

# CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY REVIEW BOARD

Via Zoom

## Minutes

April 14, 2022

### MEMBERS PRESENT

Janice Zahn (*Chair*)  
Bill Dobyms (*Vice Chair*)  
Devanta Black (*Alternate*)  
Corey Fedie  
Bobbie Forch, Jr.  
Tim Graybeal (*Alternate*)  
Senator Bob Hasegawa  
Bruce Hayashi  
Janet Jansen  
Santosh Kuruvilla  
Karen Mooseker  
Mark Nakagawara  
Irene Reyes  
Mark Riker  
Linneth Riley Hall  
John Salinas II  
Mike Shinn  
Kara Skinner  
Lisa van der Lugt  
Olivia Yang

### REPRESENTING

Ports  
General Contractors  
General Contractors  
Public Hospital Districts  
Disadvantaged Businesses  
Private Industry  
Senate (D)  
Architects  
State Government  
Engineers  
School Districts  
Cities  
Private Industry  
Const. Trades Labor  
Transportation  
Specialty Contractors  
Specialty Contractors  
Insurance/Surety Industry  
OMWBE  
Higher Education

### MEMBERS ABSENT

Matthew Hepner  
Erik Martin  
Rep. Mike Steele  
Rep. Steve Tharinger  
Senator Judy Warnick

### REPRESENTING

Const. Trades Labor  
Counties  
House (R)  
House (D)  
Senate (R)

***Staff & Guests are listed on the last page***

### CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL FOR QUORUM

*Chair Janice Zahn called the Capital Projects Advisory Review Board (CPARB) virtual meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. A roll call of members established a meeting quorum.*

### WELCOME NEW BOARD MEMBERS & INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Zahn welcomed Tim Graybeal serving as an alternate for Robynne Thaxton and newly appointed Board member Bruce Hayashi representing Architects.

Mr. Hayashi reported his company has been in operation for over 20 years in the Seattle area. Clients include public owners representing cities, state, and counties, as well as healthcare and other types of businesses. The company has delivered all forms and sizes of alternative public works projects. He looks forward to working with members and contributing to the conversations.

Chair Zahn thanked and conveyed appreciation to Walter Schacht for his many years of service to the Board both as a member and as the Chair. She looks forward to his continued participation on many Board committees.

Mr. Schacht said his service on the Board would have spanned 11 years in July 2022. He and Mr. Hayashi attended the same college, and he is pleased Mr. Hayashi was appointed representing Architects.

### APPROVE AGENDA – *Action*

The report from the Board Development Committee was moved prior to the report from the Project Review Committee. Mr. Schacht noted that action would be requested from the Board following the presentation by the Board Development Committee.

Chair Zahn reviewed changes to the meeting agenda incorporating the following information moving forward:

- CPARB’s Mission appears at the top of each agenda
- A list of parking lot items is located at the bottom of each agenda
- Inclusion of DES support information for Nancy Deakins and Talia Baker
- Page 2 - important deadlines, reminders, and commitments/reports due to the Legislature

- Inclusion of CPARB Member Shared Commitments
- Items for the next CPARB meeting

*Linneth Riley Hall moved, seconded by Irene Reyes, to approve the agenda as modified. A voice vote unanimously approved the motion.*

**APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 10, 2022 MEETING MINUTES – Action**

*Janet Jansen moved, seconded by Irene Reyes, to approve the minutes of February 10, 2022, as published. A voice vote approved the motion. Bruce Hayashi abstained.*

**INVITATION FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS – Information**

Vice Chair Bill Dobyms invited public comments.

There were no public comments.

**CHAIR REPORT –Information**

Chair Zahn apologized that she was unable to provide a pre-read for the Chair Report. Activities since the last meeting include working with Talia Baker on updating the meeting agenda format. The CPARB website page was updated to add Shared Commitments and Purpose. She attended a number of committee meetings to include the Board Development Committee, Project Review Committee, and the Business Equity/Diverse Business Inclusion Committee. She also attended a meeting with Dr. Karen Johnson and Carolyn Cole with the Office of Equity. A new group, Northwest Minority Builders Alliance, invited her to attend a March 17, 2022 meeting.

Over the course of several years, the Board developed best practices guidelines for Design-Build (DB). Training on DB has been hosted by the AGC Education Foundation. In conjunction with several other members of the Board, Chair Zahn served as an instructor for a training workshop in February 2022.

Chair Zahn reported she followed up with the Governor's Office on the status of member appointments, specifically the status of the General Contractor appointment process. She has been in contact with representatives from Municipal Research and Services Center (MRSC) on upcoming work to develop training curriculum. The training will be in collaboration with the Office of Minority and Women Business Enterprises (OMWBE).

Chair Zahn said she has also been in contact with several members of the Board as part of her commitment to reach out to all members this year. She encouraged members to contact her with any questions or concerns.

Chair Zahn reported on an invitation to participate in a May 3, 2022 meeting with the Local House Government Committee to provide an update on local procurement. Several members of the Board are also participating to share information on work by the Business Equity/Diverse Business Inclusion Committee and the newly established committee working on small works issues.

Vice Chair Dobyms inquired about the potential of creating a quorum of the Board during the legislative meeting. Chair Zahn said the meeting would be held virtually. Members invited to participate include Mark Riker, Olivia Yang, and Mike Transue, a participant on many Board committees. She suggested members consider other local procurement issues that could be included within the reports presented during the meeting. A request to the legislative committee could be forwarded to add those individuals as a panelist to speak to those issues. As the meeting will be held via Zoom, there should be no issues concerning a quorum of the Board.

Linneth Riley Hall asked whether the panel includes any representation from the Project Review Committee (PRC). Chair Zahn said she does not believe any PRC members would be on the panel. The Local House Government Committee is interested in small works legislation, as well as bid limits and the Board's work by the Business Equity/Diverse Business Inclusion Committee to increase women and minority participation. The committee is not seeking information about specific projects, rather potential legislation that would increase participation.

**BOARD ENGAGEMENT– *Informational***

**Board Member Opening Thoughts/Shared Commitments**

Chair Zahn commented that as part of the Board’s Shared Commitments, the agenda includes an opportunity for opening thoughts and closing thoughts by each member. During their meeting, Dr. Johnson conveyed that the goal of Shared Commitments is to attain a relational culture where members believe they have been seen, heard, and included within discussions. Much of the Board’s work is transactional although the Board represents a broad industry that meets to accomplish specific tasks with each member contributing different interests while working cohesively to complete the work. She invited members to share opening thoughts:

- Janice Zahn: Focus will be on continuing to be present and ensuring that sufficient time is provided for all voices to be heard.
- Bill Dobyms: Hopeful all members are respectful of each other’s opinions and are efficient with time.
- Corey Fedie: Looking forward to some progress and continuing to learn about the Board’s work.
- Bobby Forch: Will continue to listen, as each member represents different positions and may desire certain outcomes for their stakeholders. Wants to be sensitive of large contractors because often the small business community perceives others as adversaries. His goal is to listen and understand the needs of big business.
- Senator Hasegawa: Appreciative of the direction by the Board and for accommodations extended to him as a layperson lacking firsthand experience with the contracting process, which has required a steep learning curve. He is appreciative of the Board’s patience.
- Janet Jansen: Excited to have a connection with everyone. Sad to see Walter Schacht leave the Board but also pleased new members have joined the Board.
- Santosh Kuruvilla: Mr. Kuruvilla thanked Mr. Schacht for his service. He watched from a distance and appreciated and admired all of his accomplishments during his tenure on the Board. He was able to have a discussion with both Ms. Yang and Mr. Hayashi and he welcomes Mr. Hayashi to the Board and looks forward to working with him.
- Karen Mooseker: Grateful to be able to focus on work and become more engaged in capital projects for the school district.
- Mark Nakagawara: Looking forward to focusing on the opportunities as a new Board member and absorb as much information as possible.
- Irene Reyes: Excited as usual to learn and listen from different backgrounds. She looks forward to making a difference during the meeting, for the community, and for herself.
- Mark Riker: Mr. Riker thanked Mr. Schacht for his professionalism and accessibility during many conversations throughout the years. Those conversations helped him become a better Board member when he was able to attend, which is a frustration many members experience. He looks forward to the meeting.

*Bill Dobyms disconnected from the meeting.*

- Linneth Riley Hall: Similar to previous comments, members represent different backgrounds and while listening to other opinions and thoughts it is important to be respectful of each person. She plans to be respectful of everyone’s background and is ready to listen as well as being ready to be an active participant. She thanked Mr. Schacht for his service.
- John Salinas II: He is hopeful the Board can be efficient and make the most of its time.
- Bruce Hayashi: As a new member, he is excited to learn about other members and different opinions on what the Board can do for the state.
- Mike Shinn: He agreed with previous comments and believes everyone’s comments are important.
- Kara Skinner: Because of recent traveling, she is feeling somewhat stressed and rushed. The opportunity to share has allowed her to slow down. She is honored to get to know everyone. She supports the sharing opportunity.
- Tim Graybeal: Thanked the Board for the opportunity to participate on behalf of Robynne Thaxton. He has watched from the sidelines and he knows that much of the good work happens by the Board. He appreciates the opportunity to be part of the process today.

- Devanta Black: Mr. Black said he is serving as an alternate for Andy Thompson. He echoed similar comments of other members and is excited for the opportunity to attend, observe, and actively listen. The Board is vital for the community with various perspectives represented. The Board has an opportunity to make a real impact.
- Lisa van der Lugt: Very happy to be in attendance. She agrees with many of the comments. As noted by Senator Hasegawa, she continues to learn so much about the work as she views issues from a different perspective because of her work. She is learning much about policies and how the Board can ensure people are able to access what they need. She appreciates the direction the Chair is guiding the Board because it is making a difference. She acknowledged differences and the importance of getting to know one another. Taking the time is an investment worth taking. She appreciates the Chair's leadership and efforts, especially the Chair Report, which is helpful.
- Olivia Yang: Ms. Yang shared that she has reflected on many conversations by the Board since the last meeting and although she is staggered by the size of the hill to climb, on the other hand she is hopeful that all members can achieve alignment to make meaningful change one step at a time. She feels both pessimistic and optimistic. She echoed the many thanks and acknowledgments to Walter Schacht for his many contributions.

Chair Zahn closed by sharing that during a recent Design-Build Institute breakfast, one speaker cited the importance of "going slow to go fast." She believes the Board is on the right track by laying the groundwork, as it might appear to be slowing the process but over the long-term, it will enable the Board to move quicker to tackle tough topics and provide good products to the Legislature.

#### **Latest Legislation/Report from Legislators – Information**

Chair Zahn reported on ongoing tracking of legislative bills by staff. Additionally, it is important to create an opportunity for member legislators to provide information on the last legislative session. The bill activity report relies on members to provide information on bills of interest to the Board. All those bills are tracked and updated for the Board during the legislative session. She invited Senator Hasegawa to provide an update on the recent legislative session.

Senator Hasegawa commented that much happened during the short legislative session. The session resembled a madhouse with the number of bills passed during a short period. As one example, the Ways and Means Committee considered 71 bills from the House during one session and any amendments to the bills were required for submission to staff by noon the following day. It was impossible for legislators to give thoughtful consideration to each bill. Because the session was politically driven, many bills appeared to be good legislation simply by its title, but not necessarily as effective as hoped following a review of the language. It is important for the Board to consider that when the Legislature is asked to consider thoughtful and well considered bills, a long legislative session is the preferred choice unless the bill is considered a "finished product" and is able to move forward uniformly during a short session. This session, the Legislature had more funds because of federal COVID funds providing a well-funded capital budget this year.

#### **OFM CONSTRUCTION COST ASSESSMENT – Information Preliminary Report Status**

Chair Zahn invited Jennifer Masterson with the Office of Financial Management (OFM) to provide the update.

Ms. Masterson reported she serves as the Senior Budget Assistant to the Governor - Capital Budget, Office of Financial Management (OFM). Several months ago, the Board received information on the Construction Cost Assessment study. OFM's consultant for the assessment prepared a preliminary report previously distributed to the Board. The next step is preparing final recommendations to forward to the Legislature and the Governor by the end of May. Some comments were received from CPARB members. She introduced Peter Morris with AECOM, the consultant leading the study. The proposed changes are both challenging and important. It was important to work carefully as any changes can have significant impacts to state agency projects and consultant teams. The goal is to consider carefully what changes could occur within the study with a long-term view of understanding budget instructions and how many agencies are beginning work on biennial budgets. Some changes under exploration may need to be phased over time.

Mr. Morris explained that the focus of the study was exploring best practices existing outside of current practices and ways to roll some of those processes into existing processes. The recommendations do not fall in any priority order other than they are reflective of the greatest amount of input:

### **AE Fees/Agency PM Fees**

#### *What we found/heard*

- Fee percentages for basic services are too low
- Hourly rates are too low
- Fee structures do not reflect alternative delivery
- Projects are using “other services” to increase fees – often substantially
- Inconsistency in what counts as “other services”
- Not all C-100s report the “total project cost”, some agencies report budget funding per biennium, percentages are not clear

#### *Impact*

- The result is a lack of consistency or transparency across projects, and some high overall fee percentages

#### *Proposals*

- Revise the fee tables and hourly rates
- Add Alternative Delivery - Design Build – (performance, bridging, progressive)
- GC/CM
- Monitor total design/management fees on total project aside from allocation between AE/Contractor/Agency
- Improve definition of “Basic” and “Other” services

### **Escalation**

#### *What we found/heard*

- Current escalation is extremely high and erratic
- C-100 rates are missing badly – budgets are set too early to be meaningful in volatile times
- Global Insight is a national “input cost” index – does not cover market issues
- “Code & Practice” escalation is not always addressed by sponsors
- Many projects are managing – either by reducing scope or finding extra money
- Many projects are significantly impacted
- Some projects appear to be managing well

#### *Proposals*

- Keep the current escalation metric as a baseline for C-100
- Consider market specific modifiers: location, demand, market response, scale
- Consider an alternative index for civil/horizontal projects
- Make sure “Code & Practice” escalation is addressed by project sponsors through a specific line on the C-100
- Encourage project sponsors to pursue project specific escalation/market/code assessment

### **Contingency**

#### *What we found/heard*

- Contingency allowances need to have more flexibility
- Projects seem to be managing by including allowances in the C-100
- Projects seem to be managing by adjusting scope and moving funds within budgets

#### *Proposals*

- Make contingencies explicit and transparent
- Encourage project sponsors to undertake project specific risk assessments to substantiate any change in contingency. Assessments do not need to be full risk workshops

### **Life Cycle Costing**

#### *What we found/heard*

- Multiple LCC requirements are confusing
- LCC is still an afterthought on some projects – and not seen as a core budgeting process

#### *Proposals*

- Streamline the LCC tools
- Link with Value Engineering
- Consider requiring Total Cost of Ownership as a field in C-100

### **Value Engineering (VE)**

#### *What we found/heard*

- VE is still an afterthought on some projects – and not seen as a core budgeting process

#### *Proposals*

- Embed scale appropriate VE into the projects, both at concept (Value Analysis) and during design
- Link with LCC

### **Transparency/Controls**

#### *What we found/heard*

- C-100 is effective for current budget uses
- It has been modified and adapted by some users
- It does not provide for good comparison/data analysis/transparency
- Users feel it is too focused on conventional delivery
- Not matched to the scale or nature of all projects (parks)
- The set “controls” (fee schedule, contingency, scope breakdown) are not effective as controls

#### *Proposals*

- Modify the C-100 structure
- Keep rows consistent – at least at subtotals
- Improve consistency on “typical” modifications
- Include a “total project” cost – even where the funding request is only for one phase
- Improve linking to actual expenditures
- Use project scale thresholds for specific policy requirements

Mr. Shinn cited numerous cost escalations in materials since the advent of COVID, with some prices changing daily. He recommended the study should account for market volatility. Mr. Morris agreed the market is unprecedented in terms of pricing and that many of the recommendations do not address market volatility through the C-100 process. Inflation is not so much reflective of increases in prices but rather a decrease in buying power, which may entail fewer projects.

Senator Hasegawa recognized Bill Dobyms, Walter Schacht and other members who participated in providing thoughtful and comprehensive feedback on behalf of the Board. The Governor issued several executive orders that speak to some of the constraints of I-200 and ways to avoid those constraints, as well as another executive order requiring all state agencies to consider ways to improve equity both within the agency and in projects an agency manages. He asked how the executive orders are implemented within the preliminary report and whether there would be additional costs associated with implementing actions of the executive orders.

*Bruce Hayashi disconnected from the meeting.*

Ms. Masterson explained how the scope of the study was narrowly defined. The study did not consider those issues; however, the question is valid and deserves some follow-up. She offered to engage in further discussions with the Governor’s Office and legislators on those specific areas.

Ms. Reyes thanked Mr. Dobyns and Mr. Schacht for the good work. She noted that Executive Orders [22-01](#) and [22-02](#) pertain to government agencies and public contracting, respectively. She recommended the inclusion of community input within the study as well because subcontractors are often at risk of losing money. Most subcontractors are small and minority businesses.

Mr. Schacht described his professional involvement with DES and OFM on several predesigns for two new legislative office buildings on the State Capitol Campus. State legislators and capital budget analysts who are immersed in funding projects on an annual basis both in the supplemental and the biennial budgets are often not involved within their respective projects. Many times, the Legislature looked beyond the C-100 process to actual issues and questioned the 15% design contingency and other project components in an attempt to understand the scope of a project. The study serves as a way to address some of those questions. Several CPARB members contacted contractors, architects, and engineers through industry associations to meet and draft feedback on the OFM study. The overall result was agreement with the study, as well as some additional suggestions. Recommendations from the group were framed around the collective experience of architects, engineers and contractors and the belief that most projects encounter difficulty because two main categories influencing a scope of a project are often overlooked. Space programming is often compromised when the budget is inadequate. The performance requirements address building systems and sustainable design and the development requirements address site development and codes. Based on industry-wide collective experience, nearly no variability exists in development requirements and those are typically under evaluated during predesign, often requiring an agency to sacrifice space programming. Understanding site development, targets for sustainability, and code requirements are all important when identifying a project's scope of work. The group recommended enhancing that recommendation. The group also shared two different studies reflecting how the average escalation in the construction market each year is 4.0% to 4.5%, a rate that is much higher than reflected in a C-100. Another recommendation is to utilize CPARB's study on life cycle cost analysis and incorporating the flow of life cycle costs into the process. The group commends OFM and AECOM for the work completed as it provides a good foundation. He is hopeful that some of the detail and the nuance the CPARB team recommended would be considered.

Chair Zahn recommended posting the life cycle study on the CPARB website.

Ms. Yang agreed the market is extremely volatile, particularly in Western Washington. Other important issues are the inclusion and support of diverse businesses. If the question before the Board is for feedback on the C-100 and how that framework can work in this unprecedented time, it is important to acknowledge that alternative delivery as well as traditional procurement should be reflected in the C-100.

*Bill Dobyns rejoined the meeting.*

Chair Zahn agreed on the importance of clarity, consistency, and transparency because it helps to level the field and remove barriers to participation. In terms of alternative delivery and the different nuances in language between the delivery methods, it is important to incorporate language to create a level of understanding between the different methods.

Ms. Riley Hall referred to the report prepared on behalf of CPARB and the references to businesses contributing information. She asked that the report identify small businesses that were included in the process.

Chair Zahn explained that because of the short timeframe for feedback, the report represents a collection of comments solicited rather than through a formal committee process while recognizing there are different voices OFM is reaching out through other venues.

Ms. Masterson noted the efforts focused on state agencies for feedback in conjunction with CPARB as a central entity representing different voices and perspectives. OFM met with CPARB several times earlier in the study and the momentum increased after CPARB was asked to provide written feedback. She expressed interest in contacting a small business entity. CPARB was included in the budget proviso because the Board represents a balanced collective perspective.

Chair Zahn recommended that in the interest of time, the Board defer further discussion until the report from the Business Equity/Diverse Business Inclusion Committee and provide either a list of organizations to contact or pool some of the information through the committee.

Mr. Schacht offered to work with Ms. Yang, Mr. Kuruvilla, and the Business Equity/Diverse Business Inclusion Committee to review the draft report and provide information reflecting small business and diverse business inclusion interests.

Mr. Morris pointed out that the report speaks to the relationship between OFM and the sponsoring agencies. The impact on the small business community is important but most of the interaction is occurring at the agency level. Inclusion has been accommodated inherently within the policies of the C-100 process. His intent is not to diminish the input but rather to highlight the focus is between a proposing agency and OFM.

Mr. Schacht and Mr. Morris agreed to meet off-line to discuss the inclusion of the three different forms of Design-Build versus including only Design-Build.

Ms. Reyes remarked that as a small business owner and an advocate for small and diverse business owners, the opinions are often assumptions about small businesses. She questioned why small businesses were not included in the discussions during the decision-making process.

Ms. Riley Hall agreed and suggested the Board would be remiss if small and diverse businesses were not included.

Chair Zahn reiterated her previous suggestion to continue the discussion during the report by the Business Equity/Diverse Business Inclusion Committee. She acknowledged the work of Vice Chair Dobyns and Mr. Schacht for compiling comments on behalf of the Board.

*Chair Zahn recessed the meeting at 9:29 a.m. for a break.*

*Chair Zahn reconvened the meeting at 9:40 a.m. A meeting quorum was confirmed.*

Because of time conflicts of some presenters, the Board agreed to reschedule the order of Committee Reports to accommodate schedules.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **Board Development Committee – *Information/Action***

Chair Zahn invited Co-chair Walter Schacht to provide an update.

Co-chair Schacht reported the Board is scheduled to elect officers at the May 2022 meeting. The committee recommends members interested in serving, either as Chair or Vice Chair should submit a short letter of interest (no more than 2 pages) by May 2, 2022, to inform the Board's dialogue at the May 12, 2022 meeting. The format was used for the election last year. Officer elections are scheduled on a two-year cycle. However, last year, Chair Zahn and Vice Chair Dobyns were elected to serve the remaining terms of former Chair Rebecca Keith and former Vice Chair Andrew Thompson. Co-chair Schacht cited the memorandum outlining criteria identified by the committee for the Board to consider for selection of officers. He asked for approval of the outline as presented.

***John Salinas II moved, seconded by Janet Jansen, to approve the outline for officer elections as proposed.***

Ms. van der Lugt cited language in the criteria that speaks to a commitment to diverse business inclusion and implementing Section 20 of SB 5032. The language does not stipulate as either a qualification or an approach. Co-chair Schacht said the committee's approach was to include language as a core element of the Board's vision and mission on diversity. The language asks the candidate to share their view or ideas relative to that commitment. Section 20 of SB 5032 refers to the task for the Board to respond to elements of the reauthorization bill by providing a report on other measures either through future legislation or other actions to increase diverse business inclusion. Ms. van der Lugt suggested the criterion should be under the umbrella of the *Approach to Leadership* rather than under the umbrella of *Vision/Mission*.



***Lisa van der Lugt offered a friendly amendment to the motion moving “Commitment to diverse business inclusion and implementing Section 20 of SB 5032” from “Vision/Mission” to “Approach to Leadership” and revising the criterion to reflect, “Demonstration of embracing and using DBEI practices.” The makers of the motion accepted the friendly amendment.***

*Mark Riker disconnected from the meeting.*

Ms. Reyes suggested rephrasing the criterion to state, “Provide your vision for the Board with a plan to include DBEI.

Discussion ensued on the intent of the suggestion. Ms. Reyes said the existing language appears to serve as a supplement of the candidate’s commitment; however, information on the candidate’s vision and plan should be more proactive and speak to the candidate’s planned actions. Several members questioned the need for a written plan and preferred language that addresses an approach and demonstrated experience by the candidate rather than requesting a plan as the Board has established its vision and mission.

Mr. Salinas supported the intent of the first amendment because if a candidate submitted a plan and some members did not support elements of the plan or it lacked sufficient elaboration, it might result in a delay of the election process. Ms. Reyes said her reference to a “plan” was not intended to infer a comprehensive business plan but rather it speaks to the candidate’s vision and leadership role and what the candidate plans to focus on and how they plan to attain their goals in support of DBEI practices.

Co-chair Schacht emphasized that the outline is a recommendation by the Board Development Committee and the next step is action by the Board on whether to adopt the recommendation. Committee approval of the Board’s modification to the outline is not required. He referred members to the full report from the committee posted on the website.

Bobby Forch commented that when most people are asked for a commitment, most will affirm their commitment. There is a place within the outline that the Board should delve deeper as it is central to the Board’s work. It could be as simple as asking for an explanation of the candidate’s experience in supporting DBEI so that the candidate can demonstrate to the Board that they have some knowledge and experience. The Board should solicit more information from candidates on how they plan to fully engage in the Board’s work as it relates to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Chair Zahn offered a suggestion to substitute “approach” for “plan.” Ms. Reyes said the intent of her recommendation was a revision of the criterion rather than specific language that speaks to a plan. She supported substituting “plan” with “approach.”

In response to a request from Ms. van der Lugt concerning a prior question and a sense that the person was closing down, Mr. Salinas explained that his comments spoke to the Board’s conversations and various opinions on issues and his goal to avoid delaying the election of such an important position based on a potential conflict of a candidate’s plan versus the Board’s vision. The Board has agreed to a vision and mission for diversity, equity, and inclusion. He prefers candidates explaining their experience with diversity and inclusion or highlighting within their statement of qualifications information on the applicant’s work within the space of diversity and inclusion without getting caught up in the minute parts of implementing the Board’s vision.

Ms. Riley Hall said the request is for a member to assume a voluntary leadership role as a chair or vice chair. In addition to the Board Development Committee, the Board has other committees, such as the Business Equity/Diverse Business Inclusion Committee. Personally, she would prefer to seek an in-depth plan for the chair of the Business Equity/Diverse Business Inclusion Committee because of the focus of that committee’s efforts to move the Board forward on diversity, equity, and inclusion. All other committees should focus on the committee’s charge. A commitment to inclusion and equity is important not just for chairs and vice chairs of any committee but for all members of CPARB. Her goal is to seek a commitment from the chair and the vice chair for equity and inclusion without driving away candidates from the important voluntary positions.

Vice Chair Dobyns cited language in Section 20 of SB 5032 stating that in June 2022, the Board will submit best practices guidelines for diversity, equity, and inclusion and that a plan would be submitted for the Board to keep current and modified as needed indefinitely. Asking candidates whether they support Section 20 would achieve the goal of the criterion. As Ms. Riley-Hall pointed out, other issues will require review, discussion, and decisions. Asking a candidate to support future actions that have not been identified would be unreasonable. The Board is developing a plan that will eventually receive approval and a commitment by members to maintain and update.

Chair Zahn conveyed appreciation for the discussion as the issue reflects words on paper while the dialogue has helped to determine what kind of qualities the Board is seeking from a chair and vice chair as a Board. She asked for input on framing the friendly amendment to move forward.

Mr. Salinas recommended adding another criterion (bullet) requesting the candidate explain their experience working in diversity, equity, and inclusion within the industry and requesting their concurrence to support Section 20.

*Bobby Forch disconnected from the meeting.*

***Ms. Reyes offered a friendly amendment adding a statement reflecting, “Please provide a demonstration of your vision of business equity, diversity, and inclusion and how it would be implemented as a leader of the Board.”***

Ms. van der Lugt remarked that the amendment appears to request a plan and she is unsure whether it is appropriate given the Board has the option of asking those questions during the interview.

Chair Zahn cited the numerous amendments and recommended the addition offered by Mr. Salinas. She requested the makers of the motion either accept or deny the friendly amendment offered by Ms. Reyes.

Mr. Salinas respectfully declined to accept the friendly amendment offered by Ms. Reyes.

***Mr. Salinas offered a friendly amendment to include his suggested language as a separate bullet. Ms. Jansen agreed to the friendly amendment.***

***Ms. Reyes offered a friendly amendment to substitute BE/DBI for DBEI for consistency in terms. The makers of the motion supported the amendment.***

***A voice vote unanimously approved adoption of the following outline of selection criteria:***

*Qualifications*

*For example:*

- *Level of practice, how have they been involved in alternative public works*
- *Familiarity with legislative process*
- *Meeting management, experience with Robert’s Rules of Order*
- *Stakeholder engagement*

*Approach to Leadership*

*For example:*

- *Strategic thinking, establishing priorities*
- *Ability to facilitate board dialogue, empowering all members and the public to engage, consensus building/conflict resolution, impartiality*
- *Time commitment/support of organization*
- *Willingness to balance stakeholder group interests with board interests*
- *Demonstration of embracing and using BE/DBI practices Vision/Mission For example*

*Vision/Mission*

*For example:*

- *Where do you want the board to go and how do you plan to get there?*
- *Commitment to diverse business inclusion and implementing Section 20 of SB 5032*
- *Elaborate or explain your experience working with BE/DBI in the industry.'*

**Project Review Committee – Information**

Chair Zahn invited Mike Shinn to provide the committee report.

PRC Chair, Mike Shinn, reported the last meeting included members agreeing to an onboarding process for all new members. A subcommittee was established to develop a mentoring plan for presentation to the Committee in May.

The Committee considered three applications. They included Lake Washington School District for GC/CM recertification. Members unanimously approved recertification. The second application was from the City of Shoreline for a Progressive DB project, which received unanimous approval by the panel. The third project was for a Design-Build project from S3R3 Solutions Inc., for a Maintenance Facility Hangar DB project. Since the approval via a 7/8 vote in favor, the company has elected to construct the project as a private project and no longer requires approval of the project by the PRC.

Chair Zahn commented on the committee's discussion surrounding protocols. The business meeting was cut short because of the lack of time. She believes the committee will continue conversations around protocols of panels and how members are introduced as members of the PRC to avoid any perceived conflict of interest or marketing opportunity. PRC Chair Shinn added that panelists also plan not to identify their respective companies. Instead, panelists will identify the industry they represent to avoid any potential conflict of interest or self-promotion of the member's business.

Mr. Kuruvilla suggested clarifying PRC's project checklist specific to language that asks whether the project is funded. Applicants filling out the form could interpret the question as requiring the project to have funding in place before the project can receive approval.

Ms. Riley Hall noted a question in the Zoom chat asking about a project's dollar amount triggering the submittal process to the PRC. Chair Zahn responded that the PRC reviews applications based on statute requirements in the RCW rather than dollar thresholds for GC/CM, DB, and prefabricated metal buildings.

Ms. Riley Hall noted certified agencies are not required to seek approval by the PRC for projects.

Chair Zahn added that the Board submitted legislation renewing the dollar thresholds for GC/CM and DB at \$2 million with the exception of Washington State University, which is engaged in a pilot for contracts below \$2 million. PRC Chair noted the May meeting of the Board includes selection of PRC members for approximately six positions.

**Job Order Contracting (JOC) Evaluation Committee – Information**

Co-chair Linda Shilley reported the committee is scheduled to introduce JOC Best Practices Guidelines during a virtual workshop scheduled on May 19, 2022 hosted by the APWA Contract Administration Education Committee in collaboration with MRSC. A May 25, 2022 virtual workshop is scheduled hosted by the Association of General Contractors (AGC) Education Foundation. The AGC has requested a repeat of the workshop in October or November.

**Subcontractor Bid Listing Policy Evaluation Committee – Information/Action**

Co-chair Bill Dobyms provided the update.

Co-chair Dobyms reported on the outcome of the last meeting. He plans to create a statement for the committee's next meeting for members to seek feedback from their respective stakeholders on the issues and any changes to recommend. The committee is experiencing some difficulties in timing of the meetings with DES staff providing additional support to schedule a meeting to move forward on the next steps to meet the end of summer deadline of recommended modification to the legislation.

Co-chair Dobyns recapped the Board's actions for appointment of new members to the committee at the last meeting. He invited suggestions as to members to add to ensure all industry areas are represented. Mark Riker attended the last committee meeting but was unable to vote as he has not been appointed by the Board.

Ms. Yang added that the committee's focus is on the Design-Bid-Build arena rather than alternative delivery in RCW 39.10. Mr. Dobyns conceded language was added to the legislation stipulating that the bid listing statute did not apply to RCW 39.10.

*Mike Shinn disconnected from the meeting.*

Co-chair Dobyns reviewed the requested action to appoint Curt Gimmestad, Bobby Forch, and Mark Riker to the committee. Ms. Thaxton previously offered to participate on the committee.

Ms. Yang suggested including representation from cities, counties, and ports.

Mark Nakagawara volunteered to serve and noted Russell King with the City of Seattle has been engaging with the committee.

Members discussed other potential members to add. Chair Zahn recommended adding a county representative to be selected by the counties association.

***Bill Dobyns moved, seconded by Linneth Riley Hall, to appoint Curt Gimmestad, Bobby Forch, Mark Riker, and Mark Nakagawara, and create a county position to be appointed by the Washington State Association of Counties (WSAC) to the Subcontractor Bid Listing Policy Evaluation Committee.***

Ms. Reyes inquired about the possibility of including smaller cities. Mr. Dobyns noted that the makeup of the committee is to ensure each group is represented on the Board. All stakeholders are welcome to attend meetings. Following the committee's completion of its report in November, it is likely the committee will be dissolved.

*A voice vote approved the motion unanimously.*

#### **Business Equity/Diverse Business Inclusion Committee – Information**

Co-chair Kuruvilla outlined the focus and contents of the draft Executive Summary of the committee's report to the Legislature on recommended practices and guidelines to sustain and increase opportunities in public works contracting for minority-, women-, and veteran-owned businesses and small businesses (small and diverse businesses). He acknowledged the work of Rachel Murata with OMWBE and Myra Huff with Washington State University for drafting the report based on feedback from the committee.

As background, the report addresses access to opportunities, access to capital, and access to training. During some engaging conversations with the community, the entire aspect of accountability was deemed just as important. The report will focus on those elements and the Executive Summary describes those elements. The committee has also engaged with the Office of Equity and received some excellent feedback. The committee's discussions on those important elements are memorialized in the minutes of each meeting.

Co-chair Kuruvilla invited feedback from members. Over the next several meetings, the committee plans to craft the report during discussions with more details and best practices memorialized within different sections of the report.

Chair Zahn recommended sharing information on the status and schedule of the committee between now and the end of June when the report is due. Co-chair Kuruvilla shared the committee's Gantt chart for the report schedule. Prior to the next Board meeting, the committee is scheduled to meet twice. The committee will likely increase meetings to twice monthly. At the next meeting, the Board is scheduled to receive a draft report for feedback and comment with the committee finalizing the report for presentation to the Board at its June meeting. The committee released an industry survey and received useful feedback. Based on the results of the feedback, the committee created an outline. Dependent

upon on discussions over the next several meetings and how the report continues to develop, the committee might consider releasing another survey. More detailed content will be presented during the May and June Board meetings.

*Linneth Riley Hall disconnected from the meeting.*

Chair Zahn added that the June meeting is a special meeting dedicated to reviewing and approving the report. She asked the Co-chairs to comment on what they believe might emerge from the ongoing work of the committee.

Co-chair Yang advised that within the last several months, the committee has engaged in many meaningful conversations that have been captured in the report as noted in the meeting minutes. Completion of the report by June requires a discussion on opportunities for legislative changes with the first step completing the report by capturing as much of the conversations as possible and possibly identifying areas where legislative changes might be possible followed by submission of the report. Following submittal of the report, more space and time would be available to review potential legislative changes. As an example, with respect to access to capital, RCWs exist that speak to pay but the language lacks flexibility for expeditiously paying the second and third tiered subcontractors. The report is due in June, but the work to continue might require other forms or other committees.

Chair Zahn noted Section 20 of SB 5032 speaks to both best practices guidelines and recommended legislative changes. By the end of June, the report might not include legislative changes that could be pursued as a bill; however, the Legislature would likely expect a listing or some legislative recommendations. The committee should work over the summer to develop some language for legislative changes. She asked Senator Hasegawa as to how he perceives the report proceeding through the legislative process.

Senator Hasegawa commented that during the committee's engagement with the community, it is likely the committee received much anecdotal data. He asked how much numerical/hard data would be available to ensure a strong argument to the Legislature. It would be helpful to have some data supporting any recommended legislative changes.

Co-chair Yang agreed the report, as currently envisioned, could lack data; however, as the committee continues to work with OMWBE and the Office of Equity those efforts could help to identify partners for data collection. If data are required for legislative recommendations, there could be sometime during the summer to develop both legislative recommendations and some substantive data to support any changes. It is also important that for any legislative recommendations the entire Board is involved in addition to the committee to ensure concurrence of any proposed legislative changes.

Senator Hasegawa said his point was not to insinuate the need for substantiated data; however, if there are gaps in data collection, it might be possible to develop recommendations on the types of data that would be required or offer suggestions on ways to collect data. It could result in a budget proviso by the Legislature to enable the solicitation of data rather than a legislative bill. He is aware that the absence of data has been problematic.

Ms. Reyes commented that the work of the committee is an ongoing process of reviewing the metrics of accountability to ensure ongoing achievements. She has learned the importance of keeping an eye on the ball and constantly questioning ways to proactively respond to continuous changes in market conditions in today's environment. It is important to think outside of the box. She announced the formation of a new organization, the Association of Women and Minority Businesses established in 2017 and recently activated in 2021. The Board is representative of members from various industries with extensive experience advocating for women and minority businesses throughout their careers.

Co-chair Kuruvilla added that as part of the committee's work, members have identified gaps in Eastern Washington in terms of organizations and businesses. He and Co-chair Yang tapped into the resources of the Small Business Administration to identify some resources in Eastern Washington.

Ms. Reyes added that another resource is through the Business Diversity Advisory Group (BDAG) through DES comprised of small, minority-, women-, and veteran-owned businesses as well as non-profits.

Chair Zahn noted that the report will include appendices listing the different agencies and associated resources.

Co-chair Yang said the committee is also considering the culture. Although Section 20 references best practices, it is important to acknowledge the value of having tools. The committee stressed the importance of avoiding the “check the box mentality.” Members agreed providing tools that engender a check the box mentality is not the goal but rather it entails a culture shift one day at a time to integrate the values that are manifested through different avenues, locations, and in different projects. The committee is focusing on ways to identify concepts and ideas that apply to all 39 counties in the state to include those counties bordering Idaho and Oregon. The efforts may be different than originally envisioned to address best practices recognizing that a deadline in June is approaching while validating the importance of ongoing work in different forms or through different committees. The work will not end in June.

Ms. Reyes stressed the importance of working with legislators as measurements of accountability may not be successful unless accompanied by legislation. She often has observed during her 29 years in business as well as attending many classes that it is important to avoid words that represent a major culture change or a shift and instead emphasize smaller steps.

#### ***Continuation of the OFM Construction Cost Assessment Discussion***

Chair Zahn cited the inability to complete the prior conversation because of the lack of time. During the recess, Ms. Yang shared some information on the OFM assessment and C-100. She asked Ms. Yang to share some of the context of the discussion as the Board’s prior conversation failed to achieve clarity of the inclusion of small and diverse businesses within the OFM report.

Ms. Yang pointed out that the earlier discussion transitioned to a multifaceted conversation as direction to OFM to consider capital budget instructions and the C-100 process. Given that the assessment is occurring during unprecedented times there may have been some diversion given the volatility of the market with no signs of abatement of the current situation of inflation, higher interest rates, and supplier chain disruptions. There was also some underlying interest in small business inclusion. It is important issues are identified within the right categories to ensure adequate time is afforded to address those issues. As an example, the Board did not discuss the C-100 process although Mr. Morris and his team did a good job of assessing where over time there are weaknesses and opportunities to improve the C-100 process while acknowledging the greater use of alternative procurement and making sure the forms align. There were also questions about DB and whether the different forms of DB should be included. At the very least, the Board might owe Ms. Masterson some response. She offered to meet with Ms. Masterson and Mr. Kuruvilla to discuss the inclusion of the different DB processes. Additionally, C-100 does not address market volatility and as continued volatility in the market occurs, it should inform the C-100 process. The inclusion of small businesses is a separate issue and likely requires additional funds to support those efforts. It would also be important to state the obvious because she and Chair Zahn represent agencies utilizing the C-100 process, which is essentially a capital budget request tool. It is informed by but is separate from market volatility and supply chain disruptions. While diverse business inclusion underpins the Board’s work, there are limits as to how much a C-100 can address those issues.

Ms. Masterson responded by expressing appreciation for the perspective as Ms. Yang has been a good partner throughout the process both as a member of the Board and as an agency representative. Her goal was seeking input from members while understanding the timing could have been improved, which is why she reached out in February to solicit written comments from members as it has been difficult to place the request on the Board’s agenda with sufficient time to discuss the issues. She agreed to meet to continue the discussions and wants to ensure engagement with the Board to learn about alternative perspectives or elements that may have been missing within the report.

Chair Zahn offered to ensure the website includes information for contacting Ms. Masterson to provide additional comments. She acknowledged Ms. Yang, Mr. Kuruvilla, and Ms. Masterson for providing their updates.

*Chair Zahn recessed the meeting at 11:21 a.m. for a break.*

*Chair Zahn reconvened the meeting at 11:32 a.m. A meeting quorum was confirmed.*

Mr. Kuruvilla encouraged members to provide feedback to the Business Equity/Diverse Business Inclusion Committee.

**Small Works Committee: Purpose & Appoint Members – Information/Action**

Chair Zahn invited Co-chairs Bill Frare and Irene Reyes to provide the report.

Co-chair Frare reported on the scope of work and the deliverables. Additionally, the Board will be asked to appoint members to the committee.

*Bill Dobyms rejoined the meeting at 11:37 a.m. following the break.*

Co-chair Frare displayed a draft of the purpose and scope statement for the committee. The initial intent of the Small Works statute was to provide an administratively efficient process for agencies to bid smaller contracts without formal advertising to initiate projects quicker. It also provides an opportunity for simpler contracts with less detailed plans and specifications. The scope of the committee should also consider providing small and diverse businesses with an incubation area within the market or an area where diverse businesses and small businesses could develop bonding history, insurance history, and enter the market to help businesses grow and develop. Another consideration is the definition of small business, such as using the federal definition that could include many more contractors. The small business contracting arena has a different definition than the Small Business Administration definition. Rewriting the legislation could provide clarity within the legislation, such as how to establish a roster, definition of limited public works and small public works, different processes inherent in each, and clarity and flexibility for agencies. Currently, many agencies create a roster or sign onto another agency's roster. Additionally, MRSC sponsors a roster utilized by many small agencies. There may be an opportunity to create a unified roster for the state. The current definition of limited public works in the statute is confusing because it includes many exceptions. Clarity is desired for thresholds, bonding requirements, retainage requirements, and any opportunity to waive those requirements as the contracts are smaller. There may be opportunities to target small and diverse business for the incubation area within the market. The review should also address the definition of small public works, the threshold, and other requirements. There may also be an opportunity to explore a no-bid threshold. Cities often take advantage of a no-bid threshold that could be applicable to the state as well. The committee would also like to consider a two-tier system whereas some contracting agencies that are proficient could be afforded greater latitude with higher thresholds, while smaller districts could have lower thresholds. Additionally other issues include inflation, when limits should be reexamined, or whether limits could be tied to inflation and a process and identity of an escalator. Finally, it is important to consider the mechanism and whether all subs should be linked to the statute to ensure each contracting agency does not need to approach the Legislature for an increase or to avoid creating disparities and limits between different districts.

Mr. Fedie suggested consideration of the healthcare industry when developing language to ensure sensitivity to the higher construction costs incurred by the healthcare industry.

Mr. Kuruvilla noted the work by the Business Equity/Diverse Business Inclusion Committee has addressed small business incubator numerous times. During recent discussions with the SBA, some groups in Eastern Washington are serving as incubators. He encouraged the committee to include within the draft scope more emphasis on Eastern Washington.

Jon Rose, MRSC, offered MRSC as a resource for the committee. MRSC offers a roster program for cities and counties. At this time, the roster has assisted 70% to 80% of cities and counties in the state.

Senator Hasegawa cited the example of healthcare facility carveouts and suggested that any proposed legislation including carveouts should also include either some accommodations or requirements for training of small businesses to afford them with the ability to bid on contracts as opposed to locking out small businesses from those types of contracts.

Mr. Kuruvilla encouraged Co-chair Frare to review a reference he added to the Zoom chat that speaks to the topic of small business incubators.

Co-chair Reyes recommended considering some leniency on some of the requirements to accommodate small businesses. She shared information on an award of a small contract to her business in 1995 with the state of Washington under the Department of General Administration for an annual contract of approximately \$30,000. She acknowledged the

department for awarding her company with the contract as it served as her company's incubator. The department provided information on marketing and a list for marketing her business, as well as advising her on which associations to join. Small business incubators open doors for businesses.

Chair Zahn commented that based on some information she has received; a two-tier system may not be embraced by some in the industry as it may not be a direct correlation to whether an agency has the experience to use the tool effectively.

Co-chair Frare thanked members for the feedback. He reviewed the list of the current members (Co-chairs Frare & Reyes and members Rachel Murata (OMWBE), Robynne Thaxton (Private Industry), Kara Skinner (Insurance/Surety), Olivia Yang (Higher Education), Jolene Skinner (Labor and Industries), and Erik Martin (Counties). Mr. Nakagawara conveyed a desire to serve as an alternate for Cities. Cathy Robinson and Julie Underwood representing the Cities of Lynnwood and Kirkland, respectively, have volunteered to serve. Mark Riker indicated a willingness to represent Labor. Bobby Forch was volunteered to serve as a member at the last Board meeting; however, they have not had a chance to discuss membership. The committee lacks a representative from School Districts.

Karen Mooseker agreed to serve on the committee representing School Districts.

Chair Zahn recommended considering a balanced representation of voting members. She suggested identifying additional members representing the MWBE community.

Co-chair Reyes added that MWBE members should be experienced and understand the challenges surrounding the use of Small Works Rosters.

Mr. Forch supported the suggestion to seek other small business members. He suggested soliciting feedback from Seattle Public Schools and other school districts that are substantial users of Small Works Rosters.

Co-chair Reyes recommended contacting Tacoma Public Schools as the district has implemented best practices in the industry.

Co-chair Frare questioned whether Ms. Robinson and Ms. Underwood should both serve as members or have one serve as an alternate.

Mr. Nakagawara said he was listed as an alternate because the City of Seattle does not have a Small Works Roster and that it would be beneficial for the City representative to be from a city that has a Small Works Roster. He offered to serve as an alternate.

Ms. Robinson reported over a year ago, the City of Kirkland did not use a Small Works Roster but utilized DOT contracts. However, she is not familiar with the City's practice today.

Ms. Riley Hall affirmed transit agencies utilize Small Works Rosters and should be included as a member of the committee.

Chair Zahn suggested the Board could vote to create a position for Cities with Mr. Nakagawara and Ms. Robinson determining a representative with the understanding that anyone can participate but only members are able to vote.

***Mark Nakagawara nominated Cathy Robinson with the City of Lynnwood to serve in the position of City representative.***

No other nominations were offered.

*Linneth Riley Hall rejoined the meeting.*



Chair Zahn recommended the Board consider a motion for approval of the committee's scope of work and the slate of members.

Mr. Rose asked for the addition of Josh Klika from MRSC.

*Janet Jansen moved, seconded by Mark Nakagawara to approve the Scope of Work for the Small Works Committee as presented and the slate of members as presented:*

- *Bill Frare, Co-Chair - DES*
- *Irene Reyes, Co-Chair - Private Industry Diverse Business Member*
- *Rachel Murata, OMWBE*
- *Robynne Thaxton, Private Industry Member*
- *Kara Skinner, Insurance/Surety Member*
- *Olivia Yang, Higher Education*
- *Jolene Skinner, Labor and Industries*
- *Erik Martin, Counties-Lewis County*
- *Mark Nakagawara, Cities - City of Seattle (Alternate)*
- *Cathy Robinson, Cities - City of Lynwood*
- *Julie Underwood, Cities - City of Kirkland (Alternate)*
- *Mark Riker, Labor - WSBCTA*
- *Bobby Forch, Diverse Business*
- *Dawn Egbert, Washington Ports - Port of Vancouver*
- *Angela Peterson, Washington Ports - Port of Seattle (Alternate)*
- *Karen Mooseker Mukilteo School District (Seek feedback from Seattle/Tacoma Public Schools)*
- *Additional MWBE Members*
- *Josh Klika, MRSC*
- *Transit, TBD*

*A voice vote approved the motion unanimously.*

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE**

##### **Budget Report**

Nancy Deakins presented the budget report reflecting actual expenses within the budget of \$375,000.

Ms. van der Lugt asked about the possibility of conducting hybrid meetings in the near term to assist the Board in developing its culture. Chair Zahn said discussions with staff centered on the availability of technology at the DES meeting room to host a hybrid meeting. Additionally, with the geographic representation of the Board expanded, the Board might want to consider in-person meetings with options to participate virtually. She offered to conduct a poll of members on meeting preferences. Ms. van der Lugt recommended considering other locations for in-person meetings when they resume.

Ms. van der Lugt asked about the status of issues included within the parking lot. Chair Zahn replied that she is seeking information from members on the level of effort available to each member to assume new tasks at this time. Addressing Core Values will be an ongoing effort by the Board.

Ms. van der Lugt recommended assigning an assistant to track hands raised to enable more time for Chair Zahn to chair the meeting. Chair Zahn invited volunteers to assist as staff is working behind the scenes to ensure the Board maintains a quorum as members disconnect and return to the meeting. She plans to work with DES staff on ways to improve the process.

**May 12, 2022 Meeting Planning & Draft Agenda – Discussion and Action**

Vice Chair Dobyns reviewed the proposed May meeting agenda and recommended extending the length of the meeting to accommodate agenda items:

- Chair Report
- Leadership Elections
- PRC Appointments
- Small Works Committee Report
- Board Development Committee
- Business Equity/Diverse Business Inclusion Committee - Section 20 Draft Report

The Board agreed to schedule the May meeting from 8:00 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. with time for lunch.

*Ms. van der Lugt disconnected from the meeting at 12:20 p.m.*

**CLOSING THOUGHTS OF BOARD MEMBERS**

Chair Zahn invited closing thoughts from members.

Janice Zahn	Shared online meme of things we all need more of: warm hugs, good sleep, adventures, interesting conversations, laughter, and happy dances.
Bill Dobyns:	Good discussions with different viewpoints. Able to express differing viewpoints respectfully.
Corey Fedie:	The Board is similar to healthcare in its complexity. Suggested diversifying while simplifying.
Bobby Forch:	Great discussions and learned some things today.
Senator Hasegawa:	Echo same thoughts and thanks for a good meeting.
Janet Jansen:	Good discussions and the time went fairly quickly.
Santosh Kuruvilla:	Appreciate everyone’s involvement and hard work. Wishes everyone a happy Easter.
Karen Mooseker:	Appreciated the discussions today and liked the direction of the Board’s work. She thanked Chair Zahn for her approach and leadership.
Mark Nakagawara:	Enjoyed the different viewpoints as it helps to recalibrate to avoid focusing on his world.
Irene Reyes:	Agreed with much of the information shared and learned much. She feels much better and a special shout out to John Salinas for his respectfulness even though he disagreed with her.
Linneth Riley Hall:	Heard some new voices today, which is always encouraging. Look forward to more new voices and diverse opinions.
John Salinas, II	Covered a lot of ground across different topics. It was nice to have a discussion and talk about slightly different viewpoints without closing the space and that the time is allotted to avoid rushing through an issue that may be complex to some members.
Kara Skinner:	Supported the comments about the Chair’s leadership.
Tim Graybeal:	Thanked members for the opportunity to participate and agreed the Chair is doing a great job. The Chair is juggling many issues during the meeting especially when it entails motions and friendly amendments. Suggested an option of drafting and displaying motions to help track changes.
Devanta Black:	Janice and Talia are rock stars, and he is appreciative of everyone enabling him to attend. Good discussions and different perspectives that enabled him to open his thought processes. Happy Easter everyone.
Olivia Yang:	Thanked everyone as the meeting was very good and everyone is learning to disagree without being disagreeable. Great job Janice! Any interest in having a meeting in Eastern Washington, the Board is welcome to meet in Pullman at the University. Thanked everyone for a good meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT**

*With there being no further business, Chair Zahn adjourned the meeting at 12:26 p.m.*

***Staff & Guests***

Talia Baker, Department of Enterprise Services  
Myra Baldinia, Office of Financial Management  
Nancy Deakins, Department of Enterprise Services  
Bill Frare, Department of Enterprise Services  
Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services  
Kelsie Karl-Robinson, Legislature  
Josh Klika, MRSC  
Aleanna Kondelis, Akana  
Jen Masterson, Office of Financial Management  
Art McCluskey, WSDOT  
Peter Morris, OFM

Rachel Murata, OMWBE  
Seth Nickerson, Office of Financial Management  
Cathy Robinson, City of Lynnwood  
Jon Rose, MRSC  
Walter Schacht, Mithun  
Linda Shilley, Pierce Transit  
Jolene Skinner, Labor & Industries  
Tara Smith, Department of Enterprise Services  
Melissa VanGorkam, SCS  
Charles Wilson, Department of Enterprise Services

*Prepared by Valerie L. Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services, psmsoly@earthlink.net*