

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY REVIEW BOARD

Via Teams

Meeting Minutes - MFA

September 14, 2023

MEMBERS PRESENT	REPRESENTING	MEMBERS ABSENT	REPRESENTING
Janice Zahn (Chair)	Ports	Mike Shinn	Specialty Contractors
Keith Michel (Vice Chair)	General Contractors	Representative Mike Steele	House (R)
Brian Aske (Proxy for Robynne Thaxton)	Private Industry	Representative Steve Tharinger	House (D)
Corey Fedie	Public Hospital Districts	Senator Judy Warnick	Senate (R)
Lekha Fernandes	OMWBE		
Bobby Forch Jr.	Disadvantaged Businesses	Vacant	Counties
Senator Bob Hasegawa	Senate (D)		
Bruce Hayashi	Architects		
Janet Jansen	Dept. of Enterprise Services		
Santosh Kuruvilla	Engineers		
Karen Mooseker	School Districts		
Mark Nakagawara	Cities		
Irene Reyes	Private Industry		
Mark Riker	Construction Trades Labor		
Linneth Riley Hall	Transportation		
John Salinas II	Specialty Contractors		
Kara Skinner	Insurance/Surety Industry		
Robin Strom	General Contractors		
Josh Swanson	Construction Trades Labor		
Robynne Thaxton	Private Industry		
Olivia Yang	Higher Education		

Staff and 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) meeting to order at 8:02 a.m.

A roll call of members confirmed a meeting quorum.

WELCOME BOARD MEMBERS & INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Zahn welcomed new member Robin Strom representing General Contractors. Ms. Strom thanked the Board and shared that she was the Regional Vendor Diversity and Community Engagement Manager for Andersen Construction. She said she had been in the industry for 16 years and has managed many diversity compliance programs and is excited to be with CPARB.

APPROVE AGENDA – Action

Vice Chair Keith Michel proposed one change to the agenda: change the Project Review Committee (PRC) report to be at 10:05 a.m. and the SHB 1621 Review Committee report to be 11:05 a.m.

Robynne Thaxton moved, seconded by Santosh Kuruvilla, to approve the agenda with the proposed change by Vice Chair Michel. A voice vote approved the motion unanimously.

Olivia Yang recommended removing the following agenda item: Final Report Out of WSU Pilot Small Disadvantaged Business Projects. The final report was in March and there is nothing additional to report on. The pilot will continue and there is no information for this meeting; the project is obligated to report to CPARB every other year.

Olivia Yang moved, seconded by Mr. Kuruvilla, to strike the Final Report Out of WSU Pilot Small Disadvantaged Business Projects item from the agenda. A voice vote approved the motion unanimously.

APPROVE MEETING MINUTES – Action

May 11, 2023

Vice Chair Michel explained that there are two sets of minutes to approve. Chair Zahn noted there will be only one set of minutes going forward. Having two sets of minutes allowed CPARB to conclude that they preferred more thorough minutes. Talia Baker explained that having two consultants take minutes helped educate the consultant about the level of detail the Board was looking for. She said that Puget Sound Meeting Services (PSMS) is not available in September and October, and so Maul Foster & Alongi, Inc. (MFA), will take minutes for those CPARB meetings.

Ms. Baker said that the official minutes for the May meeting are the ones taken by PSMS. She said that she posted a modified version of the minutes that included red text indicating changes to the draft. Ms. Baker noted she had reviewed MFA's notes and found that the two sets of notes are very similar. She displayed the official notes for the Board. Vice Chair Michel called for comments or edits. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to approve both sets of minutes.

Olivia Yang moved, seconded by Janet Jansen, to approve the minutes of May 11, 2023, prepared by Puget Sound Meeting Services as published. A voice vote approved the motion unanimously.

INVITATION FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS – Information

Vice Chair Michel invited public comments.

There were no public comments.

CHAIR REPORT – Information

Chair Zahn shared that she connected with the Governor's Office, noting that they reappointed Josh Swanson and Bruce Hayashi for another term and the new member representing General Contractors is Ms. Robin Strom. Chair Zahn explained that there has not been a final decision regarding the other seats due to lack of applicants. The Governor's Office will solicit for the Specialty Contractors seat, and she is currently awaiting decisions about the other seats.

Related to the PRC, Chair Zahn had a conversation with the Everett Hosing Authority regarding their General Contractor/Construction Management (GC/CM) project. The project was identified as one that the PRC denied on January 26, 2023. There was an inquiry because the Everett Housing Authority put out an RFP for this GC/CM project, and Chair Zahn learned from them and their attorney that the Everett Housing Authority is pursuing federal funding. Their underlying statutes which supersede the RCW 39.10 provisions.

Ms. Yang asked for clarification regarding the Everett Housing Authority and if they will be performing GC/CM work consistent with the RCW 39.10, except for the provision that requires them to go to the PRC. Chair Zahn confirmed this and that the PRC report might discuss this issue further.

Chair Zahn has been sitting in on several committee meetings and expressed appreciation for SHB 1621 Review and the Small Works Committees that met over the summer to ensure they were ready for reporting at the meeting today.

BOARD ENGAGEMENT – Information

Board Member Opening Thoughts/Shared Commitments

Chair Zahn shared the CPARB commitments related to the values of respect, purpose, listening to understand, accountability, and inclusion. She expressed excitement about being back as well as feelings of nervousness due to the summer break and several items she needs to track during the meeting. She said she was glad to have Vice Chair Michel on the journey.

Vice Chair Michel said he was excited to be back and that he had a busy summer with committee work. He expressed excitement in welcoming Ms. Strom and was looking forward to getting to know her. Other members expressed excitement to be back, appreciation for normal routines, to see fellow board members, worry about construction trends, and sorrow about the lack of time off this summer.

Chair Zahn noted that the person who was appointed to represent Counties early this summer has resigned, and the seat is vacant again.

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE (PRC) APPOINTMENTS - Action
Owner-Higher Education—Action

Chair Zahn said that there were two applicants for the vacant Owner-Higher Education. Both applicants were unable to attend the May meeting and requested deferral of the appointment until September 2023. She asked Ms. Yang to share her thoughts about each candidate from a higher education perspective.

Ms. Yang explained that the open position is one of the three higher education positions on the PRC. She said the PRC has one person from Washington State University (WSU) representing Higher Education and that higher education as a group is transitioning to Design-Build, although there is some GC/CM experience. She noted that the designated PRC position does not mean it has to be specifically a someone from a university and what might be needed is a balance of representatives with GC/CM and DB experience. Ms. Yang shared that Ms. Brewer-Rogstad brings GC/CM experience and that both Jason Baerlocher and Traci Brewer-Rogstad have demonstrated support for diverse and small businesses. She noted that she was happy both candidates are applying for the position so that the Board has a choice.

Chair Zahn invited Traci Brewer-Rogstad to speak to her application.

Ms. Brewer-Rogstad shared that she is currently the Senior Program Facilities Director with Renton School District (RSD). Her familiarity and involvement with alternate project delivery began in the early 2000s when she worked for Washington State Ferries, followed by her owner experience working at the Northshore School District beginning in 2014, and then in early 2020 when she transitioned to RSD. She has been the lead director for GC/CM alternative project delivery methods and has led RSD through the first GC/CM approval with PRC in 2020 for a new elementary school. She has also led RSD through the next three project approvals and received agency approval this summer. Ms. Brewer-Rogstad noted she also sat on GC/CM Committee beginning in 2019 and that this committee has been focusing on the development of the GC/CM best practices. Ms. Brewer-Rogstad said that one of the committee's focus was to bring the GC/CM process to more users, to educate and train them, and to be more inclusive. She noted she would like to participate on the PRC because she feels that continuity between best practices in GC/CM and the PRC overall would be helpful.

Chair Zahn invited Mr. Baerlocher to speak to his application.

Mr. Baerlocher shared that he has worked for WSU for 11 years and prior to that he worked for a general contractor for 14 years. He did his first Design-Build project in 2001 and found the process enlightening. Mr. Baerlocher explained that he had experience in both Design-Build and in GC/CM, however, most of the projects he has done at WSU have been Design-Build. Mr. Baerlocher said he had a similar mindset to Mr. Kuruvilla in that he wants to improve things and make the process enjoyable and productive. He has worked with Ms. Yang and other leadership at WSU to improve how projects are delivered while also working to improve the diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) process. Mr. Baerlocher said DEI is challenging in Pullman, but WSU tries to make opportunities available for all projects.

Ms. Yang noted that some of the Board might remember Mr. Baerlocher because he piloted an early version of Prompt Pay for five diverse and small trade partners at the Vancouver campus. Mr. Baerlocher said that one dropped off but that there are four on the list now.

Chair Zahn invited board members to ask questions.

Mr. Hayashi said that while everyone talks about how they see diversity and improvement for small businesses, he does not see it happening with Design-Build and GC/CM, as well as Design-Build for smaller construction companies and architects/engineering (A/E) firms. He said that getting into a team is difficult and asked the candidates how they encouraged, found, and developed those types of firms. Mr. Hayashi shared that he understands trade partners, but large construction firms and A/E firms are those that lead teams, while the small firms do not have the opportunity.

Mr. Baerlocher said he understands Mr. Hayashi's concern and that WSU has begun to develop smaller projects and now has the ability to carry out projects that are less than \$2 million. He noted there have been a few projects that encourage partnerships between larger contractors and smaller architectural firms or vice versa. Mr. Baerlocher explained that in

WSU's trade partner selections, they select the primary designer and builder up front and then pick the rest of team together. Also, he noted that WSU encourages second tier selections to create partnerships. He said that one success was a small engineering firm that partnered with a larger firm.

Ms. Brewer-Rogstad shared that owners have been more focused on subcontractors and consultants and improving the sub tiers so they are more involved. She reported that RSD has learned from their work on projects, noting that RSD is beginning to track several A/E firms and talk with general contractors and see what is out there. Ms. Brewer-Rogstad said they do not have the ability to do smaller projects and that as an organization they are starting to track and look at local firms, and they are finding that a lot of A&E firms are already registered. She noted that RSD has been using those registered firms, but that most of the focus has been on the subs.

Irene Reyes asked the candidates if they would share more about their outreach to small and diverse businesses and certified firms.

Ms. Brewer-Rogstad shared that for alternate project delivery, RSD is focused on increasing the amount of information they request from GC/CM contractors. She explained they have found that companies with an FTE focused on outreach is helpful because they have one person with whom to work, noting that the one-on-one has helped with outreach. She shared that RSD will hold local meetings and work with the local jurisdiction, explaining that in one instance they have a small GC/CM project and are currently meeting with local firms and conducting local outreach to bring more awareness of the project. She have noticed that if they only advertise in the Daily Journal of Commerce or in the Seattle Times, they are not obtaining local awareness. Focusing on local outreach and education is more successful and she believes the more effort they put into outreach the more they will see local businesses bid. She categorized it as a work in progress and said that RSD is seeing small improvements in women-owned businesses, however they are working to improve use of minority-owned firms as well.

Ms. Reyes asked Ms. Brewer-Rogstad if she uses a roster or the Office of Minority and Women's Business Enterprise (OMWBE) list.

Ms. Brewer-Rogstad said that RSD does not use the state list very often and that they do not have their own roster. She noted that they advertise for most projects and that they are starting to require project managers to look at the OWMBE website and reach out to companies that are registered in order to connect with them more. RSD is beginning to use other resources throughout the winter while preparing projects that go to bid in the spring.

Mr. Baerlocher shared that after the primary builder and primary designer, WSU asks specific questions regarding the proposing companies' outreach plans. He noted they are not looking for percentages, but rather how the companies are going to increase the pool of firms, as well as how to get them on the project and grow throughout the project and going forward. He said that some of the recent questions in the RFQs ask to show examples of how the companies have brought in the team, if they selected the team, are they successful on the project, and has the business continued to grow. WSU also considers how they are creating access to capital, opportunities, and training. He said that during the project itself, WSU helps foster outreach throughout the process. Mr. Baerlocher indicated that they attend minority business groups to talk about upcoming projects as well as host open houses, so that firms know about projects in advance. He said that doing this early in a project helps to design projects for small firms. They also partner with the OWMBE office for some of the processes and go to the meetings to encourage the teams that are not on the roster or registered with the state to get registered.

Mark Nakagawara said that Mr. Baerlocher's examples would work in a Design-Build project, however in a GC/CM project there are bids and sub-bid packages. Mr. Nakagawara inquired how these firms would participate.

Mr. Baerlocher said that while he has not done a lot of GC/CM at WSU, his past experience has indicated that companies conduct outreach to properly vet that firm when it makes bids. He noted outreach on those projects is important and might be more present.

Ms. Brewer-Rogstad said that from a GC/CM perspective they have found there is a level of intimidation. Some of the smaller firms tend to be intimidated by the process of registering and following through. She noted it is important to help

these firms see that RSD wants to get local contractors and women, minority, and small businesses involved as much as possible and reassure them that RSD will help along the way. She shared they have received good responses from general contractors, who have become committed to the process in the last couple of years. However, she noted that getting the smaller firms to get registered and come forward is the piece with which RSD is struggling. Ms. Brewer-Rogstad said that they will continue to work on a partnership basis and reassure firms that going through the bidding process is worth the effort. While this takes more time, she noted that RSD is committed to making the effort.

Bobby Forch Jr. asked the candidates if they have metrics or outcomes and could provide a baseline in terms of level of participation, including how they are tracking and what they are working toward.

Ms. Brewer-Rogstad said RSD is tracking and reporting to the PRC when they come forward with projects. She noted that this summer RSD was an approved agency for GC/CM. She also indicated that they use the governor's metrics as a baseline, but that RSD is not limited to that. She explained that RSD generally has a few areas where they are not meeting metrics, including veterans' businesses and minority-owned businesses. Ms. Brewer-Rogstad noted that in general the local- and women-owned business metrics are at and above the governor's metrics.

Mr. Baerlocher said that WSU tracks metrics, but that one of the challenges in Eastern Washington is that there is a small market. While percentages are great, he noted that they can often be skewed. For example, he explained that if there is a large contractor on a project, there would be a higher percentage. He said WSU's goal is to not just track percentages and numbers but also track how WSU is doing with growing businesses and getting opportunities for firms they do have.

Chair Zahn asked for nominations for the position. Ms. Yang said that because she recruited both candidates, she would recuse herself. She urged the Board to consider what the PRC needs in terms of expertise and delivery method.

Chair Zahn suggested that Kyle Twohig might be able to provide insight into the makeup of the PRC and any existing gaps for the Board to consider. Mr. Twohig said there are 33 members on the PRC, noting there were no gaps. He indicated he did not need to influence the Board's decision-making. Vice Chair Michel said that a priority for this position is a person with expertise in alternative delivery, including both GC/CM and Design-Build. He shared that his perception of the volume of applications is that there tends to be more GC/CM applications, and so he would prioritize expertise in GC/CM. Ms. Baker said that it fluctuates, but that there are a lot of GC/CM applications overall. Ms. Baker clarified that the nomination did not need to be seconded.

Karen Mooseker nominated Traci Brewer-Rogstad to serve on the PRC representing Owner-Higher Education. Santosh Kuruvilla nominated Jason Baerlocher to serve on the PRC representing Owner-Higher Education.

Chair Zahn reported the data Mr. Twohig put in the chat: 2023 is tracking with 12 Design-Build, 20 GC/CM, 1 Heavy Civil GC/CM, 17 ASSP.

Linneth Riley Hall shared that some firms qualify for both Design-Build and GC/CM and asked Mr. Twohig if the numbers reflected firms that qualified for both. Mr. Twohig said that the numbers reflected projects approved.

A roll call vote was held for present members to name the candidate they would like to appoint; 9-Traci Brewer-Rogstad, 8-Jason Baerlocher.

Mark Riker moved, seconded by Josh Swanson, to appoint Traci Brewer-Rogstad to serve on the PRC representing Owner-Higher Education. A voice vote approved the nomination. Olivia Yang abstained.

UPDATES TO THE BIDDER RESPONSIBILITY GUIDELINES (SB 5088)—Information

Nancy Deakins said she would quickly review the Bidder Responsibility Guidelines and then Board could decide whether to vote at this meeting or the next. She noted the guidelines are very simple but because they are important guidelines, board members may want to review them prior to voting.

Chair Zahn provided some context, noting that at the last CPARB meeting, the Board decided that the guidelines should be finished by a certain date and that the Board would complete them and then retroactively review. She asked Ms.

Deakins to give a little more context. Ms. Deakins shared that SB 5088, which was passed during the last session, has ramifications for guidelines and owners tracking who has which license at the time of bid. She said it also puts into statute for the general contractor to check subcontractors' licenses at the time of subcontract execution.

Ms. Deakins said that these guidelines are mandatory requirements in all public works bidding and supplemental responsibility criteria. She explained that these guidelines lay out requirements and provide optional tools for public owners to adopt or not adopt and noted that many owners have been using this for a long time.

Chair Zahn said the guidelines are in effect and indicated that the Board now needs to update the suggested guidelines for bidder responsibility with edits from the Department of Labor and Industries (LNI) as a result of SB 5088. She asked whether the guidelines should be adopted at this meeting or if the Board would need to review them and vote at the October meeting. Ms. Deakins said that the Board needed an opportunity to look at the document, however, they could review it today and vote in October. She shared that the bill became effective in July, and that it caught the Board off guard.

Ms. Deakins said the mandatory requirements changed in the RCW 39.04.350. She explained that SB 5088 adds not only the contractor registration at the time of bid but also requires that if the general contractor will be self-performing plumbing, elevator, or electrical work they are required to have licenses for those applicable elements at the time of bid. This requires owners to confirm that the contractor performing the work has the necessary license. Ms. Deakins said the document explains the law, and also has suggested language for bidding documents and adds the licensure requirement. Ms. Deakins explained there is also suggested language regarding a potential bid that the Department of Enterprise Services (DES) added to their bid forms. She said that it could be added, and it was up to the Board to decide. She noted that there are also subcontractor responsibilities and electrical and elevator contractor language, but it does not include plumbing subcontractor license. Another addition is found in the tools section under the owners' checklist, which adds a self-performance section so that owners can check that they have met the responsibility criteria.

Ms. Reyes sought clarification about what the Board is being asked to do. Ms. Deakins said that the legislature passed the update and the guidelines are being updated to reflect the new legislation. Ms. Reyes asked what the deadline was to submit the recommended changes, and Ms. Deakins responded that if board members would give feedback by the end of September, then the Board could vote during the October meeting. Ms. Baker said that if the Board sends feedback by September 29, she will make the document available for pre-read by 10/5.

Chair Zahn said that the Board has a number of best practices that are published as part of CPARB's work; this document was created in 2007 and was last updated in 2019. She indicated the Board needs to clean up and modify the language. Chair Zahn said that moving forward, one thing the Board could discuss is whether the change should come through the Education Connections Committee or if a different committee might be the convener when there are statutory changes and when the Board needs to update their own guidelines. Chair Zahn shared that for this bill, the Board needs to make changes as quickly as possible, so it has guidelines that reflect the current statute. She recommended that the Board provide any comments by September 29 to Ms. Deakins regarding the suggested revision, and a discussion and vote will be added to the October agenda.

COMMITTEE & WORKGROUP REPORTS:

Board Development Committee—*Information & Action*

Committee Co-Chair Lekha Fernandes said that Committee Co-Chair Robynne Thaxton has excellent ideas about how the Board can avoid multiple PRC appointments coming up at the same time, as there recently were in the May CPARB meeting. She handed off the discussion to Co-Chair Thaxton.

Co-Chair Thaxton explained that when there are multiple positions and they all expire at once, the committee recommends changing the positions that are already numbered to have one-, two-, or three-year positions. These positions will be structured so that the same number of positions expire in any given year and there is not a single constituency that comes up at the same time. Co-Chair Thaxton shared that when the Board made the positions, they did not stagger them. When the Board creates new positions, the committee recommends staggering the terms so that people can apply for Position 1 with an initial term of two years, and Position 2 with an initial term of three years. Co-Chair Thaxton suggested

that after this initial term, the following terms will be for the same number years, but that then those terms will be staggered. This will take a few years to get all the PRC terms staggered.

Co-Chair Fernandes added that if the Board staggers the terms, it will avoid losing retained knowledge in specific categories. For example, if both the women- and minority-owned business enterprise (WMBE) and disadvantage business enterprise (DBE) firms need to be appointed at the same time, there is a potential to lose existing knowledge. Staggering the terms provides the opportunity to retain knowledge and sets expectations for people applying, knowing that they only will serve for one or two years. This might provide more of an incentive for people to apply because longer terms can be intimidating.

Ms. Yang noted that the committee had discussed what should happen if someone has a three-year term and steps down prior to their term ending. Co-Chair Thaxton shared that in the past, people have taken over previous terms and the Board has appointed a replacement to serve the full three years rather than the remainder of the original term. The committee proposed that if someone resigns before their term ends, the appointed replacement will finish out the three-year term. The proposal is for the position not the person, and Co-Chair Thaxton clarified that they did not want to ask current board members to give up the positions to which they have been appointed. This new process will take a few years to fully come into play.

Co-Chair Thaxton moved on to the next item regarding the makeup of the PRC. She noted that there are some positions, particularly public owner spots, for which there are many applications but there are not as many positions on the PRC for those spots. The committee is looking at the constituencies on the owner side because right now the Board is heavily private industry and light on owners. Co-Chair Thaxton shared they might expand CPARB to add owners who do GC/CM, which would involve analyzing the types of positions or owners who come before PRC.

Co-Chair Thaxton's last item was to remind the Board that there are a lot of new board members, and they need mentors. She asked that all experienced members please volunteer to become mentors, indicating that Vice Chair Michel is the coordinator. The committee will actively recruit if people do not volunteer.

Co-Chair Fernandes discussed the ad hoc committee structures, explaining that some committees cannot meet quorum because there are several people who are appointed to a committee but are not attending committee meetings. Co-Chair Fernandes posed the following question to be discussed: For these committees, if representation is important and members are not attending, how does the Board ensure that representation exists? Co-Chair Fernandes noted that she thinks representation is important and the benefit about committees is that members are able to send representatives to attend in their place, and these representatives are not required to be on CPARB. Co-Chair Fernandes shared that her first request was that if a CPARB member is not attending committee meetings, that they send a representative because representation is important.

Co-Chair Thaxton said that the committee looked at the bylaws, which indicate that committees can vote on whether proxies are able to vote and help the committee meet quorum. However, the CPARB member must inform the committee chair that someone else is representing them.

Chair Zahn reflected that this is how the Board helps hold each other mutually accountable. She said that Co-Chair Thaxton and Co-Chair Fernandes have thought about how the committees are not the same as CPARB, and that making provisions and process so that proxies can vote hopefully does create more representation and participation. Chair Zahn said that these proxies could build the bench for PRC or board members. She asked if the Board took any exception to the recommendation.

Co-Chair Fernandes said that the bylaws currently state that proxies can vote in committee meetings. Co-Chair Thaxton shared that one recommendation would be for committees to alter the bylaws to allow representation to be based on the people who have been appointed rather than the number of positions. That helps address an outstanding question about whether the quorum is based upon the people appointed. Currently it is based on the number of positions rather than the people appointed. She said that the Board does not need to make any changes but would like to remind committee chairs that their committees can vote to allow proxies to vote and meet quorum.

Ms. Yang asked if Co-Chair Thaxton was referring to the CPARB bylaws or the bylaws that govern committees and Co-Chair Thaxton clarified that the CPARB bylaws govern ad hoc committees. Ms. Baker said that there is a section in the CPARB bylaws that covers how committees are handled.

Chair Zahn asked if the committee was only referring to changes to committees and proxies and rather than changes to the Board itself. Co-Chair Thaxton said that this is not about CPARB membership, it is only about committee membership and voting. Ms. Reyes clarified whether CPARB needed to vote on this and Co-Chair Thaxton said the committee was looking for input. Then the bylaws would need to change during the next meeting in October. In order to do so there would need to be a meeting notice, the bylaw change would be introduced, and the change would be official at the next meeting in December.

Ms. Yang asked if the committee was proposing that during the October meeting CPARB allow committees to do the following: establish that a quorum is based on the number of positions and, if a CPARB member is appointed to a committee and cannot attend, the member can send a proxy and that proxies are allowed to vote. Co-Chair Thaxton clarified that there are no changes to the bylaws yet and the committees do need to vote regarding sending proxies and that proxies are allowed to vote. Committees are already allowed to determine that the appointed members can send proxies and those proxies are allowed to vote and count towards quorum. She said that the bylaws already reflect this, and the Board Development Committee is reminding the larger board.

Co-Chair Thaxton clarified that the first issue, that quorum is based on the number of people appointed rather than the number of positions, is an issue the Board would have to vote on in order to change the bylaws. This is the issue that the committee is gathering the Board's feedback on now. Co-Chair Thaxton reflected that what she heard from the discussion was that the Board is fine with the committee's current intent.

Ms. Reyes shared a concern regarding what the Board means by appointed and who appoints. She felt that the Board needs to ensure there is clarity across all committees regarding definitions that are used. Co-Chair Thaxton said that the committees that have not voted need to do so at their next meeting determining that proxies can count for quorum and are then able vote.

Ms. Baker said that sometimes when CPARB is appointing committee members there is not a specific person but rather a position, and that position is appointed to a committee. When the committee meets, that position has been considered a member, but in some cases, no one is serving in that position. CPARB needs to make sure that if someone is appointed to a committee, then someone on the Board follows up with that person to ensure they attend the committee meetings. She said that, according to the clarification from the Board Development Committee, it sounds as though any representative will count toward the committee's quorum. Co-Chair Thaxton affirmed that what Ms. Baker said was what the committee would recommend.

Ms. Baker encouraged people who cannot attend their committee meetings to send proxies to help them meet quorum. She said that there are several committees where people and several positions are appointed, when appointees are unable to attend, this results in the committee being unable to meet quorum.

JOC Evaluation Committee—Information

Committee Chair Linda Shilley said that the committee is confirming the commitment of existing voting members and will come to the October CPARB meeting for approval of changes. She noted that the Associated General Contractors of Washington (AGC) invited the committee back on October 26, 2023, to conduct another four-hour class on the JOC best practices guidelines. This will be the second time the committee has presented for the AGC. Chair Shilley said the committee is getting other inquiries, the training has been very well received, and they are seeing a lot more interest in contracting world.

Chair Zahn wondered about the JOC Best Practices Guidelines and periodic updates. She asked if there are edits to the best practices guidelines and whether the committee reconvenes to make modifications, so the update happens more organically. Chair Shilley responded that the committee is redlining and gathering thoughts during each committee meeting. She noted that if the committee changes just the last line, which is the list of the members, she does not think that would come to CAPRB for approval. However, if they adopt changes to content, she wondered if that would need to come

to the Board. CPARB had approved the guidelines, so she believes that if they make changes to the content other than the bibliography documents, the actual guidelines content would come to the Board for approval. Chair Zahn agreed that the content would come to the Board as it is, and that this is similar to the Bidder Responsibility Guidelines.

Small Works Committee—Information

Committee Co-Chair Bill Frare provided the update that the committee is working on four things simultaneously. At OMWBE they are creating the Public Works Small Business Enterprise Certification program. The committee has been concerned about using the term “small business” because it has many definitions, and he appreciated the clarity of the program’s name. They are going out with an expedited rule process that CR-105 will be filed in the next few weeks. He said that LNI is creating expedited rules for the changes to their organization and updating the system to be able to accommodate changes made relative to affidavits and bonds. He said that the Municipal Research and Services Center (MRSC) has established criteria for statewide Small Works and upgrades to the MRSC system. Co-Chair Frare said these criteria will go to application development on schedule.

Co-Chair Frare reported that DES is creating a formal rules process, has filed their CR-101, and is currently gathering informal feedback. The committee has held a series of public and stakeholder meetings and attended meetings for other organizations, with the last public stakeholder meeting being September 21, 2023. Co-Chair Frare noted that after the last stakeholder meeting, they will close the informal process, draft final rules, publish the CR-102, start the formal public comment period, and then hold their formal public meeting. Co-Chair Frare said that the support to the Small Works Committee is broad and deep, and he recognized three people who are representative of the many people who support them: Jon Rose with MRSC, Jolene Skinner with LNI, who volunteered to work as a project manager between the agencies, and Sharon Harvey with OWMBE.

Co-Chair Frare noted that they have been asking the following questions at public gatherings:

- What does rotation mean?
- What happens if bids go out at an agency estimate of \$340,000 and all the bids come in \$360,000?
- What happens if a contractor and direct contracting does not respond to the solicitation for a quote?
- What happens relative to the rotation?
- What happens if they cannot negotiate a price?

These questions were asked to the stakeholders to gather feedback about how those processes work. Co-Chair Frare said there is a question about experience and confidence, and he wants to ensure that responsibility criteria are appropriate and not exclusionary.

Co-Chair Frare said that early in the Small Works Committee they talked about openness, transparency, and building trust with the contracting community, specifically the minority business community, to ensure that the rotation and contracting methods were not favoring one contractor or a group of contractors over another. They asked what sort of documentation is required of a public agency regarding their rotation and price negotiation. He said the committee is developing themes using those questions and providing guidelines for allowing public owners to establish their own policies relative to rotation.

Co-Chair Frare said that the committee wants to make sure that rotation policies are publicly available, as well as define what publicly available means. He said the committee’s estimation is that “publicly available” means they do not have to ask someone for the rotation policies. This may be something on a website, or if an entity does not have a website, they would have a handout available. He noted the law indicates there must be a rotation when there are six or more contractors, but it did not carry that language into the six or less category. Co-Chair Frare said the rules will specify that rotation is required both for six or more contractors and six or less contractors.

Co-Chair Frare said that an important thing for LNI is setting up the contract for tracking. The committee will need public agencies to set up the contract for tracking because some agencies allow contractors to do their own setup and sometimes the information is not entered correctly. Within that rotation policy, the committee needs to describe exactly what responsiveness means. When going after a direct contract, the agency needs to state by when they need a response and provide information about what to do when they do not receive a response.

Co-Chair Frare noted that the committee has settled on these as the key elements. He complimented the participation during the stakeholder meetings and said they have received feedback that has been well received. Co-Chair Frare said there is still more work to do, and he will not solicit questions and receive feedback today regarding stakeholder outreach. The Board is already familiar with committee issues listed in the informational PowerPoint and on the website. He indicated that there is a form to provide additional feedback.

Mr. Swanson asked how the representation for the responsible bidder criteria is going, because that is what matters to Construction Trades and Labor. He wondered how much the committee vets the process to ensure that the firms that bid on jobs are complying. Co-Chair Frare replied that vetting becomes complicated in a direct contracting area. He explained that in the competitive bid area of \$350,000 and below there is responsiveness and supplemental bidder criteria that can be evaluated during the bid award process. The point of direct contracting is to grow small contractors, provide opportunities, and help them build their business. Co-Chair Frare said that the worst thing that can happen to a small contractor is that they get a bid for a contract that is a little too big or they do not have the expertise and then they get into a financial situation that destroys the businesses. He noted the committee is wrestling with the process because it does not want to be exclusionary and require 10 years' experience. There is a balance of understanding how to ensure a contractor has experience to be successful while also not being paternal or exclusionary when weeding out contractors.

Committee Co-Chair Reyes added that if OWMBE has certified a firm, then it has already been vetted and is qualified. She explained she is pushing hard for OWMBE certification because it is a part of the vetting process. Co-Chair Reyes said the committee is attempting to figure out what else would demonstrate that a firm has experience and proficiency.

Kara Skinner said that what Co-Chair Frare and Co-Chair Reyes were discussing describes her job in surety bonds. She said that she avoids writing a bond for a contractor that puts them out of business. Ms. Skinner noted that surety bonds may feel very financial because they are underwriting but that her organization asks a lot of questions when underwriting. They want to see other jobs and evaluate if it is the same kind of job, location, and owners because all of that is important. They call prior jobs and ask for references.

Project Review Committee—Information

Committee Chair Twohig introduced Jessica Murphy as the PRC's new Vice Chair. Chair Twohig said the committee has had three meetings since their last report and the first one was a two-day hybrid meeting in Spokane, which was the first time gathering in person since early 2020. Chair Twohig said the meeting went well and was the first PRC meeting ever held in Eastern Washington. The meeting had teams that presented both in person and remotely, and throughout this process they learned to have the chair and the presenter in the same room. The committee's goal is to try to have one in-person hybrid meeting on each side of the state each year.

The committee welcomed new members and said farewell to departing members in the June meeting. The new members were assigned mentors and by the July meeting all had met and were reviewing their materials.

Chair Twohig reported that the committee proposed and adopted updates to the project applications. These updates were primarily to include more explicit data in the inclusion section and to request actual performance. The other update was to provide more clarity to applicants for Alternative Subcontractor Selection Procurement (ASSP), formerly EC/CM and MC/CM. He explained that applicants either need to be working on their ASSP application at the time of their GC/CM application, which is recommended, or that applicants will need to return at a subsequent meeting if the GC/CM recommends using ASSP. Chair Twohig said there were a few things to clean up regarding the schedule of ASSP procurement and where it fits into their project timeline, as well as a few additional small components.

Chair Twohig directed the Board to the end of the report, which has a summary of what the ASSPs have been used for. He said that the intent of the change is being used in the owner community, that the applications for ASSP have been compelling, and they are crucial to the project. Chair Twohig said the intent of the change is being leveraged well in the community and the committee is adding clarity to the change as well as scoring for the panelists. He said that to date, the committee has approved \$425 million in projects over the last three months and that four ASSP solicitations were included in these projects or done separately. Chair Twohig reported that there were four Design-Build projects, four GC/CM projects, three recertifications, and noted there are currently 15 certified agencies and that all projects have been approved and none denied.

Chair Twohig said that there were two other components, and one is related to the Everett Housing Authority, which Chair Zahn discussed earlier in the meeting. He explained that they had already procured a contractor under the GC/CM model, but that the committee is unsure whether their use of GC/CM will follow the RWC 39.10. However, the committee does have information from their attorney that they have received federal Housing and Urban Development funding. Chair Twohig noted that by the federal regulations, if they do not go through the RWC 39.10 then they must go through federal procurement procedures.

Chair Twohig shared that the committee has a request to CPARB regarding ASSP. In 2016 CPARB had a committee to create an EC/CM and MC/CM best practices document and now, because the legislation has changed to allow for ASSP and is not limited to EC/CM and MC/CM, the PRC is requesting that CPARB consider reforming that group to update that document. Chair Twohig said that two PRC members who were originally on the EC & MC/CM committee have expressed a willingness to participate in updating this document.

Chair Zahn wondered if the GC/CM Committee could update the document instead of reviving the ECCM/MCCM Best Practices Committee. Nick Datz said that his committee does have a chapter in the GC/CM Best Practices Manual dedicated to ASSP and he believes the recent legislative changes are covered. Vice Chair Michel said he thought that GC/CM committee is a great venue to revisit the document Chair Twohig referred to. He said that doing the work in the GC/CM committee seems like a good way to accomplish the same outcome. Chair Twohig said he had a small handful of PRC members who would like to contribute to the update and that he would connect with Nick outside of this meeting.

Chair Zahn said that as the PRC membership grows, mentorship and process creates better clarity. She observed that the number of applications continues to increase, and she encouraged board members to periodically attend the meetings to get a sense for the cadence of discussions.

Chair Zahn recessed the meeting at 10:29 a.m. for a break.

Chair Zahn reconvened the meeting at 10:40 a.m. and confirmed quorum.

GC/CM Committee—Information

Committee Chair Datz said that the committee met to discuss the final chapter in the Best Practices Manual, the procurement chapter, but otherwise the committee has a complete draft manual. He noted the committee needs to address comments and package the manual for the public.

Chair Zahn asked if there would be a draft for the Board to review and provide feedback and Chair Datz said the committee anticipated sending the draft manual to the Board for review, comment, and input. He explained that after the Board reviews, they will incorporate the comments into the final version. Chair Datz shared that another option was to send the pre-version and gather comments before they send the final draft to the Board. Chair Zahn asked that the committee send the draft to the Board. Chair Datz said that the committee will meet in October and will send the draft to Ms. Baker to distribute to the Board for review.

Chair Zahn asked if Chair Datz thought the committee would have a final draft version by the December meeting and Mr. Datz responded that it would probably be available for the February meeting.

BE/DBI Committee—Information & Action

Committee Co-Chair Fernandes said that the BE/DBI Committee has had two meetings since it was relaunched. During their first meeting the committee discussed their mission, and in the second meeting they evaluated the report and determined the committee's focus. Co-Chair Fernandes said the committee will focus on the area of Prompt Pay and look at examples of other places in which Prompt Pay is being used. She said this will provide a focus for how CPARB can expand Prompt Pay for small and diverse businesses. She noted that in the September meeting the committee will discuss the examples from the previous meeting and determine whether they will work in the scope of Design-Build.

Chair Zahn talked about the issue of incorporating BE/DBI into common practice and how living the best practices is an important point. She wondered how the Board could entrench these best practices into all the Design-Build, JOC, and GC/CM best practices. She said that BE/DBI should be embedded so it is not a novelty, but rather an integral part of daily

business. She asked the committee if they have thought about how BE/DBI work is enfolded in the other best practices guidelines. Co-Chair Fernandes said that the committee has not begun work in that area, but as the committee is doing their work, that lens is critical. Co-Chair Fernandes said that all the best practices the committee will be discussing are applicable in Design-Build and the Board can layer those into other best practices manuals, but the committee is not there yet. Committee Co-Chair Santosh Kuruvilla shared that the committee has the BE/DBI report, and it is using that report to launch their current work.

Chair Zahn asked if the committee was doing well in terms of representation or if it was recommending any changes to membership. Co-Chair Fernandes said that that changes were not needed at this time and that more people have been attending meetings perhaps because they are responding to the interest in the subject matter, the energy in the room, and the willingness of committee members to listen to different perspectives. She invited everyone to join the committee meetings and participate as a stakeholder because everyone's opinion matters.

Ms. Deakins expressed excitement in hearing the committee's report and noted that it made her think of the recent legislation SB 5268, which included equity along with the Small Works Roster. She wondered if the committee might consider including elements of the Small Works Roster into the GC/CM best practices and if the Design-Build best practices and the JOC would be updated all three could include equity language. Co-Chair Fernandes agreed that was important and noted that the practices the committee is receiving are real examples that are very tangible.

Education Connections Committee—Information

Committee Chair Curt Gimmestad said that the committee has been meeting since February and has been gathering information about education connection opportunities in the construction industry. He said that the report he provided to CPARB included links or entities with opportunities for people to discover trainings. Chair Gimmestad shared that the committee has been refining the scope to gather foundational resources and springboard into other thoughts and comments. One such resource would be prime contractor trainings. He said that a lot of contracting entities have training resources which they have made available to other entities. Chair Gimmestad said the committee has parked that issue and will come back to it. He indicated that the committee would look specifically at contracting, subcontracting and even public entities to find training materials. In the interim, the committee has created a list and will continue to add to it. Chair Gimmestad said the next task is to add the resources to the CPARB website.

Chair Gimmestad said that the committee has found that a lot of entities provide a variety of educational opportunities. He said that when the committee is identifying training opportunities, they are putting the opportunities into the following buckets: safety, leadership, project management, finance and the like. This way, people interested in a specific topic will be able to easily locate the training they need. Chair Gimmestad added that the Education Connections Committee is beginning to engage with other committees to find crossover, provide more resources, and identify what challenges in industry they address.

Ms. Fernandes said that the BE/DBI and the Education Connections Committee need to connect because a part of the BE/DBI report included having access to training. Chair Gimmestad said that the BE/DBI committee was one of the top two on their list to contact.

Chair Zahn asked who the chair was. Chair Gimmestad shared that he is the chair, and the committee does not currently need anything from CPARB. However, the committee is working to fill the two open positions.

SHB 1621 Review Committee—Information & Action

Committee Co-Chair Nakagawara said the committee has been meeting since June. He provided an overview of SHB 1621 for the committee saying that the bill tried to level the thresholds for crew work. It specifically addressed public utility districts (PUDs), first- and second-class cities, water and sewer districts and fire districts. It attempted to level the different thresholds for single trade work and multiple trade work that the crews can self-perform. Co-Chair Nakagawara said the bill had provisions that dealt with bidder responsibility determinations and language that was grabbed from existing statutes. He said that the subcommittee found the terms taken from one area do not apply or have the same meaning for another entity. As an example, Co-Chair Nakagawara said that SHB 1621 talks about prudent utility management (PUM), which holds meaning for PUDs but not for first- and second-class cities.

Co-Chair Nakagawara said the committee focused on three things. The first was discussing if PUM is appropriate for first- and second-class cities, water and sewer districts and fire districts. The second concerns definitions of “equipment” and “materials” because these terms hold different meaning for a PUD than it does for municipal districts. The third concerns bidder responsibility language that was borrowed from second-class cities statute that was applied to first-class cities, water and sewer districts, PUDs, and fire districts.

Co-Chair Nakagawara said that this task has been a laborious process because there are a lot of voices and stakeholders who have expressed concerns with a lot of the bill. He said that one issue was that since the committee that was created in May, there have not been any CPARB meetings to add members to the committee. Co-Chair Nakagawara said that PUDs and water districts have approached him about joining as members and he would like to request adding two members to assist as the report is drafted. He noted that this relates to the earlier discussion about obtaining a quorum. He shared that the proposed members have been in attendance and participating at all the meetings, and they have concerns they would like to share as members on the committee.

Chair Zahn reminded the Board that in the May meeting, CPARB did not have all the committee members identified and that this meeting is when the Board would need to vote to add official members to this committee.

Committee Co-Chair Michel said that he and Co-Chair Nakagawara are Co-Chairs, and the work has been a heavy lift. He provided the context that the legislation passed and included an obligation for CPARB to provide recommendations about the bill because it does not go into effect until June 2024. Co-Chair Michel said that CPARB's report and recommendations will be a big component during the next legislative session. He encouraged CPARB members to review this bill with their constituents in mind.

Co-Chair Michel said although the committee's goal is to find consensus for the recommendations in its report, he and Co-Chair Nakagawara recognized that there will not be consensus for every topic, so the committee is outlining a method to include responses or perspectives from various stakeholder groups while trying to find balance. Co-Chair Michel said that when thresholds are raised and the raised thresholds include flexibility to allow for self-performed work, this could reduce the number of public bid opportunities that promote CPARB's goals to increase small, minority, and diverse businesses in public contracting. Co-Chair Michel said that this is a complicated topic, and the committee will work to provide recommendations that are balanced.

Co-Chair Nakagawara said that the membership lacks representation from PUDs, water and sewer districts, and fire districts. He can represent first- and second-class cities but since there is no PUDs, water and sewer districts, or fire districts currently represented on CPARB these positions on the committee were not initially identified.

Chair Zahn said she would like to talk about the process and timeline to get to the December 31st deadline and make sure that CPARB is transparent about points of alignment on the committee as well as points of differences.

Co-Chair Nakagawara said that Diane Pottinger of the North City Water District in Shoreline would be a voice for water districts. Additionally, Liz Anderson of the Washington Public Utility District Association would be a voice for PUDs.

Ms. Riley Hall asked Co-Chair Nakagawara if he had talked to the potential new members. Co-Chair Nakagawara said he had, and both have confirmed that they are interested, and have attended committee meetings from the beginning. Co-Chair Michel added that they are very reliable, contribute effectively, and he supports and recommends their addition as committee members.

Mark Nakagawara moved, seconded by Keith Michel, to add Diane Pottinger of the North City Water District and Liz Anderson of the Washington Public Utility District Association as members of the SHB 1621 Review Committee. A voice vote approved the motion unanimously.

Chair Zahn addressed the committee's timeline. She said that while there are two scheduled CPARB meetings before December 31, 2023, the Board can add a meeting in November for a special topic if they agree to take up only that topic. Customarily CPARB will review a draft report in one meeting, board members will take that information to their stakeholders, and bring comments and recommendations to the next meeting, and then allow time for the committee to

incorporate those comments in preparation for finalization of the report at the following meeting. It is important that CPARB allows time for dissemination of the information to the various affected stakeholder groups for feedback prior to approving a final report.

Ms. Riley Hall noted that now the committee has nine members, and she wondered if there was concern that only two of those members are owners. Co-Chair Nakagawara said that because he represented owners, there will now be three members representing owners.

In the chat, Michael Transue asked: “Are fire districts intended to be included?” Co-Chair Nakagawara shared the committee has not been able to identify a representative, and at this point he believes it would be difficult to add a member who has not attended the meetings already.

Chair Zahn asked if it would be helpful for Board members who have not been attending the committee meetings to talk about nuances. She said that CPARB wants to meet the commitments of the legislature and their timelines.

Co-Chair Nakagawara said that he thought the committee would have something for the pre-read at this meeting, but the draft has not had a full review by the rest of committee members. He said that he and Co-Chair Michel thought it would be better if the committee discussed the draft before presenting it to CPARB. Co-Chair Nakagawara said that if people are interested in the draft document, it is available on the [SHB 1621 Review Committee September 12, 2023](#) event page. The committee intends to prepare a refined draft for the October CPARB meeting. Co-Chair Michel said that the committee will meet on September 26, 2023, to refine the document and will be able to share it during the October CPARB meeting. Chair Zahn said that at the October meeting CPARB will schedule a one-hour meeting in November if it is needed.

Ms. Deakins added that because some of the committee’s recommendations are to change what was in the bill, she worries that December is late for the Board to vote on and send a report to legislators. Senator Bob Hasegawa said that having a November meeting would be a good idea. Chair Zahn said that if there are recommendations for legislative changes, CPARB would have a special meeting in November to vote on any recommendations, and that she would like to see if Board members are supportive of that. She asked if there were objections to meeting in November. There were no objections.

Ms. Reyes asked about inviting members to join CPARB committees and wondered what the sales pitch is for committee work. She suggested creating a template that says what the benefit is and why people should join CPARB committees. Chair Zahn said that the Board will take up that issue separately.

Project Feedback Process Workgroup—Information

Committee Co-Chair Gonzalez said that the workgroup is still in the fledgling stage and has had three meetings where they have added members and settled on regularly occurring monthly meetings. He said that the first meetings were spent talking through things and generating thoughts, ideas, and suggestions. The workgroup used those initial meetings to establish objectives and refine them.

Co-Chair Gonzalez shared the workgroup’s first objective is determining how to prevent noncompliance with RCW 39.10 from happening, and the next objective is figuring out what happens when noncompliance does happen. He shared that the workgroup has coordinated with the Education Connections Committee and will be reaching out to the GC/CM Committee due to some possible overlap. The workgroup’s approach will be focused on providing a deterrent rather than policing. He said that they are mindful that the PRC has established criteria for approving projects and certifications, and the workgroup acknowledges the need to be cautious towards possible changes. Co-Chair Gonzalez confirmed the workgroup wants to make sure possible changes in process do not influence or affect the criteria that have been established for approval/denial of projects and certifications. He said that the committee will continue with their work and report back to CPARB.

Chair Zahn asked if the committee has any needs in terms of committee makeup and participation. Co-Chair Gonzalez replied that they do not have any at this time. After looking at the list of members, Chair Zahn asked Mr. Riker and Mr. Swanson if they felt the need for a representative from labor to be included. Mr. Riker confirmed he would appreciate a

labor representative, but he has limited capacity to participate. He agreed to look for a representative for this workgroup. Chair Zahn said that CPARB can revisit that issue at a later date.

NEW BUSINESS

Member Ideas—Information & Discussion

Chair Zahn shared that because CPARB currently has a heavy workload, any new business will be added to the parking lot. She reviewed the current parking lot items which include how to embed the core values that were adopted in 2021 and legal interpretation. She heard concerns about continuous improvement and the recruitment process for committees and would like them to be added to the parking lot. She suggested moving past the Member Ideas agenda item for now and picking them up when there is more bandwidth. There were no objections.

ADMINISTRATIVE

2024 Scheduled Meeting Dates—Information & Action

Ms. Baker directed the Board to the agenda where the 2024 meeting dates were listed. Chair Zahn reminded the board that an April meeting was added last year and since 2024 will be a short legislative session she asked the Board if they wanted to keep the April meeting on the schedule. There were no objections.

Budget Report—Information

Ms. Deakins presented the budget to the committee. CPARB added one hybrid meeting in May and the PRC will have two hybrid meetings each year, so there will be additional costs related to travel. Ms. Baker shared that there will be additional expenses for meeting minutes because she has Maul Foster Alongi providing meeting support on 6 of the 8 active ad hoc committees.

Ms. Deakins said that the budget is supposed to be through the entire biennium, but there have been straggler bills that will affect the budget. By the October meeting, the Board should have the closing report for the biennium through June 30th and the budget for the current projected biennium beginning July 1.

October 12, 2023 Draft Agenda—Discussion

Vice Chair Michel directed the Board to the draft agenda for the October 12, 2023 meeting and asked for their input.

Ms. Baker added one item: a new PRC appointment. She said that the Public Hospitals position for the PRC expires at the end of October, and CPARB will need to appoint another member. Ms. Baker said she needed to notify the member whose position is expiring. She wondered if CPARB wanted to appoint a new member for the position in October. Chair Zahn recommended waiting until December and asking the incumbent to continue until there is an appointment. Ms. Baker agreed and said she will do the recruiting tasks.

Ms. Deakins suggested adding to the Bidder Responsibility Guidelines update. Ms. Thaxton shared that there would be proposed bylaws information, with action happening at the December meeting.

Chair Zahn suggested the Board think about the three categories of agenda items: information only, items where dialogue and discussion are needed, and actual board votes. She suggested that if the Board has many agenda items, that information-only items might be better off as a written report so the Board can maximize its time together in dialogue. Mr. Riker added in chat: I strongly support that process. Chair Zahn asked if the Board agreed, and they indicated they did.

CLOSING THOUGHTS—Information

Chair Zahn invited members to share closing thoughts. Closing thoughts centered on feeling like the Board was back at school, hearing and seeing the ASSP the PRC report included appreciation for good discussions, being impressed by the good work completed, appreciation for the many moving parts, good leadership, and pace of the Board, feeling energized at the end of the meeting, and the importance of volunteering to be a mentor. It was also flagged that small business owners are not paid for being members of committees.

Chair Zahn reminded everyone that this is a volunteer board, and they will add discussing stipends for small business participation on committees to the parking lot.

ADJOURNMENT

With there being no further business, Chair Zahn adjourned the meeting at 11:54 a.m.

Staff & Guests

Talia Baker, DES	Aleanna Kondelis, Hill International
Jason Baerlocher, WSU	Don Laford
Traci Brewer-Rogstad, Renton School District	Brynn Linville
Patricia Collins, Maul Foster & Alongi, Inc.	Monique Martinez, DES
Nick Datz, Sound Transit	Jessica Murphy, City of Seattle
Nancy Deakins, DES	Diane Pottinger, North City Water Dist.
Brandy DeLange, AWC	Jon Rose, MRSC
Bill Frare, DES	Linda Shilley, Pierce Transit
Curt Gimmestad, Absher Const. & AGC	Young Sang Song, Song Consulting
Jeff Gonzalez, DES	Michael Transue, MCAW
Theresa Gonzalez	Kyle Twohig, Spokane County
Chris Herman	