MARYLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACILITIES PLANNERS COUNCIL

February 14, 2025
MEETING MINUTES

Attendees at Howard Community College

Name	College / Agency
Katy Angstadt	**Community College of Baltimore County**
John Anzinger	**Frederick Community College**
Lisa Aughenbaugh	**Carroll Community College**
Andrew Clark (remote)	**Allegany Community College**
Miriam Collins	**Chesapeake College**
Craig Curtis	**DGS**
Steve Dyott	**Chesapeake College**
Laura Dyson (remote)	**College of Southern MD**
Gregory Grey	Warwick Community College
Kaylee Haupt	**Carroll County**

Name	College / Agency
Travis Hopkins	**Howard Community College**
Christina Kilduff (remote)	**Allegheny College**
David Koenigsburg (remote)	**DBM**
Dong-Min Kim	**Montgomery College**
Kerry Norberg	**Montgomery College**
Chris Painter	**Garrett College**
Carla Pullen (remote)	**Montgomery College**
Dan Schuster	**MHEC**
James Taylor (remote)	**Anne Arundel Community College**

Officer Reports

- Chair – Chris Painter
  - The only thing I have is that I was looking for feedback on last month's presenter. From what you know, there's been a lot of discussion about building standards, square footage, and what actions we should take moving forward. He also shared some information with me that you can refer to. The good news is, depending on your power provider (ours is Potomac Edison), there are resources available through those companies. Once you identify your buildings (I don't think they've been identified yet), they can assist with your audit at little or no cost.

- Vice Chair - Greg Grey
  - I know we're going to have a Zoom meeting, and hopefully, you'll get more information about the contractors involved. I believe they're currently working on a project at Solisa University. I think the University of Maryland used to handle a lot of new projects as well,

but it seems like things have become more streamlined. The construction companies now often handle both the building and the design, so you're not dealing with two separate contracts.
- If you have any questions about that or about the contracts, we can definitely address them. If it's something we decide to pursue later this year—maybe a smaller project—it could be a great opportunity to test things out and see where it leads. It might look different, but we'll have to see how it all unfolds.

❖ Secretary – Dong-Min Kim
- FPC website is in process and update all document up to date.

❖ Communications Coordinator – Travis Hopkins
- There have been a few emails regarding adding and removing people from the list. We've sorted things out for PG, as they had a couple of email addresses mistyped, so that's all fixed now. For forum submissions, participants should email Travis Hopkins directly.
- We don't have the form for updating completed projects on the site yet, but that's a good idea. For any new buildings, you should submit a form. Just let me know, and I'll handle it. To clarify, this form and catalog are specifically for projects funded by the state or at least co-funded by the state. The target audience is the legislators and state agencies who provide the funding, so they can track where the money is going. If it's privately funded through your college or donations, it doesn't go in the catalog. The descriptions we're looking for are straightforward. I can likely use your architect's description. We just need some basic high-level details. The facilities planners' website has a template with sections for things like three photos and six other categories, along with a brief write-up. Some people didn't provide the write-up, so I had to edit it down. One submission was a page and a half long—great content, but it needed to be condensed.

❖ Best Practice– Jim Taylor
- Nothing to report

❖ Best Practice - John Anzinger
- We're in good shape for presentation topics.
  - Today, Gilbane will be discussing CMAR. We won't have a meeting in March, but our April meeting in Hagerstown will focus on Net Zero School Construction. We're working with someone from Baltimore City Public Schools to coordinate that.
  - For our May meeting, we'll cover the Climate Solutions Now Act. Travis suggested Air Saint Rose, who will discuss the new lead ratings, the differences and challenges, and how it all ties into the bigger picture.
  - For June, we're planning a procurement roundtable discussion, potentially with representatives from various colleges to talk about internal processes.
  - We still have some openings for the retreat as we get closer to that date.
- John will be resigning from Frederick Community College, with his last working day scheduled for March 7, 2025, after 10 years of service.

Agency Reports

❖ DBM – David Koenigsburg
- The governor's proposed budget was released on January 15th and is now with the General Assembly. The GAA aims to have the budget bill passed in both chambers by the 83rd day of the session, which falls on March 31st. Therefore, we can expect the budget to be adopted in early April. Once enacted, the budget becomes law immediately, but funds won't be available for BPW items until the start of the fiscal year for that specific budget.

- Dan has shared the deadlines for facility program submissions. The DBM deadline is two days earlier, on March 1st, 2025. As Dan mentioned, we have already received one request.

❖ DGS – Craig Curtis
- We are currently reviewing FY26 programs. This is my part of the process. DGS is also in the queue to review Hagerstown 482, the DDS, and DGCCGNP Contract Award 6.
- I'm happy to say that we are up to date on closeouts and have submitted all necessary paperwork. This is really the result of Iman and Dan working closely with all of you—I can't take much credit other than hiring bonds. Credit where credit's due!
- You've all worked very closely with this, and when I first started, I had a lot of questions. Now, to be in a position where I can say, "Hey, start submitting stuff," feels really good.
- So, for the colleges, Howard, please start submitting.
- Shelly, we should mark this day in history—DTS is saying, "I need your stuff, stop sending me stuff!" But seriously, I understand what you all are going through; I'm dealing with the same issues with local school boards. However, to stay on top of everything, we need to avoid falling back into the hole we were in before.
- To prevent that, let's stay on top of things and keep in contact with Iman, so we can get everything submitted and eventually process payments to you in a timely manner—not taking 7-12 years, alright?
- The main point of this is to keep submitting your information and stay in touch. I'm a big believer in communication—Dan and Iman know that. I stress it constantly, especially on the school side. My role and my office can only work effectively if we communicate. If I don't know what's going on, I can't react. If we can keep the lines of communication open about where you're at, what you're struggling with, and what we're struggling with, we'll all be able to move forward more efficiently.

❖ MHEC – Dan Schuster
- The budget process is currently going through the Assembly. Our budget hearings are scheduled for March 3rd in the House and March 4th in the Senate. The Senate anticipates too many issues with the capital side of the budget, so they expect the operating side to receive more attention. Hopefully, we'll fly under the radar and be left alone. The goal is for the budget to be passed as is by April.
- In the meantime, we're continuing to review Part 1 and Part 2 programs for FY26 and FY27 projects, with the hope of getting approval before the end of the fiscal year. I've also submitted a request for a few site visits to CCBC, Montgomery, and CSM this spring, and I'm coordinating with you all on that.
- Additionally, we have some new master plans to review from Hagerstown, Howard, and Allegany, with more expected in the next few months from your offices and from Prince George's County. These are keeping me busy.
- March 1st or 3rd is the due date for Part 1 and Part 2 programs for FY28 cycle projects. Last month, I mentioned there might be up to 14 submissions, but it looks like only 4 projects will be submitted: Anne Arundel, Warwick, Hartford, and Howard. If anyone else plans to submit a project that I'm not aware of, please let me know so we can plan accordingly. And if you anticipate trouble meeting the deadline, be sure to communicate with us and DBM. We've already granted one extension, so let us know how things are going on your end.
- Hopefully, you received the notice sent a couple of weeks ago about the state share for FY27 projects. If not, please reach out. The next major item on the agenda is the annual inventory report, which is due on April 1st as usual. We'll be sending out a template and instructions for that in March.

❖ MACC – Monica Randall (absent)

- Chris Painter said that Our Director of Institutional Compliance and I reviewed some legislative bills and came across one that might be relevant to us. It's part of the 2025 legislative session, and it requires the installation of water bottle filling stations in new construction and renovations where drinking fountains are being added or replaced. This bill has been approved and will take effect on October 1st, so we should keep it on our radar.

  - In terms of renovations, I think many of us are already incorporating this. For example, when replacing old drinking fountains, we've been installing water bottle filling stations. We got fortunate because the water fountain we purchased had a retrofit option, allowing us to easily update it. It feels like we've done our part for the planet!
  - If Chris remembers the bill correctly, it applies to new construction and major renovations. So, if you're refurbishing a building and there's an old water fountain in the hallway, the bill will require you to replace it with a new one that includes a water bottle filling station. We installed ours during COVID, and the funding covered the costs, but I know many were put in at that time.
  - To clarify, the bill specifically applies to new construction or major renovations—not to simple repairs or replacements of existing water fountains. If a fountain simply breaks down, you won't be required by legislation to replace it with a water bottle filling station.
  - Dan said the law essentially states that if you're replacing a drinking fountain in new construction or during a renovation, it must be replaced with a water bottle filling station. It doesn't require you to replace existing drinking fountains, but if you are replacing one, this is the type of fountain you need to install. That's the main point.

- Vaping House Bill 238
  - Some campuses place the notices just outside, while others have them both inside and outside.

- **FPC FY25 Goals**
  - Goal 1 Identifying and share best practices for facility planners by exchanging individual college practices as well as presentation from industry and state agencies.
  - Goal 2 Continue publishing CIP State Projects on both the MACC and FPC websites. We should expand this one but we will discuss this at the retreat
  - Goal 3 Monitor MACC and to keep the FPC better informed, as the two-week notice for vaping regulations was insufficient.
  - Goal 4 Restructure meetings and broaden our member base to enhance knowledge sharing by annually reviewing the Facilities Manuals, examining the website during meetings, integrating these elements into the meeting structure, and sharing standards and lessons learned from other projects. We will tie these ideas into the agenda and use the meeting location as a physical link by inviting others from the hosting campus for special topics.

- CMAR Discussion, Dan Kodan of Gilbane Construction and Howard Community College Staff
  - We have Dan Kodad here to talk about construction management at risk. He's with Gilbane Construction.
    Dan, please go ahead.
  - Welcome, everyone. I'm a project executive with Gilbane, and I've been with the company for 17 years. Over that time, I've worked on a variety of projects, but lately, my focus has shifted more to higher education. I've had the opportunity to work with Johns Hopkins and, as Mike Travis mentioned, I've spent quite a few years working with Howard Community College, which has been an exciting experience for me.

- I’ve been given a brief overview of what we’ll be discussing today, but I’d love for this to be an interactive conversation. Please feel free to ask questions at any time.
- From my perspective, at Gilbane, our preferred method of construction is the Construction Management at Risk (CM at Risk) approach. This method really promotes collaboration, as we’re involved early with both the design and ownership teams. This allows all of us to work together toward a successful construction project.
- It also lets us leverage our technical expertise from the start. Rather than waiting until you’ve completed a full design and then going out for a hard bid, where we’ve missed the chance for early collaboration, CM at Risk lets us contribute earlier in the process. This ensures we can address issues before they arise, helping to keep the project on track and minimize delays.
- Everyone knows the construction industry can be challenging, and issues will inevitably come up. But by involving the CM and design team from the beginning, we can anticipate these challenges and forecast potential problems, which helps the project move more smoothly in terms of both cost and schedule.
- In our Maryland region, over 75% of our work is CM at Risk. It’s our preferred method because we find that teams have better morale when they’re involved early and all working toward a common goal.
- This approach also increases transparency regarding project costs and timelines. Instead of receiving a final design and then trying to figure out how to meet the budget, we’re involved from the beginning, which allows us to manage costs more effectively and avoid surprises down the road.
- If you have any questions, please don’t hesitate to stop me. To give you a concrete example, we recently completed a performance gym project. During the estimating phase, we brought in our steel subcontractors early. They told us there was a nationwide shortage of bar joists due to demand from Amazon facilities, and it would take 18 months to get the necessary materials. Since this was a phased project, we could have faced significant delays. However, by identifying this issue early, we worked with the structural designer to design fabricated beam trusses, which allowed us to stay on schedule.
- Had we been brought in later, once the design was complete, we would have had to scramble to find a solution and the project could have been severely delayed. Because we were involved early, we were able to make adjustments to the design before the bid process, ensuring the project stayed on track without any impact on the timeline.
- The architect typically gets a few months ahead of us, but we’ve found that the earlier we’re involved, the better—especially when it comes to the critical site work. This allows us to provide input early on. We do this through a pre-construction services contract, which enables us to gather feedback and address construction-related aspects right from the start. The main difference between CM and CM at Risk is the level of responsibility and risk management. With CM at Risk, we're brought on early in the process and assume responsibility for managing the project, including taking on the risk associated with contractors. This approach helps mitigate the owner's risk by consolidating the responsibility under the CM firm, rather than having the owner manage multiple contracts.
- In contrast, CM Agency is more like having a project management consultant. In this model, the owner manages all the contracts themselves and assumes the risk, with the CM agency just providing expertise and overseeing the process. While this can be helpful for smaller teams or one-off projects, it doesn’t alleviate the owner's risk in the same way as CM at Risk.
- From a financial standpoint, one of the biggest advantages of CM at Risk is cost certainty. By involving the CM early in the process, we can provide more accurate estimates and validate costs by engaging directly with subcontractors. This approach helps identify cost-saving opportunities early, so the project stays within budget. For example, during the SD and DD phases, we gathered estimates from 40 subcontractors,

providing real market feedback and allowing us to validate pricing. If we find ourselves over budget, we can collaborate with the design team to adjust, avoiding situations where the final bid is millions over the budget.

- The earlier we're involved, the more certainty we can provide regarding costs, which ultimately leads to a smoother and more predictable project. While there may be higher upfront costs, CM at Risk helps prevent the potential for significant overruns and redesigns that can occur with traditional design-bid-build methods.
- What do you think is the difference between contracting with a company, whether it's sole source or through Sourcewell, for a design-build approach versus the construction manager at risk (CMAR)? Where are the benefits?
- In a traditional design-build, the owner hires the CM firm, which then partners with design teams to handle the entire process. The CM firm holds the contracts with the designers and manages the design phase. For the owner, the major benefit is that there is only one point of contact—one entity responsible for delivering the project. This simplifies communication and management compared to managing both the design team and the CM team separately, ensuring alignment between them.
- For example, one of our larger design-build projects was at Salisbury University a couple of years ago. It’s one of the few large-scale design-build projects in Maryland, and the key benefit we saw was that there was a single point of contact for managing the entire project. The design-build process can also help accelerate the project, as designers and CM teams can work hand-in-hand, allowing construction to begin while the design phase is still progressing. This can help get portions of the building operational faster.
- That said, design-build is not as common in higher education or public projects, although we are starting to see it more. It ultimately comes down to the ability to streamline the process with one point of contact while still ensuring efficient collaboration between the teams.
- On the other hand, CM at risk involves handling multiple contracts, which requires more sophistication in construction knowledge. The owner is managing the contracts directly, so it's essential to have someone on the owner’s team who understands the complexities of the construction process. For example, a church committee might not be the best fit for CM at risk, but many community colleges do have the expertise to handle both the contracts and the project’s management.
- At the college level, while we’re still driving the project and meeting with the architects, we bring the construction manager on board early, as we did with the KC building. One challenge in that project was building on top of an existing athletic facility. We had to keep the gym functional while constructing the new building in phases. This involved coordinating with the CM and design teams to ensure the gym remained operational during construction. We had discussions on temporary air handlers versus permanent ones, considering costs, phasing, and site layouts, all while keeping the project aligned with the development plan for state submission.
- The benefit of this approach is that the CM firm is involved in the design process early, so they can weigh in on the logistics, costs, and practicalities from the beginning. This ensures that everything is feasible before we go to bid, as opposed to a situation where the civil engineer handles the initial design and then a CM firm later tells us it won’t work, which would be inefficient.
- One of the things Travis mentioned earlier was that early on we considered whether we could set up a temporary structure, almost like a tennis bubble, with a gym inside to allow us to demolish the existing building and complete the entire project at once. After running the numbers, it turned out that this approach wasn't cost-effective. It made more sense to phase the construction, breaking it into two phases instead. We ran estimates on both scenarios, and while the tennis bubble idea didn’t make financial sense for this project, it turned out that it could have been useful for another project at Hopkins, where they were looking for an indoor fabric structure.

- These are the types of “what if” scenarios we can explore early on when we’re involved in the process. For the MAC building, we had to split the project into four GMPS just to get things moving, but that setup was complicated, and the timing was difficult since it was right at the tail end of the COVID-19 pandemic, when materials costs were rising. Our structural steel subs were already telling us there would be price increases—steel costs had ramped up by 35%.
- To address this, we worked with the design team and got a steel package out early, so we could lock in the steel prices. We secured early funding to purchase the steel and get it on order before the design of the building was even finalized. That decision likely saved us hundreds of thousands of dollars as the price of steel continued to rise. If we’d gone with a single GMP and couldn’t phase out the project, we wouldn’t have been able to buy materials early, which could have cost us.
- Similarly, on the workforce building, we identified long-lead items like electrical gear. We went ahead with a smaller GMP for electrical gear and site work. This allowed us to get the switchgear ordered even before the full building permit was in place. As a result, when we got the grading permit, we were able to start site work right away and had the switchgear ready to go, saving us time and money.
- These early-phase GMPS are invaluable because they help keep the project on track by identifying potential delays due to long lead times. When we’re working on public projects, we also have to account for the approval cycles, which can take a month or more. If we don’t plan ahead, these approval delays can push back the schedule even further. So we need to proactively manage procurement to ensure we stay on schedule.
- From my experience on the public side—especially in the K-12 world—it was challenging to explain these processes and contracts to people who weren’t familiar with the language or how the system works. For example, when we were doing our first CM at risk project with Carroll County, there were some hesitations about going in front of the commissioners’ multiple times for one construction job. But that’s how the process works. On the owner’s side, especially if they aren’t as familiar with these methods, it can be difficult to understand the benefits of phasing the project and getting things rolling early, but in the long run, it really helps with the overall schedule and cost.
- I would say it's all the internal conversations we need to have, but it's definitely helpful because, in our field, we can give that type of input—whether it's letters, essays, or presentations—so that we can guide others through the process. Often, you're having to educate people while still doing what's best for the project. There have been times when we've had to advocate for certain things, especially when finalizing contract terms. I laughed when you mentioned finalizing the wording on contracts because, yes, there are typically three main tracks we follow: securing the signed contract with the construction manager, working through procurement with the board of trustees and the GMP estimates, and the design track.
- Where things end up often depends on who’s on the critical path, and that can change every week. So, the procurement process can be complicated, especially when you have a procurement officer who’s not familiar with construction—it makes the process even more challenging. We’ve had several discussions about finalizing the contract because no one explained the AIA contractor language properly.
- When working with procurement, it’s easier to navigate the design team side since they just need to go through interviews, scoring, and hiring. The real challenge comes when we talk about how to balance the weight of technical skills versus fees. For a large project, like a $50-70 million project, you might see pre-construction fees around $100,000. How do you prepare for that and avoid contractors lowballing their design fees to get the bigger job? Working with procurement to understand the technical reasons behind why a contractor is a good fit, not just the numbers, is key.
- What we appreciate, on the procurement side, is the method of submitting our technical proposal first, getting shortlisted, and then presenting our price afterward. This is a great approach because it ensures we’re being selected based on our technical capabilities,

not just offering the lowest price. If you have 10 CM firms, and three of them are offering low prices, you have to ask: are they going to cost you more later because they lack technical experience? We love that our technical abilities get us shortlisted, and then we present the price because it lets you focus on the value we bring.

- From my perspective, the beauty of CM at risk is that construction is inherently difficult and comes with challenges, especially when the team isn't working together. CM at risk encourages collaboration from the start, which is a huge motivator for us. When we work with someone like Travis, we're all in it together to make sure the project goes smoothly. I don't want to just bid hard, give you a number, and then nickel-and-dime you with change orders. It's about being part of a team, working toward a common goal of delivering the project on time and under budget.
- At Montgomery College, for example, procurement and legal struggled with the idea that the GMP is a fixed number and would never change. How do we get past that misconception? We've had to sit down and explain how we're bidding in parts—one piece now and another piece later—and how, in the end, those numbers add up to the budget. The flexibility built into the GMP, such as construction and owner contingencies, allows us to account for changes without going back to the board for more money. If the owner wants to make changes, it comes out of the owner's contingency, not the GMP itself, so the overall project cost doesn't change.
- Another challenge we've faced is understanding how contractors perceive CM at risk, especially if they don't have much experience with it. Sometimes, a contractor will propose a project as CM at risk, but it's clear they don't understand the specifics of how it works. We've had projects where the contractor wasn't familiar with the nuances of CM at risk, and that made things difficult. It's a catch-22: if they don't get the CM at risk job, they can't gain the experience, but sometimes that lack of experience shows in the project.
- When procuring architects, it's important to make sure they understand the CM at risk process as well. Letting them know from the start ensures they can structure their team properly. The architect's team needs to know that their estimator's number won't be the final one, as they'll need to reconcile and adjust numbers throughout the design phase.
- A key challenge with CM at risk projects is that the design documentation needs to be much more detailed compared to traditional design-bid-build projects. As we're reviewing proposals from architects, we expect more detailed drawings and specifications, not just minimal schematic-level information. This is crucial because it impacts the decisions we make on scope and budget. When we're interviewing design teams, we emphasize the need for a higher level of documentation to ensure the project can move forward smoothly.
- On the flip side, the strong relationship between the CM and the design team is invaluable. When we come on board early, we start building those relationships with the architects and designers, which makes the process smoother. If issues come up in the field, we can call the architect, propose a practical, budget-friendly solution, and work it out together. Having that relationship means that we're all working toward the same goal, and the project moves forward more efficiently. It's far better than starting from scratch with an architect you've never worked with before, which can lead to a lot of friction and delays.
- In conclusion, having a team mentality from the very beginning of a project, especially on a CM at risk project, makes a world of difference in ensuring that things run smoothly and on time. Relationships with all parties involved, including architects, procurement teams, and subcontractors, are critical to navigating the inevitable challenges that arise in construction.
- Who typically handles your meeting minutes—your architect, construction manager (CM), or the owner?
- For most of our projects, as the CM firm, we take the lead on OAC (Owner-Architect-Contractor) meetings and handle the meeting minutes. Of course, if there are differing

opinions on the content, we can adjust them, but generally, we manage this responsibility.

- I personally don’t handle the minutes because I'm busy juggling other tasks, so for design-heavy meetings, we invite construction team members to join, including the architect.
- This applies once construction begins. For reconciliation meetings, the CM usually manages that process and finalizes things. During design, the architect generally takes the lead, but once construction starts, the CM takes over the responsibility.
- Does that make sense? Sometimes, it adds up to a significant amount of work, but it’s manageable.
- Another thing that's useful when working with CM at risk is having a lead requirement. The architect knows a lot, but the construction methods and challenges could come up. Having the CM on board during the design phase to sort that out can be crucial. For example, on a project, we knew we had to build a new structure 15 feet from an existing active building, which required excavation and shoring. We worked closely with the design team to incorporate this into the civil drawings and our estimate.
- This collaboration helped ensure we included $200k for shoring in the estimate, which could have been an unexpected cost if the design team didn’t consider the constructability of the site. Also, we looked at how to integrate the utilities more efficiently and minimized the costs by using two-sided laybacks, saving money on the excavation process.
- Having these discussions early on with the design team helps us avoid surprises later, such as unexpected costs or changes when hard bids come in. It also ensures that the civil drawings and construction plans align well, avoiding issues during construction.
- As an example, when reviewing proposals, it’s important to ensure contractors understand the CM at risk model fully. Some contractors may not be familiar with it, which could lead to difficulties later. One project we had faced challenges because the contractor didn’t fully understand the CM at risk model, which made the process harder than it needed to be.
- On the flip side, having good relationships with design teams early in the project makes everything go more smoothly. We work together to find solutions, and instead of defensively sticking to the design, everyone works to solve problems and implement solutions efficiently.
- So, when we have RFIs or issues, we call the architect, propose a solution, and work through it together. This collaborative approach, developed throughout the design process, ensures smooth implementation once construction starts.
- When it comes to procurement, there’s a lot of shared knowledge across projects. For example, we’ve all worked on similar CM at risk projects for different colleges, so we know what to expect. Standardized documents are in place, and it makes it easier for us to structure proposals in a way that aligns with expectations. We're familiar with how contingencies are handled and where to allocate GC costs, which helps streamline the whole process.
- Now, in terms of GMP (Guaranteed Maximum Price), there’s often a need to revise it more than once. With issues like COVID, material uncertainty, and tariffs, it’s common to revisit the GMP during the project. But something worth considering is the "design assist" approach, which can be incredibly useful. For example, with the recent Mac project, we had a design assist package for the precast system, bringing the precast contractor on early to work with the design team. This helped us ensure the structure could accommodate the system and locked in the cost early on, which helped avoid over-engineering the structure and keeping things within budget.
- Sometimes design assist packages make a huge difference. With the $1.5 million precast, we locked in the price early, which helped us design the structure around it without the need for multiple bidders later. It was much more efficient.

- There was also the option to have precast delivered with the windows in place, but we ultimately chose against it. We spoke to other contractors who had issues with glazing in factory-built windows, which sometimes led to damage during transport. By having the design assist package, we were able to avoid potential issues like that. It's always good to look at these options early to ensure everything stays on track.
- One of the challenges we're facing now is that the owner has a lot more things on their plate, so we need to be really organized and mindful of how we schedule our time. Chuck spends a lot of time down the line, and we haven't really discussed whether that's because he's extremely involved, or if it's just how other owners operate. We always appreciate when owners stay engaged in the process, because the worst-case scenario is when an owner shows up a month later and questions why something was done a certain way. Clear communication is key, and having the owner involved helps catch potential issues early.
- For example, during the height of COVID, our design team and the owner weren't on-site for three months. When they returned, they didn't like how the layout had turned out, and we had to rip out and redo work. While that was an extreme case, it shows why it's so beneficial to have an involved owner. Their input can help prevent costly mistakes or delays, especially if something doesn't meet their expectations. If we catch these things early, we can make adjustments without the added cost of rework.
- Having the owner involved helps us avoid scenarios like a rough-out room looking good on paper, but when built, it doesn't function well. Instead of waiting until the end, we can catch it early and change it before construction progresses further, preventing costly changes later on.
- On a lighter note, it's important to make sure the coffee's good for these meetings. I once tried to include Nacho Cheese Doritos in the specs just for fun, but my procurement office shot that down.
- Switching gears, regarding the contract evolution: as we've worked on multiple projects, the contracts have definitely tightened up. There's also been input from different board officers, which changes the language a bit. In terms of costs, however, it's remained fairly consistent with 2.5% owner's contingency and 2.5% construction contingency. The procurement office has made adjustments over time, especially with changes to AIA documents, like moving from the 2007 version to 2019.
- One of the questions that came up earlier was about owner and architect participation during the bidding process. In hard bid jobs, the CM or GC usually submits a price with all costs baked in. But, when we go through the GMP process, we find it really beneficial to involve the owner and design team in scoping discussions. It allows us to ask questions and ensure the price reflects the design intent, as well as the owner's preferences. For example, Chuck, with his electrical background, can weigh in on details like MC cable versus hard pipe, which is crucial for the long-term maintenance of the building. With everyone involved in the scope review, we ensure that all contractors are on the same page and avoid surprises later in the project.
- In terms of bidding, we don't have to take the lowest bid by law, but we do present an open-book GMP. We list all the bids we receive, and we'll often scope the low three bids. If we recommend someone other than the lowest bidder, we'll justify that decision to the owner. It's important to be transparent and make sure the final choice aligns with the owner's needs.
- Having the owner present during meetings can also show subcontractors that the project is valued, which can set the tone for better collaboration. But of course, there are legal constraints around favoritism, and we can't outright recommend contractors based on personal preferences. In the past, we've had cases where we had a bad experience with a contractor, but they managed to turn it around on future projects, which shows that performance can change over time. So, while the risk is always present, the relationship with subcontractors can evolve.

- As we wrap up, we have a few more minutes before lunch. Does anyone have any final thoughts or questions before we break? We can also continue with old and new business after lunch if anyone has any pressing topics.

❖ Lunch Break

❖ **Old Business**

1. Bond Bill Review Committee (BBRC) Role:
   - The BBRC's role has evolved from prioritizing projects to ensuring all required documents are submitted correctly.
   - Travis Hopkins emphasized the importance of having all paperwork in order before submission to avoid delays and issues.
2. Project Submission Process:
   - Travis explained the process of plugging in numbers and reviewing project requests for the upcoming year and subsequent four years.
   - Last year, initial project requests totaled $130 million, which had to be adjusted to align with available funds.
3. Facilities Planners Council:
   - The council was created to review and prioritize projects based on a cost model developed over a decade ago.
   - The BBRC now acts as a self-check to ensure all paperwork is complete before submission to higher agencies.
4. Learning and Shadowing:
   - New members are encouraged to shadow experienced representatives to learn the process.
   - Andrew D. Clark expressed interest in joining the BBRC but requested more information before committing.
5. Data Review and Meetings:
   - The BBRC reviews submitted projects, checks for discrepancies, and ensures data alignment.
   - Meetings are typically virtual and involve discussing project details and any issues that arise.
6. Retreat and Logistics:
   - Upcoming retreat details were discussed, including hotel arrangements at the Hampton Inn.
   - The retreat provides an opportunity for colleges to discuss and review project submissions.

Action Items:

- Travis Hopkins to send an email with retreat details and logistics.
- Andrew D. Clark to receive more information about the BBRC role and decide on his participation.

❖ **New Business**

No New Business

❖ **Upcoming Meetings**

- All meetings will have Zoom/Teams access. Contact meeting host for the remote invite.
  - April 11, 2025 – Hagerstown Community College
  - May 9, 2025 – Harford Community College
  - June 5-6, 2025 – Wor-Wic Community College