Capital Projects Advisory Review Board SHB 1621 Review Committee Meeting Notes October 8, 2024 Page 1 of 3

Committee Members: (11 positions, 6 = Quorum)

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

Guests & Stakeholders:

Eric Alozie

Logan Bahr, Tacoma Public Utilities

- x Talia Baker, DES/CPARB Staff
- Randy Black, Lakewood Water District
 George Caan, WA PUD Association
 Bill Clark, WA PUD Association
 Joren Clowers, Sno-King Water District Coalition
- Nancy Deakins, DES/CPARB Staff Brandy DeLange, Assoc. WA Cities
- x Jack Donahue, MFA Erin Frasier Judi Gladstone, WASWD

x Monique Martinez, DES/CPARB Staff Scott Middleton, MCAWW

Roe Pulalasi-Gonzalez

Paul Richart, Alderwood Water & Wastewater District

x Janice Zahn, CPARB

Abigail Vizcarra Perez, MetroParks Tacoma Rob Wettleson, Forma Construction

Ryan Spiller

- x Linneth Riley-Hall, CPARB
- x Brianna Morin, Cities

The meeting began at 11:31 a.m.

Welcome & Introductions

Co-Chair Keith Michel welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Review/Approve Agenda – Action

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

Approve Meeting Notes from 10/1 – *Action*

Steve Russo motioned to approve the meeting minutes, seconded by Josh Swanson. The motion passed through a voice vote. Sharon Harvey abstained from voting because she was not in attendance on 10/1.

Proposed final amended 1621 Review – *Discussion*

Co-Chair Michel pulled up the final amended report, which was sent over as a pre-read. He included language to give CPARB a choice to honor the explicit results of the committee's votes or to honor the results from a "majority" but not "consensus" position.

Linda spoke up to say that her goal in participating in the committee was to try and ensure everyone was on the same page, and to develop consistent language. She added that she was feeling conflicted, since second-class cities were making a concession. She understood the reasons why water and sewer districts and fire districts voted the way that they did, but that it did lead to her feeling conflicted.

Josh said that he, too, thought about both options quite a bit. He said that Mark Riker made a "full-court press" on the use of prevailing wages for workers, and that he appreciated Co-Chair Michel's focus on the language of 1621. He added that they recognized the importance of being a fair negotiator during this bargaining process, and therefore made concessions. They

Minutes prepared by Jack Donahue, Maul Foster & Alongi, Inc.

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board SHB 1621 Review Committee Meeting Notes October 8, 2024 Page 2 of 3

were rather taken aback by the voting of water and sewer districts and fire districts in the last meeting. He said that labor would support the second option.

Michael Transue apologized for being late and recalled the committee's feelings in 2023 were that there was a solid middle ground that could be reached for all stakeholders. He said there wasn't enough data in place to make "prudent utility management" effective policy, and that he found the result of the voting to be surprising. He added that he appreciated the good-faith engagement by cities to find a solid middle ground, and that he supported choice number 2.

Liz Anderson said that consistent from last discussion, she supported choice number 1 because the language was written by and for cities to use. She supported cities making use of that language, but did not think that the language would be best for the water and sewer districts and fire districts to use.

Sharon Harvey said that her preference was for option 2, citing Michael's same reasons for voting.

Randy Black thanked Co-Chair Michel for his leadership over the negotiation process and said that sewer and water districts fully support 1621 as it was written, but that they support the cities' efforts to amend the language to better suit their needs. He voted for choice number 1.

Michael reiterated that he understood the need for flexibility from water and sewer districts and fire districts, but that keeping the bill was not the deal that they had agreed upon coming out of the legislative session. He said he was let down by the water and sewer districts and fire districts' unwillingness to work toward a middle ground.

Co-Chair Michel acknowledged this and said he really appreciated the compromise made by cities to find common ground, and thanked Linda and Co-Chair Mark Nakagawara for their contributions to the discussion. He added that compromise was an important part of negotiation, and while he respected the votes of water and sewer districts and fire districts, also acknowledged that they had not made compromises. He stated that he would support CPARB's evaluation of the committee's work.

Janice Zahn spoke up and said that the committee prepared a list of recommendations for CPARB in 2023, which was voted out. This body of work was a continuation of the work recommended by CPARB. Co-Chair Michel said that the report was a continuation of the items that CPARB identified as needing further stakeholder engagement.

Co-Chair Michel explained what he would be doing during the CPARB meeting and offered the committee a chance to present a short explanation of why they voted the way they did.

Michael asked Linda if she had brought up the idea of combining language, which was presented by Maggie Yuse from the City of Seattle. She said that if there were a different set of language for first- and second-class cities, they would need to take time to consider and review the G&H language. Linda volunteered more time for second-class cities to vet the recommendations and ensure that she wasn't proposing something that second-class cities would have a problem with.

Co-Chair Michel said he wanted to touch on that and called on Brianna Morin, from the Association of Washington Cities. Brianna noted the language was new to her, and that she would be able to help Linda reach out to and gain feedback from cities.

Co-Chair Michel asked the committee for targets to find legislative sponsorship for the bill. Michael said that they normally use ex-officio CPARB members and could also tap the original sponsor of the bill, Rep. Cindy Ryu. He also suggested looking to the local government committee chairs, Rep. Davina Duerr or Sen. Liz Lovelett, as well.

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board SHB 1621 Review Committee Meeting Notes October 8, 2024 Page 3 of 3

Michael asked Co-Chair Michel how he was feeling about the recommendations. Co-Chair Michel responded that he didn't feel like he needed a motion to proceed since the report as it stood reflected the discussion from last meeting.

Liz called attention to the red-line report and asked Co-Chair Michel if they could clarify some language there. She pointed out Page 3, clarifying that the PUD statute would not be affected by the change to Prudent Utility Management.

Co-Chair Michel noted the next committee meeting is on Oct. 22. He asked the committee if they should keep this meeting in order to debrief the CPARB session. Sharon and Linda supported keeping the meeting.

Nancy Deakins asked Talia Baker if the report had been sent out yet. Talia said that she was waiting until this meeting had been concluded to send it over. Nancy said that the committee might say they had not had enough time to review the report, and that there were other committees that might force another CPARB meeting in November.

Establish Next Meeting Agenda

Welcome & Introductions Review/Approve Agenda Review/Approve 10/8/2024 Meeting Notes Next Meeting Agenda

The meeting ended at 12:15 p.m.

Action items:

- 1. Cities will work to validate second-class cities' reaction to the potential changes.
- 2. Linda will review the combination G&H that Michael and Maggie worked on.
- 3. Co-Chair Michel will make Liz' edits to the red-line report.