design, price certainty, etc.?"
  - xxi. General Contractors: We did a whole section on "why GCCM," so maybe there are a few points where we pull the thread all the way through the document and reiterate here.
  - xxii. Chair Datz: That's a good point; you should be able to access those earlier chapters on the OneDrive.
  - xxiii. Architects: That's helpful. Did we address both the GCCM and the alternative subcontractors in that section?
  - xxiv. Specialty Contractors: I'm pretty sure we did in the 385 section.
  - xxv. General Contractors: We did, and I'm pretty sure you can tie the two together.
  - xxvi. Architects: Great, we'll pull that together. Anything else on intent? That was a great catch to bring in the subcontractor piece throughout the document.
- d. *Section 2: Relationship between the Owner, Design Team, and GCCM*
- i. Construction Trades Labor: We have one touch on it down in bullet 5. I think we run across that a fair amount—our tendency as a group is to want to articulate that early on.
  - ii. Architects: We can pull in some of the language shared on continuous involvement.
  - iii. Chair Datz: Just to let you know, this document is also saved on the OneDrive.
  - iv. Construction Trades Labor: I'll throw one out for the group—we're focused on GCCM, but in this relationship section, we touch on the difference to design-bid-build, but maybe we should touch on the difference to design-build. From an owner's perspective, that's a relevant choice, because some want a single contract with their design builder, but GCCM provides a separate contract employing the architect/design team separately from the construction manager, so that separation is a difference that could be worth noting. Possibly it could be a means of saying it's similar to design-build, in that GCCM is a middle ground separating the two.
  - v. General Contractors: That's a great point and could be worth touching on. I think the best use of GCCM feels like design-build in preconstruction. That's what my comment is all about, that this should feel like that same kind of collaborative environment, if it's done well.
  - vi. Chair Datz: I agree with that. Is it worthwhile throwing anything about third parties into that section? All our projects are very linear, so we have a lot of third-party coordination with jurisdictions through the design process, permitting, utilities, all that kind of stuff, so how does the GC and the designer and the owner coordinate with those external parties to make decisions? It gets complicated when you have multiple contracts. That might be more of a heavy civil-type GCCM.

**GC/CM Committee**

Meeting Summary January 26, 2022 (Meeting #29)

- vii. Architects: Maybe given that we have three parties already, it's just "external parties."
  - viii. Chair Datz: Yes, that's clearer.
  - ix. DES: I think some of that could be emphasized in the roles and responsibilities, which is the next section.
  - x. Chair Datz: Also going to design-build, a big advantage to us is having one firm going to our jurisdictions to get buyoff, so getting the two parties working together with the owner could be beneficial.
  - xi. Architects: Any other comments on the relationship section?
  - xii. Higher Ed: I'm not sure if it's been stated yet, but because the contractor and designer work for the owner, while it's a full team effort, there are times where issues come up and there are differences of opinion, so it makes it easier when the designer and the contractor are not both on the same payroll. From an owner's perspective, it's helpful when you are paying them separately and can sometimes get a more unbiased opinion from either party.
  - xiii. Architects: The creative tension, perhaps? I agree with that. I think it's one of the distinguishing factors of GCCM, in that it's not a single party, so you have multiple avenues of communication and contractual responsibility that play off one another.
  - xiv. Construction Trades Labor: I think that's a great point as well, and it kind of relates to what you're saying about the different roles and the contractual relationship between the parties. The reality is that often there are differences of opinion.
  - xv. DES: I think sometimes there's a tendency in a design-build situation where the design team is more responsive to the contractor than to the owner.
  - xvi. Architects: That's a great point, thank you for making that. I think distinguishing this from design-build is an important part of this, so that's helpful.
- e. *Section 3: Roles and Responsibilities*
- i. Architects: We first started with the roles and responsibilities of GCCM in preconstruction, then we thought it would be beneficial to expand to provide an understanding of what each of the three parties are responsible for. So, we started to get it all sorted out according to the three groups, and that was tricky, so we're looking for input.
  - ii. Chair Datz: One thing that might be helpful is that the team environment is set by the owner. How well you're communicating, meeting, sharing information—that all starts with the owner. If they don't set that up properly, you're not going to hit the intent or goals that we put up top.
  - iii. Architects: Any other thoughts?
  - iv. Higher Ed: I think when we say managing expectations of stakeholders and users, it's not just managing expectations, it's also gathering input, facilitating, and decision-making. I guess managing expectations is a large umbrella, and there's decision-making that goes into that.
  - v. Architects: Maybe it's "facilitating stakeholder involvement?"
  - vi. DES: The owner needs to set the priorities.
  - vii. Higher Ed: Yes, thank you, the owner needs to engage the stakeholders, but they have the final say in how it's integrated into the priorities. I also think it's the owner's responsibility to administer both construction and design contract, which is a big part.
  - viii. Architects: Yeah, that's good one.

**GC/CM Committee**

Meeting Summary January 26, 2022 (Meeting #29)

- ix. Cities: Another thing that comes into the relationship piece is that you might have a longer relationship with that designer, and then the GCCM comes online and feels like they're late to the party and don't know the group as well. Or if you turn and start taking the contractor's side, then you run the risk of alienating the architect. It's really a leadership issue. You may feel like you have both on board, but then you're still managing these conflicts, because there's money involved, differences of opinion, etc., and vetting for compatible personalities up front can't always prevent that.
- x. Ports: Maybe we're talking about establishing and nurturing a culture of partnership, collaboration, and any other words this team feels are fitting. That's on the owner—setting the team up for success and owning that responsibility of nurturing that culture.
- xi. DES: I love that word “nurture” because it's not just in the beginning—it must be throughout the project.
- xii. Chair Datz: I think another part of that is transparency, right? Establishing trust between the groups is huge. That's always been a roadblock for us, if one party is perceived to be holding cards behind their back. One thing to think about in the priorities is to set that expectation up front, because that will help you make the decisions that maybe not everyone will agree with, so you can really tie it back to what goal it helps you achieve.
- xiii. Architects: Thanks, I've added that. I wonder if there's a transparency component to that, in that you're sharing your values up front and it's not a mystery how you're going to make decisions.
- xiv. Ports and General Contractors both agreed to adding “transparency.”
- xv. Higher Ed: I don't know if this affects the wording of what we're working on right now, but I've been thinking about what [Higher Ed] brought up. It would worry me if during the design phase, one member of the team couldn't speak up, and you'd need to have separate contracts with the owner for this member to speak up. What is wrong with the dynamic if the designer in a design-build situation doesn't feel comfortable pushing back on the contractor, if they are subbing? The owner must set the tone and say “listen, this is how it's going to work,” regardless of how many contracts there are.
- xvi. Higher Ed: We're talking about setting expectations for behavior, hierarchy, etc.—I'm not sure of the words.
- xvii. Architects: To your point, it does vary from owner to owner, and really all the participants, and there are instances where the design team can feel one step removed from the decision-making in a design-build situation. I think that's a difference GCCM, in that there's more a sense of equal footing between the GCCM and the design team. So, it's partly contractual, but it's very much relationship based. If there's not a culture of trust, collaboration, and partnership, it reverts to a contractual basis which can stifle collaboration.
- xviii. Ports: We're writing a best practice here, so we want to be very aspirational. What is truly the best practice for building a team, recognizing that we're all on a journey and we're not always our best selves?
- xix. Architects: Anything else on owners? OK, moving on to design team.
- xx. Chair Datz: Maybe for design and build at site, it's just final design and construction. I guess I'd pull that out a little more generally. They're basically responsible for the full design of whatever the project is.
- xxi. Architects: So, design and documentation of the project?
- xxii. Chair Datz: Yes.  
I'm not sure bullet 8 is necessarily always the design team's responsibility.

**GC/CM Committee**

Meeting Summary January 26, 2022 (Meeting #29)

- Some owners want control, or to push it over to the contractor, or they do want the designer to lead it. So maybe that's a good point for the owner section, that it's their responsibility to establish clear roles and responsibilities for all the team members.
- xxiii. Architect: Yes, I'll add that in.
  - xxiv. General Contractors: I'm not sure if this falls under design or GCCM or both, but I think there's a responsibility to determine what's really needed in the 90%, so if you're not going to get to 100% before you go out to the trade community, and you're at 90%, what can be in that last 10% that's not going to be hugely impactful from a cost or time standpoint, vs. what needs to be in the 90% to have a good package to go out?
  - xxv. Chair Datz: I think I would also want the designer to track decisions throughout the design.
  - xxvi. Architects: Good idea.
  - xxvii. Architects: On number 11, "import on temporary works and supportive construction," could I get more context? This seems like it's getting into means and methods.
  - xxviii. Construction Trades Labor: I'm not sure if it was mine—I'm with you, it feels like an outlier in this list. I agree with your point but hesitate as I think there's a relationship between what is in the design and what goes into an effective subcontracting plan. Is it fair to articulate a willingness to blend GCCM input with design deliverables?
  - xxix. Architects: That's a great idea. I don't think we have anything like that—basically something like "responds to GCCM input?"
  - xxx. Construction Trades Labor: We maybe talk about in terms of coordinating schedule or other things further down on this list, but for the example of doing an early procurement, what are the deliverables to make the 90% package effective? What can be left in the last 10% that won't be catastrophic?
  - xxxi. Architects: I can also think in terms of doing constructability reviews on what can be done far cheaper or far better, then we can adjust the design accordingly based on that input. That seems like a valuable point to make.
  - xxxii. Construction Trades Labor: Yes, to summarize in terms of a designer's role, we're talking about an ability to integrate or be adaptable in ways you might not think about in a different delivery method. That's a differentiator for GCCM—that flexibility is key and very relevant to the market we're navigating right now.
  - xxxiii. Architects: Yes, I think that's a key piece, and going back to what we were talking about in terms of ongoing involvement, we integrate that into the design process.
  - xxxiv. Chair Datz: How much does the designer help package the drawings and specs for the GCCM when they're going out?
  - xxxv. General Contractors: I think that's part of what's in the package. For example, on a heavily phased job, who's going to articulate the phasing, the contractor or the architect? Probably either could do it, but sometimes it's more appropriate in the actual document, like with permitting, or visa-versa.
  - xxxvi. Architects: It's also indicating completeness, because in that sense, you're responding to what the architect is saying.
  - xxxvii. Construction Trades Labor: So, we are speaking to an overarching theme of these touch points between design and CM deliverables outward facing deliverables—there's a lot of key coordination there to work together on.
  - xxxviii. Architects: To the earlier point, it's the key part of best practices that this is the not-obvious part of what makes projects successful or not.
  - xxxix. Ports: The secret sauce.

**GC/CM Committee**

Meeting Summary January 26, 2022 (Meeting #29)

- xi. Architects: Should we move on to GCCM? And to the point that we kind of neglected, the alternative subcontractor delivery, could we substitute almost like we did with “design team?” Could we say, “construction team,” or do we need a fourth section around subcontractors, in terms of roles and responsibilities?
- xli. General Contractors: I think you can combine them; you could say GCCM/alternative trade partners if you want to differentiate.
- xlii. Ports: From a broad sense, the alternative subcontracting—is there a title we’re giving that category? This discussion made me think of how we used to say “MCECCM”—it was a quick tag for this category. Now that it’s broader, is there actually a word we’re using for this category?
- xlili. Chair Datz: No, we just call it alternative subcontractor selection. It’s more describing a process.
- xliv. Ports: But to this discussion, is it really “alternative subcontractor trade partners?” It may be helpful to have a definition or a set of words we want to use, so that there’s consistency throughout the manual.
- xlv. Ports: We’re using “SCCM” in the ports (subcontractor construction manager).
- xlvi. Construction Trades Labor: We’re calling it alternative subcontracting since broadening it. SCCM sounds good though; I think this group has the pull to start putting that term into use.
- xlvii. Chair Datz: Do we want to use that as a placeholder?
- xlviii. General Contractors: One thing I’ll say is I had thought that we were trying to get away from using the word “subcontractor” period, as it denotes subordinacy.
- xlix. Ports: I think the goal at the end of this is to agree as an industry to a standard set of language.
  - i. Architects: That’s a good placeholder; we’ll flag that.
  - ii. Construction Trades Labor: I think we can articulate a lot of this in the intent section. We’ve gotten a lot of great input to capture the benefits of early integration of a trade partner.
  - iii. Architects: I think a lot of these are somewhat obvious; maybe what’s missing is the nuance of what’s a best practice. What is the secret sauce here?
  - iiii. General Contractors: Behavior.
  - lv. Architect: Should there be a bullet on collaborative approach? I guess that’s up in the relationship section.
  - lvi. Chair Datz: I don’t think we can emphasize enough how important collaboration is; we’ll just keep emphasizing it.
  - lvii. Construction Trades Labor: Now I think 10 is redundant with 1, just as some clean up. The area I’m starting to refer back to is in terms of reasons to go GCCM. To qualify, there are usually project circumstances that allow the use of GCCM. Maybe we should touch on those project realities and uniqueness, for which the CM’s involvement is intended to give you a benefit in managing through those. Maybe we talk about those items on the application.
  - lviii. General Contractors: You could say something like “work to mitigate identified project risk through early involvement and engagement.”
  - lix. Architects: I think tying it back to the earlier section is a great idea, because that’s the reason you’re doing it through GCCM—you’d expect GCCM to address that head-on.
  - lx. General Contractors: I think the only thing is we want to stop short of setting the expectation that the contractor will solve all the problems in the project, just because they’re there.

**GC/CM Committee**

Meeting Summary January 26, 2022 (Meeting #29)

- ix. Architects: Yes, but they'd be working on the issues that were identified as being unique and worthy of the GCCM process.
- lxi. General Contractors: One that's big right now is identification of long lead items.
- lxii. Construction Trades Labor: That value proposition that's touched on in the owner section, that balance between scope, cost, and time—is that the CM's input is working within those project constraints to benefit that value proposition and balance it with more input. I'm really trying to get at maximizing scope, which is especially relevant within public contracting.
- lxiii. Chair Datz: A couple things I'd add for the GCCM is developing the subcontract packaging plan and everything that goes with it, i.e., the small business outreach plan, participation, etc.—that's a huge responsibility they need to put together to demonstrate how subcontracting is going to achieve (and ideally exceed) the project's goals.

f. *Section 4: Schedule*

- i. General Contractors: Speaking to my comment, sometimes when GCCM selection happens a little bit later, you need to revisit the design schedule to make sure everyone's perspective is integrated. Ideally, you're brought on early enough to be developing the design schedule together, so that everyone is bought into that.
- ii. Architects: Yeah, and that speaks to best practices.
- iii. Construction Trades Labor: Should we go as far as to say that's a notorious challenge sometimes? Sometimes there's reluctance to revisit the design schedule, despite the expectation that the team will revisit it. There can be external pressure, like a user expectation on a constraint, but really, you need alignment with everyone's process.
- iv. General Contractors: To give a nod to that, you could say "ideally the GCCM is brought on very early and there's an opportunity to develop the design and construction schedule together. In the event GCCM is brought on later, it's important to draw back and reassess and evaluate the design schedule and overall expectations." In general, we tend to focus on the construction schedule—I think what can be missing is the input that's needed to make sure design is as efficient as possible. Time you spend in design that's inefficient is money that can't be spent on scope, so helping that be an efficient process is key.
- v. Specialty Contractors: I think in considering the same scheduling issues we talked about above, we also consider getting input from the subcontractors you're bringing on.
- vi. Architects: This kind of bifurcates design schedule and construction schedule, and ideally in a well-run GCCM schedule there's overlap. Maybe it would be valuable to break out the components of the overall schedule and speak to how they interact with each other.
- vii. General Contractors: I agree but would go so far as to say design and construction schedule, because often when people talk about schedule in this context, they only consider construction schedule.
- viii. DES: Schedule becomes important when you're talking about early packages.
- ix. Ports: Maybe preordering materials as well.
- x. Architects: So maybe it's a third item—there's a design schedule, a construction schedule, and the integration of the two. That might be a way to organize this.
- xi. General Contractors: I'd actually go the opposite way. I'd put them all together, calling it "design and construction schedule," then talk about

**GC/CM Committee**

Meeting Summary January 26, 2022 (Meeting #29)

- everything sort of mixed. I think to the extent that we divide in our best practices, it sets that expectation for division in execution.
- xii. Ports: Maybe we call it a blended schedule. When we talk about early work, we might say that design is x% complete, but that doesn't mean that everything is x% complete. Some aspects will be much farther along than others because we want it as an early bid. Coming up with a word that really encompasses how we think of GCCM, such as blended schedule, integrated schedule, etc. could be helpful.
  - xiii. General Contractors: "Integrated design and construction schedule," sort of defines the layout as you described it.
  - xiv. Architects: That also reinforces the need to have GCCM on early, to help facilitate that.
  - xv. Architects: "Assign resources at outset of project" was a mystery entry for me; did anyone from our group remember what that was?
  - xvi. Engineers: Wasn't that more on owner preparedness—assigning staff at the beginning of the job?
  - xvii. Architects: And how does that relate to schedule?
  - xviii. Engineers: The owners are deciding the right level of staffing from their end.
  - xix. Architects: Maybe that goes into owner responsibilities.
  - xx. Specialty Contractors: We have an earlier section on owner preparedness, so maybe we can add a reference to that in the text.
  - xxi. Higher Ed: I suggest "owner readiness."
  - xxii. Architects: Good, that could be another link back, and it probably fits best in owner responsibilities.

*g. Section 4: Subcontract Planning*

- i. Architects: I'm not sure if this is a duplication for the roles and responsibilities section. Any thoughts there?
- ii. Chair Datz: I think you're fine to embed that in GCCM roles and responsibilities.
- iii. DES: If you want to start the trend of calling them "trade partners," this could be a good place.
- iv. Ports: Going back to scheduling, do we want to introduce in this section tools like poll planning, and the whole concept of getting everyone in one room, planning together and working backwards from the desired end?
- v. General Contractors: Yes. We want to make sure we define things as we use them so the reader can weave it all together.
- vi. Chair Datz: I don't know if it's still in the section, but something I'm going back and forth on, is how we have the GCCM responsible for making subcontracting plans and involving small business etc. The owner signs off on it, so we don't want to give the impression the owner has no responsibility there. And that goes back to self-performed work too—you need to make sure they're going to perform what was identified in procurement. So maybe that goes back to owner responsibilities.
- vii. Construction Trades Labor: I think we just went full circle on whether this needs to be its own section. That subcontractor planning is kind of the reminder that the design team, CM, and owner should be focused on that process, and there's more to expand on when we get into those nuances.
- viii. General Contractors: We went through a ton in the earlier section on subcontracting (both alternative and traditional) on roles and responsibilities. I think the planning is captured in there, so adding in a link back while reiterating the high points here would be useful.
- ix. Architects: I like that; it helps us avoid duplicating and link together the sections.

**GC/CM Committee**

Meeting Summary January 26, 2022 (Meeting #29)

- x. General Contractors: Yes, this is a tough section because a lot of this is what differentiates the process from bit-build.
  - xi. Architects: And, how you differentiate from design-build.
  - xii. Ports: I like the idea of the subcontract planning section. I wonder if we have the right participants, or if we need to do some outreach to get subcontractor voices telling us what best practices might look like in this area.
  - xiii. General Contractors: We had a group of trade partners look at this when we were writing that section.
  - xiv. Ports: So, should we just tie it back to the earlier section?
  - xv. General Contractors: I think give an overview here, then loop it back. It was a long time ago, so it's worth checking on.
  - xvi. Architects: I'll go back and check. I think what I'm hearing is that we don't need a separate section here on subcontract planning—we'd embed it in the owner responsibilities list, then link it back to the subcontracting section to further define best practices.
  - xvii. Chair Datz: Is it worthwhile, in the GCCM responsibilities section, to note during preconstruction to start developing boilerplate references and procurement documents, to make it quicker and easier to get the contracting going, over the life of the contract?
  - xviii. General Contractors: Yes, bid package development? For sure.
- h. Section 5: Contract*
- i. Architects: We had some loose ends at the end, so we made this section. But maybe it's covered in earlier sections. Thoughts?
  - ii. General Contractors: I feel like we need to have it; I don't know that it belongs in preconstruction, because theoretically you're already contracted at that point. It seems like the definition portion would be in the total contract cost section that we already have.
  - iii. DES: A lot of this will be covered in procurement.
  - iv. Chair Datz: It's probably better in the TCC section because we don't want to confuse the processes, but maybe a blurb here would fit.
  - v. Engineers: Maybe it's introduced in preconstruction or maybe it's a separate section, but the whole issue of early coordination with AHAs and other stakeholders—that has an impact on schedule, agreements, etc., so hopefully that's cited somewhere.
  - vi. Chair Datz: We talked about that a little in owner responsibilities—establishing how you're going to deal with external parties.
  - vii. Ports: I wonder if maybe it's not so much the contract, but where does early work fall? Because it happens during preconstruction. I don't know if we want to leave it until the contract section. Especially when there are separate contracts.
  - viii. General Contractors: I think that's a good point. I would put it up in the roles and responsibilities: identification of early work, timing, and contract method.
  - ix. Chair Datz: It's even more than that. It's getting it procured, establishing those contracts—you're probably going to be doing work while you're doing preconstruction, so do we want to cover the whole breadth of that here, or is it broken out between this and construction services, TCC, something else?
  - x. Architects: I think maybe the identification and defining of early work is part of preconstruction, and then the procurement and doing of it falls elsewhere? That's just based on the definition of *pre*-construction.
  - xi. Chair Datz: Let's just flag it, so we keep leaving the breadcrumbs to tie it to whatever section in which we talk more about it.
  - xii. Architects: Exactly. So, we're going to take out the contract section entirely from this section and cover elsewhere. Is there anything else we're missing,

**GC/CM Committee**

Meeting Summary January 26, 2022 (Meeting #29)

big picture, from preconstruction? Early work was a good catch, anything else along those lines?

- xiii. General Contractors: I think you did a comprehensive job. This is a good start.
- xiv. Architects: Thanks for this discussion, it's been very helpful.

**4. Action Items and Next Steps:**

Chair Datz: We have the CPARB briefing coming up in February. Just to let you know, Mark is up for taking over for Rebecca in her spot for Cities. We'll be presenting that and asking CPARB to vote on it.

**5. Meeting adjourned at 2:31pm.**