

**AGC/DOD Coordination Committee
Meeting**

November 1, 2019
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

AGC of Washington, 1200 Westlake Avenue N., Seattle, WA 98109
2nd Floor Conference Room

Minutes

In attendance

Phil Wallace, Kiewit Infrastructure West (phone)	Phil.Wallace@kiewit.com	360 340 2476
Julio Iguina, Walsh Group	jiguina@walshgroup.com	206 516 9643
Jeff Arviso, Manson Construction	jarviso@mansonconstruction.com	360 340 2476
Ben Fraser, Tunista Construction	bfraser@tclcon.com	206 966 9477
Brad Rundquist, Hensel Phelps	brundquist@henselphelps.com	425 646 2660
Dale Clark, Hensel Phelps	DClark1@henselphelps.com	206 455 4535
David Allen, McKinstry	davida@mckinstry.com	206 762 3311
Mike Irish, McKinstry	Mikel@McKinstry.com	206 247 1204
Mike Steinthal, Absher Construction	mike.steinthal@absherco.com	253 446 3442
Mark Slominski, USACE – Seattle District	mark.v.slominski@usace.army.mil	206 764 6766
Justin Nodolf, NAVFAC	justin.m.nodolf@navy.mil	360 315 4450
Sonja Forster, AGC of Washington	sforster@agcwa.com	206 683 6015

1. Welcome and introductions
2. AGC/DOD Coordination Committee
 - a. Discussion on effective feedback models:
 1. Typically, AGC reviews are done by subcommittee, compiled as one document
 2. Building design website to submit comments. WBDG, Whole Building Design Guide
 3. AGC San Diego model: create document that identifies priority areas to discuss
 4. A priority document would be helpful to DoD for internal distribution, and to prioritize CCR requests.
 5. NAVRAC would like to get specs updated on a timelier basis rather than the current 2-3-year timeline
 6. Local DOD has more equity on changing Div. 1 specs so that may be the best place to start.
 7. Specific requests for edits are good, but discussion at meetings is also valuable.
 - b. Next meeting:
 - Focus on Div. 1 specs and other issues which come up.



- Suggested changes and identify areas which would be better if they were editable
- Caution against chasing too many of the technical aspects.
- Live demo WBDG, Whole Building Design Guide site
- AGC of WA specifications review document draft for discussion (based on CA presentation and edited)
- "WBDG" which stands for Whole Building Design Guide.
-

c. AGC/ Department of Defense Coordination Meeting – Purpose Statement

Draft committee purpose statement - Comments by December 1. Revisions sent out for approval via email, if no comments the following is adopted:

To provide liaison between contractors, U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, Naval Facilities Command and Coast Guard on matters of mutual interest.

To maintain continuing discussion with Corps representatives on specifications, contract administration, standard contract documents, bidding procedures, and governmental regulations.

To promote public awareness of the need for justifiable and feasible public works projects.

3. Contractor feedback on Value Engineering Change Proposals – VECP

- Contractors like them, but not sure if the government processes them very often.
- Discussion on streamlining on the government side so VECP's may get implemented sooner.
- VECP's are aligned with industry standard but government personnel isn't comfortable moving to new methods.
- Communicating the value in a way that is properly received is key. Sometimes the government processes the idea like a change benefiting the contractor rather than a VECP with mutual benefit.
- Overengineering is detected often but right sizing seems to not be considered as VECP.
- Trying to find mutually beneficial opportunities only loses potential savings along the way in instances where it only benefits one side.
- Specifications is a backstop when you can't rely on the VECP reviewer. Assigned reviewer may not have that area of expertise necessary to make the decision.

4. Joint Risk Register Initiative & Team Partnering Assessment Initiatives

- Power point presentations - Mark Slominski, USACE
- Underway is a pilot project. USACE is interested on feedback.
- Contractor feedback & discussion points:
 - All says good stuff, but how is it truly being implemented and bought into?



2. Contract type might be a consideration as to what contract type this is to be applied. CMGC - joint risk assessments
3. Communicating the rollout is seen as a big challenge - potentially a place AGC can give comment and assistance.
4. Is this applied based on scale? There is a cost to contractor and government to apply.
5. There should be clear differentiation between partnering efforts in existence on a project, and what would be new partnering activity under TPAI. Don't want to disrupt something that is already working.
6. Timeline: Aug 2020 feedback to national, then unclear what is the next step with regard to scaling. There will be an opportunity to weigh in at that point.
7. Goal: How to take the best of what comes out of this and apply to enhance the good partnering that is already happening.

d. What is NAVFAC's adoption?

1. Joint RR's are still internal, partnering there are a few things being worked right now.
2. ECMS required 1.5 years ago. Department is still working through kinks and will be ready in 2020.
3. New FY20 requests will have the requirement included.
4. NAVFAC's version of RMS. A couple modules will cover partnering tools dialogue of communication required in partnering.

e. More discussion

1. Discussion on the importance of project management team buying into partnering efforts and historic issue of buy-in on the government side.
 1. Decision to pull un-helpful personnel from a project is always a last resort.
2. More involvement by government with the specific projects vs regional operation is key.
3. Opportunity to revisit partnering when key personnel changes.
4. Addition to consider post completion, have a final partnering session to talk about what went well and what didn't. CPARS meeting sometimes has too much emotion in them. The teaming at a higher level would be beneficial to take those lessons learned to the next project.
5. Major benefit to partnering is to come together on outcomes.
6. Timing: Internal policy memo will be done in the next 30 days with the next implementation on a project in the next year.

5. Cyber Security Maturity Model Certification

a. Discussion non CSMCC

1. USACE - going back to get more information on when we might see in an RFP, and what kind of oversight will be attached.
2. Concerns about access to certification for small and disadvantaged businesses.
3. Question on which solicitations will include this starting fall 2020.



- b. Facilities cybersecurity
 - 1. There are also changes in cyber security requirements on the facilities themselves and contractors need to be aware of what is coming.
 - 2. Design criteria on its way. NAVFAC will bring more information.

- 6. Acquisition policy changes
 - a. FOP transitioning to SAM on Veterans Day
 - b. NAVFAC Getting away from table for LD's, NFAS Part 11 eliminated to get rid of table. LD's will be based on actual damages anticipated by the government. Not a formula based but based on the actual project. Effective immediately on new contracts, not retroactive. ACOE already doing this - calculated cost of continued oversight. Move away from punitive LD's to actual LD's. On some you may see higher LD's based on project use/loss of use.
 - 1. Why is Navy and Army so different in rates? They aren't sure but likely with moving away from the table they can have a talk about coordinating.
 - c. Increase in ONM vs MILCON. Weapons storage maintenance base is very large. Regional - biggest PISNER, series of projects of ecosystem restoration.

- 7. Action items & next meeting:
 - a. Action Items
 - 1. NAVFAC to send AGC San Diego brief and AGC to distribute to contractors in order to develop AGC of Washington priority document.
 - 2. Distribute Specs and DIV 1's for next meeting
 - 3. NAVFAC will bring more information on changes to facilities cybersecurity design criteria.
 - 4. USACE: provide more information on when we might see in an RFP with CSMMC requirements.
 - 5. Can we get information on what type of solicitations will have CSMMC?
 - 6. Next meeting agenda items
 - b. Early contractor involvement (ECI) (put on next agenda as place holder) roundtable discussion with the objective to roll out FAR
 - 1. Include AGC of Amerioca on the phone for cybersecurity update on realistic timelines, and educational/outreach tools.
 - 2. DIV 1 Specifications Review:
 - 1. Focus on Div. 1 specs and other issues which come up.
 - 2. Suggested changes and identify areas which would be better if they were editable
 - 3. Caution against chasing too many of the technical aspects.
 - 4. Live demo WBDG, Whole Building Design Guide site
 - 5. AGC of WA specifications review document draft for discussion (based on CA presentation and edited)
 - c. Next meeting date:
 - 1. Friday, Feb 7, 2020, 9:00 am, Kiewit Infrastructure West, Federal Way



8. Adjourn

