Date:	2/28/25	GC/CM Approve		Approved	b	Χ	
Public Agency:	WSU	DB		Denied			
PRC Member:	Alexis Blue	Both	Х				
	Recertifi	cation Evaluation (	Criteria				
					Pass	Fail	
		es it made, if any, on how native contracting procedo		nes which	х		
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.							
Included the status of each alternative delivery project.							
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.							
•		gs relative to previous pro	jects.		X		
Reason for Determ	n by Committee Membe nination: Criteria	r					
Observations/Cond	cerns:						
Great presentation	and work!						
-							
Alpabhe							
Signature							

Date: 2/27/2025 GC/CM Approv					Approved		Х
Pι	ıblic Agency:	Washington State University	DB		Denied		0
PF	RC Member:	Garett Buckingham, Public Hospital Dist	Both	X		_	N.,
		x	•				
		Recertification Ev	/aluation	Criteria			
						Pass	Fail
A.		ained any process changes it made, i ppropriate for use of alternative contra			nes which	X	
<ol> <li>Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.</li> </ol>					d/or DB are	Х	-
		the steps that are taken in approving				Х	
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	
Included the status of each alternative delivery project.						Х	
Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.						Х	×
C.		rided an updated organization chart wand construction experience using the ication.				Х	-
D.		resolved any audit findings relative to	previous pro	ojects.		Х	
	son for Determ	n by Committee Member ination: gold standard for alternative delivery	method.				1
							-
Obs	ervations/Conc	eerns:					
				<i>N</i> .			
Sign	Garett Buck	kingham					

Da	Date: 02/27/2025 GC/CM Approved				X		
Pu	blic Agency:	Washington State University	DB		Denied		
PR	C Member:	Timothy Buckley, Private Sector	Both	Х			
		,	). <del>-</del>	12			
		Recertification E	valuation	Criteria			
	A 15 ( 1				on a contain to the	Pass	Fail
A.	projects are ap	ained any process changes it made, opropriate for use of alternative contr	acting proced	dures.	,	х	
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	
	Included the status of each alternative delivery project.						
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 pro	ojects.	<i>s</i>	Х	
Rea	son for Determ				, ,		
		ppear there have been no projects re					
		ff do have healthy past GC/CM expe	35	<u>ne institutio</u>	<u>n is highly orgar</u>	nized an	<u>d</u>
expe	erienced in alte	rnative delivery processes and projec	cts.				
					100		
Obs	ervations/Conc	erns:					
Grea	at lessons learr	ned, and reducing barriers to Small a	nd WMBE bu	sinesses b	y allowing reduc	<u>ed</u>	
nsu	rance/bonding	for sub-contractors for the smaller po	ortions of the	work.			
							-
					*		*
		t Hay		10 g			

Signature

Date: 2/27/2025 GC/CM Approx			ed	Χ	
Public Agency: WSU DB		DB	Denied	_	
PRC Member:	Jeff Gonzalez	Both	X		2
	Recertif	ication Evaluation Cri	iteria		
				Pass	Fail
		ges it made, if any, on how it or rnative contracting procedure		X	
appropriat	e for a proposed project			X	
		in approving this determination	L_	Х	
B. Applicant des Works in the p RCW 39.10.	X				
1. Included to	he status of each alterna	tive delivery project.		Х	
<ol><li>Described certificatio</li></ol>	Х				
C. Applicant prov management previous certif		x			
•••••••••••••••••••••••••••		ngs relative to previous project	ts.	Х	
Reason for Determ		er			
Applicant met the r	equirements.				
· · ·					
Observations/Cond	cerns:				
Excellent presenta	tion. A true leader in the	industry.			p)
		V			
	- F				
all de	mol_				
Signature	7	<del>-</del>			

Da	nte:	2/27/25	GC/CM	X	Approved	I	Χ
Pυ	ıblic Agency:	Washington State University	 DB	Х	Denied		
PF	RC Member:	Gina M. Hortillosa	Both				
		Recertification	n Evaluation (	Criteria	a		
						Pass	Fail
A.		ained any process changes it ma opropriate for use of alternative o			nines which		
	<ol> <li>Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.</li> </ol>						
	2. Described		Х				
B.		cribed their experience in deliver past three years and summarized					
	Included the status of each alternative delivery project.						
	<ol><li>Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.</li></ol>						
C.		ided an updated organization chand construction experience usirication.				Х	
D.	•	resolved any audit findings relat	ive to previous pro	jects.		Х	
	erall Evaluation Ison for Determ	n by Committee Member ination:					
Obs	servations/Conc						
	Well experience	enced staff.					

M. Hortilla

Ap	plicat	ion Eva	mittee (PRC) luation Shee Recertificatio						
D	ate:		2/27/	25	GC/CM		Approve	d	V
Public Agency: DB Denied									
PRC Member: DAVE JOHNSON Both				-					
Recertification Evaluation Criteria							2 4		
								Pass	Fail
A.				ess changes it mad se of alternative co			es which	×	
			what steps are for a propose	taken to determine d project.	that the use of	GC/CM and/o	or DB are	×	
	2. D	escribed	the steps that	are taken in approv	ing this determir	nation.		×	
B.	Work			erience in delivering and summarized h				×	
	1. In	cluded th	e status of eac	h alternative delive	ry project.			×	
		escribed a		r significant dispute	s on any project	since previo	us	×	
C.	mana		nd constructio	d organization char n experience using			the	×	
D.	Applic	ant has r	esolved any a	udit findings relative	to previous pro	jects.		X	
		<b>aluation</b> Determi	by Committe	e Member					
1	NSO	HAS !	SKLESS FL	LLY DELIVELE	D ALT DE	ELIVERY	PROJECT	3,	
				RAS ANDWINE				,	SE
	TO	CONT	NUE CERT	FIGHTON				, -	
Obs	ervatio	ns/Conce	erns:						
					u u	\\\\\\\\\\\			

Revised 7/27/2023

Date:	February 27, 2025	GC/CM	Approve	X		
Public Agency:	Washington State University	DB	Denied		.11	
PRC Member:	Art McCluskey	Both	X		- 5	
	Recertification	Evaluation Cri	teria			
A Applicant oval	ained any process changes it ma	do if any on how it	determines which	Pass	Fail	
	ained any process changes it ma opropriate for use of alternative co			X		
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.						
Included the status of each alternative delivery project.						
Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.						
	ided an updated organization cha and construction experience using ication.			x		
D. Applicant has	resolved any audit findings relativ	ve to previous project	s.	Х		
Reason for Determ	n by Committee Member ination:  CW requirements and all recertific	cation criteria		)	. 8	
Observations/Conc	erns:					
Good use of alterna	ative contracting methods		-	57		
	/		6	34	7	
0			*			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
1.+701-01	4.					
Art McClus Signature	- Exercise					

Date:  Public Agency: Washington State University DB X  PRC Member: Bret Mithe Both X  Denied	
Recertification Evaluation Criteria	
P	ass 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
<ol> <li>Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.</li> <li>Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.</li> </ol>	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
Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X
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:	
Although they did not discuss changes made to	their
in application of the attenutive delivery process.	- oxpers
Observations/Concerns:	
	<del>-</del>
Signature	

Date:	2/27/25	GC/CM	Χ	Approved		Χ
Public Agency:	WSU	DB		Denied		
PRC Member:	Heather Munden	Both				**
		_				
	Recertification Ev	aluation	Criteria			
	1					
A Applicant aval	ained any process changes it made it	fany an hay	u it datarmin	aa whish	Pass	Fail
projects are ap	ained any process changes it made, i opropriate for use of alternative contra	cting proced	dures.		Х	
<ol> <li>Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.</li> </ol>						
	the steps that are taken in approving			_	Х	II <del>I</del>
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.						
Included the status of each alternative delivery project.						
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.						
Reason for Determi	n by Committee Member ination:  oresentation. Really appreciate your to ore rural settings for alternative deliver.		ss in address	ing some of the	e uniqu	<u>e</u>
				9		17/
	4		2			
Observations/Conc	erns:	- /				
No concerns.						
		<u>0</u>				
			8			
Heather Munde Signature	en					ď

Da	te: February 27, 2025 GC/CM Approx			Approved		X	
Pu	blic Agency:	Washington State University	 DВ		Denied	3. <del>7</del>	
PF	C Member:	Jessica Murphy	Both	x		V <del>a</del>	
		Recertification	on Evaluation	Criteria	ı		
						Pass	Fail
A.	10.00	ained any process changes it n ppropriate for use of alternative	100		nines which	х	
<ol> <li>Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.</li> <li>Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.</li> </ol>							
_		12 L	<del>=</del> 2		ra Dublia	7	
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.							
Included the status of each alternative delivery project.							
Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.							
C.	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 rela	tive to previous pr	ojects.		х	
	son for Determ	n by Committee Member nination: exceeds criteria					
	weets and	exceeds criteria					
1							
Obs	ervations/Cond	erns: at recruiting first time alternativ	e delivery prime c	ontractors.			
5							
,	Jane 1	1.100					
	Jestica Murphy (Feb 27,	20 12 (PST)					

Signature

Date:	Date: February 27,2025 GC/CM Approve			Approve	d	X
Public Agency:	Washington State University	DB	DB Denied			10
PRC Member:	Jeannie Natta	Both	X			
8	* 1	-				
	Recertification I	Evaluation	Criteria			
e .					Pass	Fail
	ained any process changes it made ppropriate for use of alternative con			nines which	х	- Cui
Explained appropriat	nd/or DB are	х				
	the steps that are taken in approving cribed their experience in delivering	_		. Dublic	Х	
Works in the p RCW 39.10.		х				
Included the status of each alternative delivery project.						
<ol><li>Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.</li></ol>						
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.					х	-
D. Applicant has	resolved any audit findings relative	to previous pro	ojects.		х	
Reason for Determ	n by Committee Member ination: ted sophistication and leadership w	ith both deliver	y models.		2	
				75		
		W				
		Ą.				
Observations/Cond	cerns:		<u> </u>			
8	- 3	12		1		
			3	÷.		
	-					*
Jeannie Natta	Digitally signed by Jeannie Natia DN C-US, Erjnatta guwedu, O-UW Facilites, OU* Project Delivery Grupt, Cit-Jeannie Natia Dale 2025 02 70 56 50 5000 000					
Signature	<del></del>					

Date:	2/27/2025	GC/CM		Approve	d	×			
Public Agency:	Washington State University	DB	•	Denied					
PRC Member:	Ron Paananen	Both	×						
	St 4 /			•					
Recertification Evaluation Criteria									
					Pass	Fail			
	lained any process changes it made ppropriate for use of alternative con			mines which	×				
appropriat	what steps are taken to determine to be for a proposed project. I the steps that are taken in approvin			and/or DB are	X				
	cribed their experience in delivering	_		ive Public					
	past three years and summarized ho				×				
	he status of each alternative delivery	y project.				1			
<ol><li>Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.</li></ol>						#3 28			
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.									
	resolved any audit findings relative	to previous p	rojects.		X				
Reason for Determ						50			
	as shown the necessary experier		2007 100 KD 100	100 N	000040 100 00				
i	ck record of successful project delive	ery and estab	olished staf	fing to continue u	tilizing G	<u>SCCM</u>			
and DB delivery.									
Observations/Cond	cerns:								
WSU is active wi	th a number of industry organiza	tions and fo	rums. The	ey continue to m	nake su	re they			
are incorporating	g best practices in delivery of	projects the	ough alte	ernative deliver	Ŋ.				
<i>(</i>									
			-						
Muld Race Signature	wine								

Project Review Committee (PRC) **Application Evaluation Sheet Public Agency Recertification** Approved GC/CM February 27,2025 Date: Denied DB Washington State University

Both

	Recertification Evaluation Criteria		
		Pass	Fall
A.	Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.	The server of programmes	
	<ol> <li>Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.</li> </ol>	X	
	Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.	X	
В.	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.		
	Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	- 11
	Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous	Х	
	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	<u> </u>
Ove	erall Evaluation by Committee Member ason for Determination:		
Pre	sentation was extremely informative and well thought out, I appreciate the dedication to cor	ntinued	

improvement and the growth that was shown.

Observations/Concerns:

Great Presentation!

Public Agency:

PRC Member:

Catina Patton

App		nmittee (PRC) Iluation Sheet Recertification				
Da	te:	2/27/25	GC/CM	Approved	X	-
	blic Agency:	62(1)	DB	Denied		
	RC Member:	Mike Perimeri	Both X		-	J
		Recertifica	ation Evaluation Criteria	a		
				. 4	Pass	Fail
A.	Applicant exp projects are a	olained any process changes appropriate for use of alterna	it made, if any, on how it deternative contracting procedures.	_	1	
	appropria	te for a proposed project.	ermine that the use of GC/CM approving this determination.	and/or DB are		
B.	Applicant des	cribed their experience in de	elivering projects under Alternati arized how these projects met th	ive Public ne statutes in	1	
		the status of each alternative	e delivery project.			
C.	certification	on. vided an updated organizati	disputes on any project since pr on chart with personnel possess e using the GC/CM and/or DB s	sing	/	
	previous certi	ification.		_		
D.	Applicant has	resolved any audit findings	relative to previous projects.	L		
	son for Detern	on by Committee Member mination:	-	9		
	WSVis	WELL QUALIES	L unuxe DB/6	com comma	cnj	
	METHODS.					
Obs	ervations/Con	cerns:				
Sign	ature /					

Date:	02/27/2025	GC/CM		Approved		X
Public Agency:	WSU	DB		Denied		
PRC Member:	Traci Rogstad	Both	X			
	Recertifica	ation Evaluation	Criteria			
					Pass	Fail
	ained any process changes ppropriate for use of alterna			nines which		
Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.						
<ol><li>Described</li></ol>	the steps that are taken in	approving this determ	ination.		X	
	cribed their experience in de past three years and summa					
<ol> <li>Included the</li> </ol>	he status of each alternative	e delivery project.			Х	
<ol><li>Described certificatio</li></ol>	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	
•	resolved any audit findings	relative to previous p	rojects.		X	
Overall Evaluation Reason for Determ	n by Committee Member nination:					
Observations/Cond	cerns:					
						_
Traci Rogstad 2/27/2 Signature	225 – electronic signature 11:4	9 am				

Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date: 27F6B2025 GC/CM Approved

DB Denied

**Recertification Evaluation Criteria** 

Both

- A. Applicant explained any process changes it made, if any, on how it determines which projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.
  - 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.

rass	1 611
X	
X	
x	
X	
X	
X	
X	
K	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member Reason for Determination:

Leur	Answers	DN TH	he proud	Tron -	THEY	were	OFFECT A	w
To TH	& POLNT.	N 1 1 1 1 1						

Observations/Concerns:

Project Review Committee (PRC)

PRC Member: YOUL SAND SONG

Public Agency:

WSW HAS A STRONG GROUP OF LEADERSHIP WITH A LOGICAL PLAH. GREAT PRESENTATION & Q/A.

Signature

Date:	2/27/2025	GC/CM	Approved		Χ	
Public Agency:	Washington State University	DB	Denied		2	
PRC Member:	RC Member: Kevin Thomas Both X					
	Recertification	Evaluation Crite	ria			
				Pass	Fail	
	ained any process changes it ma opropriate for use of alternative c	= 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1	ermines which	х		
appropriate	what steps are taken to determin e for a proposed project.		l and/or DB are	х		
	the steps that are taken in appro	_		Х		
	cribed their experience in delivering east three years and summarized					
<ol> <li>Included th</li> </ol>	ne status of each alternative deliv	ery project.		Х		
<ol> <li>Described certification</li> </ol>	any litigation or significant disput า.	es on any project since	previous	Х		
C. Applicant prov management a previous certifi		х				
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	resolved any audit findings relativ	e to previous projects.		Х		
Reason for Determ	n by Committee Member ination:  ve training included in their DEI p	olicy, they have a willing	gness to discuss app	rentice	<u>ship</u>	
aspiration goals						
Observations/Conc			* \ \ v =		120	
	None					
	·					
2 2 2		<i>x</i>		- 1		
Kevin MTh	nomas					
Signatura						

Date:	February 27, 2025	GC/CM Approv		Approve	d	X
Public Agency:	Washington State University	DB	DB			
PRC Member:	Lance Thomas	Both	X			7
			2			
	Recertification	n Evaluation	Criteria			
13					Pass	Fail
	lained any process changes it ma ppropriate for use of alternative c			ines which	Х	
appropriat	what steps are taken to determing the for a proposed project.			d/or DB are	Х	
	I the steps that are taken in appro			o Dublio	X	1
	cribed their experience in deliveri past three years and summarized				X	
<ol> <li>Included t</li> </ol>	he status of each alternative deliv	ery project.			Х	
certificatio	1				Х	-
	vided an updated organization cha and construction experience usin fication.				x	
D. Applicant has	resolved any audit findings relative	ve to previous pro	jects.		Х	
Overall Evaluatio Reason for Determ	n by Committee Member nination:				r f	
		*				
Observations/Cond	cerns:					
I appreciate	them reaching out to contractors	s that may not usu	<u>ally use al</u>	ternative delive	ry metho	<u>od</u>
		=1				
Lance Thom.	<u>eas</u>					

Date:	2/27/25	GC/CM		Approve	d	Χ
Public Agency:	Public Agency: Washington State University DB Denied				-	
PRC Member: Kyle Twohig Both x						3
	2"					
	Recertification	n Evaluation	Criteria			
					Pass	Fail
	plained any process changes it ma appropriate for use of alternative c			nines which	х	- Cili
appropria	l what steps are taken to determin te for a proposed project.			nd/or DB are	х	
	d the steps that are taken in appro	_			х	
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.						
<ol> <li>Included t</li> </ol>	he status of each alternative deliv	ery project.			х	1
Described certification	vious	х				
	vided an updated organization cha and construction experience usin fication.				х	
■ NAME OF THE PROPERTY OF THE	resolved any audit findings relati	ve to previous pro	jects.		х	
Overall Evaluatio Reason for Detern	on by Committee Member nination:					
WSU is a leader in	n alternative delivery and plays a l	arge role in educa	ation and a	advancement of	methods	<u>3.</u>
	* 1	-		V		
		2	•		-	
Observations/Con	cerns:					
Deep bench with o	continued dedication to training an	nd educating. Ver	y success	ful outcomes in	alternati	<u>ve</u>
delivery projects.						
					_	
16/2/	Digitally signed by Twohig, Kyle Date: 2025.02.27 19:25:52-08'00'			*	2	