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

Date:	06/27/2024	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	City of Tacoma	DB	X	Denied	
PRC Member:	Garett Buckingham	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:

City of Tacoma has done a great job in using the Design Build and has done a commendable job in ensuring staff are trained and given resources to use the tool with best practice tool set.

Observations/Concerns:

Garett Buckingham
Signature

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

Date:	6/27/2024	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	City of Tacoma	DB	X	Denied	
PRC Member:	Jeff Gonzalez	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:

Applicant met the requirements.

Observations/Concerns:

Applicant did a good job with application and the start of their presentation but did not manage time in order to get through it. Questions had to be asked of the applicant in Q&A in order to hear about it.

Signature

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

Date:	6/27/2024	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	City of Tacoma	DB	X	Denied	
PRC Member:	Karl Kolb	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:

Demonstrated compliance with RCW 3910 agency criteria.

Observations/Concerns:

Strong applicant, demonstrating competence in alternative project delivery, team capabilities, significant investment in development of the team via excellent training, and adoption of lessons learned. Good specific focus on DB.

Karl A Kolb
Signature

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

Date:	June 27, 2024	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	City of Tacoma	DB	X	Denied	
PRC Member:	Art McCluskey	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:

Applicant met all RCW requirements

Observations/Concerns:

Presentation could not be completed due to time limit, questions answered adequately

Art McCluskey
Signature

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

Date:	6/27/24	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	City of Tacoma	DB	X	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:

Breadth of DB projects and experience is very good.

Observations/Concerns:

Heather Munden, PE
Signature

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

Date:	June 27, 2024	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	City of Tacoma	DB	X	Denied	
PRC Member:	Ron Paananen	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.		
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:

The City has extensive successful experience delivering projects utilizing design-build. They are appropriately staffed, and have succession planning in place to maintain expertise in the future. There is an established process in place for determining if DB is the appropriate delivery method for a project.

Observations/Concerns:

Signature

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

Date:	June 27, 2024	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	City of Tacoma	DB	X	Denied	
PRC Member:	Catina M Patton	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:

Appreciated the lessons learned and completing projects within budget.

Observations/Concerns:

Training taken into consideration when working on DB projects within the staff- think this is wonderful.

Catina M Patton
Signature

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

Date:	7/27/24	GC/CM		Approved	XX
Public Agency:	City of Tacoma	DB	XX	Denied	
PRC Member:	Mike Pellitteri	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:

City of Tacoma has proven their abilities to manage DB projects for successful projects.

Observations/Concerns:

None

Michael J Pellitteri Digitally signed by Michael J Pellitteri DN: C=US, E=mikep@pellcoconstruction.com, O=PELLCO Construction, Inc, CN=Michael J Pellitteri Date: 2024.06.27 09:25:32-07'00'

Signature

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

Date:	6-27-24	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	CITY OF TACOMA	DB	X	Denied	
PRC Member:	KEVIN THOMAS	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:

I HAVE REVIEWED SEVERAL APPLICATIONS FOR THE CITY OF TACOMA AND EVERYONE HAS BEEN WELL PREPAIRED WITH EXPERIENCED TEAM MEMBERS.

Observations/Concerns:

K M Thomas
Signature

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

Date:	June 27, 2024	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	City of Tacoma	DB	X	Denied	
PRC Member:	Tim Thomas – Bouten Construction	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:

Extensive experience and proven track record of delivering design build projects successfully. Committed to training their staff in alternative contracting methods with the retirement of experienced staff.

Observations/Concerns:

Strong DEI process and reporting.

Signature

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

Date:	6/27/24	GC/CM		Approved	x
Public Agency:	City of Tacoma	DB	x	Denied	
PRC Member:	Kyle Twohig	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:

Very experienced owner with strong processes and a highly qualified team committed to ongoing training.

Observations/Concerns:

Have used DB to successfully delivery some very challenging projects and leveraged the benefits of the delivery methodology well.

Digitally signed by Twohig, Kyle
Date: 2024.06.27 10:00:09-07'00'

Signature

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

Date:	06/27/2024	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	CITY OF TACOMA	DB	X	Denied	
PRC Member:	ANTHONY C. UDEAGBALA, AIA	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.		
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:

CLARITY OF PRESENTATION, KNOWLEDGE AND EXPERIENCE CONSISTENT WITH REQUIREMENTS OF THE PROCESS.

Observations/Concerns:

THE TEAM DID NOT ALLOW SUFFICIENT TIME FOR DBE PORTION OF THE PRESENTATION.

Signature

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

Date:	6.27.24	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	City of Tacoma	DB	X	Denied	
PRC Member:	Taine Wilton	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.		
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:

Have applied lessons learned regarding Proprietary meetings, partnering charter, overcame virtual delivery challenges, and supply chain delays. Projects have been delivered on budget even with delays.

Observations/Concerns:

The team couldn't complete their presentation. They addressed questions thoroughly but could have had better in-depth communication regarding DBE. Bill Kent spoke about their commitment to design build done right by attending multiple workshops to train all departments.

Wilton, Taine E. (ESC) Digitally signed by Wilton, Taine E. (ESC)
DN: CN="Wilton, Taine E. (ESC)", O=Edmonds School District
Date: 2024.06.27 11:27:30-07'00'

Signature

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

Date:	June 27, 2024	GC/CM		Approved	x
Public Agency:	City of Tacoma	DB	x	Denied	
PRC Member:	Becky Barnhart	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:

I appreciate, and applaud, the City's commitment to ongoing training and education around Design-Build delivery.

Well organized and thorough application made compliance with RCW 39.10 apparent.

Observations/Concerns:

Signature

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

Date: 06-27-24
Public Agency: City of Tacoma
PRC Member: Marvin Doster

GC/CM ____
DB X
Both ____

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.		
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:
Past history of successful utilization of RCW for D-B.

Observations/Concerns:
Proactive in getting staff resources trained in the application of D-B.

Signature

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

Date:	6-27-2024	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	City of Tacoma	DB	X	Denied	
PRC Member:	Brian Holecek	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:

Owner has been using this method on past projects and demonstrated successful deliveries. They have a strong team to continue using this delivery method.

Observations/Concerns:

None

Signature

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

Date:	6/27/24	GC/CM		Approved	✓
Public Agency:	CITY OF TACOMA	DB	✓	Denied	
PRC Member:	DANE JOHNSON	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.	✓	
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:

AGENCY HAS DEMONSTRATED SUCCESS IN DELIVERY OF PROJECTS THEY DEMONSTRATED STAFF HAS APPROPRIATE EXPERIENCE AND CONTINUED TRAINING.

Observations/Concerns:

PRESENTATION TIMING WASN'T MANAGED WELL SO DBE SECTION WAS EVALUATED FROM APPLICATION AND Q+A.

Signature

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

Date:	6-27-2024	GC/CM		Approved	✓
Public Agency:	City of Tacoma	DB	✓	Denied	
PRC Member:	Traci Bogstad	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.	✓	
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.	n/a ✓	
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.	n/a ✓	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Altho' timing was off w/ presentation - I felt the answers were appropriate + complete & support Tacoma's re-certification

Observations/Concerns:

Traci Bogstad
Signature

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

Date:	6/27/2024	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	CITY OF TACOMA	DB	X	Denied	
PRC Member:	MIKE D SHINN	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:

HAS DONE MANY DB PROJECTS.

Observations/Concerns:

NO CONCERNS.

Mike D Shinn
Signature

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

Date:	6/27/24	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	City of Tacoma	DB	X	Denied	
PRC Member:	Tom Golden	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:

An agency who has many years of alternative project delivery history and has been recertified several times. The City works on their process, seeking constant improvement.

Observations/Concerns:

None.

Signature

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

Date:	27 JUN 2024	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	CITY OF TACOMA	DB	X	Denied	
PRC Member:	YOUNG SANG SONG	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.	✓	
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:

EXPERIENCED TEAM/OWNER WITH A GOOD PAST RECORD.

Observations/Concerns:

DESIRED MORE DETAILS TO HOW THE CITY INTERACTED WITH THE USED MINORITY GROUPS ~~[illegible]~~. FOCUS ON GROUPS WHERE LEVEL OF EFFORT WAS USED.

Signature

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

Date:	6-27-24	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	City of Tacoma	DB	X	Denied	
PRC Member:	Mallorie Davies	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:

Observations/Concerns:

Signature

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

Date:	June 27, 2024	GC/CM		Approved	x
Public Agency:	City of Tacoma	DB	x	Denied	
PRC Member:	Jessica Murphy	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:

City team has good experience overall and demonstrated good feedback loop of lessons learned and good use of the methodology for public benefit.

Observations/Concerns:

Jessica Murphy (Jun 27, 2024 15:25 PDT)

Signature

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

Date:	6/27/2024	GC/CM		Approved	X
Public Agency:	City of Tacoma	DB	X	Denied	
PRC Member:	Vicky Schiantarelli	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:

Meets all requirements

Observations/Concerns:

Vicky Schiantarelli
Signature