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

Date:	7/24/2025	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	University of Washington (UW)	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Eza Agoes	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. As stated in the application, "*The UW has not received any audit findings.*"	X	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member

Reason for Determination:

Observations/Concerns:

Eza Agoes Digitally signed by Eza Agoes Date: 2025.07.24 09:58:41-07'00'

Signature

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

Date:	July 24, 25	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	UW	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 (actually excels at meeting criteria)

Observations/Concerns:

Thanks!

Alexis C Blue, signed digitally
Signature

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

Date:	07/24/2025	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	University of Washington	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Joshua Cheatham	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.	P	
1. Explained what steps are taken to determine that the use of GC/CM and/or DB are appropriate for a proposed project.	P	
2. Described the steps that are taken in approving this determination.	P	
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.	P	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	P	
2. Described any litigation or significant disputes on any project since previous certification.	P	
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.	P	
D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	P	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

The application demonstrates a clear understanding and compliance with the RCW.

Observations/Concerns:

The University prepared a very clear and concise application that demonstrated compliance with all the aspects of being able to successfully deliver GC/CM projects that benefit the public.

Joshua A. Cheatham
Digitally signed by Joshua Cheatham
Date: 2025.07.24 09:53:43-07'00'

Signature

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

Date:	7/24/25	GC/CM	x	Approved	x
Public Agency:	University of Washington	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Brandi Colyar	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:

Team Structure and project experience well defined. RCW requirements demonstrated. I appreciate the process for reviewing the need for selecting Alt delivery by project.

Observations/Concerns:

Brandi Colyar
Signature

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

Date:	07/24/2025	GC/CM	x	Approved	x
Public Agency:	University of Washington	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Lisa Corcoran	Both			

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

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

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Observations/Concerns:

Signature

Revised 7/27/2023

Criteria extracted from RCW 39.10.270

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

Date:	7-24-25	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	University of Washington	DB		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:

Applicant meets requirements for recertification and has demonstrated abilities to manage projects as GC/CM.

Observations/Concerns:

Mallorie Davies
Signature

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

9AM PRESENTATION

Date: 7-24-25
Public Agency: UNIV OF WASH
PRC Member: JIM DUGAN

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:

VERY QUALIFIED; DEEP BENCH STRENGTH; STRONG LEADERSHIP; EXTENSIVE EXPERIENCE

Observations/Concerns:

NONE

JRDugan
Signature

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

Date:	7/24/2025	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	University of Washington	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:

Great presentation. Applicant has demonstrated a knowledge and expertise in the use of GC/CM delivery.

Signature

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

Date:	7/24/25	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	University of Washington	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Gina M. Hortillosa	Both			

Recertification Evaluation Criteria

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

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Observations/Concerns:

G. M. Hortillosa
Signature

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

Date:	7/24/2025	GC/CM	x	Approved	X
Public Agency:	University of Washington	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Brian Jewett	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.		

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Demonstrated clear understanding of GC/CM and a clear decision making process with stakeholder involvement.

Observations/Concerns:

None

Brian J Ewett 7/24/2025
Signature

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

Date:	7/24/25	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	UW	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:

AGENCY HAS HAD GOOD EXPERIENCE W/ GC/CM AND PERSONNEL THAT HAVE GC/CM EXPERIENCE. MEETS CRITERIA FOR GC/CM

Observations/Concerns:

Signature

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

Date:	July 24, 2025	GC/CM	x	Approved	x
Public Agency:	University of Washington	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Jeff Jurgensen	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 well defined experience and personnel. They are very mature in their use of the delivery method.

Observations/Concerns:

NONE

Signature

Revised 7/27/2023

Criteria extracted from RCW 39.10.270

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

Date:	July 24, 2025	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	University of Washington	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:

Applicant meets RCW requirements

Observations/Concerns:

Very experienced applicant

Art McCluskey
Signature

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

Date: 7-24-25
Public Agency: University of Washington
PRC Member: Bret Miche

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.	X	
1. Included the status of each alternative delivery project.	X	
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.	X	
D. Applicant has resolved any audit findings relative to previous projects.	N/A	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

Applicant clearly demonstrated their compliance w/ RCW 39.10 requirements and demonstrated they have the proper tools and procedures to ensure compliance

Observations/Concerns:

Signature

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

Date:	7/24/25	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	University of Washington	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:

Appreciate the detailed information in the recertification application. UW has a lot of knowledge of GCCM and it shows in the application and in the presentation. Really liked the slide on safety in the presentation.

Observations/Concerns:

No concerns.

Heather Munden
Signature

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

Date:	07/27/25	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	University of Washington	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Yuki Seda-Kane – DBE2	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.	N/A	

Overall Evaluation by Committee Member
Reason for Determination:

All areas are covered, UW is a highly experienced Owner. The Owner described the process between selecting GC/CM, DB and even DBB, which showed their strong understanding of each delivery method.

Observations/Concerns:

Yuki Seda-Kane

Signature

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

Date:	7-24-25	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	UNIV. OF WASH.	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:

COMPREHENSIVE SAFETY PROGRAM, EXTENSIVE EXPERIENCE, HISTORIC CAMPUS REQUIRES SPECIALIZED CONSTRUCTION, OMWBE TRACKING

Observations/Concerns:

K M Thomas
Signature

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

Date:	7/24/25	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	University of Washington	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	Lance 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.	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 the requirements

Observations/Concerns:

Complete Presentation

Signature

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

Date:	July 25, 2025	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	University of Washington	DB		Denied	
PRC Member:	T. 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:

Well qualified and experienced team in alternative project delivery. A leader in the industry.

Observations/Concerns:

Two GC/CM projects that are currently in preconstruction out of 24 other DB projects.

Signature

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

Date:	7/24/25	GC/CM	X	Approved	X
Public Agency:	University of Washington	DB		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.	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:

Use tools GC/CM part of the Project Delivery Group at UW. Collaborative delivery, training of team, outreach for bid packages, sees themselves as leaders in the industry and aids others. Alternative subcontractor. Provided updated org chart. They have a Governance model to manage projects to make timely decisions and clear expectations.

Observations/Concerns:

Educate teams, solve issues and challenging situations at the lowest levels before becoming contentious, take preventative measures to manage risks with amenable resolutions, projects presented attest to complexity and delivery method works.

Wilton, Taine E. (ESC) Digitally signed by Wilton, Taine E. (ESC) DN: CN="Wilton, Taine E. (ESC)", O=Edmonds School District Date: 2025.07.24 09:57:42-07'00'

Signature