

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board
Board Development Committee

Meeting Notes 11/7/2023

Page 1 of 5

Co-Chair Robynne Thaxton called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m. A quorum was established.

Welcome and introductions:

Committee members in attendance unless otherwise noted:

- Robynne Thaxton *Co-Chair*, Thaxton Parkinson PLLC CPARB
- Lekha Fernandes, *Co-Chair*, OMWBE CPARB
- Santosh Kuruvilla, Exeltech CPARB
- Jeff Jurgensen, OAC Services (absent) PRC
- Irene Reyes, The Glove Lady CPARB
- Linneth Riley Hall, Sound Transit CPARB
- Olivia Yang, Washington State University CPARB
- Janice Zahn, Port of Seattle CPARB

Other attendees include:

- a) Talia Baker, DES
- b) Colleen Newell, MFA

Review and approve agenda:

Co-Chair Thaxton reviewed the agenda and asked the group for any edits before proceeding. Talia Baker noted that there were a few items that should be added to the agenda, including a discussion about mentors and meeting schedule for next year. These items were added to New Issues.

Lekha Fernandes moved, seconded by Janice Zahn, to approve the agenda. The motion was approved by a voice vote.

Irene Reyes joined the meeting at 3:04 p.m.

Review and approve last meeting's minutes:

Co-Chair Thaxton asked the group to review and provide any edits to the minutes from the meeting on August 1, 2023 and September 5, 2023.

Santosh Kuruvilla moved, seconded by Lekha Fernandes, to approve the minutes from August 1 and September 5, 2023. A voice vote approved the motion. Janice Zahn abstained.

Linneth Riley Hall joined the meeting at 3:05 p.m.

Invitation to the public to participate

Co-Chair Thaxton noted this committee meeting is open to participation from non-committee members.

Structure of the PRC:

Staggered Appointments

- a) Co-Chair Thaxton pulled up the Project Review Committee (PRC) member list and presented a proposed solution to stagger the appointments. She had looked at all stakeholder positions that were expiring at the same time and assigned staggered terms—one-, two-, or three-year terms—for each of those positions. Length of service was considered for some of the term assignments, but otherwise the appointments were randomly assigned. With this new proposed solution, each of the stakeholder positions would be staggered, with 11 out of the 33 total positions expiring each year.
- b) Co-Chair Thaxton asked that the committee look at the proposed plan for staggering positions and provide feedback or suggestions, which they could discuss more in depth at the next meeting. Another opportunity this committee might need to consider is whether to spread the appointments out over various months. For example, PRC appointments could take place in April and then again in October—it would depend on what CPARB would like to do for their schedule. The hope would be that these appointments do not all happen during the same meeting, which may help with recruitment of

Board Development Committee

Meeting Notes 11/7/2023

Page 2 of 5

applicants.

- c) An issue arose this past year when appointments were attempted to be spread out over several months. This resulted in the deferral of votes because there were not enough applicants, and more time was needed for recruitment. Building in sufficient time for recruitment will help with the ability to spread out appointments and keep the schedule on track. It was also brought up that the number of applicants and “enough” needs to be defined in terms of applicants for PRC positions.
- d) It was clarified that the proposed plan for staggering appointments is based solely on the position and not on the member. The only consideration given for creating term lengths was to assign shorter term lengths for those positions in which a member has served in that role for a while. The positions that had individuals serving in them for a while were assigned the shorter-term length.
- e) It was pointed out how some of the same positions are expiring at the same time. For example, the appointments of Construction Manager positions are all happening in 2023. While there are fewer owners than practitioners, there was an attempt to preserve those who had been appointed to their terms as much as possible. Beyond that, the number of years chosen was defaulted to keeping three years, and then two years, and the last resort was giving someone one year. The intent was to maximize the appointments.
- f) As the committee reviews this proposed plan, some consideration should also be given to whether certain positions are harder to fill.
- g) It was clarified that current terms are not being cut short, but rather they begin after the current terms are up. If someone is appointed for a term, they will fulfill that term. It is the next round of appointments in which that current term will be affected, with 2025 being a big year for appointments.
- h) This proposed plan will be beneficial for recruitment and indicating how long each term length is. It may attract the interest of more candidates if there was a shorter term to which they could apply, rather than the standard three-year term.
- i) It was brought up that the DBE positions posed challenges, because they were all created at the same time and were not staggered from the beginning. Additionally, another challenge was considering the balance of the PRC, with the makeup being two-thirds private. This representation was taken into consideration when staggering the positions.
- j) Co-Chair Thaxton will send this working plan to PRC Chair Kyle Twohig and Vice Chair Jessica Murphy to look over, but prior to that she would like to get the committee’s feedback. In addition to sending it to the PRC for review, it was suggested to make this draft plan available to the public to allow time for review and comment.
- k) In order to streamline the process, it was recommended that the draft plan be provided to the PRC at the same time this committee is reviewing it. Additionally, if there were any recommended changes to the makeup for the PRC, then this would also need to go out for public comment. If this document were presented to the public, it was suggested that all personal information be removed and just leave the position, term expiration, and proposed dates.
- l) It was noted that this plan should be framed in a way that indicates that everyone has a chance to apply for any position. In deciding between positions with one, two, or three years, Co-Chair Thaxton noted that there had to be some direction or analysis, and the deciding factor regarding how to assign various terms was randomly assigned. There is a potential scenario in which a person applies for all three positions, or a person in position 1 could apply for position 2.
- m) It was pointed out that one year can go very quickly and the hope is that one of the more experienced candidates would apply for the one-year term and then they could apply for the following term for three years.

Makeup of the PRC

- a) There are not nearly as many owners as there are practitioners on the PRC. For example, there is only one school district position and there are quite a few school districts that come to the PRC. Understanding who is coming to the PRC should be a good consideration for where more representation is needed on the PRC. Additionally, there are more counties and cities coming to the PRC.
- b) It was pointed out that the job of those on the PRC is not to advocate for their stakeholders but rather to

Board Development Committee

Meeting Notes 11/7/2023

Page 3 of 5

hold specific knowledge of delivery methods. However, the PRC is supposed to reflect the makeup of CPARB, and currently the balance does not reflect that.

- c) The hope is that the stakeholders filling the position are familiar with the projects and would be able to ask the right questions to ensure the applications are fully formed. PRC members have the opportunity to submit questions prior to the meeting so applicants are able to provide answers and fill in any gaps.
- d) It was noted that it goes both ways. Linneth Riley Hall provided an example: she represents General Owners on the PRC but represents the transportation stakeholder group. WSDOT plans to come to the PRC in January. As a General Owner, WSDOT has been asking for advice on how to fill out the application. Linneth plans to recuse herself because she has been involved in the process. The balance of Owners should also be considered, and where there are Owners with just one position, it may be an opportunity to add an additional position.
- e) Currently the Project Feedback Process Committee is having a similar conversation. They are discussing the importance of not fixating on the project but rather owner-readiness. The focus is not on the project type but rather the owner, which may be done best owner to owner.
- f) There was a clarification the about Owner-Transportation position and it was confirmed that Linneth's position is General Owner. WSODT has an Owner-General Public position. There are categories on the PRC that are not clear on what they are representing, as well as owner groups that are having a difficult time recruiting. There should be consideration for what stakeholder groups are missing, but there is also concern about adding categories due to challenges in recruitment.
- g) Regarding the consideration of ensuring a better balance between owners and practitioners, the question was posed about whether the type of owners and vertical and horizontal is important. When considering owners and different types, it is important to create a balance of voices and types. For example, it is important to have someone who understands what an owner goes through, such as funding, cost allocation, stakeholders, etc.
- h) Historically, Sound Transit took the General Owner position on the PRC because there was no category for transportation at the time. This is also how WSDOT ended up in the Owner-General Public position. There is support for having more General Owner positions which provides more flexibility where people can go.
- i) It was reiterated again that the composition of the PRC is supposed to reflect CPARB. It was asked whether it would be possible to restructure or name positions within the PRC so that that they are in alignment with the makeup of the Board. While this would entail a complete overhaul of the PRC, there may be a way to demonstrate a correlation. It was recommended to reclassify and define what each of the positions are.
- j) Once it is determined if there are any positions that are vague, the next steps would be to define the positions. This would entail looking back at the PRC position descriptions, making them more consistent, and adding in any others. Additionally, this would require an analysis of all CPARB positions and PRC positions, how they line up, and determine what is missing. Janice Zahn noted that she can help Co-Chair Lekha Fernandes with the analysis of the PRC positions and the CPARB positions.

Ad Hoc Committee Structure:

- a) The ad hoc committee structure is an issue that needs to be resolved by the next CPARB meeting on December 14, 2023.
- b) This issue has come up in several committees. For example, one committee member had been a representative of Cities, but that person now works for a university. They wanted to know if they should step down from their position since they are no longer in a position representing Cities. In the same regard, if there is an open position that someone is able to step into but does not currently represent that stakeholder group, the question is whether that person should be allowed to step into that position.
- c) This same issue has arisen with other committees, in which there was an open position and an appointment was made without much discussion from the committee. While this can work out sometimes, it was noted that straying from protocol can quickly lead to chaos.
- d) This issue has arisen primarily in several committees. The question remains regarding whether someone who once represented the stakeholder group but no longer does can continue to remain in that position if they have the knowledge, skills, and ability.

Board Development Committee

Meeting Notes 11/7/2023

Page 4 of 5

- e) This issue may be able to be resolved through conversation and input from the stakeholder groups. There have been instances in which a stakeholder voiced disagreement with someone representing their stakeholder group and the issue was quickly resolved.
- f) It was asked whether the issue is related to the position or the person and how this can be addressed, in the ad hoc committees. It was noted that anyone can participate in a committee, but voting members are appointed. The committee chairs may need to monitor the issue to ensure that stakeholder groups are comfortable with shifts in representation.
- g) The issue may arise later down the road with a change in the makeup of the committee. One possible solution would be to give the committee co-chairs the ability to have someone fill the position on an interim basis, which could then be a temporary solution until the next CPARB meeting. It was noted that this is similar to what the PRC and CPARB does.
- h) Members were asked to think about a solution to this issue.

New issues for next meeting:

Mentors

- a) New CPARB members Robin Strom and Matt Rasmussen currently do not have and are in need of mentors. Irene Reyes volunteered to be a mentor to Robin.
- b) When this committee discussed mentorship earlier in the summer, one of the questions was who appointed the mentor to the mentee. It was confirmed that CPARB Vice Chair Keith Michel appoints the mentors. He needs a reminder and confirmation that he is the one who handles the appointments.
- c) The description of the mentorship requirements and time commitments can be found in the mentorship description document drafted and completed earlier this year.
- d) It was asked whether people are not signing up to be mentors due to a misunderstanding of the time commitment. It needs to be reiterated that mentorship is not a huge time commitment, but rather it is important to ensure mentors are there to provide support to mentees.
- e) A question was raised about the mentor training that was indicated in the mentorship requirements document. The hope was that Vice Chair Michel would go through the mentorship process with the mentees. There is a need to establish a checklist or formal process to ensure an orientation is set up.

Meeting dates for 2024

This committee needs to establish meeting dates for next year and consider the timing and frequency.

Next Agenda:

- 3 – 4:30pm
- Agenda
- Minutes
 - 11/7/2023
- Structure of PRC
 - Staggered position
 - Additional positions
- Ad Hoc Committee Structure
- Mentorship and training
- 2024 meeting schedule
- Next agenda

Action Items:

- a) All members will review the proposed plan to stagger PRC appointments and compile edits, suggestions, and questions.
- b) Co-Chair Robynne Thaxton will send the working plan to stagger PRC appointments to PRC Chair Kyle Twohig and Vice Chair Jessica Murphy to look over.

Board Development Committee

Meeting Notes 11/7/2023

Page 5 of 5

- c) Janice Zahn and Co-Chair Lekha Fernandes will conduct an analysis of the PRC positions and the CPARB positions.
- d) Co-Chair Robynne Thaxton and/or Co-Chair Lekha Fernandes to check in with CPARB Vice Chair Keith Michel to confirm his role and responsibilities in overseeing the mentorship program.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:31 p.m.