

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY REVIEW BOARD
PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE
Northwest Carpenters Facility
25120 Pacific Highway South
Kent, Washington
September 27, 2007
9:00 AM

MEMBERS PRESENT

Eric Smith, Vice Chair, University of Washington
Christy Trautman, King County
Penny Koal, General Administration
John Mannix, Spokane Public Schools
Bob MacIssac, Port of Seattle
Gary Arndt, P.E., Parametrix
Jonathan Hartung, SHKS Architects
Peg Staeheli, SvR Design Company

Tom Peterson, Hoffman Construction Co of WA
Rodger Benson, Chair, MA Mortenson Company
Jim Cameron, Cameron-Reilly, LLC
Darron Pease, Pease & Sons, Inc.
Gary Baldasari, AIA
Jim Anderson, Burton Construction, Inc.
Rick Benner, Western Washington University

MEMBERS ABSENT

Jim Paapke, Olympic Medical Center
Darlene Septelka, King County
Tom Balbo, Ferguson Construction, Inc.
Mike Shinn, Shinn Mechanical
Keith Schreiber, AIA, Schreiber Starling & Lane
Architects

Dave Marberg, University of Washington
Phil Lovell, Turner Construction, Inc.
Dan Chandler, PE, AIA, Olympic Associates
Paul Berry, Harris & Associates

STAFF, GUESTS, PRESENTERS

Nancy Deakins, GA
Searetha Kelly, GA
Cheri Lindgren, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Robyn Hofstad, GA
Roland Orr, GA
Mike Murphy, State Treasurer
Dick Goldsmith, AWP/PHD
Pam Johnson, OST
Jerry Schlatter, Washington State University
Mike Leonas, Washington State University
Pete Bloom, Washington State University
Dax Logsdon, Construction Services Group, Othello
Mike Currie, Construction Services Group, Othello

Jim Christensen, Architects West, Othello
Mike Currie, Othello School District
Gina Bullis, Othello School District
Jim Christensen, Architects West, Othello
Mark Johnson, Design Architect, Klickitat
Judy Peterson, Project Design Team, Klickitat
Mike Madden, Klickitat Co Public Hospital Dist
Jim Panko, Klickitat Co Public Hospital Dist
Cary Guenther, Project Architect, Klickitat
Ralph Rohwer, Project Manager, Klickitat
Greg Guedel, Foster Pepper, Klickitat
Subir Mukerjee, City of Olympia
Roger Myklebost, Ryca Swanson & Cleveland

Welcome & Introductions

Chair Benson called the Project Review Committee (PRC) meeting to order at 9:23 a.m. Everyone present provided self-introductions. *A meeting quorum was not attained when the meeting convened.*

Panel Responsibilities Review – Panel Lead, Questions

Chair Benson said it's important for members assigned to a panel to read applications and forward any questions to project applicants 10 days prior to the scheduled meeting. It's critical for panelists to attend the meeting. Project applications are sent only to members assigned to a panel. If a panelist is unable to attend, the Panel Chair should be contacted so adjustments can occur. Panel Chairs have responsibilities beyond leading the panel, such as ensuring panel members are prepared, organizing questions, mailing the list of questions, collecting decision forms at the conclusion of the panel process and forwarding copies to General Administration (GA), and summarizing reasons for denial of a project application. A copy of panel lead operating procedures will be sent to members.

Discussion ensued about the types of questions members are asking prior to and/or during the application process. Chair Benson explained it's the committee's responsibility to determine whether project applicants and projects meet criteria established in statute. Any question that assists members in rendering a decision is appropriate. Questions concerning budget, schedule, and how an applicant plans to complete a project should relate to determining whether an owner understands and is qualified to manage Alternative Public Works (APW) processes. Mr. Smith agreed and said questions should be relevant to ascertain whether a project qualifies or an owner is capable of managing a successful project. A question on a proposed schedule or budget that suggests an owner doesn't understand the process is relevant. Members should exercise caution about questions pertaining to site logistics details.

Members offered the following comments:

- Reasons on why a project might be appropriate for the General Contractor/Construction Manager (GC/CM) method leads to questions about how an owner arrived at the decision, which is a gray area.
- Some owners might think that using the GC/CM delivery method will cure all evils, which is not necessarily true.
- Linkage between accounting and budget can't be separated.
- It's one thing if a schedule reflects a lack of understanding about GC/CM. It's another issue if schedule reflects a bad delivery strategy. The committee is tasked to determine whether a project is appropriate for the delivery model and whether an owner is qualified to manage the project.
- It's important to protect the integrity of the PRC in the process and to add value.
- It might be beneficial for panels to provide applicants feedback on their project whether approved or denied.
- Letters to owners could include comments offered by panel members. Comments become part of the record and demonstrate PRC's diligence during project application reviews.

Dick Goldsmith, speaking on behalf of a Public Hospital District, said it's been valuable to hear expertise offered by Public Hospital District Review Board (PHDRB) members. Hospitals take the information seriously even if it does not directly relate to approval or disapproval. Comments and/or suggestions will help ensure a successful project.

John Mannix and Jim Cameron arrived at 9:40 a.m. A quorum was attained. However, a supermajority of the membership was not present.

Ms. Trautman asked that members appointed to consider a reapplication request should be provided copies of the initial application.

Ms. Staeheli asked whether it's appropriate for members that have reviewed project applications to also ask questions. Applications are posted on the website for review. Chair Benson replied members can forward questions to panel leads.

Mr. Mannix said as a panel lead, he appreciates questions forwarded by other PRC members.

Chair Benson recessed the meeting from 9:45 a.m. to 10:43 a.m.

Tom Peterson arrived at 10:43 a.m. A supermajority of the committee was attained.

Public Body Certification Review for Design Build – Washington State University

Chair Benson outlined certification application review procedures.

Jerry Schlatter introduced Mike Leonas and Pete Bloom. Mr. Leonas is experienced with Design Build (DB). Mr. Schlatter reported Washington State University (WSU) is experienced with the GC/CM and Design Bid Build (DBB) delivery methods. WSU is interested in pursuing certification for DB to enable some flexibility with upcoming projects.

Mr. Schlatter provided a PowerPoint presentation of the request.

Mr. Schlatter reviewed capital planning and development components. One goal is to retain a sustainability officer on staff who serves the entire academic community. A wide array of projects completed throughout the state, Oregon, and Idaho were highlighted. Capital planning plays a major role in preparation and development of a 10-year capital plan. Mr. Schlatter reviewed WSU's budgeting and planning experience.

WSU would like to utilize DB for three upcoming projects: Martin Stadium Renovation Phase III; Pullman Campus Residential Housing Program; and infrastructure upgrades/improvements. WSU understands the needs and limitations of the DB process. WSU plans to have schematic design and specifications in place, include clients in the process, and identify university needs and expectations before soliciting DB qualifications and proposals.

Mike Leonas, a new Project Manager with Capital Planning and Development, briefed the committee on his background and public works contracting experience. He responded to a question submitted by members prior to the meeting asking for a list of building projects successfully performed in the last five years using DB delivery methodology within the state and clarification of current WSU staff members that were involved in those projects. Mr. Leonas explained projects completed in the last five years were not appropriate for DB. Section 107 of the statute addressing public body certification states experience is required for DB or GC/CM. WSU is asking for permission to use DB and yet it requires the owner to have experience within the last five years. The owner could request approval to use DB for a specific application and successfully complete the project prior to asking for certification; however, it is a time-consuming process. The PRC should consider the agency's public works contracting experience package as a whole to oversee the DB process and its successful experience utilizing GC/CM. Additionally, consider that the legislation includes "or." WSU wants to establish itself as a competent owner for DB delivery. The team possesses previous experience with DB projects outside the campus.

Mr. Leonas reviewed a flowchart outlining WSU's DB process. The owner's project user group is a critical component.

Mr. Bloom reviewed his public contracting background and experience. He reviewed project management, team elements, and completed DB projects to include mechanical system upgrades, Clark Chiller replacements, Cub/Fine Arts CHW loop connections, greenhouse upgrades, and CHW plant chiller replacements. Lessons learned were outlined. An owner must provide strong leadership to the design and construction team.

PRC members provided self-introductions.

In response to a request from Chair Benson, Mr. Schlatter provided additional details on criteria WSU will use when selecting a design builder. One challenge is the university's remote location. The agency is looking for DB experience of the same scale, the firm's ties and involvement with the community, and a firm with a Northwest presence.

Mr. Bloom added that a team with a strong design connection, whether a partnership or in-house, is critical. In addition, a history of working together is important.

Mr. Smith asked whether the owner proposes a design base competition or a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to complete the documents process. Mr. Schlatter said it will be the latter. There are too many nuances involved without WSU involvement. WSU will establish the framework by developing design schematics, specifications, and a package of criteria developed by a consultant prior to advertising for RFQs.

Discussion followed about risks in the DB process and a design builder's control over the design. Mr. Schlatter said the agency is willing to consider other strategies. However, WSU will not permit a third party to make a decision on its behalf.

Mr. Bloom said one way to avoid risk is to outline a strong, clear program at the beginning of the process and ensure the owner's expectations are understood. WSU's design standards and construction specifications are part of the DB package with owner control instituted from the beginning.

Mr. Hartung asked whether the design builder will purchase the design from WSU. Mr. Bloom said the design builder will be provided with WSU's standards.

Mr. Smith asked whether WSU is not setting the price until design is complete. Mr. Schlatter replied it will occur at the end of Design Development (DD). The agency will identify the amount of money available. WSU's traditional DBB process is not close enough to the market to know what's available to purchase in a timely manner. Involvement on the owner's part is important for an effective process.

Chair Benson asked if WSU's reference to "Maximum Allowable Construction Cost" equates to a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) relationship compared to a lump sum. Mr. Schlatter answered yes.

Discussion ensued about other campus project management staff who will be involved in the DB project. Mr. Schlatter noted there are three senior project managers who can manage the project.

Ms. Staeheli provided additional details on how user groups are involved and the number of meetings and the amount of interaction occurring when a design builder is hired. Mr. Schlatter said the owner uses an in-house

predesign process and interviews clients and maintenance personnel. For the schematics, WSU typically hires an architect who possesses good programming ability. Precinct studies give the owner an opportunity to think about long-term visions. User group activity is limited to questions about the scope as it relates to the budget. Central administration is at the center of the process.

Chair Benson reported his firm is experienced with DB projects. The described approach is unique. He asked WSU representatives to refer to the stadium project to describe the benefits of DB compared to GC/CM and DBB methodologies. Mr. Schlatter replied benefits include an improved response from the contractor to meet the MACC established for the job and there is no lack of willingness by the architect to pick up the work completed by another architect. The biggest advantage is that a contractor and its design team will collect input from the market more directly.

Mr. Smith asked at what phase of the design is the final team selection. Mr. Schlatter replied it will vary depending on responses at the qualification level, how the schematic is accepted, and whether the team can meet the financial objective. Pricing will be tested through DD. Mr. Smith asked whether WSU would proceed with more than one team. Mr. Schlatter answered only through the end of DD.

Discussion followed on the various disciplines within the organization.

Mr. Smith asked why WSU chose to apply for DB certification rather than project approval. Mr. Schlatter said he was informed about the availability of funds for the stadium and the expectation to move ahead immediately. Certification eliminates the need to return to the committee on a project-by-project basis. Each project application takes time. WSU was authorized to use APW under the initial legislation. Requesting DB certification is more efficient and less expensive compared to seeking individual DB project application approvals.

Mr. Goldsmith commented that he was involved in drafting new legislation and disagrees with the owner's interpretation of the statute. One factor was that a public body has to have experience in at least one project for the delivery type when applying for certification. The PRC will set up a political firestorm if it approves WSU's certification to use DB. The owner should request application approval, demonstrate successful completion of the project, and then approach the PRC for certification.

Mr. Bloom referred to a slide highlighting DB projects completed within the last five years. The projects are not large and were limited to mechanical and electrical systems. The projects met many of the criteria established in the statute. Mr. Schlatter said it appears WSU is caught up in a political process that doesn't necessarily apply to the university. Previous to the new process, there were no challenges or problems with the university's process. The owner possesses experience and has completed similar projects.

Additional comments from committee members included:

- Some of the projects listed use a similar process compared to DB. A reason for not many DB campus projects is because of owner's control of aesthetics and characteristics. The owner understands the pitfalls and ramifications of DB. WSU will exercise caution when selecting projects that could benefit from the DB delivery method.
- The process described is similar to others used by government agencies that included a fairly detailed early design process.
- The statute requires a public body to request approval to use DB for a project.

- The intent of the law was that an agency applying for GC/CM project approval needs GC/CM experience, and an agency applying for DB approval needs DB project experience. The language is not as clear as it could be.
- Saying the language is not clear is a weak argument. Mr. Schlatter said it was his impression that the statute was focused on the GC/CM methodology and not DB.
- The owner possesses GC/CM and DB experience. It appears WSU is qualified to request DB certification.

Mr. Smith reported the process as described is not DB. To argue that the word “or” in the statute means an owner qualifies to use DB with GC/CM experience is not appropriate. Regardless of whether owners are qualified and are able to use alternative delivery methods prior to the new law, the law is what it is. It now requires project approval or agency approval based on criteria established in statute. Mechanical and electrical projects do not qualify as DB experience under the law. If the owner requested project approval for DB, it would probably be successful. In order to be certified as an agency to do DB, the owner must have successfully completed a DB project. Approving certification is wrong and is not within the intent of the statute. He said he will not support certification approval.

Mr. Schlatter said if the university’s process is not considered DB then he is free to use its process and circumvent the system by calling it something else. Mr. Smith replied the process as described is very similar to the GC/CM method and not DB. WSU is requesting an action that is inappropriate. WSU should have requested project approval and not certification.

Discussion ensued about characteristics specific to energy savings projects and the selection process.

Mr. Peterson said he doesn’t disagree with Mr. Smith’s comments about the intent of the legislation. However, it states GC/CM *or* DB. He suggested members keep that in mind when voting.

Committee members were asked to vote on the certification application. Additional comments during the vote included:

- Owner does not meet criteria established in the law.
- Energy savings projects resemble a DB process used by other universities.
- Concerns that the process resembles GC/CM.
- DB certification should require DB experience.
- The statute is unclear.
- Unease about the lack of clarity in the statute.
- Approach to use a schematic design as part of the DB process is fair to the construction industry.

A supermajority of the committee (9-6) voted to approve WSU’s certification application for DB.

Approval of Agenda

John Mannix moved, seconded by Tom Peterson, to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried.

Approval of August 23, 2007 Meeting Minutes

A correction was requested to the August 23, 2007 minutes: beginning on page 16 within the fifth paragraph, to change “Mr. Willis” to “David Willett.”

Tom Peterson moved, seconded by Jonathon Hartung, to approve the August 23, 2007 minutes as amended. Motion carried.

Chair Benson recessed meeting 11:53 am to 12:09 pm for lunch.

Project Re-Application Review – Othello School District – Lutucaga Elementary / McFarland Middle

(Panel Chair John Mannix, committee members Gary Baldasari, Christy Trautman, Rick Benner, Jim Cameron, Eric Smith, and Darron Pease)

Panel Chair Mannix welcomed Othello School District representatives and explained application review procedures. Panel members provided self-introductions.

Gina Bullis, Business Manager, Othello School District, introduced Jim Christensen, Senior Project Architect and GC/CM consultant with Architects West; Mike Currie, Project Manager/Construction Manager, Construction Services Group; and Dax Logsdon, Senior Project Manager, Construction Services Group.

Mr. Currie reviewed three findings from the previous application review – 1) the Othello High School site is not appropriate for GC/CM, 2) schedule was not realistic and, 3) limited competition and insufficient GC/CM experience.

Mr. Christensen said the project scope was reduced and the high school site was removed from the request. The McFarland Junior High and Lutacaga Elementary School project sites are appropriate for the GC/CM methodology because of project complexity, the schools will be occupied during construction, and because of phasing components with multiple student relocations.

Mr. Currie reviewed slides of the two sites and outlined proposed modernization and square footage addition elements. He noted the schools are located across the street from one another. GC/CM is the appropriate delivery method. Available funding for the project totals approximately \$56 million. Project budget totals \$37 million for the two school sites.

In response to the second finding, a slide was presented of a new project schedule expanded by several months. It increases the overall construction schedule by three months and delays construction by four months for up-front activities. Slides outlining project schedule components, including GC/CM selection and associated milestones were reviewed. Construction is expected to conclude in mid-2010. Pending PRC approval, the owner is prepared to advertise for Statements of Qualifications (SOQ) in early October with proposals due on October 19, 2007. Selection will follow culminating with notification of the selected GC/CM on November 16, 2007. All documents are prepared. GC/CM services consist of three distinct phases: pre-construction, construction document, and construction.

Concerning the original third finding of insufficient GC/CM experience, Mr. Currie explained additional members have been added to the project team. An organizational chart was reviewed. He reviewed design and management team members and their roles and responsibilities.

In summary, the Othello School District team has demonstrated knowledge with more than 175 years of successful project management experience. GC/CM is new to school districts. Construction Services Group (CSG) is probably the only organization in the state that specializes in K-12 school construction. CSG has completed and successfully managed DBB and GC/CM projects totaling \$1.5 billion during the last 13 years.

Mr. Currie briefed members on his project manager experience.

Panel Chair Mannix asked for more information about the cost estimator's GC/CM experience. Mr. Christensen replied Mr. Thomas has been involved with a number of GC/CM school projects. Mr. Thomas is familiar with and has undertaken the reconciliation process.

Discussion ensued about how the GC/CM helps keep architecture and engineering on track. Mr. Christensen said he will meet with Mr. Currie and develop a detailed checklist with milestones to coincide with the schedule. Bimonthly meetings with the owner's design team, GC/CM, and the project team will enable the group to work through issues as they emerge.

Mr. Baldasari asked whether Othello has a plan or strategy for early procurement of some items. Mr. Currie replied it's too early in schematic design and that the schedule has been pushed back. Othello has reviewed the projects and is identifying areas that would benefit from early procurement. Overall phasing and coordination has been discussed. Othello is interested in feedback from the GC/CM.

Mr. Baldasari said one of the slides indicates construction begins the day following MACC negotiation, which is tight. He asked about the school board's approval process and whether the superintendent is authorized to approve projects. Mr. Logsdon replied the board will identify a preauthorized MACC and permit the superintendent to enter into an agreement. If MACC negotiation exceeds that amount, the team would go back to the board.

Mr. Baldasari asked whether resubmitting the application affected the project schedule. Mr. Currie replied that Othello pushed the project back to reapply for GC/CM project approval. Mr. Christensen added that revising the schedule might prove beneficial from an economy of scale perspective and the ability to attract a better group of subcontractors.

Mr. Smith commended the team for resubmitting and addressing issues raised during the first review. He thanked the team for walking members through the preconstruction design phase process. He asked Othello representatives to explain new team member roles and responsibilities (particularly Richard Prentke), why a cost estimator was brought on board, and Mr. Currie's direct experience with the Lake Washington project. Mr. Currie explained Mr. Prentke was contracted to take advantage of his expertise to draft the contract between the owner and GC/CM. Mr. Prentke will be involved and will advise the district throughout that process. Mr. Thomas possesses GC/CM cost estimating experience and is a positive addition to the project team. Mr. Christensen added Mr. Thomas has worked with generals that are likely to apply for the job and will serve as a third party to help with reconciliation.

Mr. Currie outlined his experience as construction manager for the Lake Washington project and his involvement and participation in the initial K-12 GC/CM pilot project legislation. Lake Washington was a very successful GC/CM project that met the intent of the legislation to broaden the horizons of owners with no GC/CM experience.

Panel Chair Mannix said he appreciates the efforts by Othello School District representatives in addressing the issues. The team has designated a specific individual to act as GC/CM coordinator. He cautioned them to continue self-monitoring within the organization.

Mr. Smith conveyed that GC/CM is a good tool for the right project and is beneficial to owners who can now use GC/CM.

The panel voted unanimously to approve the Othello School District – Lutucaga Elementary / McFarland Middle School project application.

There were no public comments offered on the project application.

Chair Benson recessed the meeting from 12:40 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Project Re-Application Review – Klickitat County Public Hospital District No. 2 – Skyline Hospital Addition and Renovation Project

Panel Chair Penny Koal, committee members Jonathon Hartung, Jim Anderson, Peg Staeheli, Eric Smith, and Darron Pease

Panel Chair Koal reported members are encouraged by changes represented in the owner's program and project. She explained application review procedures. Panel members provided self-introductions.

Mark Johnson reported the GC/CM method is appropriate for the hospital because of its 24/7 operation, site challenges, construction phasing requirements, and multiple release packages. A slide highlighting site constraints was reviewed.

Ralph Rohwer, day-to-day project manager, introduced Mike Madden, Jim Panko, Greg Guedel with Foster Pepper, Judy Peterson, Mark Johnson, and Cary Guenther. Mr. Rohwer reviewed an organizational chart and project team member individual roles and responsibilities. He noted 35% of his time is allocated over the life of the \$8.3 million project and spans preconstruction and construction activities. He reviewed his background and construction experience including his position as project manager with Heery International for the last 25 years. He reported he has worked on four GC/CM projects, DB projects in the private sector, and was certified through GC/CM training, which was recently provided.

Mr. Rohwer reviewed a revised schedule and how GC/CM fits within the schedule. The law requires the hospital district to have approval and a GC/CM on board prior to Schematic Design (SD). Architects are working on concepts and completing planning design phase work. The duration on the preliminary schedule represents working days and not planning days. Phasing was adjusted to reflect a 14-1/2 month construction schedule compared to 17 months. He outlined duration, start, finish, advance procurement, and construction elements associated with four construction phases.

Specific to setting the MACC, Mr. Rohwer explained the goal is to establish a "mini-MACC" for a stand-alone package in advance of negotiating a total contract cost to get on the ground in spring 2008. Additionally, the owner is not committed to advance steel procurement, site, and foundation work if a total package cannot be negotiated.

Concerning constructability review with GC/CM, construction review is ongoing. It should consist of a reiterative process between the project team as designs evolve. Mr. Rohwer referred to activity #27 (CD) on the preliminary schedule. The owner is affording approximately two weeks for constructability review and a week to incorporate comments and conduct a background check.

Mr. Rohwer reviewed a construction cost budget summary, project components (ground and basement levels, helipad relocation, site work/utilities, abatement, renovation of existing square footage), and associated costs including escalation and local sales tax totaling \$14.5 million. Moveable equipment purchased is not reflected in the numbers. Another set of funds (10% of total construction) is set aside for construction contingences. A

project reserve was established. The project includes 23,000 additional square feet and 5,000 square feet of remodel.

If the project is not approved for GC/CM, Klickitat will be required to use lump sum (lowest responsible responsive bid). GC/CM allows an owner to select the most qualified firm with the best price and team. Skyline Hospital is a critical community facility. The owner wants to minimize risk and maximize opportunities GC/CM provides for the hospital. The goal is to ensure the community receives the best critical care hospital possible.

Mr. Madden reported the patient care portion of the hospital is 60 years old. The facility itself plays a part in a patient's recovery. The GC/CM delivery method enables the owner to save money that can be allocated to benefit patients.

Mr. Pease asked if there is a commitment for Mr. Rohwer to fill the GC/CM role. Mr. Rohwer indicated it is but that it has not been confirmed formally. He reported he's on contract with the hospital to provide project management for the life of the project. Resource support is available in Portland. He said his office is located in Seattle.

Mr. Rohwer distributed a responsibility matrix document of team roles and responsibilities during the GC/CM process. He indicated he will take a lead role with the selection process. He advised that he has worked on seven GC/CM hiring selections to date.

Panel Chair Koal asked the owners to explain how scope reductions made with the initial proposal affects the schedule and budget. Mr. Rohwer replied that certain parts of the facility will not be built out or renovated. The intent is to identify all facility needs up front with the GC/CM.

Mr. Johnson said he prefers to design health care projects with pressure relief valves to not gouge the client's scope. He explained how the owner has approached planning in the early conceptual design. The most significant is inpatient renovation at the lower end of the existing inpatient bed wing budgeted at \$497,000. A plan was presented for review. The need at this time is 14 or 15 beds at the most. The structure has been designed to allow expansion over time to 15 to 21 beds within the new 23,000 square foot addition. Other options include shelving one double occupancy room, two additional single occupancy rooms, not relocating respiratory therapy or pharmacy functions, and refining the size of the basement.

Mr. Smith complimented Mr. Rohwer on the presentation and his understanding of process and risk management issues. The need for a GC/CM on the project is well articulated. He said he is appreciative of how the owner addressed strategy for early procurement. Mr. Smith said his previous concerns have been addressed. He asked whom the GC/CM looks to on the owner's side for day-to-day contact, direction, and for resolving emerging issues. Mr. Rohwer explained all decisions will run through him. Mr. Panko will serve as the on-site contact during construction. In case of an emergency, he has staff in Portland that can assist with technical issues. Klickitat has worked hard to develop a user-friendly web based tool to obtain an immediate response concerning issues.

Discussion ensued about whether the owner has an idea about what firms might compete for the job, criteria to evaluate proposals, and pricing and phasing considerations. Mr. Rohwer reported four or five firms have contacted the hospital about the project (unsolicited) ranging from Washington and out-of-state-based firms with offices in Portland. There are contractors interested in smaller projects in that area of the state. The

criteria shouldn't change the size of the firm; however, locality will be an issue. Portland or Vancouver-based firms are preferred because hospitals require 24/7 attention during a construction sequence.

There were no public comments in response to the application request.

Additional panel comments are summarized as follows:

- Excellent and concise presentation.
- Concerns about schedule and expertise were addressed.
- The schedule is still aggressive and will require careful monitoring.
- Roles have been clearly defined in the revised application.
- Questions have been answered.
- Changes made to the project will ensure a successful GC/CM project.
- The budget is fairly constrained.

The panel voted unanimously to approve the Klickitat County Public Hospital District No. 2 Skyline Hospital Addition and Renovation project application.

(Note: Several PRC members have now left and a quorum is no longer present.)

Application Review Post Mortem

Members commented on attendance and WSU's certification application for DB. Chair Benson emphasized it is critical for committee members to notify the Chair, Vice Chair, and panel leads if they are unable to attend the meeting.

Ms. Koal and Chair Benson thanked Mr. Smith, Mr. Anderson, and Mr. Baldasari for their willingness to serve on panels at the last minute.

Discussion ensued about requesting guidance or a written legal opinion about interpreting statute language concerning certification, the committee's decision to approve WSU's public body certification for DB, the appeal process, clarifying statute language during the next legislative session, and adding a clarifying note on the certification application.

Ms. Deakins reported section 109 addresses appeals by a public body or interested party to the Capital Projects Advisory Review Board (CPARB) within seven days of the determination.

Application Pipeline Review

Mr. Orr reviewed upcoming projects to include Washington State Department of General Administration's (GA) request for public body certification for both DB and GC/CM and Seattle School District's application for public body certification for GC/CM.

Discussion followed on cities that have multiple departments requesting public body certification.

Adjournment

With no further business, Chair Benson adjourned the meeting at 2:36 p.m.

Rodger Benson, Chair

Prepared by Cheri Lindgren, Recording Secretary
Puget Sound Meeting Services