

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

GC/CM Committee

Meeting Summary January 27, 2021 (Meeting #23)

1. **Chair Middleton called the Zoom meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. A quorum was established.**
2. **Administrative**
 - a. Introductions
 - i. Committee members in attendance, including by phone: Scott Middleton (Specialty Contractors), Nick Datz (Owners), Rebecca Keith (Cities), Todd Mitchell (Construction Trades Labor), Penny Koal (DES), Santosh Kuruvilla (Engineers), Shannon Gustine (General Contractors), Janice Zahn (Ports), Sam Miller (Architects), Olivia Yang (Higher Ed), Traci Rogstad (Schools)
 - ii. Stakeholders in attendance, including by phone: Shelly Henderson (Schools), Keith Mitchel (General Contractors), Curt Gimmestad (General Contractors), Mike Pelliteri (General Contractors), Rad Milosavljevic (Port), Tom Peterson
 - b. Approval of December 15, 2020 meeting summary – M/S/P to approve meeting summary with the following change.
 - i. Keith Michel is a stakeholder not a committee member.
 - c. 2021 recurring meeting schedule
 - i. The last Wednesday of each month from 1-3 p.m. worked for most committee members. We will proceed with this schedule understanding that some committee members will need to have proxies attend in their place.
 - d. Chair Middleton outlined today's agenda which focuses on chapters two and three of the Best Practices.
3. **Subcommittee Assignments/Schedule**
 - a. The following revisions to the subcommittee assignments were discussed:
 - i. Add Tom Peterson to Heavy Civil
 - ii. Add Traci Rogstad to GCCM Procurement and to the GCCM Readiness
 - b. Attendees discussed how to integrate the Diverse Business Inclusion guidance into the best practices. The committee agreed to the following:
 - i. Owners—We planned to talk about it throughout the best practices document.
 - ii. Cities—We need to figure out what expertise we need and identify who is best to review the best practices.
 - c. Attendees discussed the schedule to complete the best practices and to share updates with CPARB. The committee agreed that the Chairs will share a verbal update at the February CPARB meeting and include the schedule and assignments document and the outline. They will also mention the interest in coordinating with the Diversity Business Inclusion committee and ask for the best way to coordinate with them. The Chairs will also note that we're taking feedback on this outline and are happy to invite others to join our meetings and to help writing of this report.
 - d. Attendees discussed what to do if the legislature approves the revisions to 39.10.380 prior to the completion of the best practices. The committee agreed to track this and if needed consider providing a written update about what is different.
4. **Continue/Finalize Discussion: Chapter 2 Evaluating the use of GCCM**
 - a. Engineers—How do we talk about quality in GCCM? Suggest we include a general overview of how we understand quality in GCCM, it could go in the introduction.
 - b. General Contractors—Would this be best placed in section 360 about parameters around evaluation and award? If the root cause is the people and we're talking about a delivery method that based on qualifications, then it seems like we'd want to address this issue on section 360.
 - c. Cities—We identified our audience for this document to be primarily people who are new to GCCM on both the owner and the contractor side. So, we should include some guidance on qualifications and readiness for the owner, in addition to the contractor.

[AI] indicates an action item for follow up.

Prepared by Kate Elliott, 206.450.6726, kelliott@maulfoster.com

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

GC/CM Committee

Meeting Summary January 27, 2021 (Meeting #23)

- d. Architect—We need more detail in our staffing section regarding qualifications and readiness for both owners and contractors.
 - e. Engineers—This is about preparing the owner for this process and encouraging owners to be proactive about quality and planning. This is also about being clear about the importance of work experience and readiness to take on these big, complex projects.
 - f. Engineers—For example WSDOT’s fish passage projects have goals, and some of those goals and objectives are very high level so this is additional description to help bring those high-level goals and make it a process in which to reach those goals.
 - g. Architects—This is important because it puts quality up front and reminds readers about the importance. The only sentence in the proposed text that I don’t agree with is the one that points out a lot of design issues with GCCM projects and you could say that for all delivery methods and therefore shouldn’t single out GCCM unnecessarily.
 - h. General Contractors—When looking at the internal staffing, important considerations include staff experience in alternative contracting including understanding the evaluation and buildup of cost in GCCM, trade-partner contracting options, how the delivery can be leveraged to expedite schedule, expectations and challenges associated with quality, and the owner’s role and participation in the project safety planning. What are we addressing that directly impacts GCCM? I suggest we address quality on a higher level with regard to readiness but not get into qualifications and staff selection.
 - i. Specialty Contractors—I think when we get into procurement of the GCCM and subcontractors there will be more best practices and ideas about the qualifications and selection of those individuals because it is qualification-based.
 - j. Engineers—How do we incentivize GCCM to prioritize quality? Maybe we can talk about this in the construction costs part.
 - k. General Contractors—Include clarity on roles and responsibilities.
 - l. Ports—This is a risk-based look at quality. There are models that allow us as owners to monetarily incentivize quality work by being clear about the specifications of the work product.
 - m. General Contractors—Quality in preconstruction sets the tone for quality during construction. You should not need incentives to accomplish quality if preconstruction is executed with quality.
 - n. All agreed that quality is an important topic and will likely need to be addressed in multiple sections throughout the best practices document.
 - o. [AI] Chair Datz will revise the text provided and notate where it might fit within and throughout the best practices document.
5. **Continue/Finalize Discussion: Best Practices Chapter 3 GCCM Readiness.** The committee worked through several edits, some of which were resolved quickly and therefore were not included in the notes unless there was added discussion on the purpose and need of the change.
- a. Chair Datz circulated the draft content and received several comments from the subcommittee. Let’s walk through each section and address the comments.
 - b. Cities—Since part of our audience is people who are new to GCCM, then I think we should include information for them to understand why they could choose GCCM versus Design Build and then what benefits are available with GCCM. This will help people prepare and know what to pursue.
 - c. Higher Ed—If the audience includes a new owner and they have decided to pursue GCCM, then knowing what you can get out of preconstruction and what you can get out of GCCM in comparison to Design Build would be helpful. The introduction helps clarify the difference between GCCM and Design Bid Build.
 - d. General Contractors—Just because an owner wants to use GCCM, doesn’t mean it will qualify. Part of this chapter should describe what projects will qualify for GCCM.

[AI] indicates an action item for follow up.

Prepared by Kate Elliott, 206.450.6726, kelliott@maulfoster.com

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

GC/CM Committee

Meeting Summary January 27, 2021 (Meeting #23)

- e. Chair Datz asked the committee to also include ideas for when charts and graphics might be better than text to help explain concepts, including what projects will qualify for GCCM.
 - f. Cities—The JLARC audit has some graphics we might be able to repurpose.
 - g. General Contractors—One of the benefits of this delivery method for an owner is a best value procurement process which allows them to dictate which qualifications matter to them the most.
 - h. Ports—What value and benefit are we looking for that drives the need for GCCM as the delivery method, which helps the owner address a particular risk or some other reason.
 - i. Ports—The purpose of certifying owners so that they don't need to go through the PRC process every time is that they will make similar decisions and have similar thought processes as having the PRC involved.
 - j. Chair Datz offered that to address this conversation perhaps we expand on the last sentence in the section to add a bit more detail. The attendees agreed to add additional detail on the key decision points and processes.
 - i. [AI] Keith, Traci, and Rebecca offered to work on additional language.
 - ii. Suggestion from the Chat: General Contractors—Perhaps: other factors should still be considered later in the design to determine if GCCM is a good choice for the project, for example.
 - k. General Contractors—My suggestion regarding the list of items to communicate about during preconstruction is that while this is a great list, it's not comprehensive so adding some language about other issues, such as the GC is less empowered to address site conditions. Also suggest we break these out into categories.
 - l. Cities—Agree that we need a disclaimer at the top of this section that says this isn't a comprehensive list and outline some of the fundamentals to help illustrate the process and what to keep in mind, rather than what it currently looks like is a checklist. Suggest something with "as applicable" would help alleviate some of the issue with the checklist.
 - m. Architects—We can be more explicit about the value of continuity from one phase to the next.
 - i. Suggestion: General Contractors—Understanding the GCCMs plan for continuity from preconstruction into construction is an important component of the selection process.
 - n. Higher Ed—I'm trying to get us away from what I call the sin of one becomes the sin of all. Just because we have one bad actor, doesn't mean we need to include it in the best practices.
 - o. Schools—We could include something in the introduction such as all owners that participate in alternate delivery methods have an obligation to the integrity of the process.
 - p. Cities—We're trying to talk about best practices so we should start with that as our intention. Is it important to include this statement or can we rephrase?
 - i. [AI] Rebecca offered to rephrase (soften) the sentence in question.
 - ii. Suggestion—Add as appropriate to soften the language and add reference to the PRC requirements to clarify what is required versus what is not.
 - q. [AI] Nick, Keith and Olivia will work through the staffing section together.
6. **Other Business.** This topic was not discussed and will be included in the next meeting agenda.
7. **Action Items and Next Steps**
- a. 2/24/2021 meeting topic – We will finish up on Chapter 3 and then discuss Subcontracting (RCW 39.10.380 and .385)
 - b. Action Items – Four action items are identified with [AI] are found within the text above to provide additional context.
8. **Meeting adjourned at 2:57 p.m.**

[AI] indicates an action item for follow up.

Prepared by Kate Elliott, 206.450.6726, kelliott@maulfooster.com