

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY REVIEW BOARD

1500 Jefferson Street SE; Presentation Room

Olympia, Washington 98504

Minutes - Amended

February 13, 2020

MEMBERS PRESENT

Walter Schacht (*Chair*)
Rebecca Keith (*Vice Chair*)
Brian Belarde (*Telecon*)
Garrett Buckingham
Bill Dobyns
Bill Frare
Matthew Hepner
Charles Horn (*Telecon*)
Santosh Kuruvilla
Karen Mooseker (*Telecon*)
Irene Reyes
Mike Shinn
Robynne Thaxton
Andrew Thompson
Lisa van der Lugt (*Telecon*)
Jane Wall
Janice Zahn

REPRESENTING

Architects
Cities
Construction Trades Labor
Public Hospital Districts
General Contractors
State Government
Construction Trades Labor
Insurance/Surety Industry
Engineers
School Districts
Private Industry
Specialty Contractors
Private Industry
General Contractors
OMWBE
Counties
Ports

MEMBERS ABSENT

Senator Bob Hasegawa
Mike McCormick
Rep. Mike Steele
Rep. Steve Tharinger
Senator Judy Warnick
Vacant

REPRESENTING

Senate (D)
Higher Education
House (R)
House (D)
Senate (R)
Specialty Contractors

Staff & Guests are listed on the last page

WELCOME & BOARD MEMBERS INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Walter Schacht called the regular Capital Projects Advisory Review Board (CPARB) meeting to order at 8:33 a.m.

Members present and participating by telecon provided self-introduction. A meeting quorum was attained.

APPROVE AGENDA - *Action*

Bill Frare moved, seconded by Robynne Thaxton, to approve the agenda as published.

Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVE DECEMBER 11, 2019 MEETING MINUTES – *Action*

The following changes were requested to the minutes of December 11, 2019:

- On page 12, correct two occurrences of “Mr. Andrews” to reflect “Mr. Thompson.”
- On page 2, revise the third sentence in the second paragraph to reflect, “Members agreed to meet monthly during January, February, and March...”
- On page 9, correct two misspellings of “Lisa Young” within the fourth paragraph, to reflect “Elisa Young.”
- On page 10, revise the first sentence in the last paragraph to state, “Ms. Zahn shared that Mr. Maruska is planning to retire in early 2020 and any feedback from him for the committee needs to happen soon.”

Andrew Thompson moved, seconded by Rebecca Keith, to approve the minutes of December 11, 2019 as amended. Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVE JANUARY 8, 2020 SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES – *Action*

The following change was requested to the minutes of January 8, 2020:

- On page 5, correct “theatrical” to reflect “theoretical” within the second sentence of the fourth paragraph.

Robynne Thaxton moved, seconded by Bill Frare, to approve the minutes of January 8, 2020 as amended. Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Schacht advised that Mr. Thompson previously requested an attendance record of CPARB members. Staff prepared a record of attendance. The information reflects that most members attend meetings regularly. He conveyed appreciation to members attending meetings during the last year as attendance has improved from previous years. Members were encouraged to send an alternate when they are unable to attend or participate by telephone.

INVITATION FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS

Vice Chair Keith invited public comments throughout the meeting.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Reauthorization Committee– *Information*

Vice Chair Keith reported the January committee meeting was cancelled. Much of the committee's focus has been on work currently underway by the GC/CM Committee. GC/CM Committee members continue to meet every other week to review RCW 39.10. The Reauthorization Committee is scheduled to meet later in the week followed by meetings every other week. A work plan was drafted to facilitate the preparation of a draft reauthorization bill to the Board for its review at the May meeting.

Vice Chair Keith encouraged anyone with an issue to share the information with the committee prior to the end of February. All GC/CM issues are currently under review by the GC/CM Committee. The Reauthorization Committee continues to focus on fine-tuning and narrowing issues to enable members to begin compiling written changes rather than focusing on conceptual issues. Later in the day, she, staff from the Department of Enterprise Services (DES), and Chair Schacht are scheduled to meet with the Joint Legislative Audit Review Committee staff member overseeing the Board's sunset review process to coordinate with JLARC on pending questions and information required from the Board.

Robynne Thaxton acknowledged participation by committee members and stakeholders. She encouraged everyone to be cognizant of the deadline for submittal of issues.

JOC Evaluation Committee – *Information*

Tae-Hee Han and Quinn Dolan updated members on the status of efforts by the JOC Evaluation Committee. Mr. Han explained that Quinn Dolan has been overseeing meetings since January as he is leaving the committee.

Mr. Dolan reported members are mid-way through completing the report to CPARB on JOC contracts throughout the state. Because of member turnover over the last six months, development of a standard operating procedure (SOP) was identified as a need to assist in reporting and to provide information to public agencies completing the reports. A draft of the SOP is under development. The draft will include some definitions to provide guidance on the appropriate information to report because there has been some confusion in reporting data. Following completion of the documents and after data input commences the committee will focus its work on a review of best practices to develop a draft outline of JOC best practices. The committee's next meeting is in the next several weeks.

Vice Chair Keith reported Tae-Hee Han accepted a private sector position and is no longer with Sound Transit and will no longer serve on the committee. She thanked him for his service and for his efforts on changes to the statute that were successfully passed last year. The report to the Board is required under RCW 39.10.460 as public bodies utilizing JOC are required to submit a report to the Board. Efforts by the committee have addressed challenges with formatting and input of JOC data.

Jane Wall arrived at the meeting at 9 a.m.

JOC Evaluation Committee Appointments – *Action*

Vice Chair Keith reported current membership lacks a representative from the Board. Mr. Dolan advised that Brent LeVander served as the Board's representative and continues to participate even though he is no longer on the Board. Chair Schacht commented that the Board would be receptive if a member volunteered to participate.

Mr. LeVander's recent term of service on the Board provides continuity in terms of the Board's interest. The proposal is to assign two new members for positions vacated by Tae-Hee Han and Maia Huff with Washington State University (WSU). Mr. Dolan affirmed that WSU nominated Michael LaVielle, who works in construction management at WSU. The second nominee is Linda Shilley, representing Pierce Transit. Pierce Transit is a new user of JOC.

Ms. Shilley reported she has worked in public procurement in Washington since 1977. Her first project was at the Satsop Nuclear site. She has worked for contractors and public agencies for many years. The Pierce Transit Board approved using JOC contracting last spring. She has been with Pierce Transit for 18 months. At the time she joined Pierce Transit, the agency did not utilize any alternative public works methods. Since joining the agency, the agency began using GC/CM, unit price contracting, and JOC. The agency recently awarded two GC/CM contracts. She serves as the Procurement Manager for the agency. She cited other agency employees who have prior JOC experience.

Andy Thompson added that he has been working with Ms. Shilley and her staff for the last eight months. Staff understands the nuances of alternative public contracting very well.

Rebecca Keith nominated Linda Shilley and Michael LaVielle to serve as members on the JOC Evaluation Committee. Bill Frare seconded the nominations.

By unanimous affirmation, Linda Shilley and Michael LaVielle were appointed to the JOC Evaluation Committee.

The Board recognized Mr. Han for his service.

GC/CM Committee – Information

Committee Co-Chair Nick Datz provided an update on the status of GC/CM Committee activities. Since the last meeting in January, the committee has met several times to review proposed legislative changes. He referred to a copy of a spreadsheet depicting a summary of proposed legislative changes. The committee narrowed proposed changes to two pages with the committee concentrating on those issues. Some items have been designated as "TA" reflecting tentative agreement by the committee. Not all changes have been finalized and efforts continue to reach tentative agreement on all issues with a final review to ensure all proposals are in alignment. Several changes on the first page of the document will continue to be reviewed by the committee. Most of those issues have been agreed to tentatively. Members are beginning the review of evaluation factors for GC/CM. The committee believes it is on track to complete recommended changes by the end of March. A joint meeting with the Reauthorization Committee is scheduled in March to review the proposed changes.

Mr. Datz requested consideration of a committee nomination to replace Josh Kavullj, a higher education representative from Western Washington University with Olivia Yang, representing higher education. Mr. Kavullj left Western Washington University and accepted a position with the City of Spokane. Ms. Yang has been an active participant of the committee.

Ms. Thaxton advised Board members who may have issues, questions, or concerns surrounding any proposed changes to address those concerns with the GC/CM Committee rather than delaying input until the Reauthorization Committee receives those proposed changes. At that point, the Reauthorization Committee will not have sufficient time to address issues.

Janice Zahn said she appreciates the meeting notes and updated information to help the Board track information and progress on the proposed changes.

Vice Chair Keith commented on the proposals submitted by MCA of Washington related to early alternative procurement of electrical and mechanical contractors for GC/CM. Those proposals were initially received by the

Reauthorization Committee and referred to the GC/CM Committee for input. The proposals are likely some of the most substantive issues for consideration. A review of the proposals is scheduled at the March meeting.

Chair Schacht reported said that on behalf of the Business Equity/Diverse Business Inclusion Committee, the legislation for Design-Build changing “may” to “shall” and other changes to ensure provisions were more clearly defined in the statute were provided to the Reauthorization Committee to ensure similar language changes are considered for the GC/CM statute. The committee has only considered changes for GC/CM and not for MC/EM. Vice Chair Keith affirmed she would follow up to ensure the information was forwarded to the GC/CM Committee.

Chair Schacht suggested reconsidering the term “MACC” in GC/CM. “MACC” is the maximum allowable construction cost in a Design-Bid-Build contract and constitutes the entire bid by the general contractor. In a GC/CM contract, MACC is only the total of all subtrades and is not inclusive of contingencies, overhead profit, other GC/CM costs, and negotiated support services. The term is confusing especially to the Office of Financial Management (OFM). Architects and engineers object to the use of MACC strenuously because when completing a State C100 form for a GC/CM contract, it calculates design services based on subtrades rather than the entire contract, which requires a manual correction. He suggested reconsidering the term “MACC” and consider a substitute term because it would be helpful to many in the industry who either have forms using both terms or for the design, contracting, and the public owner community who are transitioning from a Design-Bid-Build contract to an alternative method and are often confused as to why the MACC is not the total price.

Mr. Datz affirmed he would address the concern at the next committee meeting.

Chair Schacht invited a nomination of Ms. Yang to serve on the GC/CM Committee as the higher education representative.

Bill Frare nominated Olivia Yang, Washington State University, to serve as the Higher Education representative on the GC/CM Committee. Robynne Thaxton seconded the nomination.

By unanimous affirmation, Olivia Yang was appointed to serve on the GC/CM Committee representing Higher Education.

Business Equity/Diverse Business Inclusion Committee – Information

Chair Schacht reported the committee did not meet in December or January. Co-Chair Lisa van der Lugt’s schedule has been challenging as OMWBE is focusing on the State Disparity Study. He spent most of December and January writing letters to a variety of different entities concerning legislation and statutory requirements. The next step by the committee is to resume efforts to complete an outline focusing on how the Board can effectively provide education to public bodies on ways to increase inclusion, updating the GC/CM statute to strengthen requirements for participation to align with Design-Build and JOC statutes, as well as cataloging how public owners are using available mechanisms to increase participation rates. The Board is not currently collecting that data but he believes the Board has become aware of public agencies that are collecting the data, such as the Department of Labor and Industries (L&I). The intent is to provide access to the industry to those data sources.

Ms. van der Lugt shared that the Governor included funds in the budget for OMWBE to pursue Disparity Study actions. OMWBE staff members are working closely with the Senate and House to ensure the funding is approved as it would support the agency’s data collection efforts, the Governor’s Subcabinet on Business Diversity, and the work on Communities in Practice and Policy Action Teams. She anticipates another month of intense efforts. She also met with Mr. Frare to discuss the matrix DES is drafting for the study’s 14 recommendations.

Mr. Frare said he met with Rex Brown and they reviewed the 14 recommendations outlined in the Disparity Study to determine which recommendations might align with public works and how the Board might assist in some of

the actions, such as best practices, guidance, or model language, etc. He offered to provide the matrix of the recommendations to Ms. van der Lugt prior to their next meeting.

Chair Schacht said he and Ms. van der Lugt would discuss scheduling their next meeting.

Ms. Zahn asked whether the responsibility and focus of the committee remains unchanged in light of the release of the Disparity Study. Chair Schacht affirmed the committee was tasked with diverse business inclusion and assisting the Board in defining its roles and responsibilities relative to ensuring business inclusion within alternate project delivery, as well as coordinating with and identifying other efforts through Public Works in the state. The Board represents the entity of alternative public works while the Disparity Study only applies to state agencies. The intent is to leverage what was learned from the Disparity Study. During the presentation of the study's 14 strategies for improving participation rates, many members recognized that the rates either align with a section in the Best Practices for Design-Build Guidelines for encouraging competition or align with other issues discussed by the Board that would benefit improved outcomes for inclusion.

Irene Reyes noted that she is incorrectly designated on the committee as representing OMWBE. Chair Schacht recommending correcting the designation to reflect a private industry representative.

Santosh Kuruvilla reiterated the importance of the committee's responsibility for creating consistency in language. Many of the other committee discussions have centered on the need for ensuring consistency in language. Chair Schacht responded that initial efforts addressed consistency through some recommended changes in the Design-Build statute, as well as recommending similar changes to the GC/CM Committee for the GC/CM statute. Specificity of the language would likely be different between the statutes because the RFQ/RFP process is different for each delivery method.

Data Collection Implementation Committee– *Information*

Andy Thompson, Co-Chair, reported he has not had an opportunity to touch base with Aleanna Kondelis since the last meeting. Essentially, they have stepped back because of other efforts on data collection by L&I and in discussions with the Governor on an initiative to fund a data framework bill. The Board has a unique role in data collection and its reporting responsibilities through JLARC. He cautioned that there are many efforts focusing on data with the implementation of the actions in the Disparity Report to include other recommendations included within Washington State Department of Transportation's disparity study. The committee is stepping back to gain a better understanding of all efforts by other agencies and advocates. Although the Board has a responsibility for data, the Board does not serve as a data collection body. The Board would benefit if other entities assist in the collection of data.

Chair Schacht said it appears the committee's efforts align with efforts by the Business Equity/Diverse Business Inclusion Committee to identify sources of data stakeholders can access. Many entities are currently collecting a substantial amount of information. Those agencies have the resources for collection and sorting of data to provide useful reports. He suggested considering a way to coordinate the work of the Data Collection Committee with the goal to improve outcomes for business equity and diverse business inclusion.

Vice Chair Keith added that the confusion surrounding data is uniformity in collection and packaging data to meet each user's specific needs. Essentially, it is an unfunded mandate as the collection and packaging of data requires resources and expertise. It is important for the Board to consider its ability and identify data necessary to complete the Board's work and how it can be obtained.

Chair Schacht noted the topic will be addressed later in the meeting as Mr. Thompson's reference to data pertains to language that if adopted would direct CPARB to conduct a study to address bid shopping. Data will also be addressed when the Board discusses a letter received from Senator Fortunato and the Board's response. The letter requested some data.

Mr. Thompson assured the Board that he and Ms. Kondelis plan to update the Board on the status of the committee.

Education Committee – Information

Chair Schacht provided the update on behalf of Mike McCormick, who emailed a message earlier that he would be unable to attend the meeting.

Chair Schacht reported the idea of convening a special meeting in April was to focus on lessons learned rather than the business transactions of the Board. The meeting was scheduled based on an earlier suggestion from Mr. Kuruvilla to convene a meeting to receive input from the industry on lessons learned. Initial and ongoing discussions with Mr. McCormick generated feedback from a number of individuals who offered to participate. It was also recognized that presentations on lessons learned can often result in descriptive highlights of a particular project rather than genuine lessons learned that would benefit members. Mr. McCormick recommended a different approach as members would benefit from a discussion on evolving trends in the industry by presenting a topical approach involving two topics. The first topic would be on diverse business inclusion by inviting a panel of presenters focused on best practices to share information on successful outcomes, areas that have experienced an increase in participation, and current practices. Mr. McCormick suggested the topic as the Board continues to work on changes in the statute to strengthen the focus on diverse business inclusion. However, in reality, success depends on public owners having an interest in increasing participation and knowing what tools to use to increase inclusion.

Chair Schacht added that panel presenters would include several public owners and business owners from the contracting and design community. The presentation would provide information to the Board on current practices and efforts to help members understand whether more language should be included in the statute or whether more educational efforts might be warranted.

The second topic is focused on Design-Build and the issues of integration and project delivery. The Board's discussions have not broached that subject too much as its focus has been on other issues; however, within the industry a transformation is occurring at an amazing rate. One example is the company, Kattera, which is rethinking vertical integration by owning the natural resource, creating the materials and products, designing the buildings, and constructing the buildings. The process creates efficiencies and value at a reduced cost. The company's major focus is housing but its portfolio includes other types of development projects. Mr. McCormick is exploring options for the special meeting because globalization of efforts might impact small businesses. The UW and WSU are focusing on integration and project delivery. Renée Cheng, Dean, College of Built Environments, UW, is focusing on integration and delivery methods.

Chair Schacht said he asked Mr. McCormick to add a third topic to the special meeting in addition to globalization, sustainability, and challenges for small and medium-sized businesses. It would be helpful for the Board to receive information on the evolution of alternative project delivery in general in terms of GC/CM, as the conversation could address whether GC/CM is being used more or less or whether there has been any change in the consistency of use. Rather than seeking data, the conversation should focus on feedback from public owners, design professionals, contractors, and others as to how GC/CM has been effective or is working for them. That information in terms of current practices would help inform the Board when considering reauthorization. Design-Build is changing at an incredible rate progressing from traditional procurement to progressive to now selecting the builder and then selecting the design team later in the process. He asked Mr. McCormick to consider adding the topic as a third panel and possibly organizing the meeting by covering evolving trends, vertical integration activities in the industry, and ending the meeting with conclusions. Chair Schacht invited other topics of interest by the Board.

Mr. Thompson asked whether the meeting format would be concurrent with a Board meeting or as a separate presentation panel. Chair Schacht said the April meeting is intended as a special meeting devoted to the presentations for Board and stakeholder benefit. The intent is to attract a broader audience. The format of the meeting would be presentations by three panels with attendance by the Board and other stakeholders.

Vice Chair Keith asked that Mr. McCormick contact and involve the Project Review Committee as lessons learned are referred to in the JLARC recommendations and it has been a topic of discussion by the Board for some time. She agreed that a topic on lessons learned could be challenging as most people believe lessons learned are equated to what went wrong within a project. While that may be true and it is important to learn from experience, it is also difficult to have that type of a conversation in a constructive manner as opposed to hearing a presentation on how well a project was completed. At one point, Jim Dugan had discussed an option of presenting a comparison of three projects that the PRC had considered and approved. That kind of analysis could be helpful for the Board as well. She asked whether the request is to provide input now or contact Mr. McCormick directly.

Chair Schacht replied that input would be helpful at this time while members could also contact Mr. McCormick directly.

Mr. Kuruvilla said he also believed that part of the goal of the Education Committee included education and outreach to stakeholders in eastern Washington, which has not been mentioned or has been overlooked.

Chair Schacht agreed that information should be shared with Mr. McCormick because he believes Mr. McCormick has been in communication with WSU because both UW and WSU have different approaches. Both universities are not pursuing GC/CM but have completed Job Order Contracting (JOC) projects. Both universities are heavily invested in Design-Build projects, but with very different approaches. Much of the leadership in Design-Build has been generated by both institutions. He believes WSU would be involved in the panel presentation.

Mr. Thompson asked whether the concept of looking outward is within the state or whether the scope would be greater, such as looking at other states, and how they are doing things, or whether the focus would be determined by Mr. McCormick.

Chair Schacht said the focus of the presentations would be Mr. McCormick's decision. However, as a presenter at DBIA National for the last several years as a facilitator of panels on CPARB and RCW 39.10, Design-Build Best Practices Guidelines, and evolving practices in Design-Build in higher education projects including community colleges administered by DES, UW, and WSU, it is his perception that Washington State is ahead of the curve compared to other states. Presentations by other institutions during DBIA conferences tend to reflect Design-Build 101 compared to Design-Build activities occurring in the state. It is possible to reach outside the state, but there is successful activity underway in the state for the Board to consider.

Ms. Thaxton said she has been a 15-year member on the DBIA National Legal and Legislation Committee. The committee looks to CPARB as one of the leaders in the industry because there are very few states with statutes that are as open. Most states do not have the capacity to pursue Progressive Design-Build projects. Those with the capacity to pursue Progressive Design-Build projects have very prescriptive statutes. Washington State is at the forefront for Design-Build procurement. She is not familiar with any other state that would serve as a positive example of completing a Design-Build project any better than Washington State.

Chair Schacht said another positive for the state is the Board and the entire dialogue surrounding policy and constantly revisiting alternative procurement methods. No other state is as engaged in seeking stakeholder input and improving outcomes.

Mr. Buckingham encouraged Mr. McCormick to consider the consistency across the board of procurement application as WSU is pursuing projects differently than UW. Generally, that would be okay when the market is so removed; however, as more concentration of Design-Build projects occurs in the market, he is receiving feedback from contractors about the difficulty between UW and other public owners, which has increased problems in competition. Including some evaluation of consistency and inconsistency compared to best practices would be of value.

Chair Schacht suggested the subject could be covered as part of the panel on evolving trends. During the work of the Design-Build Committee on best practices that issue was also a major topic of conversation. In general, a 39.04 procurement is different with each public owner and it often entails consideration as to how to pursue the work. As a design professional, each public agency is a different situation. Unless there are statewide requirements for each public agency other than the statewide umbrella all owners operate under, it will continue to be a challenge. It is possible to discuss and share challenges about the issue.

Ms. Zahn commented on her experience as an instructor for the Design-Build Best Practices class and how all owners are at different points in the evolution with some more sophisticated using more leading edge tools versus those owners using the traditional realm of Design-Build. There are some differences between owners. In terms of the Education Committee, she is trying to determine from a big picture standpoint the scope of the committee's efforts as training is already offered through DBIA and Design-Build Best Practices classes, which is geared as a Design-Build 101 course. It can be very confusing to understand how public owners might pursue implementing Design-Build, as one example. In terms of education, the April meeting with an emerging trends panel may cover some methods many public owners might not be employing while others are utilizing those methods. She asked whether the Education Committee discussed the overall strategy for education and outreach throughout the entire state. Currently, the Education Committee has only three active members. It is likely the April meeting could move forward with a panel on emerging trends but it is also important to ensure the Board replaces members and develops a strategic plan for education and outreach.

Vice Chair Keith noted that the committee provided a report on its tasks moving forward for education. The minutes of the Board's September meeting speak to a request by the Board for scheduling an April meeting because the Board wanted to address areas of improvement and lessons learned. The April special meeting was not intended to be the committee's entire work product but a meeting requested by the Board dedicated to review lessons learned and areas for improvement to be organized by the Education Committee.

Chair Schacht agreed and noted that the special meeting is also evolving to trends and best practices as opposed to lessons learned, which he supports because at the end of the day, not many project sponsors will share information on projects that were not successful. Between public owners, design professionals, contractors, and others in the industry, it is difficult to establish a panel that would be willing to share that information. However, if the focus is on how to improve outcomes underlying lessons learned would automatically be included. Many members of the Board are likely unaware of where alternative project delivery is headed because the method is such a powerful procurement tool and there is a tendency to leverage it to the extent possible. As a practitioner, he can see the positive but also has some concerns that the methods are becoming so specialized and rarified that only a few public owners can participate. It is important to ensure that the Board is focused on keeping the doors open for everyone to have the ability to participate.

Mr. Thompson referred to Mr. Kuruvilla's request for the last three years to schedule a special meeting while the Board acknowledged that its primary mission is advocacy and policy. The Board agreed to schedule a special meeting. He suggested extending an invitation to the four legislative members as it would serve as a good education opportunity for legislators to learn about stakeholder concerns, competitiveness, and outreach.

Mr. Kuruvilla remarked that the next meeting of the Education Committee is not scheduled until May 9, 2020. Essentially, the committee is not scheduled to meet prior to the April meeting. Chair Schacht acknowledged that Mr. McCormick has been working on the agenda for the April meeting. Mr. Kuruvilla asked about the possibility of prompting the committee to meet to develop the scope of the April meeting. Chair Schacht replied that he believes Mr. McCormick is working on the April special meeting and likely would not want his name attached to an event unless it was highly successful. He offered to communicate the concern with Mr. McCormick. Mr. Kuruvilla asked about a potential back-up plan.

Vice Chair Keith said the concerns conveyed by Mr. Kuruvilla are similar to the comments from Ms. Zahn in terms of the overall work product and how they tie into other things. Previously, Mr. Frare, Mr. Maruska, and

Mr. McCormick discussed other educational opportunities and training availability within the industry. Many recent efforts have been geared to GC/CM, JOC, and reauthorization. It may be possible to focus on the next steps to invigorate the committee.

Chair Schacht requested a transcription of the discussion to assist Mr. McCormick in understanding the questions and concerns, as well as providing information on some suggestions. He plans to follow-up with Mr. McCormick on a potential feedback loop with the Board without violating the Open Public Meetings Act. As he emphasized earlier, he believes Mr. McCormick will deliver the April meeting. The meeting venue is scheduled to be at the DES Building. Other outstanding questions are how many people can be accommodated in the meeting venue and steps needed to attract to a broader audience as the Board is interested in hearing from other stakeholders as it deliberates what's best for alternative public works. Next steps include advertising for a broader audience and ensuring the meeting room has both audio and visual broadcast capability.

Ms. Thaxton questioned the topics of the meeting presentations. She is somewhat troubled that the Board is offering an educational meeting, and, at this time, is unsure as to what will be presented. It is not that she does not trust Mr. McCormick, but it appears there is no Education Committee other than for the fact that Mr. McCormick is handling the arrangements with the Board not knowing the identity of the presenters or the topics.

Chair Schacht reminded the Board of the two topics proposed by Mr. McCormick and the third topic he introduced. The Board has the option of canceling the meeting based on not knowing enough about the meeting or showing some faith that the University of Washington has the capacity to deliver the program. He prefers to err on the side of the University. He asked for feedback from members on whether the meeting should be put on hold because of a belief that the Board is not prepared.

Mr. Shinn asked whether the intent is to offer new topics to add to the reauthorization. Chair Schacht said the Board is preparing for reauthorization while also conducting a special meeting to receive feedback from stakeholders practicing alternative public works. The Board has never scheduled a similar meeting to receive and share information.

Vice Chair Keith cited the direction the Board established as outlined in the Board's September 2019 meeting minutes: "Chair Schacht queried the Board on willingness to schedule an additional meeting to focus on case studies/lessons learned with potential presentations from:

- Tacoma Public Schools to present information on its project of three schools using three delivery methods.
- The University of Washington presenting information on the logic of selecting the contractor first and the designer later.
- Inviting a successful Design-Build or GC/CM procurement project.
- Inviting a project that achieved targets for diverse business inclusion."

It appears the Board's discussion has satisfied some of the previous direction. The Board also has the option of moving in another direction.

Chair Schacht commented that it appears the Board's conversation has veered away from receiving a slideshow of projects to having a panel focused on evolving trends and best practices, which would be more informative. He invited feedback from members.

Mr. Thompson said he believes the Board should move forward despite some anxiety about the lack of clarity and Mr. McCormick's inability to speak to those concerns at this time. After the meeting, it is likely the Board will have a better understanding of Mr. McCormick's plan for the special meeting. He suggested members should afford some benefit of doubt as the meeting is planned for April 9, 2020, with a framework of topics that would appeal to the Board, stakeholders, and elected officials that could also roll into reauthorization. One of the Board's platforms is education as part of its charge.

Mr. Hepner asked about the opportunity to ask questions and on what topics.

Chair Schacht explained that Mr. McCormick's proposal is to present panels of individuals who have experience with respect to the panel subject. Panelists will provide a presentation with members and other stakeholders asking questions or offering comments.

Ms. Reyes asked whether panelist experiences would focus on the positive rather than on the negative because when the focus is only on the positive it appears to be a sales presentation on their respective inclusion program. It would be preferable to receive information on what did and did not work.

Chair Schacht agreed that the preference would include both positive and negative experiences; however, it has been difficult in other venues for presenters to share information that has not been as successful.

Ms. Thaxton noted the issue of scheduling a special meeting was discussed during the Board's September meeting. It is now February and the special meeting is scheduled to be the Board's next meeting. She asked that members receive an update either by email or some other form of transmission that speaks to the identity of the panelists and the topics because emerging trends is a very broad topic. The topics as described are incredibly broad and the speakers have not been identified.

Chair Schacht stressed the importance of identifying the topics and the speakers to attract an audience. To be successful, meeting details must be finalized 45 days prior to the April meeting, which will require an agenda, prospectus for panelists, and the identity of the panelists.

Mr. Shinn suggested the Board consider placing an advertisement in the Daily Journal to publicize the meeting to attract attendance.

Mr. Kuruvilla asked about the possibility of scheduling another meeting prior to the April special meeting with the intent to create an agenda or to provide Mr. McCormick with some direction as the Board has some hopes and expectations. At some point, the Board and Mr. McCormick need to converge.

Ms. Zahn urged the Board to consider whether the topic on emerging trends might become an optic of misunderstanding as the Board progresses on reauthorization because it could convey action on emerging trends rather than the Board offering some education on the issue. She is concerned about that aspect as it could be ill-founded as the Board is not launching into any emerging trends beyond the Board's scope for reauthorization.

Chair Schacht recommended offering a motion based on Ms. Thaxton's suggestion.

Vice Chair Keith asked to redirect the conversation to the original intent of the meeting as discussed during the September meeting as feedback to Mr. McCormick for preparation of the agenda.

Chair Schacht recommended recessing to a break to enable him, Mr. Kuruvilla, Vice Chair Keith, and Ms. Thaxton to meet and draft a motion for the Board to consider.

Chair Schacht recessed the meeting from 10:20 a.m. to 10:36 a.m.

Mr. Horn was no longer participating via telecon.

Rebecca Keith moved, seconded by Irene Reyes, to proceed with the April 9, 2020 special meeting as scheduled and delegate authority to Santosh Kuruvilla and Bill Dobyms to assist Mike McCormick in establishing a meeting agenda that will incorporate the feedback from the Board's discussion as depicted in the September 12, 2019 meeting minutes and today's discussion to flesh out panel presentations. The information for the special meeting will be published by February 28, 2020. Motion carried. Mr. Belarde opposed.

Chair Schacht reviewed the current composition of the Education Committee:

- Mike McCormick – currently active with University of Washington
- Bill Frare – currently active with DES
- Elisa Young – no longer with OMWBE but still focused on diversity issues as an employee with the City of Seattle.
- Steve Crawford – retired from his position and is no longer active
- Shari Reiter-Johnson, currently active with Department of Labor and Industries

Chair Schacht asked for feedback from the Board for delegating support and engagement by Bill Dobyms, Santosh Kuruvilla, and Robynne Thaxton with Mr. McCormick without being appointed committee members while conforming to the statute and the Open Public Meetings Act.

Vice Chair Keith pointed out that the Board can schedule a special meeting and delegate the preparation of the agenda to the three Board members. Chair Schacht affirmed that it would be possible for the Board to delegate responsibility to provide an agenda to the Chair by delegating that responsibility to Mr. McCormick, Mr. Kuruvilla, Mr. Dobyms, and Ms. Thaxton. The agenda will be reviewed by the Chair and Vice Chair while adhering to normal protocols.

Discussion ensued on the membership of the Education Committee. Chair Schacht affirmed the resignation of Mr. Crawford because of his retirement. Ms. Young should not be disqualified from being a member of the committee as she is still involved in diverse business inclusion on behalf of the City of Seattle.

Ms. Reyes offered to follow-up with Ms. Young to affirm her interest in remaining a member of the committee.

Board Development Committee – Information

Mr. Frare reported the Board Development Committee has not met since the last meeting. The committee is contending with several challenges. The committee is comprised of five members and two members are no longer active leaving current members Bill Frare, Lisa van der Lugt, and Janice Zahn. He suggested the Board consider appointing additional members. Additionally, the timing of Board officer elections is during even years with the last elections in 2018. The next election cycle is this year with the Board contending with other priorities for reauthorization. Current rules enable the chair and vice chair to serve two terms. With those issues facing the Board he recommended a discussion about Board and committee leadership and whether current incumbents plan to pursue another term of office.

Charles Horn rejoined the meeting via telecon at 10:45 a.m.

Ms. van der Lugt asked whether the committee scheduled any meetings as she does not recall being notified of any meetings. Mr. Frare said only one meeting occurred after the formation of the committee between him and Bob Maruska. The purpose of that meeting was to develop a proposal for creating the committee.

Mr. Frare outlined the responsibilities of the committee to aid in candidate outreach, recruitment, improve transition, and educate new Board members on the roles, operating procedures, and scope of the Board.

Chair Schacht advised that he planned to serve one two-year term and step down with the intent Vice Chair Keith would succeed him as Chair. The Board would seek nominations from the private sector for the Vice Chair position. The bylaws require leadership positions be split between private and public sectors. In most organizations, the Vice Chair automatically assumes the Chair position to enable a learning curve for a new Vice Chair.

Vice Chair Keith shared that based on her experience with other board development committees, the focus typically involves identifying potential leadership candidates. The Board has assigned many committees and members are overextended working on many issues before the Board.

Mr. Kuruvilla suggested the possibility of combining the Education Committee and the Board Development Committee because of some overlap in functions and because of the Board's numerous priorities this year.

Ms. Thaxton offered that board committees are often more effective when members are not on the Board. Part of the recruitment effort could entail external recruitment of Board and industry stakeholders to serve on some of the committees with Board members serving as liaison members to avoid overtaxing members. She supported the suggestion to consider combining some of the committees. Board members should contact their respective stakeholders and invite their participation to avoid overtaxing members in their multiple roles.

Chair Schacht commented that it has been awkward for many years to determine how the Board could establish an effective succession plan. Additionally, the Board lacks a new Board member introduction program or any form of orientation for new members. Some newer members have been clear about the challenges they faced when they were first appointed to the Board. The intent is to develop a package of information to help inform new members.

Matthew Hepner offered that at the very least, it would be helpful to develop a glossary of acronyms and abbreviations to assist new Board members.

Mr. Thompson added that former members Ed Kommers and Bob Maruska developed an outline on the roles and responsibilities of the chair and vice chair. He recommended forwarding a copy to each member.

Chair Schacht noted that the most pressing issue is officer elections scheduled in May. Anyone can offer a self-nomination; however, effective boards have adopted processes for identifying candidates.

The Board discussed next steps and potential actions to assist in initiating activities of the Board Development Committee. Mr. Frare suggested appointing more members. In terms of moving forward on leadership after May 2020, he supported Vice Chair Keith assuming the Chair position to maintain continuity as the Board works through reauthorization.

Ms. Thaxton referred to the DBIA's Board Development Committee's efforts to create a multi-year succession plan because of the difficulty of appointing officers with organizational experience. She supported development and formalization of a succession plan.

Bill Dobyms, Irene Reyes, Jane Wall, and Robynne Thaxton volunteered to serve on the Board Development Committee.

Walter Schacht moved, seconded by Garrett Buckingham, to appoint Bill Dobyms, Irene Reyes, Jane Wall, and Robynne Thaxton as members of the Board Development Committee. Motion carried unanimously.

Project Review Committee – Information

Chair Schacht noted that PRC Chair Jim Dugan was unable to attend because of illness. Nancy Deakins will provide the report.

Ms. Deakins reported that at the January 23, 2020 meeting, the PRC approved the following 8 applications:

- Port of Seattle Recertification for Design-Build and GC/CM
- City of West Richland – City of West Richland Police Facility Design-Build project
- Ellensburg School District – Lincoln Elementary Modernization Design-Build project
- Rochester School District – Expansion & Modernization of Rochester High School GC/CM project
- Mukilteo School District – Discovery Elementary School Addition GC/CM project
- Seattle School District – Van Asselt School Addition & Mercer Middle School Replacement GC/CM project
- Seattle School District – Rainer Beach High School Replacement GC/CM project
- Spokane Valley Fire Department – Spokane Valley Fire Maintenance Facility Design-Build project

Ms. Deakins reviewed 2020 PRC statistics to date reflecting combined project costs of over \$531 million. Last year, the PRC approved 32 applications reflecting over \$1 billion in projects.

Chair Schacht pointed out that PRC has already approved projects totaling half the value of all projects approved in 2019, which could be attributed to funding trends. However, it should be noted that the largest volume of projects are completed by certified agencies. Certified agencies are not required to report on the value of project budgets. Consequently, the statistical report is not entirely representative of the total value of projects completed by public agencies. He asked whether certified agencies report on procurements when the certification expires. Vice Chair Keith advised that the recertification application includes information on prior procurements. Currently, there are 13 certified agencies.

Chair Schacht suggested it would be valuable for the Board for each certified agency to provide a report on the dollar value of Design-Build and GC/CM procurements at the end of each year. Additionally, the recertification application should include information on the procurement total for the previous five-year period.

Members shared information on reporting requirements following completion of a project, sources of data, and ways to determine the dollar value of alternative project delivery versus the total of publicly funded capital projects to identify the percentage of the market for alternative delivered projects. Members discussed the timing for reporting projects. Chair Schacht suggested capturing project data when agencies apply to the PRC in addition to requesting project values completed during the previous certification period when agencies reapply for recertification. The Board has the authority to request certified public agencies report annually on total project dollars. Essentially, it would be beneficial to determine how many dollars are expended through alternative project delivery.

Ms. Deakins and Talia Baker reviewed position vacancies and identified members seeking to reapply for their position. Currently, PRC has 14 positions open for recruitment.

Discussion ensued on how each position is designated by industry representation. Panel members are assigned to ensure there is representation from the entire industry. The vacant positions represent nearly half of the committee. Typically, the recruitment process is lengthy. Ms. Deakins asked the Board to consider extending some of the terms for one to two years to develop a membership of staggered terms to avoid an extended appointment process by the Board. Members reviewed positions that have been difficult to fill and offered suggestions on ways to improve recruitment or revise position representation while acknowledging the importance of maintaining an adequate roster of committee members to process project, recertification, and certification applications. Members agreed to consider PRC appointments at the May meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

UW Critical Care Roster Report – Information

Chair Schacht reported the University of Washington is required to provide an annual report to the Board on the Critical Care Roster. The format of the report is not defined or mandated by statute. The Board previously agreed to accept a written report. He recommended moving the report for inclusion on the Board's May meeting agenda for review and input. The Board agreed.

Legislative Updates

- SB 5457 Special Meeting on 1/8, Letter to Senator Keiser

Chair Schacht acknowledged attendance of Board members during the special January meeting. He thanked Mr. Hepner for providing the meeting venue and Mr. Thompson for facilitating the meeting. The outcome of the meeting demonstrates the ability of the Board to play a central role in attaining consensus by various parties representing the industry. The outcome of the meeting resulted in a discussion among the interested parties involving general contractors and construction trades labor. Senator Keiser attended the January meeting and accepted the Board's offer to facilitate a conversation among key stakeholders to resolve issues.

Subsequently, Senate Bill 5457 was revised to require the listing of subcontractors for structural steel installation and rebar installation on public works construction projects expected to cost over \$1 million, within 48 hours after the published bid submittal time. There was consensus that the requirement was reasonable. CPARB was tasked to evaluate current subcontractor listing policies and practices and submit a report to the Governor and the appropriate committees of the Legislature by November 1, 2020.

Chair Schacht recommended appointing a committee of interested stakeholders to address bid shopping that does not create unnecessary risks for public owners, general contractors, or design professionals.

Bill Frare left the meeting at 11:34 a.m.

Ms. Deakins added that because of the Board's work on the reauthorization, the goal is for an amendment to defer the due date of the report to June 2021.

Chair Schacht shared that he met and discussed the issues with Representative Tharinger. He was accompanied by Ann Larson, Government Relations Director at DES.

Chair Schacht said the Board's efforts elevated the value of CPARB. He conveyed appreciation for everyone who was involved and encouraged members to reach out to legislators and others to promote extension of the report deadline to June 2021 to afford adequate time for the Board to work on issues.

Mr. Thompson thanked Mr. Hepner for providing the January meeting venue. At the last regular Board meeting in December 2019, construction trades labor was not represented. It was important to ensure a representative from construction trades labor was part of the January conversation. He suggested maintaining the momentum regardless of the report due date by creating a roster of stakeholders that could be involved in the development of the report. Mr. Hepner expressed interest in participating.

Chair Schacht said it would be possible to establish the committee and direct the committee to provide a report in May and identify a roster of participants or assign several members a task of developing a recommendation for moving forward.

Vice Chair Keith commented that given the interest by labor and general contractors, it would be helpful for those interests to assume leadership in establishing a committee. She recommended representation from small business or women-owned businesses on the committee.

Mike Shinn supported moving forward to establish a committee.

Following discussion on the specific responsibilities of the committee, Mr. Thompson and Ms. Zahn offered to advance a motion to establish the committee. Members shared opinions as to the purpose of the committee and following another round of discussion agreed the committee should be formed in response to ESB 5457. Chair Schacht offered the following motion:

Walter Schacht moved, seconded by Matthew Hepner, to form a committee to respond to ESB 5457 to be comprised (at a minimum) of representatives from construction trades labor, general contractors, public owners, and specialty contractors and nominate Bill Dobyms and Matthew Hepner to serve as Co-Chairs.

Ms. Reyes offered a friendly amendment to include minority and women-owned business enterprises as members. The makers of the motion accepted the friendly amendment.

Chair Schacht recommended a membership of approximately 14-16 members. Mr. Buckingham agreed to represent public owners. Ms. Reyes agreed to represent minority and women-owned business enterprises. Mr. Shinn nominated Scott Middleton to represent specialty contractors.

Motion carried. Brian Belarde opposed.

Chair Schacht reminded the Co-Chairs of the requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act to prepare agendas, announce meetings, produce meeting minutes, and coordinate committee business with Ms. Baker and Ms. Deakins.

Chair Schacht suggested the name of the committee as Subcontractor Bid Listings Policies Committee.

- Senator Fortunato's letter to CPARB

Chair Schacht reported he received a letter from Senator Fortunato. DES posted the Senator's letter and the Board's response to the letter. The Senator asked a series of questions about the Board's transparency, whether adequate opportunities are provided for participation during the process, and the measures the Board implements to ensure taxpayer dollars are protected. The response letter included responses on industry participation, opportunities to compete, and public access to meetings. An appendix to the letter provided more detail in response to Senator Fortunato's questions. The Board has not received a response to its letter. Several contacts were initiated to coordinate a meeting with the Senator. One meeting was scheduled, but the Senator was unable to attend. He plans to follow up with Senator Fortunato after the conclusion of the legislative session.

Mr. Thompson commented that contact to the Board about specific issues of concern were indicative of the need for the Board to do a better job in providing information to the Legislature on the Board's responsibilities. The Board's response identified the Board's roles and responsibilities. It also appears that the Senator's interest in data was reflective of the lack of understanding of the Board's efforts over the last several years to focus on and better define its responsibilities. It just speaks to how much information an elected official can miss.

Ms. van der Lugt suggested pursuing a request to the Senator to convene some of the groups to identify their concerns as the letter is somewhat vague because it speaks to some people feeling left out of the process. Chair Schacht affirmed that it might be possible to meet with the individuals in conjunction with a meeting with the Senator. The response letter invited the Senator to direct those individuals with concerns to the Board to engage in a conversation about what they perceive is not working. To date, the Board has not received a response. He plans to follow up with the Senator and ask similar questions. The Board is also receptive to meeting with anyone with concerns.

Mr. Kuruvilla observed that training offered for interviews often stresses the importance of answering the question behind the question. The questions in the letter should prompt the Board to ask whether the question behind the question has been answered. The response letter did a good job of stating the obvious, but answering the question behind the question should be expanded. The Board should figure out how to answer the question behind the question as each member has a different perspective. Chair Schacht responded that there was significant discussion between the Chair, Vice Chair Keith, and Ms. Deakins during the drafting of the response in terms of the questions asked and how to respond. He avoided presuming what the question was behind the question as it could lead to dangerous territory.

Vice Chair Keith added that the Senator also represented a different perspective in terms of the Board's role versus how the Board perceives its role. Board leadership is more than willing to meet with the Senator and provide advisory services, information, and the Board's expertise. It was difficult to convey that information in a meaningful way through a letter.

Chair Schacht pointed out that there appeared to be several over-arching themes in the letter. One theme is whether the Board is a transparent public body. The Board is a transparent public body and although it might require some effort to locate information on the webpage, all information is accessible and can be located. The second theme identified in the letter was a question as to what the Board is doing to track schedule and

budget outcomes of taxpayer dollars. The Board is not charged with that responsibility by statute. No entity, other than specific public bodies contracting work, is charged with tracking schedule and budget outcomes.

Mr. Kuruvilla said that although he does not want to continue stressing the point, the Senator's letter represented an opportunity to vocalize the Board's desire to engage and collaborate to improve the process. He believes an opportunity might have been lost.

Chair Schacht responded that the Board pursued the opportunity by offering to reach out and communicate to individuals with concerns. Efforts continue to reschedule a meeting with the Senator to discuss his concerns.

Mr. Thompson said that initially when he learned that the Chair and Vice Chair responded with a letter after receiving the Senator's letter without consulting the Board, he questioned whether leadership had the authority to respond. However, after reading the response letter, he agrees it was important to respond quickly to identify the Board's responsibilities. The Chair and Vice Chair have reached out to the Senator to schedule a meeting and he is hopeful a meeting can be scheduled prior to the next Board meeting to provide the Senator with some clarity.

- **SB 5418 (2019) – Local Government Public Works Study Update – Action**

Chair Schacht introduced Jon Rose, Finance & Administrative Manager, Municipal Research & Services Center (MRSC). Mr. Rose reviewed the project scope, process, and next steps for completing the Local Government Public Works Contracting Study.

Mr. Rose said he serves as the Project Manager for the study and works closely with Ms. Deakins and Mr. Frare. In 2019, the Legislature passed SB 5418 in response to the Legislature addressing public works issues each year from different public agencies working on different statutes for various thresholds that apply to different agencies. The request to CPARB was a comprehensive review of local government bid limits contingent upon funding. Funding was not initially allocated for completing the study; however, DES is providing the funding and overall project management for the study. The study is due by November 1, 2020 to the Governor and legislative committees.

The purpose of the study is a comprehensive review of local government bid limits with the intent to develop considerations and guidance for an appropriate standardized method of adjustment to contract thresholds. The tasks include:

- A. Identification of Most Common Local Government Contracting Procedures
- B. Development of an Bid Threshold Matrix of Public Works Contracting Bid Thresholds
- C. Analysis of Estimate Project Cost Comparison to Contracting Thresholds
- D. Analysis of Potential Application of Regional Inflation Index to Contracting Thresholds
- F. Rates of Participation in Small Works and Limited Public Works Contracting
- E,G. Recommendation for Public Works Contracting and Procurement, including Identification of Barriers to Participation in Small Works Roster and Limited Public Works Contracting Processes

MRSC's role is to compile information to reflect what options are available and the impacts of each option. All recommendations will include a list of pros and cons for all options.

The three primary components of the process include:

- Direct stakeholder interviews
 - 25 of 30 interviews completed, representing over 19 agencies and businesses
- A Survey of Questions for Agencies and Public Works Contractors
- Public Works Data Analysis of L&I's data on 180,000 public works contracts from FY 2013-2019 and Economic Data on construction costs and wages from L&I

Diverse business inclusion questions included:

- Does your agency have diversity goals for Public Works contracts?
- What barriers do you see to engaging with minority- and women-owned businesses on your Small Works Roster?
- Has your agency taken any specific steps to increase participation by diverse contractors?
- What are barriers to increasing participation in the small works roster including the limited public works process?

Next steps included drafting the report in April and presenting the draft to CPARB in May. A final draft of the report will be presented to CPARB in September for review and approval to finalize the report for submission by November 1, 2020.

Chair Schacht commented on the complexity of the study and recommendations to be included in the report. The findings will be presented to the Board in May, which gives the Board until the September meeting to finalize the report. Mr. Rose said the findings will also include pros and cons. The review will consist of discussing each issue's pros and cons and selecting a recommendation to enable development of the final report. Chair Schacht reported the May meeting is anticipated to be an all-day meeting to accommodate all agenda items. He recommended assigning a Board liaison to identify stakeholders that would be most affected by the recommendations to serve on the committee to ensure the Board's recommendations are informed by a consensus of stakeholders. The stakeholders would include public owners using the subject public works mechanisms, diverse business community members, and contractors.

Mr. Thompson volunteered to serve as the Board liaison to chair and steer the committee. The Board supported the assignment of Mr. Thompson.

Chair Schacht commented that Ms. Reyes has always volunteered when she recognizes that her participation is critical because she represents minority and women-owned businesses. He asked members to speak to their colleagues and others in the industry to extend outreach and engage others who are interested in protecting the interests of that stakeholder group while increasing the level of participation.

Ms. Reyes affirmed her interest in participating and shared that she serves on the Board of the National Association of Minority Contractors.

Ms. Zahn suggested that there are large public owners that have specific departments focused on outreach to small, minority, and women-owned businesses. She offered to follow-up with the department within the Port of Seattle to ascertain any interest in participating and assisting the committee.

Robynne Thaxton left the meeting at 12:32 p.m.

Chair Schacht added that larger public owners often procure small public works projects and it would be important to include a larger owner on the committee to share some knowledge and experience that would inform how smaller public bodies pursue smaller projects.

Mr. Kuruvilla asked whether the 19 agencies interviewed were located across the state. Mr. Rose said the entire state was represented in the interviews.

Mr. Shinn asked whether the study would address work that is self-performed. Mr. Rose said the issue was raised during the interviews. Mr. Shinn noted that it is an issue with specialty contractors because some specialty contractors do not believe the work is completed efficiently and dollars are wasted. Mr. Rose said the issue falls under the heading of "complex and sensitive" topics.

Mr. Thompson inquired as to the cost of the study. Ms. Deakins said the study costs approximately \$215,000 with DES anticipating to receive funds from the supplemental capital budget to cover the cost of the study.

ADMINISTRATIVE

CPARB Budget Report – Information

Ms. Baker advised that the budget report was posted on the website prior to the meeting.

Mr. Thompson inquired as to whether a budget report would be reviewed at the May meeting. Ms. Deakins responded that the budget report was provided as part of the agenda materials. Typically, the budget report is an informational item.

May 14, 2020 Meeting Agenda

Chair Schacht reviewed the proposed agenda:

- Regular Committee Updates:
 - Reauthorization Committee
 - JOC Evaluation Committee
 - GC/CM Committee
 - Business Equity/Diverse Business Inclusion
 - Data Collection Implementation
 - Education Committee
 - Board Development Committee
 - Project Review Committee
 - Subcontractor Bid Listings Policies Committee
 - Progress on efforts for Local Government Public Works – Andy Thompson
- Officer Elections
 - Review of accomplishments
- Critical Care Report
- Legislative Update
- Budget Report
- PRC Appointments
- Updates on SB 5457 & 5418 and update on meeting with Senator Fortunato

Robynne Thaxton rejoined the meeting at 12:39 p.m. via telecon.

On behalf of the Board, Mr. Thompson welcomed Garrett Buckingham as a new member representing Public Hospital Districts.

ADJOURNMENT - Action

Andrew Thompson moved, seconded by Mike Shinn, to adjourn the meeting at 12:41 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

STAFF & GUESTS

Talia Baker, Department of Enterprise Services
Nick Datz, Sound Transit
Nancy Deakins, Department of Enterprise Services
Quinn Dolan, Centennial Construction
Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Tae-Tee Han, Sound Transit

Janet Jansen, Department of Enterprise Services
Aleanna Kondelis, University of Washington
Art McCluskey, WS Dept. of Transportation
Jon Rose, Municipal Research Services
Linda Shilley, Pierce Transit

Prepared by Puget Sound Meeting Services, psmsoly@earthlink.net