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

Date:	05/22/2025	GC/CM	x	Approved	x
Public Agency:	Lake Washington School District	DB	n/a	Denied	
PRC Member:	Eza Agoes	Both	n/a		

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:

The applicant demonstrates clarity in their goals. They avoid unnecessary complexity, keeping their processes straightforward, yet well-informed. Their efforts are clearly focused on effectively achieving their intended outcomes.

Eza Agoes Digitally signed by Eza Agoes Date: 2025.05.22 11:00:45-07'00'

Signature

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

Date:	5/22/25	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	Lake Washington School	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Alexis Blue	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 criteria, thanks for a great presentation!

Observations/Concerns:

Alexis C Blue

Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)

Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	05/22/2025	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	Lake Washington School District	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Garett Buckingham, PHD	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 meets the requirement of the RCW.

Observations/Concerns:

Garett Buckingham

Signature

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

Date: 05/22/25
Public Agency: Lake Washington SD
PRC Member: Marvin Doster

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

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Organization has proven experience in meeting RCW 39.10 successfully for projects AND setting best practices

Observations/Concerns:

Signature

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

Date:	5-22-25	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	LAKE WASHINGTON SD	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	JIM DUGAN	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.		
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:

COMPETENT & PREPARED.

Observations/Concerns:

JD
Signature

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

Date:	5/22/2025	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	Lake Washington School District	DB		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 criteria.

Observations/Concerns:

Very impressive presentation. Appreciated the thoughtful and deliberate decision-making, innovation, and improvements made based on lessons learned.

Signature

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

Date:	5/22/25	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	Lake Washington School District	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Gina M. Hortillosa	Both			

Certification Evaluation Criteria

All 3 must pass to Pass.

	Pass	Fail
A. Applicant has the necessary experience to determine which of its projects are appropriate for use of alternative contracting procedures.	X	
B. Applicant has necessary qualifications and experience to carry out the alternative contracting procedure including: *(Must pass all 7 to Pass)*		
1. Project delivery knowledge and experience;	X	
2. Personnel with appropriate construction experience;	X	
3. A management plan and rationale for alternative public works projects;	X	
4. Demonstrated success in managing public works projects;	X	
5. Has the ability to properly manage its capital facilities plan including, but not limited to, appropriate project planning and budgeting experience; and	X	
6. Demonstrated success in managing at least one GC/CM or DB project *(as applicable)* within the past five (5) years.	X	
7. Has the ability to meet requirements of RCW 39.10.	X	
C. Public Body has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Observations/Concerns:

G. M. Hortillosa
Signature

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

Date:	5/22/05	GC/CM	✓	Approved	✓
Public Agency:	LAKE WASHINGTON SD	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	DAVE 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:

LWSD DEMONSTRATED SUCCESSFUL DELIVERY OF PROJECTS OVER THE LAST 3 YRS AND HAS A CAPABLE TEAM TO MANAGE & DELIVER GC/CM PROJECTS.

Observations/Concerns:

SL
Signature

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

Date:	May 22, 2025	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	Lake Washington School District	DB		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:

Meets RCW requirements.

Observations/Concerns:

Well organized presentation, easy to relate to score sheet.

Art McCluskey
Signature

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

Date:	5-22-2025	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	Lake Washington SD	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Bret Miche	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:

Well thought out and prepared presentation.
Strongly supported their history of and capability w/ GC/CM delivery

Observations/Concerns:

See above

Signature

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

Date:	5/22/25	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	Lake Washington School District	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Heather Munden	Both			

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

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

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Enjoyed the presentation, hearing about lessons learned and successes/innovation from the GCCM contracting.

Observations/Concerns:

Not sure when the contract expires for the long term contracted consultants that are performing the PM role(s), but something to think about with the possibility of the knowledge base leaving and how that may be planned for with the LWSD should that need to happen.

Heather Munden
Signature

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

Date: 5/22/25 GC/CM X Approved Abstain

Public Agency: Lake Washington School DB ____ 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:

I am undecided at the time of the vote due to public body experience being supplemented by consultants.

Observations/Concerns:

Agencies should have & maintain the in-house experience requirements for agency certification at the time of re-certification. Supplemental consultant staff should not form the basis experience requirements for an agency.

Jessica M. Murphy
Signature

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

Date:	May 22, 2025	GC/CM	X	Approved	x
Public Agency:	Lake Washington School District	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Jeannie Natta	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 the thoughtful process of selecting delivery methods, selecting consultants and GCCM. LWSD has a clear mission and goals to guide their projects. They demonstrated a commitment to partnership with the industry and ensuring a fair and transparent process. Examples included robust debriefs.

Observations/Concerns:

Jeannie Natta Digitally signed by Jeannie Natta DN: C=US, E=jnatta@uw.edu, O=UW Facilities, OU=" Project Delivery Group", CN=Jeannie Natta Date: 2025.05.22 09:57:47-07'00'

Signature

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

Date: 5/22/25
Public Agency: Lake Washington School Dist
PRC Member: Mike Pennington

GC/CM X
DB
Both

Approved ✓
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.	✓	
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:

LWSD has the experience & expertise to successfully execute GC/CM contracts.

Observations/Concerns:

Signature

Criteria extracted from RCW 39.10.270

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

Date:	5.22.25	GC/CM	✓	Approved	✓
Public Agency:	Lake WA SD	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Trail Rogstad	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:

Grant team + application

Observations/Concerns:

Signature

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

Date: 22MAY2025 GC/CM X Approved X

Public Agency: LAKE WASHINGTON SCHOOL DIST DB ____ Denied ____

PRC Member: YOUNG SUNG 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.	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.	✓	
D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	✓	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

- GREAT PRESENTATION → STRONG STAFF W/ CONSULTANT SUPPORT IN AREAS TO LEAD THE APPROACH.

Observations/Concerns:

- RELATIONSHIPS W/ STAFF + CONSULTANT IS THE SAME MAKE UP AS THE PREVIOUS APPLICATION. THE KEY LEADERSHIP IS SAME AND EXPECT SAME 3YR RESULTS.

Signature

Revised 7/27/2023

Criteria extracted from RCW 39.10.270

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

Date:	5-22-25	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	LAKE WASH. SCHOOL DIST.	DB		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:

GOOD POLICY ON USE INCLUSION, LONG HISTORY OF CONTRACTING RESPONSIBLE CONTRACTORS

Observations/Concerns:

MODULAR CONSTRUCTION HAS MINIMAL COMMUNITY & INDUSTRY BENEFIT

K M Thomas
Signature

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

Date:	5/22/25	GC/CM	x	Approved	x
Public Agency:	Lake Washington School District	DB		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:

SD has staff with qualifications and experience for successful project delivery.

Observations/Concerns:

Bundling can cause concerns about availability of work to various contractors, but also has advantages. Glad to hear they have a robust feedback mechanism to continue evaluating.

Digitally signed by Twohig, Kyle
Date: 2025.05.22 09:38:47-07'00'

Signature

Project Review Committee (PRC)

Application Evaluation Sheet
Public Agency Recertification

Date:	05/22/2025	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	LAKE WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	ANTHONY 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:

Great presentation, fantastic team structure and understanding of project needs. I find the team to have a good understanding of RCW requirements.

Observations/Concerns:

Exemplary.

Signature

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

Date:	5/22/25	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	Lake Washington School District	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Taine Wilton – School Districts	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:

Outreach and support $23.7M paid to partners. Bond support success factors – in house management and expertise. Hybrid PM's allows projects to flex to fit workload.

Observations/Concerns:

LWSD gave a thoughtful clear presentation demonstrating outreach to community while sharing knowledge with other districts. Bundling projects is a way to make smaller projects run more efficiently and creates interest with GC/CM's.

Wilton, Taine E. (ESC) Digitally signed by Wilton, Taine E. (ESC)
DN: CN="Wilton, Taine E. (ESC)", O=Edmonds School District
Date: 2025.05.22 11:08:11-07'00'

Signature