

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

January 24, 2019

Minutes

*Northwest Carpenters Facility
25120 Pacific Highway South
Kent, Washington 98032*

Attendees:

Ato Apiafi, Minority/Women Businesses	Sherrie Montgomery, Owner-Higher Education
David Beaudine, Construction Manager	Jason Nakamura, Minority/Women Businesses
Kurt Boyd, Specialty/Subcontractor	Sam Obunike, Design Industry-Engineer
Jim Dugan, (<i>Vice Chair</i>) Construction Manager	Mark Ottele, General Contractor
Bryan Eppler, Specialty/Subcontractor	Ed Peters, Owner-School Districts
Rustin Hall, Design Industry-Architect	Linneth Riley Hall, General Owner
Brian Holecek, General Contractor	Mike Shinn, Specialty/Subcontractor
Matthew Lane, Design Industry-Architect	David Talcott, Design Industry-Engineer
Art McClauskey, Owner-General Public	Janice Zahn, (<i>Chair</i>) Owner-Ports

Guests:

Talia Baker, PRC Support from DES	Tom Golden, NAC Architecture
Marjorie Chang Fuller, Hoffman Construction	Rebecca Hutchinson, Architect Mahlum Architects
Dan Cody Parametrix	Ben Larson, Hoffman Construction
Randy Cook, TCF Architecture	Mike Meadows, Director of Construction Puyallup Schools
Bill Dobyys, Lydig	Steven Moore, GC/CM Advisor CBRE\HEERY
Dan Frazier, Chelan PUD	David Mount, Architect Mahlum Architects
Gary Frentress, Exec Director Puyallup School District	Jesse Noga, Parametrix
Dan Gendreau, Program Director CBRE\HEERY	Graehm Wallace, General Counsel Perkins Coie

8:30 am **Business Meeting**

PRC Chair: Janice Zahn

The Chair introduced new members John Palewicz (Owner-Higher Education), Thomas Golden (Design Industry-Architect), and Jeff Jurgensen (Construction Manager)

- PRC Ended 2018 by approving 37 projects totaling \$2.5 billion dollars.
- Year End Lessons Learned
 - There had been some debate about a GC/CM project that ultimately got PRC approval and then was shut down for the exact reasons Janice had brought up during the project deliberation. Discussion brought up some questions to consider:
 - Should PRC find a way to track project progress, and whether or not it was successful?
 - Would that data be helpful in some way?
 - What about the CPARB data collection effort?
 - What exactly would be collected? It would be good to know how many projects vs. applicants are successful.
 - Janice recently was appointed to the CPARB Data Collection Committee and they have a list of questions:
 - Do they come up with a template for what kind of requirements are needed for data?
 - What if different owners have compiled data collected in different ways?
 - What data actually is helpful?
 - Is there a way to help applicants determine if they are ready to go before the PRC so they are more likely to be successful?
 - Currently, members are supposed to review each application and submit their questions to the Admin Staff a week prior to the meeting so the applicant has time to clarify their scope, schedule and experience.
 - Many members agree that spending more time to review the applications and submitting quality questions based on the RCWs would greatly benefit the whole interview process.
- Cleanup is needed in the applications, including the signature page where the applicant agrees to everything in the document as well as following PRC recommendations for training.
 - PRC Chair asked the Committee to review the applications for possible additions, subtractions or rewording.

Next meeting: March 28, 2019

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

January 24, 2019

Minutes

- Does the Committee believe that Projects should have adequate funding already secured to be approved to avoid the possibility of them going on and on due to the hindrance of acquiring only partial funding?
 - Language can be added directing applicants to become familiar with the DB Best Practices Guidelines as well. We cannot score them on their familiarity, so we cannot make it a requirement. There was discussion regarding how large the Design-Build Best Practices Guidelines website is and inquired as to why there isn't a document that can be downloaded for reference as needed vs a webpage owned by a private entity.
 - The Certification application has some confusing language. It currently reads that only one recertification period can be granted after the initial 3-year period. The RCW 39.10.270 (6) references 3-year periods with and "S". The gray area can imply that every 3rd application must be a full certification application vs a recertification. With a number of recertifications coming up this year, the PRC must have consensus on how to proceed.
 - ✓ ***The Committee voted to have the Chair and Vice Chair clean up the certification and recertification language in the applications to remove the implication that only on recertification is possible.***
- CPARB Legislative action was discussed. HB 1295 and impacts RCW 39.10.270(4) had the words 'if practical' dropped because the PRC makes their determination at the meeting. This relates to the certifications, and the pieces relating to projects did not get addressed.
- CPARB is drafting a formal letter regarding the self-performance limitations in the GC/CM applications. PRC will then incorporate their language into the GC/CM certification applications per their direction.
- The CPARB data collection reference is in process of being discussed as well. Any CPARB directives will lead to more application updates.
- The Bylaws need to be reviewed, definitions updated, and the travel section will be updated to reflect state requirements.
 - It would be a good idea to review the Bylaws and applications to provide clearer direction for applicants.
 - Consistency needs to be the same for all projects to ensure projects with similar issues have the same determination.
 - There needs to be a mechanism in place that applicants can use as a resource when they encounter difficulties being true to RCW 39.10. Like a mentorship subcommittee or peer group. This could be a FAQ, Best Practices for filling out the applications and coming before the PRC, or something else.
 - The Chair & Vice Chair will review the Bylaws and applications for possible updates. The Committee can review them and vote at the next Business Meeting. Members should send comments, feedback and questions to the PRC inbox prior to the next meeting.

The chair reminded the Committee when a member is scheduled, attendance is mandatory, the meeting dates for the entire year are posted on the PRC homepage so everyone has plenty of notice, and if members miss more than 2 consecutive meetings without notifying the chair, they can be removed from the committee at the chair's discretion.

Administrative Staff reviewed the PRC website and showed the members where to locate the current meeting information, the statistics, past meeting documentation, recruitment information, and training opportunities. Additionally, administrative staff reminded all members whose positions will be expiring in June to get their Letters of Interest turned in asap if they wish to stay on the Committee. CPARB used the definitions the PRC developed last fall (2018) for the evaluations of the letters of interest and are very appreciative of the resource.

Business Meeting concluded at 10:06 am

9:30 am **Lake WA School District - GC/CM Withdrew their recertification application.**

10:30 am **Chelan County PUD #1 – Service Center GC/CM Project**

Panel Chair: Bryan Eppler

Panel: Ato Apiafi; David Beaudine; Dave Ernevad; Brian Holecek; Art McCluskey; Sherry Montgomery; Sam Obunike

Presentation:

Jim Dugan gave team introductions and reviewed the District Overview and inclusion of the community in the project development. He showed the existing District campus vs. where the new location plans to be constructed.

Next meeting: March 28, 2019

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

January 24, 2019

Minutes

- *Project Budget:* \$133,539,000.
- *Procurement Schedule:* July 2019 to the end of October 2022 and warrantee in 2023.
- *GC/CM Project Criteria:* Meets 3 of 6.
- *Project Details:* 24-hr operations, complex coordination, phasing plan.
- *Success factors, and Public Benefits:*
 - Collaboration for better planning,
 - Improved scheduling and phasing,
 - Improved cost controls,
 - ability to plan for long-lead items.
- *Safety and consideration:*
 - Enhanced budget and schedule control,
 - Risk allocation,
 - Greater fiscal accountability,
 - public outreach
- Team has qualification and experience with GC/CM

Public Comment: *No Public Comments*

Deliberation:

Team continuity and Parametrix for consultation provided confidence for the panel that the project will be successful. They appear to be well connected and prepared for this project. Project meets all criteria for GC/CM.

Conclusion:

Janice Zahn made the motion to approve the project. Ato Apiafi seconded the motion.

Application Approved

11:30 am **Puyallup School District – Ballou Junior High School GC/CM Project**

Panel Chair: Ed Peters

Panel: Bryan Eppler; Jim Dugan; Brian Holecek; Art McClauskey; Jason Nakamura; Linneth Riley-Hall; Dave Talcott

Presentation:

Project Budget: \$16.9 M

Project meets 4 of the 6 GC/CM qualifiers.

Project Challenges:

- Occupied site with 3 schools, safety is of utmost concern, and adjacent community.
- Portable relocation,
- Construction coordination,
- construction impacts to school; one entry point for all 3 schools,
- Water Main replacement,
- Wetlands and drainage concerns.

They intend to bring the GC/CM onboard as early as possible to maximize subcontractor interest and maintain the schedule. The team has appropriate GC/CM experience which is reinforced by a consultants from CBRE\HEERY. They have a history of GC/CM projects on time and under budget.

Public Comment: *No Public Comments*

Deliberation:

There has to be a 1st time for everyone, but have surrounded themselves with good consultants. New applicants for GC/CM really don't have an idea of what the time commitment actually will be. Being aware of what it will take

Next meeting: March 28, 2019

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

January 24, 2019

Minutes

for involvement is key to being successful. It will take some effort, training, and commitment. The project qualifies and is a good project for GC/CM. The budget right where it should be and they have a decent contingency built in for success.

Conclusion:

Bryan Eppler made the motion to accept the project. Linneth Riley Hall seconded the motion.

Approved

12:30 pm

Adjourn

Next meeting: March 28, 2019