

Committee members in attendance unless otherwise noted: (11 Active Members, 6 = Quorum)

Linneth Riley-Hall, Co-Chair, Owner Transit	CPARB
Jessica Murphy, Co-Chair, Public Owner Cities	PRC
Eza Agoes, Owner Transit	PRC
Lekha Fernandes, OMWBE	Absent CPARB
Bruce Hayashi, Architects/Labor/Other	CPARB
Dave Johnson, General Contractors	PRC
Santosh Kuruvilla, Owner Engineers	CPARB
Mike Pellitteri, Specialty Subcontractors	PRC
Irene Reyes, Private Industry	CPARB
Olivia Yang, Owner Higher Ed	CPARB
Janice Zahn, Owner Ports	CPARB\PRC Emerita

Other attendees included:

Talia Baker, CPARB Staff	Jessica Letteney, Maul Foster & Alongi, Inc.
Robert Blain, Benton County	Tom Peterson, Hoffman Construction
Nancy Deakins, DES Staff	Robynne Thaxton, Private industry

Welcome and Introductions

A quorum was established. Co-Chair Riley-Hall called the Board Development Committee (BDC) meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

Review and approve agenda – Action

The BDC reviewed the agenda.

Olivia Yang moved to approve the agenda, seconded by Dave Johnson. The motion was passed by a unanimous voice vote.

Review and approve minutes from 09/02/2025 – Action

Co-Chair Riley-Hall asked the group to review and provide any edits to the minutes from the September 2, 2025, meeting and mentioned that the draft minutes of the September 11, 2025, CPARB meeting included information that indicated there was an error in the BDC minutes related to the Small Works Roster. The statement that the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) would fund the state Small Works Roster was not accurate; WSDOT will maintain a separate Small Works Roster for its own use. The correction to the September 2, 2025, minutes—to characterize the donations to the Small Works Roster as “external,” not WSDOT—was made.

Olivia Yang moved to approve the minutes as corrected, seconded by Santosh Kuruvilla. The motion was passed by a unanimous voice vote.

Invitation to Public to Participate

Co-Chair Riley-Hall made three invitations for public comments. None were forthcoming.

Strategic Planning

Reimagining the Project Review Committee

1. What is the role of the Project Review Committee?

The BDC reviewed the text of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 39.10.240 and the Capital Projects Advisory Review Board Bylaws (CPARB Bylaws).

RCW 39.10 describes the role of the Project Review Committee (PRC). The policing or oversight function sometimes referred to in past discussions of the BDC is not the role of the PRC as written in the RCW.

In the CPARB Bylaws in Article VII, Section 1, Item 2 states the following:

The Project Review Committee shall establish and maintain its own procedures or bylaws.

The PRC procedures and bylaws shall incorporate a conflict of interest and recusal policy that complies with all federal and state requirements and that inspires the public trust. And in statute they appoint [their] own chair.

In the past, CPARB has invited a representative from the Attorney General's (AG's) office when there have been complaints about the PRC. The AG representatives have given an opinion about what to do when issues arise. The BDC can propose a change to the CPARB Bylaws if needed but the change would be subject to a CPARB vote. It would be important to establish the reason for changing the CPARB Bylaws.

In the past there have been issues with the autonomy of the PRC. There is not a clear mechanism for holding the PRC accountable or for monitoring PRC activities. In the past, some PRC members may have disregarded conflicts of interest between their usual work and their PRC duties. For example, when people on the PRC spoke up during virtual meetings their name and company were displayed. PRC leaders asked everyone to remove references to their company names even during introductions to avoid the perception that members were marketing their companies.

There was also tension between having team members that were experienced Construction Managers (CMs) on a project team and having those same CMs as part of the PRC, which added to perceptions that having those CMs on a team would make project approval more likely. But there is a benefit to having good experienced CMs and advisors helping owners be successful. There have been at least two instances in which an applicant or their attorney had complained about the PRC. However, the visibility of the PRC's decisions or actions takes care of the perception of unfair selection.

Robynne Thaxton presents to the PRC often and understands that there may be a different level of scrutiny for presenters that are members of the PRC compared to those who are not. Project advisors who are presenting and not on the PRC have had their level of experience questioned. Nevertheless, that kind of questioning is part of the work of presenting to the PRC and getting the client ready; it does not appear to be any kind of favoritism.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall proposed the idea of a survey of owners that present to the PRC and/or people volunteering time on the PRC. The survey could ask people to weigh in on what is working and what needs improvement.

Co-Chair Murphy mentioned that when she was the PRC chair, she mentioned that the issue of reimagining the PRC was on the BDC agenda. She had encouraged PRC members to think about it but did not make it an official item. It would not come as a surprise to PRC members if there were a survey.

Dave Johnson, current PRC Chair, noted in the last PRC business meeting, he invited members to show up and give ideas but he has not had a lot of response to that request.

Irene Reyes said a survey of applicants or post-application feedback in writing could be useful. Small owners and agencies do not want to identify themselves or risk being branded as complaining—a common challenge in any bidding industry. The introduction could explain that CPARB is looking at possible improvements to the PRC. Questions could include: Had they done business with this presenter? Did they feel the process was equitable and that they were heard? The survey could be anonymous and administered within a month of the application.

Though a survey of applicants is a good feedback loop, there is more to reimagining the PRC than just that feedback. Feedback from PRC members is important as well; however, the frequency of getting feedback should be considered because everyone is busy. Maybe twice a year makes sense, and the survey gives participants the option to identify themselves or not. All ideas should be considered and then prioritized. Co-Chair Murphy and PRC Chair Johnson are available to provide feedback from their time serving on the PRC.

Olivia asked whether the PRC, in its current configuration, is still operating efficiently and still needed. There is no accountability mechanism in place specifically for the PRC. The finer points of public works procurement are not known to the state auditor or the AG's office representatives, so the Public Agency Owner representatives are responsible for holding each other accountable.

The bigger issue is how the PRC can be responsive in the current environment. The PRC was created in 2007; the group should discuss whether it should still have the same role it had nearly 20 years ago. CPARB needs to think about what the PRC is in 2025 and into the future.

Co-Chair Murphy suggested listing all suggestions and prioritizing them for discussion. She and Dave are available to help with feedback for the PRC.

Talia Baker noted that she has combed through archives and meeting minutes for CPARB and compiled a history of the PRC up to 2007. She sent it to members of the BDC.

Robynne noted that the reason the PRC was formed originally was that the entities that were capable of doing Design-Build (DB) in 2007 were limited. There were concerns about the inexperience of the agencies—especially the small ones—that wanted to do DB work. The PRC was created make sure that agencies using alternative delivery were using DB for the right projects with the right people.

Mike Pellitteri noted that the PRC seems to be working pretty well at this point. He did not feel there was a clear mandate for fixing something that does not appear to be broken. He has seen quite a few discussions on the issue and there does not appear to be a clear definition of the problem. In fact, he is concerned that there might be unintended consequences down the road if the PRC is changed without a well-considered approach.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall summarized the discussion and asked the group to consider whether the PRC has met its goal and is still needed. The PRC does not have to be broken; it could just “graduate.” Irene advocated for seeing what could be improved.

Co-Chair Murphy observed that the discussion has vacillated from “*don’t fix what doesn’t appear to be broken*” to “*get rid of PRC*” and then to something in between. From this discussion she has heard that there are complaints about the PRC. She would like to have those complaints aired in the open. She invited discussion on whether PRC membership should be evaluated and whether agencies should be recertified every five years instead of every three years. She would like to examine the issues with the PRC and discuss how to make it more relevant. The world has changed since RCW 39.10 was first introduced. Santosh has always encouraged the BDC to look at lessons learned and the committee should follow his advice in this case. The world of the DB marketplace has evolved. The competence level of owners, designers, and contractors has changed. The group should discuss how the PRC can be relevant in the current context.

Eza Agoes suggested reaching out to other states to see whether there is a body that is equivalent to CPARB or the PRC and get a little perspective.

Robynne has reviewed statutes in other states; no other state has the same process or has a CPARB. The PRC does a pretty good job determining whether a project is ready to go. The system works right now for getting people ready to present to the PRC.

Mike pointed out that the PRC has been pretty good at identifying and addressing issues with the PRC as they have come up. The topic of reimagining the PRC has been under discussion for several meetings and there has not been much progress. He questioned whether the discussion is truly needed.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall noted that this discussion about the PRC ties into a new issue, discussed below.

New Issues

Co-Chair Riley-Hall received an email on September 26, 2025, from the Washington State Auditor’s office with the subject line “*Action needed by 10/31 re: JLARC sunset review of alternative works contracting procedures.*” The Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee (JLARC) is gearing up for another sunset review to assess whether the state still needs a program or agency. If nothing were done, the authority to use all alternative public works contracting methods would end June 30, 2031. There was a requirement to submit performance measures to JLARC in December 2024 but somewhere communication wires were crossed and this issue fell off the radar. The requirement is for CPARB to submit a list of performance measures by October 31, 2025. As of this date, CPARB does not have performance measures. Co-Chair Riley-Hall will meet with representatives of JLARC soon to discuss the email.

Olivia noted that the sunset provision for RCW 39.10 noted in the email does not have to be part of the statute. If alternative public works contracting is functioning properly, perhaps the requirement for review and sunset should be removed from the law, which would remove the requirement for a JLARC review.

There are things that CPARB is doing every month that can be monitored as performance measures, including:

- The number of projects approved or denied by the PRC.
- The efficacy of a new feedback or complaint process.
- The number of project feedback or complaint issues logged.
- The number of reports CPARB has submitted at the request of the Legislature.
- The number of statute updates proposed.

Irene suggested getting an opinion from the Legislators on the issue. She also noted that the Small Works Roster has been an added value.

Talia is gathering information for the performance measures to be listed in a spreadsheet. It is due in short order. The intention for the creation of the PRC may be a metric that the BDC can use.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall will discuss the email with CPARB; a special CPARB meeting may need to be convened. Part of the role of the BDC is to identify issues for the strategic plan. Developing performance measures should have been in the list for the strategic plan. This issue raises the question of whether there are other issues that may have been overlooked and have a short-term deadlines. She requested that members send their ideas for the PRC to Co-Chair Riley-Hall or Talia for the next meeting.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall will mention at the CPARB meeting on Thursday, October 9th the need to develop performance measures, and will meet with JLARC representatives on Friday.

Next Meeting Agenda - 11/04/2025

- November 4, 2025, 4:00 – 5:00 p.m.
- Review Agenda
- Approve Minutes – October 7, 2025
- Reimagining the Project Review Committee (Co-Chair Murphy)
- Continue to review list and assess where items need to be added for consideration.

Action Items

1. Talia Baker will compile the list of performance measures for JLARC. ✓
2. Co-Chair Riley-Hall will meet with JLARC on Friday to discuss performance measures. ✓
3. All BDC members should review the PRC history that Talia Baker compiled.
4. All BDC members should send their ideas for reimagining PRC to Talia Baker before the next meeting.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Olivia Yang. The motion was passed by a unanimous voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm.

Resources

[Capital Projects Advisory Review Board Bylaws](#)

Strategic Planning Issues List

Issue	Objectives	Action Needed:	Completed
1. Owner\stakeholder readiness 2. Determining who is the 'public works coplenforcement' 3. Creating a feedback loop for lessons learned	<i>Provide guidance to public agencies and collective construction industry for successful accountable public works contracting.</i>	(1) Education - Other Owners - MRSC – Webinar Owner\Owner - Attend PRC reviews - Mutual 'report cards'? (consider small firms as well) (2) Use potential violation report form – <i>online</i>	(1) In process (2) Completed (3) postpone until later
4. Reimagining the PRC a. What is the role of the PRC? <i>i. Original intent?</i> <i>ii. Current Role?</i> <i>iii. Future?</i> b. Do we have the right people on the PRC?	(a) Control to ensure alternative delivery is used appropriately. (i) Provide resources \ opportunity for project success	(1) Review the whole PRC process (2) Consider Public Bodies who have had (a certain # of) certifications w/o issue to no longer need to go to the PRC.	(1) In process
5. Defining CPARB's value add for public works a. Taking stock of accomplishments b. Standardize decision-making in committees and on the board (recommendations include legislative reports)	# of reports / recommendations to the Legislature that have been adopted <i>Advise the Legislature on policies related to public works delivery methods and alternative public works contracting procedures.</i>		
6. Conducting an outcome-oriented review of the strategic plan (<i>sequential with priority 1 & 2</i>) a. Defining measurable goals b. Describing interim steps c. Creating actionable outcomes 7. Discussing ethical considerations for membership for CPARB, PRC or Committees a. Building in capacity (bringing in individuals to participate)	Ethics Board presentation annually at CPARB and PRC BMs.	ECC take on?	
8. Reauthorization and how to streamline it; (sequentially dependent on other issues being addressed) a. What should the Board Development Committee's role be? (regarding strategic plan and reauthorization) b. Setting the number of years for reauthorization c. Reading the JLARC studies to see what they said in 2019 and 2012			