

Capital Projects Advisory Review Board  
**Board Development Committee**

Meeting Notes 01/07/2025

Page 1 of 5

**A quorum was established at 4:05 pm.**

Olivia Yang served as facilitator in the absence of Co-Chairs Bill Frare and Linneth Riley-Hall, called the meeting to order.

**Welcome and introductions**

Committee members in attendance unless otherwise noted:

Bill Frare, <i>Co-Chair</i> , Owner State	<i>Absent</i>	CPARB
Linneth Riley-Hall, <i>Co-Chair</i> , Owner Transit	<i>Absent</i>	CPARB
Lekha Fernandes, OMWBE		CPARB
Bruce Hayashi, Architects		CPARB
Dave Johnson, General Contractors		PRC
Santosh Kuruvilla, Owner Engineers	<i>Absent</i>	CPARB
Jessica Murphy, PRC Leadership		PRC
Mike Pellitteri, Specialty Subcontractors		PRC
Irene Reyes, Private Industry		CPARB
Olivia Yang, Owner Higher Ed		CPARB
Janice Zahn, Owner Ports	<i>Absent</i>	CPARB

Other attendees include:

Talia Baker, CPARB Staff

Natalie Sacker, MFA

**Review and approve agenda – Action**

Olivia reviewed the agenda and asked for any amendments. She asked to include in the agenda listing issues with the three themes of CPARB’s objectives, covering the goals under each theme and focusing on what the barriers are for each.

*Lekha Fernandes moved to approve the agenda, seconded by Irene Reyes.*

*The motion was passed by a voice vote.*

**Review and approve minutes from 12/03/2024 – Action**

Olivia asked the group to review and provide any edits to the minutes from the meeting on December 3, 2024.

Talia Baker said that she left a comment in the minutes noting that she consolidated and reordered the list of themes and clarified the intent of the “ethical considerations” topic. While ethical considerations apply to CPARB, PRC, and committees, it was noted that regardless of a person’s employment, whether they are a private employee or a public employee, if they serve on a board, then the state public employee ethics rules apply to prevent people from pushing policies that could benefit themselves personally. (See [Boards & Commissions Handbook](#) regarding Advisory Boards, Being an Effective Board Member, Executive Branch Ethics in Public Service, and Ethic and the Appearance of Fairness)

*Olivia Yang moved to approve the minutes from December 03, 2024, seconded by Irene. The motion was passed by a voice vote.*

**Strategic Planning Topics**

It was recommended that this group prioritize the topics for scoping the strategic plan, addressing the biggest issues or easiest issues first, then make progress on the rest.

It was asked how these items relate to the “three themes” identified on the agenda and whether these are the topics the group wants to cover in the strategic plan. Olivia suggested the “three themes” of what CPARB should be doing be renamed “guiding principles.” The guiding principles could be used to assess the list of topics to integrate the two lists.

Irene asked where “owner readiness” would fall under the three guiding principles. Olivia clarified that the guiding principles are not category headings. When considering owner readiness, it refers to whether the

## Board Development Committee

Meeting Notes 01/07/2025

Page 2 of 5

owner understands what they are getting into and whether or not they know what is asked of every public owner. The idea is to make public contracting effective and fair instead of trying to find loopholes in the RCW. If gaming the system can be reduced, then public contracting can be improved. "Active industry engagement" indicates that everybody is involved in defining feedback. If that happens then recommendations could be created and brought to legislation, which applies to the third guiding principle of helping legislators make good laws and improve processes.

Three guiding principles on the agenda included the following: 1) Betterment of Public Contracting—Improving Outcomes, 2) Active Industry Engagement, and 3) Help Legislators Make Good Laws/Improve the Process.

The challenges to be categorized by guiding principles were listed in the previous meeting minutes.

1. *Owner Readiness;*
2. *Defining CPARB's value add for public works;*
  - a. *Taking stock of accomplishments;*
3. *Reauthorization and how to streamline it;*
  - a. *What should the Board Development Committee's role be?*
  - b. *Setting the number of years for reauthorization;*
  - c. *Reading the JLARC studies to see what they said in 2019 and 2012;*
4. *Determining who is the 'public works cop';*
5. *Creating a feedback loop for lessons learned;*
6. *Reimagining the PRC;*
  - a. *What is the role of the PRC?*
7. *Conducting an outcome-oriented review of the strategic plan;*
  - a. *Defining measurable goals ;*
  - b. *Describing interim steps;*
  - c. *Creating actionable outcomes;*
  - d. *Building in capacity (bringing in individuals to participate);*
8. *Discussing ethical considerations for membership for CPARB, Ad Hoc Committees, or the PRC;*
9. *Standardizing decision-making in committees and on the board, and for recommendations included in legislative reports;*
10. *Maintaining and measuring accountability and transparency.*

This was confirmed and it was suggested the group consolidate the topics into broader categories. The committee made the following suggestions to consolidate and organize topics:

- Group A included: Combine owner readiness, creating a feedback loop, and determining who is the public works enforcement.
- Group B included: Reauthorization and how to streamline.
- Group C included: Reimagining the PRC (*this was added as its own group*).
- Group D included: Defining CPARB's value add for public works and conducting an outcome-oriented review of the strategic plan.
- Group E included: Standardizing decision-making in committees and on the board and for recommendations included in legislative reports, discussing ethical considerations for membership of CPARB, PRC, or Committees, and maintaining and measuring accountability and transparency.

The topics were reordered by the group so the committee could see the categorizations more easily. The committee was asked whether the five groups made sense to everyone or if any topics needed to be separated out to make it clearer.

Bruce Hayashi said maintaining and measuring accountability and transparency overlaps into multiple groups and suggested that concept should be looked at across the board. Olivia removed maintaining and measuring accountability and transparency from the topic list and added it as a subpart of the third guiding principle, "Help Legislators Make Good Laws/Improve the Process."

The committee was asked whether they wanted to prioritize the groups in order from easier to more difficult and then talk about one group per meeting. One suggestion was to prioritize and create a strategy around

## Board Development Committee

Meeting Notes 01/07/2025

Page 3 of 5

complexity. Dave Johnson noted none of the groups are easy.

It was noted that some items are sequential. For example, it might make the most sense to talk about Group A first because it is overarching. If there is no direction with the topics in Group A, then no one will believe in topics from Group B, like reauthorization. If the expectation for owners is understood, it can inform what the PRC's role is.

It was agreed that moving through the items sequentially made sense if there were no mandatory requirements coming up surrounding reauthorization, such as pressing deadlines. Within CPARB there can be some uncertainty based on legislation or who is in the room, so a strategic plan might be helpful to establish common guidance and direction. The group agreed with taking a more strategic and structured approach.

It was noted that reauthorization should be addressed last because the outcomes of all the other topics may impact it. The committee agreed these groups should be prioritized, and reauthorization should come at the end. Until the other issues are resolved it will be hard to get people to accept a different model of reauthorization, since reauthorization is an outcome of the rest of the work. Reauthorization is not low priority but is sequentially dependent on other issues being addressed.

It was established that Group A informs Group C, because if the issues in Group A are restructured that can inform the reimagining of the PRC.

It was suggested that the conducting an outcome-oriented review of the strategic plan item under Group D was a parallel track to Group A, as Group D related more to how things are done and Group A related more to what things are done, and the content.

Dave Johnson agreed but said that defining CPARB's value add for public works under Group D relates more to what is CPARB and its role. Conducting an outcome-oriented review of the strategic plan under Group D is more about monitoring what is being done after CPARB's role has been clearly defined. Mike Pellitteri suggested tackling defining CPARB's value add for public works before reauthorization.

Olivia restated the topics discussed in order of priority:

- Owner readiness (Group A)
- Determining who is the public works cop (Group A)
- Creating a feedback loop (Group A)
- Reimagining the PRC (Group C)
- Defining CPARB's value add for public works (Group D)
- Conducting an outcome-oriented review of the strategic plan (Group D)
- Reauthorization and who to streamline it (Group B)

Mike suggested changing the item numbers to go in the order that the committee wants to address them:

1. Owner readiness (Group A)
2. Determining who is the public works enforcement (Group A)
3. Creating a feedback loop (Group A)
4. Reimagining the PRC (Group C)
5. Defining CPARB's value add for public works (Group D)
6. Conducting an outcome-oriented review of the strategic plan (Group D)
7. Discussing ethical considerations for membership of CPARB, PRC, or Committees (Group E)
8. Standardizing decision-making in committees and on the board and for recommendations included in legislative reports (Group E)
9. Reauthorization and who to streamline it (Group B)

Item six relates to how they monitor what they are doing going forward. It is a process, not a content.

Additionally, item eight was established as more of a process than a content. Committee members suggested refining item eight.

For item eight, the idea was to have consistency in how decisions are made on the board as well as the board's committees, and to make sure that there is consistency in how reports are submitted to the legislature.

## Board Development Committee

Meeting Notes 01/07/2025

Page 4 of 5

This was reframed as standardizing processes. In this session alone, CPARB had two different reports to the legislature and there were two different ideas about what consensus looked like. There were two different reports that were built out of that and two different styles for how CPARB wrote recommendations. CPARB should have a standard process and way of reporting back when people ask things of them.

Item eight was suggested to be changed to: “standardize decision making in committees and on the board.”

Olivia said that would make it a process and not a content and therefore should not be included in Group D with item five. As a process it should be included in Group D with item six. Some committee members agreed. From an administrative perspective, Talia Baker disagreed and suggested number eight be categorized with number five because if the standardization is made, then the legislature and everyone else will know what the format should be. Mike agreed with Talia’s point and said one of CPARB’s value adds is that they provide standardization.

Olivia reiterated that standardization should become a part of CPARB value.

Irene asked what “taking stock of accomplishments” means under item five. It was clarified it means how many reports were made, how many best practices, or how many statutes were proposed.

It was explained that CPARB’s accomplishments were better tracked before COVID. There used to be a list of all the bills that CPARB approved, all the reports and a summary. Now things are more scattered, and they want to take stock so during strategic planning there’s more visibility on what was accomplished.

The topics to cover list was renumbered as follows:

1. Owner readiness (Group A)
2. Determining who is the ‘public works cop’ (Group A)
3. Creating a feedback loop (Group A)
4. Reimagining the PRC (Group C)
  - a. What is the role of the PRC?
5. Defining CPARB’s value add for public works (Group D)
  - a. Taking stock of accomplishments;
  - b. Standardize decision-making in committees and on the board (recommendations included in legislative reports);
6. Conducting an outcome-oriented review of the strategic plan (Group E - *sequentially with priority 1 & 2*)
  - a. Defining measurable goals;
  - b. Describing interim steps;
  - c. Creating actionable outcomes;
7. Discussing ethical considerations for membership of CPARB, PRC, or Committees (Group E)
  - a. Building in capacity (brining in individuals to participate);
8. Reauthorization and who to streamline it (Group B)—*sequentially dependent on other issues being addressed*
  - a. What should the Board Development Committee’s role be?
  - b. Setting the number of years for reauthorization;
  - c. Reading the JLARC studies to see what they said in 2019 and 2012;

A question was brought up about whether defining the Board Development Committee's role should be determined earlier on. It was clarified that that item refers to the Board Development Committee’s role within the structure of the strategic plan and reauthorization. The question is whether the Board Development Committee will lead the strategic plan effort or whether there will be a subcommittee specifically tasked to do so.

The committee approved of the newly numbered and prioritized list.

It was noted that the items in Group A have been previously discussed by the Project Feedback Process Workgroup. Reimagining the PRC also is a byproduct of that workgroup. After the items in Group A are solidified, they will inform Group C, reimagining the PRC.

*Olivia moved to approve the grouping and order in which this committee tackle the issues. Mike and Irene*

## **Board Development Committee**

Meeting Notes 01/07/2025

Page 5 of 5

*seconded the motion. Motion passed with a voice vote.*

Olivia suggested that this committee work through the items by priority in future meetings. Depending on how the discussions go, some topics might take more than one meeting but one topic per meeting is a good starting point. Lekha noted she would be missing a couple meetings.

**Next meeting agenda** - February 4, 2025, 4:00 – 5:00 p.m.

- Agenda Review
- Minutes – January 07, 2024
- Review priority list with BDC Co-Chairs
- Confirm strategic planning issues and grouping sequence
- Begin tackling strategic planning issues
- New issues

### **Action items**

1. None

*Olivia Yang moved to adjourn the meeting; Irene Reyes seconded.*

**The meeting adjourned 4:47pm**