

**CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY REVIEW BOARD
PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE
Northwest Carpenters Facility
25120 Pacific Highway South
Kent, Washington
February 28, 2008
9:00 AM**

Draft Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT

Dave Marberg, University of Washington	Tom Balbo, Ferguson Construction, Inc.
Eric Smith, Vice Chair, University of Washington	Phil Lovell, Turner Construction NW
Christy Trautman, King County	Gary Baldasari, AIA
John Mannix, Spokane Public Schools	Darron Pease, Pease & Sons, Inc.
Bob MacIssac, Port of Seattle	Dan Chandler, P.E., AIA, Olympic Associates Co.
Jonathan Hartung, SHKS Architects	Fred Tharp, WSDOT
Keith Schreiber, AIA, Schreiber Starling & Lane Architects	Jim Anderson, Burton Construction, Inc.
Tom Peterson, Hoffman Construction Co of WA	Miriam Israel Moses, Rebound
Rodger Benson, Chair, MA Mortenson Company	

MEMBERS ABSENT

Gary Arndt, P.E., Parametrix	Rick Benner, Western Washington University
Peg Staeheli, SvR Design Company	Jim Cameron, Cameron-Reilly, LLC
Mike Shinn, Shinn Mechanical	Darlene Septelka, Landon Construction Group
Penny Koal, General Administration	Paul Berry, Harris & Associates

STAFF, GUESTS, PRESENTERS

Robyn Hofstad, GA	Ron English, Deputy General Counsel, Seattle Public Schools
Cheri Lindgren, Puget Sound Meeting Services	Donald King, Program Manager, Seattle Public Schools
Pete Barletto, Jr., Director & Chief Operating Officer, UW	Ian Kell, Project Manager, Seattle Public Schools
Michael Kelly, Assistant Director & Fiscal Manager, UW	Butch Reifert, Mahlum Architects
Mike Purdy, Contracts Manager, UW	Mike Finnegan, Program Manager, Seattle Public Schools
Carmen Espanole, UW	Chuck Clegern, Program Manager, Seattle Public Schools
Don Gillmore, Program Mgr, Seattle Public Schools	

Welcome & Introductions

Chair Rodger Benson called the Capital Projects Advisory Review Board (CPARB) Project Review Committee (PRC) meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. A quorum was present.

Approve Agenda

Chair Benson commented that members not serving on panels are welcome to leave following the action items on the agenda. A discussion about PRC responsibilities and auditing role was added to the agenda.

Keith Schreiber moved, seconded by Phil Lovell, to approve the agenda as amended. Motion carried.

Approve January 24, 2008 Meeting Minutes

Miriam Israel Moses moved, seconded by Keith Schreiber, to approve the January 24, 2008 meeting minutes as published. Motion carried.

Public Comments

There are no public comments.

Application for Certification of Public Body – General Contractor/Construction Manager (GC/CM) and Design Build (DB) - Alternative Contracting Procedures - Modifications

Chair Benson reported General Administration (GA) staff separated the combined form and created two distinct application forms – one specific for GC/CM and one specific for DB certifications. Committee members reviewed the revisions.

Discussion ensued on the language contained in a box on the first page of each of the applications describing the alternative contracting procedure. Mr. Lovell suggested that for the GC/CM application it should read in part, “GC/CM refers to a firm with which a public body intends to select and negotiate a Maximum Allowable Construction Cost (MACC) to provide pre-construction services during the design phase ...” Members offered the following comments about the proposed change:

- It sounds like the MACC is to provide for pre-construction services, which is a separate issue. The MACC is to construct the project. Pre-construction services are a separate fee.
- Eliminate “pre-construction.”
- Language describing the alternative contracting procedure should be consistent with the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) statute.
- Why is the language necessary?
- The applications are specific for GC/CM and DB certification applications. An applicant shouldn’t have to check a box for the type of certification being sought. Item #2 on both applications could be eliminated.

A majority of the members agreed to delete item #2 on page 1 of the applications.

Mr. Lovell suggested and offered to verify RCW references for each of the applications.

Ms. Trautman suggested changing references of “Alternative Contracting Procedure” to GC/CM or DB as appropriate throughout the documents.

Eric Smith moved, seconded by Bob MacIssac, to approve the forms subject to the changes discussed. Mr. Lovell will verify the RCW references are correct for each application. Motion carried.

Discussion – Responsibilities and Auditing Role

Chair Benson reported he received an e-mail requesting the committee review the Washington State Convention & Trade Center (WSCTC) 800 Pike Conversion project. The PRC approved the project application for GC/CM in January. The owner was encouraged to hire an owner’s representative with GC/CM experience. WSCTC has since hired a firm unfamiliar to him. Jerry Heinlein was hired and provides scheduling, forensics, claims consultant, and accountant analysis services. The contractor WSCTC hired does not have GC/CM knowledge. The Request for Proposal (RFP) states the owner is interested in GC/CM experience, but it’s not a requirement. The PRC cannot make conditional approvals based on something an owner may or may not do. The statute includes provisions for the committee to rescind approvals in some cases.

Mr. Baldasari agreed it's improper if WSCTC didn't follow through with adding construction management services to the project team. Additionally, hiring people without the necessary qualifications indicates the applicant missed something.

Mr. Marberg reported that Jerry Heinlein is familiar with the GC/CM process but has never managed a project.

Ms. Moses referred to page 5 of the January 24, 2008 minutes, specifically paragraph 6 where clear direction was provided. Based on that, the PRC has the right to rescind project approval.

Mr. Mannix quoted language from the first paragraph on page 5 of the minutes.

Mr. Balbo suggested obtaining a copy of the RFP and responses. Mr. Heinlein might have responded that he possesses GC/CM experience.

Chair Benson offered to contact CPARB Chair John Lynch at General Administration (GA) about the Board's authority governing the process and whether the committee should invite WSCTC to the next PRC meeting to discuss concerns.

Mr. Schreiber asked whether the term, "strongly encouraged" is a condition of approval or simply a recommendation. He questioned the committee's ability to rescind approval or give conditional approval. It appears the owner chose to ignore the PRC's advice.

Mr. Anderson said the PRC should not approve similar requests in the future and that applicants should return to have all concerns addressed.

Mr. Mannix said it appears the PRC gave conditional approval as several panel members indicated support for the project application provided the RFP includes criteria for construction applicants to possess GC/CM experience.

Discussion followed on the Fort Vancouver Regional Library District's (FVRLD) project application review for GC/CM, which was denied at the January meeting because the owner did not have the required experience. Members discussed requesting the CPARB rescind approval to WSCTC.

Mr. Chandler offered that the committee could write a letter to WSCTC explaining concerns have been raised about the owner's approach to the project with a request to return and present additional information. The PRC should be extremely cautious about rescinding approvals. WSCTC could have a project manager with GC/CM expertise.

In response to a question from Mr. Smith concerning the complaint, Chair Benson said the person raising the concern said that the selection of a contractor demonstrates a lack of experience on the part of the owner's representative.

Ms. Moses said a GC/CM project failing to meet the requirements of the statute cannot move forward under the law.

Mr. Lovell referred to a copy of WSCTC's application, which includes three pages of information on in-house staff or subconsultants who have GC/CM experience. Most of the knowledge is on the design side.

Mr. Balbo asked if PRC's authority goes beyond the approval stage.

Chair Benson suggested the issue warrants a discussion at the CPARB's next meeting. The law states that the PRC can rescind approvals. The issue is under what conditions. He advised that he will contact Mr. Lynch on how to proceed.

Chair Benson recessed the meeting from 9:40 a.m. to 9:45 a.m.

Project Application Review for Design/Build – University of Washington (UW) – Regional Scale Nodes (RSN) Project

(Panel Chair Dan Chandler, panel members Jim Anderson, Tom Balbo, Jonathon Hartung, Bob MacIssac, Christy Trautman, Fred Tharp, and Miriam Israel Moses.)

Panel Chair Chandler reviewed the application process and procedures.

Mr. Smith reported UW is excited about the opportunity to participate in a worldwide scientific endeavor. In order to compete for and win the chance to move forward with the project, UW must demonstrate its ability to deliver all the project components, including the undersea cabling system and attached nodes, to support both power and data requirements for instrumentation. The UW determined it has two alternatives to deliver the undersea cabling system that includes approaching the Legislature and requesting specific authority or moving forward with an Alternative Public Work (APW) project. The perfect vehicle to deliver the project is the DB method.

Mr. Smith introduced Pete Barletto and Michael Kelley. Mr. Smith acknowledged Mike Purdy and Carmen Espanole from UW.

Mr. Barletto described his telecommunications background and experience specifically on the submarine cable segment. His presentation included a PowerPoint overview. Mr. Barletto described the importance of oceans. A pictorial chart showing interactions and processes of the atmosphere, oceans, and the earth was presented. A Regional Cable Observatory (RCO) is a networked, undersea sensor grid to collect and disseminate ocean and seafloor data in a multi-disciplinary effort over the next several decades. The RSN component of the National Science Foundation's (NSF) Ocean Observatories Initiative (OOI), and the complementary NEPTUNE Canada program will be associated with the Juan de Fuca tectonic plate, one of a dozen or so major plates that make up the surface of the earth. The project calls for the design and construction of 1,200 kilometers of fiber optic cable. The internet will be brought to the seafloor with 100 kilowatts of power and high bandwidth providing for real time data return and control. Mr. Barletto described the RSN system configuration. Two shore landing stations are currently in use on the coast of Oregon. He reviewed the endurance lines consisting of a series of instruments on the Oregon coast. That infrastructure is part of the RSN project. The sensors and instruments are part of the NSF OOI project, Coastal Nodes.

The goal of the RSN is to exploit high bandwidth and power to enable transformational ocean science through construction of networked sensor grids collecting ocean and seafloor data.

Mr. Barletto reviewed DB scope components. RSN design specifications were examined. Samples of the cable were provided. Primary and expansion nodes are non-standard and require design and integration with telecom components.

Mr. Barletto explained why DB is the appropriate delivery model for the project:

- Highly specialized technology.
- Accepted practice in commercial undersea business since inception of the technology.
- Design builders viewed as integrated “solution providers.” One responsible party.
- Integration required between multiple subsystems and multiple layers.
- Integrated solution empowers evaluation of maintenance and long-term total cost of ownership.
- UW will take advantage of lessons learned from MARS and Neptune Canada.

A preliminary information meeting was held at UW on February 20, 2008, which generated strong enthusiasm among a number of companies.

Mr. Smith summarized the UW management plan and the team’s project experience. He reviewed a procurement timeline. Answers to four questions submitted by panel members prior to the meeting were reviewed.

Ms. Moses asked about prevailing wages and non-fabricated items. The project is located in Oregon. Washington’s APW act is not enforceable in the State of Oregon. Mr. Kelley explained UW is bound by federal and State of Washington requirements. The Jones Act governs marine activity.

Mr. Purdy explained how the UW plans to integrate the Jones Act and federal requirements with the APW process. Collecting more information on federal requirements will be undertaken. The UW is firmly committed to paying prevailing wages for the project. Mr. Barletto said Mr. Purdy will provide expertise on identifying fees in the contract and ensuring UW and suppliers comply with all applicable regulations.

Ms. Moses expressed confidence about Mr. Purdy’s experience.

Mr. Chandler asked if overlaying contract requirements and prevailing wages will come through the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and RFP for design and construction. Mr. Barletto replied that Ocean Leadership has the primary contract with the NSF. Mr. Chandler asked if the Northwest piece is a subset. Mr. Barletto said more than half of the \$331 million OOI program is for the RSN project.

Mr. Chandler asked whether large companies, such as Boeing, will take the lead. Mr. Barletto said the UW anticipates Alcatel Network Systems and Tyco Telecommunications to compete. However, Alcatel will not compete as a prime. NEC representatives from Japan requested supplier information. The competition is more than the industry anticipated.

Discussion followed about the proposed RFP process.

Mr. Chandler asked whether UW will use in-house legal counsel to draft and review contract documents. Mr. Smith affirmed that is the plan. He said he and Mr. Kelley will have primary responsibility to integrate technical programmatic requirements and the performance specifications to create a document complying with RCW procedural requirements. They will rely on legal counsel to define the performance and evaluation criteria, draft the specifications, determine how the points are assigned, and identify who will participate on the selection panel. The goal is to advertise the RFP in May 2008.

Mr. Chandler asked if Mr. Barletto and Mr. Kelly are employed by the UW. Mr. Smith confirmed they are both employed by UW.

Mr. Balbo asked if UW is required to obtain approval from other agencies prior to final contract award. Mr. Barletto replied Ocean Leadership will ultimately own the system. Ocean Leadership will be involved from the beginning with RFQ development, contract award, and during construction and acceptance of the project.

Members discussed UW using a joint bid strategy and a single prime contractor.

Mr. Balbo asked whether the Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) engineer will write the quality assurance program and is involved in the RFP process. Mr. Barletto replied UW plans to interview for the QA/QC position in March. The UW has QA/QC expertise. An in-house biophysics lab engineer will manage testing activities. The UW could commission from a group of engineering consultants to assist with factory acceptance tests with suppliers.

Discussion ensued about the specifications document, the contract form, and how the UW will evaluate proposers. Mr. Smith said the university will use an industry standard as the starting point and overlay RCW requirements.

Mr. Tharp asked about the ownership of risk and whether the UW will ask the design builder to own the risk and insure it or whether the university maintains the risk. Mr. Barletto said the risk for operational effectiveness is on the design builder. A warranty period will be in effect. Typically, 5-10% is held back from the fees until the end of the contract period, which could be from two to five years. The risk is assigned to the design builder and a monetary incentive is offered for motivation. Testing is conducted throughout development and installation. Any problems will be known early. Weather and nature can have an impact on the ultimate cost. The cost of a cable ship is approximately \$90,000 a day. Quality of weather is straightforward and verifiable. Force majeure is in play and is controllable in a number of ways. There is flexibility within the project schedule. The NSF is required to identify technical, commercial, and inflationary risks. Those funds are set aside and held at Ocean Leadership unless and until needed.

Mr. Tharp asked what type of payment performance bonding is associated with the project. Mr. Barletto said it varies. UW has not received a response from its sponsor. Performance bonds are balanced with the warranty period. Liquidated damages typical with a contract relate more to schedule. The schedule is flexible and can be used as a tool in negotiation.

In response to a question from Ms. Moses about whether environmental and ecological impact statements and/or studies have been completed, Mr. Barletto replied the project will undergo a national environmental assessment. The assessment will be released for public comment in March and should be completed in April. Initiating a number of required permits cannot begin until the national assessment is completed.

Mr. MacIssac and Mr. Hartung both agreed that the project appears to be eligible for the DB delivery.

Mr. Benson asked about the percentage of the work proposed for the DB method and how would a disapproval of the request impact the project and interest from vendors. Mr. Barletto replied that approximately 90% of the work will be through the DB methodology. The NSF has experienced projects running over budget. This project will be built to cost. If costs go up, the scope will be reduced. The UW is sensitive to having an adequate level of risk included in the budget, set aside, and managed by the program office.

Mr. Lovell asked about the ownership of the project. Mr. Barletto reported Ocean Leadership will be the owner. Mr. Lovell said it's not uncommon for the federal government to attach additional requirements regarding procurement, contracting, payments, and bonding. Mr. Barletto replied that UW is working to better understand and incorporate federal requirements into the process. The owner has met monthly with Ocean

Leadership and other universities involved, as well as the NSF, since spring 2007. A panel of 30 experts was assembled last December to conduct a pre-design review and to look at the programmatic aspects of the project.

Bob MacIssac moved, seconded by Miriam Israel Moses, to approve the University of Washington project application for DB for the Regional Scale Nodes Project. Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Benson recessed the meeting from 10:35 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

Mr. Hartung and Mr. MacIssac left during the break.

Project Application Review for GC/CM – Seattle Public Schools – Nathan Hale High School Project

(Panel Chair Tom Peterson, panel members Keith Schreiber, Darron Pease, Christy Trautman, Phil Lovell, John Mannix, and Dave Marberg.)

Panel members provided self-introductions. Panel Chair Peterson outlined the project application process.

Don Gillmore, Building Excellence (BEX) III Program Manager, introduced Seattle Public Schools project team members Ron English, Donald King, Ian Kell, Butch Reifert, Mike Finnegan, and Chuck Clegern.

Mr. Gillmore reported the Nathan Hale High School project is well suited for the GC/CM delivery based on the complexity of the project and maintaining existing school and campus operations during construction. The proposed project involves multiple phases. The first phase will be bid as a low bid lump sum with the GC/CM project following. It's an ideal project for a GC/CM contractor to be involved during both design and construction to ensure the best outcome.

Mr. Reifert provided an overview of the project. The high school was built in the early 1960s. Currently, 1,400 students are enrolled. The project is designed to accommodate growth. The site is located in an environmentally sensitive area. There is limited parking and lay down areas available. He reviewed a proposed site plan and project components.

Project components include:

- New addition and east entry – 15,000 square feet
- Demolition of existing library and portables - 16,000 square feet
- Significant modernization – 208,000 square feet
- Site improvements and landscaping

The project entails two phases: Project 1 – Lump Sum – Traditional Design Bid Build (DBB) will add a new library, renovate the shop building into art classrooms, and connect with the new building. Project 2 – GC/CM consists of five separate phases. Mr. Reifert reviewed the phases.

Mr. Kell reviewed the proposed project schedule, which is aggressive. Site work will begin on Project 1 this summer with completion expected in summer 2009. Concurrent with that phase, Construction Documents (CDs) will be drafted for Project 2. Pending approval of Project 2 for GC/CM, the school district is prepared to advertise within two weeks with the target of hiring a GC/CM in June 2008. Design will span nine months wrapping up in early spring 2009. A MACC will be negotiated at 90% CDs. Construction will begin on Project 2 in summer 2009. The three major components will be completed in 18 months.

The project budget is \$84.8 million. Approximately \$8.6 million has been allocated for Project 1. Mr. Kell described Project 2 budget components, which includes the MACC (\$35.2 million), General Contractor (GC) contingencies (\$2.4 million – 7%), specified general conditions (\$2.3 million – 7.5%), negotiated support services (\$300,000 – allowance), and \$1.8 million (5%) to cover the GCs bid fee. Other components include pre-construction (\$500,000), owner incentive contingency (\$100,000), and owner change order out contingency (\$5.6 million – 13%).

Rationale to use GC/CM for the Nathan Hale High School project includes project complexity, an occupied site, multiple phases and bid packages, concurrent mechanical/electrical systems, existing conditions verification, and environment and technical constraints.

Mr. King presented a project team organizational chart and project team qualifications.

Mr. Clegern outlined GC/CM contract documents. He noted Seattle Public Schools has been sensitive to the Mike M. Johnson discussions over the last several years.

Mr. Gillmore reported the Nathan High School project is an ideal candidate for the GC/CM delivery model. The project team is qualified and experienced. The district has the proper resources and controls and has completed four GC/CM projects.

Mr. Gillmore reviewed answers to questions submitted by panel members prior to the meeting.

Mr. Lovell expressed concerns about the potential for problems between Project 1 and 2 with concurrent mechanical and electrical systems. He asked representatives to explain the school district's strategy if Project 1 is not completed on time which will affect the GC/CM and Project 2. Mr. Gillmore replied a consultant has been hired to advise the district on its phasing plan. A major concern is the utility interface. Each wing must be kept operating while the mechanical systems are replaced.

Mr. Kell explained that the building is currently served by a boiler room. The owner is studying a preferred option of a stand-alone geo-thermal well for heat located adjacent to Project 1. Other alternatives are to run pipe throughout the building and setting aside space for a small boiler room that will require a gas line. He added that temporary boilers are also possible. Referring to the strategy question, Mr. Kell said Project 1 must be completed prior to school opening in the fall. If the project is delayed, the district would look at having two GCs on site during the summer. The GC/CM would likely do an advance bid package to demolish the existing library wing to make room for additional portable buildings.

Mr. Lovell commented that the organizational chart contained in the application is vertical. He asked the owner to explain the relationship between DKA and the GC/CM. Mr. King replied the school district will contract directly with the GC and GC/CM. Mr. Gillmore added that the construction manager is mentioned in the contract with the GC/CM. Mr. King clarified that DKA is the owner's representative for the school district but not the owner. DKA has an owner's authority. Mr. King described authority levels on site. He said neither him nor Mr. Finnegan will be on site at all times during construction.

Discussion followed about recent changes to the APW statute, constructability (third party) review independent of the GC/CM review, and MACC negotiations at 90% CDs and 95% CDs.

Mr. Schreiber asked whether the abatement piece is part of the DBB or GC/CM project. Mr. Kell replied abatement for Project 1 will likely be a separate bid package that will be released in June. Abatement for Project 2 will be completed under the GC/CM in sections.

Mr. Schreiber asked the owner to elaborate on what it hopes to gain by having students present during construction. Mr. Gillmore said initially, the plan was to move students to Lincoln High School. However, that step meant a three-year delay. Construction escalation costs remains extremely high. The school district is gaining three years of construction escalation. Rather than putting money into escalated steel prices, the money can be put back into the building. It was the community and staff's desire to remain on site to benefit from more amenities. The interim site is in need of repairs. The value engineering team has reviewed the phasing plan.

Mr. Marberg asked whether Mr. Kell acts as the construction manager for monitoring day-to-day activities. Mr. Kell replied that there will be an assistant project manager. He will be on the site daily, attend weekly meetings, negotiate change orders with the contractor, will act as the owner's agent, and is responsible for all permitting. Mr. King added that Mr. Kell is 100% dedicated to one project.

Discussion ensued about the time it takes to process change orders that are critical in nature. Mr. Gillmore said a change order can be turned around in a day. He reported he has signature authority for change orders up to \$100,000. The Chief Financial Officer (CFO) is required to execute change orders between \$100,000 and \$250,000, which can also be accomplished in one day. Change orders greater than \$250,000 require approval by the school board. The school board meets every two weeks.

Mr. Marberg commented that the earlier the district can get the GC/CM hired the better. There is four weeks between interview and selection followed by another six weeks to approve the contract. He asked if it's possible to reduce the timeframe and if the GC/CM can attend any of the design meetings earlier in the process. The school district could benefit from the GC/CM's construction experience. Mr. Gillmore agreed it is a lengthy process. In some cases the district has issued a small contract to enable the GC/CM or superintendent to work with the owner prior to final negotiations. Mr. Kell pointed out the five-week period is compressed and involves three committee reviews.

Mr. Marberg said Seattle Public Schools has a good record of completing major remodels on time.

Panel Chair Peterson asked whether DKA and Heery is a joint venture. Mr. King replied that DKA is the lead and Heery is a consultant to DKA. Mr. Kell said he works for Heery. Technical issues are referred to Mr. Finnegan. Contractual issues would be referred to Mr. Finnegan and Mr. Gillmore. A representative added that the relationship strategy has worked well for the last 12 years. Mr. King stated the BEX team is housed at the DKA offices.

Mr. Mannix acknowledged that the district has successfully completed four GC/CM projects. He recommended that the owner emphasize the multiple phases and occupied conditions with the submittal and interview process, and specifically request successful experience under occupied conditions to mitigate noise, dust, and vibration.

Mr. Kell said he's drafted criteria for the selection process. At least 20 points out of 100 will be awarded to companies having prior experience working with occupied high schools.

Panel Chair Peterson invited public comments.

In response to a question from Mr. Benson regarding the portables, Mr. Gillmore said the portables are temporary in nature. A goal is to eliminate all portable buildings.

Ms. Moses advised that she is not speaking on behalf of organized labor. The Seattle King County Building Trades Council is in discussions with the Seattle School District concerning its contracts with minority, women, and small business enterprises. As much as 20% of the contactors involved are not registered and/or do not have business licenses. The high percentage of unregistered and/or unlicensed contractors creates some concerns about district cross controls. She asked how the owner will ensure that all contractors working on the high school project are appropriately registered and licensed. Mr. Gillmore explained the school district has a small business department managed by a consulting firm. It is the district's intent for all contractors to be licensed and to follow all state regulations. He questioned the high percentage and advised he will speak with Ms. Moses about the source of the information. Seattle School District sponsors weekly classes on how to run businesses. The program is successful. There are currently 230 small, licensed contractors registered with the school district.

Mr. English added that the district has rejected bids from contractors that were not licensed.

Mr. King said the owner conducts an extensive check for licensing, insurance, and bonding for its general contractors as well.

Panel members deliberated the application request. Additional comments are summarized as follows:

- In general, the program team has been successful. The narrative and slide regarding contingencies was helpful.
- If the project is approved, it is based on the supplemental information provided for Project 1 (lump sum), and corrected bidding dates.

Dave Marberg moved, seconded by Keith Schreiber, to approve Seattle Public Schools project application for GC/CM for the Nathan Hale High School project. Motion carried unanimously.

Application Review Post Mortem

Chair Benson commented that the project application reviews went well. He suggested panel members should introduce themselves and briefly review their background.

Discussion ensued about supplemental information provided following the initial applications filed by applicants, specifically whether to note that approvals are also based on supplemental information provided to the PRC. Chair Benson said decisions are based on all the information that includes the initial application, answers to questions from panel members, supplemental information presented at a meeting, and verbal communications.

Mr. Lovell suggested the approval letter include a statement that PRC decisions are based on all information provided by an owner. Mr. Baldasari agreed with the suggestion.

Mr. Peterson said the topic is a follow up from the discussions (*Responsibilities and Auditing Role*) earlier in the meeting.

Chair Benson asked Mr. Peterson to include language in the approval letter to Seattle Public Schools that the committee's decision is based on all information provided, including the supplemental data.

Other ideas from members included:

- Letters back to applicants should include an attachment that documents all of the information considered by the committee when making a decision. (*Chair Benson noted decisions are also based on what the owners say at the meeting.*)
- Add text that states something similar to, “this approval is based upon all of the information presented including the initial application, addendums to the initial application, answers to questions posed by the panel, and discussions as documented in the meeting minutes.”

Mr. Mannix said the PRC should have some latitude with the questions it presents; however, the decision should be based on the criteria outlined in the legislation. He asked if members should refrain from asking questions that don't directly pertain to a decision. Chair Benson agreed that the statute is clear. It's fine for the committee to entertain those discussions and it's important to let the applicants know that feedback related to certain questions (bonding and prevailing wages) will not be used when rendering a decision. Some questions are helpful to determine the strength of the management team.

Mr. Pease said the CPARB directed the PRC to conduct due diligence in its project and certification reviews.

Miriam Israel Moses gave great kudos to Cheri Lindgren for all her effort and hard work in preparing the monthly meeting notes for the PRC. Thank you Cheri!!

Application Pipeline Review

Ms. Hofstad reported that the FVRLD has submitted a revised project application for consideration at the March meeting.

Chair Benson said there might not be a need to have a general meeting in March for one project application.

Mr. Schreiber suggested convening the same panel that reviewed the library district's initial application, which was denied.

Discussion followed about the importance for members to notify the Chair and/or Vice Chair, and Ms. Hofstad if they are unable to attend a scheduled meeting.

Discussion ensued about what constitutes a complete project application, the importance to foster an agency-friendly process, and the Chair and/or Vice Chair pointing out gaps in project applications to proposers.

Mr. Chandler said from his perspective as an applicant and panel member the questions are valuable.

Mr. Chandler inquired about expiration of member terms. Chair Benson advised that some terms expire on June 30, 2008. Members wishing to serve a second term are required to forward a letter of interest to Mr. Lynch. Mr. Carpenter resigned from his position. He recently changed jobs and is leaving the state.

In response to a question from Ms. Moses, Chair Benson said he will follow up with the CPARB about the length of her appointment to the PRC.

Adjournment

Keith Schreiber moved, seconded by Miriam Israel Moses, to adjourn the meeting at 12:26 p.m. Motion carried.

Prepared by Cheri Lindgren, Recording Secretary
Puget Sound Meeting Services