

Committee Members: (11 positions, 6 = Quorum)

x	Keith Michel (General Contractors) – Co-Chair	x	Mark Nakagawara (Cities) – Co-Chair
	Liz Anderson (WA PUD Assoc)		Diane Pottinger (Water District Representative)
x	Linda De Boldt (Cities)	x	Steve Russo (UMC, Specialty Contractors)
	Roger Ferris, Fire District Representative	x	Mark Riker (Labor)
x	Bruce Hayashi (Architects)	x	Michael Transue (MCA)
x	Sharon Harvey (OMWBE)		Vacant, Private Industry
			Vacant, Higher Education

Guests & Stakeholders:

	Eric Alozie	x	Monique Martinez, DES/CPARB Staff
	Logan Bahr, Tacoma Public Utilities		Scott Middleton, MCAWW
	Talia Baker, DES/CPARB Staff		Roe Pulalasi-Gonzalez
	Randy Black, Lakewood Water District		Paul Richart, Alderwood Water & Wastewater District
	George Caan, WA PUD Association	x	Janice Zahn, CPARB
	Bill Clark, WA PUD Association	x	Josh Swanson, IUOE
x	Joren Clowers, Sno-King Water District Coalition		Abigail Vizcarra Perez, MetroParks Tacoma
	Nancy Deakins, DES/CPARB Staff		Rob Wettleson, Forma Construction
x	Brandy DeLange, Assoc. WA Cities		Maggie Yuse, Seattle Public Utilities
x	Jack Donahue, MFA	x	Ryan Spiller, WFCA
	Judi Gladstone, WASWD		

The meeting began at **11:32 a.m.**

Welcome & introductions

Co-chair Keith Michel welcomed everyone and thanked them for attending.

Review/Approve Agenda – Action

Michael Transue motioned to approve the agenda, seconded by Linda De Boldt. The motion passed through a voice vote.

Approve Meeting Notes from 6/4, 6/18, & 7/16 – Action

Monique Martinez noted that edits from Steve Russo (6/4, 6/18) and Diane Pottinger (6/18) had been incorporated.

Michael Transue motioned to approve the meeting minutes, seconded by Steve Russo. The motion passed through a voice vote.

Feedback Report on Action Items – Discussion

Linda shared the tracked changes document, with combined input from cities and labor. She started at Section 2. The document was included as a pre-read.

Michael reviewed his edits, as well. He said that he had not had time to review Linda’s materials that were sent as a pre-read on the morning of the meeting.

Michael read through his edits to Section 2, where he, Mark Riker, and Josh Swanson tried to define “exigency” and “urgency” differently, without bringing too many of the “urgency” items forward. They suggested removing language around “urgency” and the example circumstances, rather to keep it at a higher level.

Linda spoke to the definition of “exigency,” and that she understood the desire to take it to a higher level. She wanted to tweak the wording for clarity. Michael agreed with Linda’s suggestion; Josh and Mark agreed as well. Linda asked Brandy DeLange and Co-Chair Nakagawara whether she represented their perspectives properly, and they agreed that she did.

Linda read through the section on reportage to the state auditor. Michael suggested that they were ok with removing the 10% motor vehicle tax penalty, noting that public utilities do not receive that portion of the tax. He said that the reporting requirement was deterrent enough.

Josh said that he thought the audit process was already an appropriate mechanism for ensuring compliance, and that it wasn’t advantageous to labor for cities to be deprived of money for public works projects.

Linda noted that the added requirement for reporting to the state auditor would be a new requirement for second-class cities, and that there would need to be an effort to get the word out to them to ensure that they keep track and are prepared to report project budgets to the auditor. Michael mentioned that there was an item in the Revised Code of Washington that previously established a reporting process, and Linda wondered whether it was a requirement of all cities. Michael said he would check up on that.

In Subsection 5, Michael suggested they delete “any associated administrative costs.” Linda agreed with that.

Co-Chair Nakagawara stated that he wanted to make sure there was no cloudiness on the subject of competitive bid waivers, and that cities are already allowed to work within the existing threshold. Michael asked Co-Chair Nakagawara to provide some context in the exigent circumstances section.

Co-Chair Michel said that he interpreted Co-Chair Nakagawara’s comment as work below \$75,500, which does not have to be in exigent or emergency circumstances. Co-Chair Nakagawara added that taking that away would prevent union employees from being able to do in-house work for the city.

Mark said that not all unions were the same, while Co-Chair Nakagawara said he was not able to move on from that because he is beholden to his current union contracts and agreements. Mark said that the legislation as it currently stands expands beyond the purview of what he’s agreed to with his union, taking work away from other unionized contractors.

Linda said that she saw this falling into three categories: a declared emergency, small public works projects that fit under the \$75,500 limit, and the term exigent works, which is currently being debated. She added that it is important to keep those categories separate.

Co-Chair Nakagawara said that consideration is the reason for his worry over the use of “competitive bid waiver,” as it really is used for emergencies. He provided clarification, saying that Prudent Utility Management was the use of crews, rather than a competitive bid waiver. Competitive bid waivers are reserved for emergencies.

Ryan Spiller said that his constituents were having trouble accepting restrictions on the limits, and that any changes to the \$75,500 limit would make it a priority to kill. Michael confirmed that the committee would not be touching the \$75,500 limit.

Josh pointed out a part of Subsection 3, marking it for editing to ensure that it matches up with the rest of the subsection. Michael said he would make that edit.

Michael said that he hoped by the next meeting the committee would be ready to move the recommendations along. Co-Chair Michel stated that it sounded right and called for a high-level overview of committee progress. He reminded the

committee that the goal was consistency for several public entities, excluding PUDs, and that they would be getting the same language.

Ryan stated that his goal was to keep it under Prudent Utility Management, and that he'll have to show a final draft to his constituents to determine whether the compromise was fair.

Michael said that the definition of Prudent Utility Management, as it currently stands, is poorly defined, and that—while he understood where fire and water districts were coming from—he hoped they would be able to see an amended definition or replacement as agreeable.

Co-Chair Michel expressed his excitement at the progress being made and thanked the committee for their commitment in seeing it through.

Linda stated that she'd like to start vetting with second-class cities, now that the recommendations were nearing completion.

Establish Next Meeting Agenda

Welcome & Introductions

Review/Approve Agenda

Feedback Report on Action Items

The meeting ended at 12:30 p.m.

Action items:

Michael Transue will review whether the RCW mentioned previously established a reporting mechanism for all municipalities, or just first-class cities.

Michael Transue will implement Josh's edit to Subsection 3, ensuring all the recommendations match up.