

**CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY REVIEW BOARD**

**Minutes**

**1500 Jefferson – Presentation Room**

**Olympia, Washington**

**May 12, 2016**

---

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Representing</u>	<u>Members Absent</u>	
<u>Representing</u>			
Robert Maruska (Chair)	Washington Ports	Greg Fuller	Specialty Contractors
Ty Heim	Public Hospital Districts	Vacant	Senate (R)
Steven Crawford	School Districts	Rep. Hans Dunshee	House (D)
Santosh Kuruvilla	Engineers	Senator Bob Hasegawa	Senate (D)
Teresa Berntsen	OMWBE	Gary Rowe	Counties
Mark Riker	Construction Trades Labor	Lee Newgent	Construction Trades Labor
Alan Nygaard	Higher Education		
Rep. Vincent Buys	House (R)		
Walter Schacht	Architects		
Bill Frare	State Government		
Rebecca Keith	Cities		
Charles Horn	Insurance/Surety Industry		
Andrew Thompson	General Contractors		
Brent LeVander	General Contractors		
Mike Shinn	Specialty Contractors		
Joaquin Hernandez	Private Industry		
Irene Reyes	Private Industry		

**STAFF & GUESTS are listed on the last page**

**Welcome & Introductions**

Chair Robert Maruska called the Capital Projects Advisory Review Board (CPARB) meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

A meeting quorum was attained.

Everyone present provided self-introduction.

**Approve Agenda - Action**

Bill Frare requested including a discussion on a future committee proposal.

***Bill Frare moved, seconded by Andy Thompson, to approve the agenda as amended. Motion carried.***

**Approve February 11, 2016 – Action**

The following change was requested to the minutes:

- On page 2, change “approved” within the first paragraph (line 7) under the *Project Review Committee – Information* agenda item to reflect, “approval.”

***Andy Thompson moved, seconded by Bill Frare, to approve the minutes of February 11, 2016, as amended. Motion carried.***

**Public Comments**

Chair Maruska encouraged public comments throughout the meeting.

**Project Review Committee - Information**

**February, March, April Meetings Report**

Curt Gimmestad, Chair, Project Review Committee (PRC), referred members to the meeting summary of the March 24 special meeting and April 28 meeting.

During the March 24 meeting, the PRC reviewed three project applications for GC/CM, one public body certification for Design-Build (D-B), and one public body recertification for D-B and GC/CM.

The City of Richland submitted an application for certification as a public body for D-B. The PRC quorum of members denied the application for certification of D-B. For approval of the application, 14 affirmative votes were required. The vote was 11 for approval of the application. A majority of the conversation and deliberation centered on the agency's understanding and ability to use the D-B delivery method. The City of Richland had used D-B for a previous \$4 million fire station project. Several representatives from the City and the City's consultant presented the application.

*Irene Reyes arrived at the meeting.*

Mr. Gimmestad reported some PRC members did not believe the agency had the necessary personnel qualifications and lacked an overall process of review within the City for D-B projects within different departments.

Steve Crawford said certification of D-B would have provided the ability for all departments to utilize D-B. The City lacked the necessary experience within the departments. Approximately 230 projects were listed as potential projects to complete using the D-B delivery method in the next eight to ten years.

Mr. Gimmestad said Washington State University submitted its application for recertification for both GC/CM and D-B. The University was able to demonstrate previous successes on other projects and received approval by a unanimous vote of the PRC for both GC/CM and D-B.

Grays Harbor County Public Hospital District #1 submitted a project application for GC/CM for the Summit Pacific Medical Center project, a new medical office building on an existing campus housing a hospital. The application was unanimously denied because members believed the necessary team experience was lacking, as well as the GC/CM experience to complete the project. Although the construction management firm had good construction management experience, no other team members were involved in a previous GC/CM project. Consequently, the application was resubmitted and considered by the PRC on April 28. PRC members unanimously approved the second application for GC/CM because of the new process the team had implemented.

Seattle Public Schools submitted an application for the Lincoln High School Renovation GC/CM project. The project was located on an historic and occupied campus in the north Seattle area within a dense urban setting. Seattle Public Schools and its team were able to demonstrate that the project met the requirements of the RCW and that the appropriate staff was assigned to complete a difficult GC/CM project successfully.

Tacoma Public Schools' application for replacement of Browns Point Elementary School using the GC/CM delivery method was approved by the PRC. The project met the requirements of the RCW. The District had the appropriate staff, methods, and best practices in place to complete the project successfully.

The April 28 meeting was a special meeting. A panel of eight PRC members considered the resubmittal of the City of Richland's project application for D-B delivery of a new City Hall. Assigned team members had previous D-B experience. After a series of questions, answers, and deliberation by the panel, the application was approved.

*Joaquin Hernandez arrived at the meeting.*

The Summit Pacific Medical Center GC/CM project was resubmitted and included an experienced project team able to meet the requirements under the RCW. The panel approved the project application.

The next meeting is scheduled on May 26 and includes two agency certifications and one GC/CM project application.

Representative Buys asked whether the applicants not receiving approval received information on ways to gain experience to present an application with an experienced team. Mr. Gimmestad affirmed the experience could be obtained during current projects approved for the D-B delivery method, participating in training, or hiring consultant team members with the necessary expertise. The certification for the City of Richland pertained to the lack of understanding and experience of the D-B delivery method by personnel in City departments. Some personnel might have an opportunity to work on other D-B projects to assist the department in gaining the necessary experience.

Representative Buys asked whether the committee comprised of 21 members review the applications or whether there are multiple boards within the committee. Mr. Gimmestad said the PRC is comprised of 30 members. Consideration of a public agency certification or recertification requires a full meeting quorum of the 30-member PRC. For project applications, PRC panels of approximately eight members review and consider the applications. Certification and recertifications require a quorum of the entire membership.

Chair Maruska noted that the rationale for requiring consideration of certifications and recertifications by the full PRC membership is because agency certification enables the agency to utilize the alternative delivery method for any project without re-application to the PRC during the period of certification. Project-specific applications are considered by a PRC panel that typically include a minimum of eight member specialists dependent upon the type of project.

Andy Thompson asked whether the issue surrounding utilization of consultant expertise for certification has been resolved. Mr. Gimmestad said the issue is scheduled for discussion later in the meeting to some degree. However, it's uncertain whether the PRC has moved beyond the issue or whether it has become part of the dialogue when PRC members consider a certification and are comfortable with the applicant's capability to deliver D-B projects over a three-year period. Since the PRC is comprised of 30 members, not all members agree or may consider information during the presentations differently. However, when deliberating collectively, members render a reasonable vote for the applicant.

Chair Maruska mentioned the possibility of a request for another special meeting. Mr. Gimmestad affirmed a request for a special meeting on June 9 to consider two GC/CM project applications from the Central Kitsap School District.

Chair Maruska noted that the statute for agency recertification requires an applicant seeking recertification to submit the application 90 days before certification expires. One public body did not meet the requirement. Since it's a statutory requirement, the PRC did not have any alternative to waive or adjust requirements under the statute. Mr. Gimmestad affirmed that a public entity was certified to use GC/CM for the last three years. The

agency's certification expires at the end of May and the agency submitted an application for recertification within 30 days of the expiration. The RCW specifically requires the submission of recertification applications 90 days prior to expiration. He spoke with the owner's representative who submitted the application and explained the circumstances. The public body might likely reapply for certification or submit a project application.

Chair Maruska said the issue speaks to whether the Board wants to consider whether 90 days is appropriate for recertification and whether the requirement should be revised.

Mr. Frare said the statute essentially impedes good customer service. He supported efforts by the Board to initiate a legislative amendment to afford more flexibility in terms of the submittal timeline similar to, "shall be submitted far enough in advance to allow sufficient time for review," as the PRC is currently able to schedule meetings or include an additional application on a meeting agenda.

Mr. Gimmestad commented that although he's not familiar with why legislation requires 90 days, there could be some level of scrutiny required for an agency certification requiring additional reference checks in the industry to determine an agency's track record in successfully delivering projects. Thirty days might not be practical while 90 days might be too long. To some degree, the PRC wants to know the history of the public agency. Additionally, at the conclusion of projects, final reporting is required, which has been challenging. Having that information available also supports the recertification review process.

Chair Maruska acknowledged the points especially as one who was involved in some of the negotiations for establishing the PRC, as there were concerns that recertification was the final opportunity for the public to voice an opinion. The timeline affords ample time for notification and provides a forum for the public to provide comments or raise issues surrounding the recertification. Providing adequate notice was an important element in the legislation. It's also important to note that an internal PRC schedule should be considered as well as the public's opportunity to contribute comments during recertification.

Nancy Deakins recalled that the 90 days was included to provide the opportunity to follow up on data provided by public bodies. At this time, data collection is not occurring, which has been problematic. Until data collection resumes, the PRC might want to consider modifying its application to request additional information.

### ***Review of Candidates – Action***

Chair Maruska commented on the excellent caliber of the individuals applying for membership on the PRC.

Ms. Deakins reported that for the two General Contractors positions, 11 applications were received with one application from an incumbent:

- Curt Gimmestad (incumbent)
- Tomas Doig
- Hollis Barnett
- Dave Johnson
- Russell Meeds
- Mark Ottele
- Becky Blankenship
- Mike Bell
- Tim Thomas
- Brian Holeck
- Brett Earnest.

Ms. Deakins invited applicants to comment on their respective application.

Mr. Gimmestad said he's enjoyed his tenure on the PRC and would like to continue his membership and would appreciate the opportunity to participate. As the Chair during the last year, he's made good progress on understanding the importance of PRC and identifying those issues that deserve more work. He supports GC/CM and D-B alternative deliveries and would like to continue participating as a member of the PRC.

Dave Johnson reported he is the Vice President of Hoffman Construction. He's been involved in alternative delivery projects for the last 20 years. He spent the first six years on D-B projects and the last 14 years on GC/CM projects within the Seattle area. His experience spans a number of different projects ranging from a treatment plant to Seattle Central Library to Sound Transit projects. He's identified some improvements that could be implemented for GC/CM and would like to contribute that experience to PRC, as well as contributing as a member to ensure all GC/CM and D-B projects are successfully completed in the state.

Mark Ottele said he is a Project Manager of alternative procurement deliveries. He has attended several Board and PRC meetings and enjoyed watching the process. He began his career in construction in the late 1990s at the Port of Seattle and was involved in the third runway project for Sea-Tac Airport. The experiences opened his eyes to alternative procurement delivery methods. In 2000, he graduated from the University of Washington with a construction management degree and began working for Granite. For the past 16 years, he's worked exclusively on heavy civil and transportation public works projects both traditional and alternative procurement methods. His most recent relevant experience was working with Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) on a \$340 million D-B project for the SR 520 Eastside Transit and HOV project. He's worked exclusively on heavy civil projects during the span of his career and under the new Heavy Civil statute, which would benefit the PRC. He is a hands-on practitioner and is more involved on the jobs. He developed the ideas, prepared the proposals, and executed the jobs. He knows what is required for the team to work effectively together for alternative procurement projects and is appreciative of the opportunity to be considered.

Mike Bell agreed that the applicant pool is well qualified. It speaks to the success of the PRC. Mr. Bell said he is the Operations Manager for Walsh Group, a large national heavy civil contractor for transportation. As the Operations Manager, he oversees active projects, as well as being heavily engaged in the development of business, which focuses on the pursuit of alternative delivery projects. As a PRC member, he believes he can offer his representation of a large heavy civil contractor that hasn't been engaged with the CPARB or PRC to provide a new perspective. He has worked in the industry for 25 years at a variety of levels. During the last two years since legislation was implemented for heavy civil GC/CM delivery, he followed all eight project deliveries. He was also engaged in the delivery of heavy civil D-B projects as a D-B professional recognized by DBIA. Thirdly, he offers his pledge to evaluate certifications and projects in a fair-minded way in accordance with the RCW. Many best practices have been memorialized in the RCW and he looks forward to championing that process.

Brett Earnest reported he is the Vice President for Clark Construction Group and leads the company's Pacific Northwest efforts based in Seattle and Pullman. He's worked in alternative project deliveries in public/private partnerships for D-B and GC/CM for the last 10 years of his 15-year career completing over \$1 billion in projects. He is currently working on two Sound Transit projects, the Port of Seattle's D-B International Arrivals Facility, and Washington State University's Digital Classroom project. He also had the opportunity to work with Walter Schacht, Andrew Thompson, and Steve Crawford on the CPARB D-B Best Practices Committee. He expressed appreciation for consideration of his application.

Chair Maruska invited nominations for both positions.

Mr. Thompson recused himself from voting for Mark Ottele because he works with Mr. Ottele; however, he is supportive of his nomination. He asked the Board to consider applicants with heavy civil experience to provide some balance on the PRC.

Mike Shinn echoed similar comments as applicants experienced in heavy civil offer an opportunity to broaden the committee's representation for heavy civil projects.

***Mike Shinn nominated Mark Ottele. Brent LeVander seconded the nomination.***

***Bill Frare nominated Curt Gimmestad. Andrew Thompson seconded the nomination.***

Mr. Frare spoke to his nomination of Mr. Gimmestad. Mr. Gimmestad has done a good job as Chair of the PRC. The Board should consider reappointment of Mr. Gimmestad to provide continuity for the review and administrative process.

***Santosh Kuruvilla nominated Mike Bell, Irene Reyes seconded the nomination.***

***Walter Schacht nominated Brett Earnest. Steve Crawford seconded the nomination.***

Mr. Schacht spoke to his nomination of Mr. Earnest, who he has known for several years. Mr. Earnest has been an effective and regular participant on the D-B Best Practices Committee and served as a proxy for general contractors. Mr. Earnest provides a national perspective on alternative project delivery because of the scope of the company's work, which could benefit the state.

***Mike Riker nominated Dave Johnson. Bill Frare seconded the nomination.***

Mr. Riker said is not familiar with any of the candidates, but has worked with Hoffman Construction on several projects and personally dealt with some different conflict resolutions on several of the Hoffman projects. The professionalism administered by Mr. Johnson was very impressive and it's reflective of what he would offer to the PRC.

No additional nominations were offered. Chair Maruska closed nominations. He advised that in order to elect applicants to fill the two vacant positions, a majority vote of the Board is required for each position.

Mr. Kuruvilla asked how many PRC members currently represent general construction and how many represent heavy civil construction. Mr. Gimmestad said General Contractors members currently seated represent Hoffman Construction, Lydig Construction (vertical), Mortenson Construction (vertical and heavy), and Absher Construction (vertical).

Chair Maruska addressed questions and reviewed the voting process and required affirmative votes to fill the vacant positions.

Primary voting results for Position 1 – General Contractor:

***Curt Gimmestad received 7 votes***

***Dave Johnson received 1 vote***

***Mark Ottele received 2 votes***

***Mike Bell received 3 votes***

***Brett Earnest received 1 vote***

***Curt Gimmestad and Mike Bell advanced to the general vote.***

***Position 1 – General Contractor:***

***Curt Gimmestad received 10 votes***

***Mike Bell received 4 votes***

***Curt Gimmestad was re-elected to Position 1- General Contractor.***

Primary vote results for Position 2 – General Contractor:

***Dave Johnson received 2 votes***

***Mark Ottele received 7 votes***

***Mike Bell received 4 votes***

***Brett Earnest received 2 votes***

***Mark Ottele and Mike Bell advanced to the general vote.***

***Position 2 – General Contractor:***

***Mark Ottele received 8 votes***

***Mike Bell received 6 votes***

***Mark Ottele was elected to Position 2 – General Contractor.***

Chair Maruska thanked all candidates for applying to serve on the PRC. He encouraged their continued participation with the CPARB and PRC.

Ms. Deakins reviewed the candidates for one Specialty Subcontractor position. Applicants include Mike Shinn (incumbent) and Jed Olafson. She invited applicants to speak to their application.

Mr. Shinn reported he has been a member of the PRC since its establishment. It's important to understand the MC/EM process and the specialty market. Under the RCW and the different procurement methods of GC/CM and MC/EM, it's important to be represented because specialty contractors are major stakeholders in those projects, as well as ensuring public owners understand how specialty contractors can help most projects. It's also important to understand the approval process of the PRC because the committee enforces the rules established by the CPARB. It's important for team members to understand the different procurement methods. Being a PRC member also speaks to commitment and a willingness to attend and participate. For public body certifications, the entire PRC membership is required to vote. Members often must adjust personal schedules to attend and render a vote. Over the years, he's had to adjust his schedule and make sacrifices. The PRC should serve as a training ground. He has the experience. He established his company 20 years ago and built his company over the years. It's important the process consider smaller contractors. In the late 1990s, he was involved in one of the first GC/CM projects at the University of Washington. He asked for support for his continued service on the PRC.

Jed Olafson said he works for Johnston Construction Company in Tacoma. He began working in the construction industry in 1982. He worked on panel systems, which were cutting edge in the masonry industry. He worked on the development of prefabricated panels affording quicker and cleaner installations. He's been involved in the installation of panel systems for 23 years and in the purchase of Johnston Construction Company in 2005.

He's developed relationships with general contractors, architects, and engineers and has spent his career serving the construction industry and making the contractor's job easier. He submits his own drawings and works closely with general contractors to help streamline projects. He looks forward to sharing some his knowledge and helping to improve the process.

Chair Maruska called for nominations for one vacant position of Specialty Subcontractor.

***Mike Riker nominated Mike Shinn. Brent LeVander seconded the nomination.***

***Steve Crawford nominated Jed Olafson. Alan Nygaard seconded the nomination.***

***Mike Shinn was elected with 14 votes.***

Ms. Deakins reviewed the eight applicants applying for the Construction Manager position:

- Jim Stoner
- Jeff Jurgensen
- Rusty Pritchard (incumbent)
- Bob Baldwin
- Sam Obunike
- Gregory Brown
- Jim Dugan
- Matt McMenamins

The applicants were invited to speak to their respective application.

Jim Dugan reported he manages an office for Parametrix in Tacoma comprised of 10 senior level project managers. He recalled D-B prior to it being considered an alternate delivery method. During the first two decades of his career with the Austin Company, he authored reforms for D-B followed by a decade as a project manager for design firms. He worked for Merritt Pardini on the Tacoma Convention Center for GC/CM project delivery followed by the Stadium High School project, a 10-year project. He then decided to start his own section within Parametrix dedicated to owner representation to provide management and construction management support on the owner side by teaching and training how best to select design teams and contractors. More recently, he's been teaching and training K-12 public agencies how to use different tools in a better way to the point where they no longer need assistance from consultants. He would personally like to be considered more than just an applicant because he believes in alternative delivery and has been pursuing alternative deliveries his entire career. He enjoys teaching, training, and bringing in new agencies to train. He believes he has the resume for D-B and GC/CM, as well as working with design, owner, and contractors teams. He enjoys teaching and believes teaching to use tools differently makes everyone better in the built environment. Many tools remain to be taught. As an elected official for Tacoma Public Schools and a founder of a nonprofit, he understands the commitment required for membership and is prepared to do so. He would like to be more than an applicant and serve as a teacher to train in what everyone does best – serve the taxpayer and the community.

Chair Maruska invited nominations for the Construction Manager position.

***Mike Shinn nominated Jim Dugan. Alan Nygaard seconded the nomination.***

No other nominations were offered.

***Jim Dugan was elected with 14 votes.***

Ms. Deakins reported only one applicant, Neil Hartman, applied for the one Construction Trades Labor position.

Mr. Riker said Mr. Hartman has been a valuable asset to the labor community and does a good job for the industry. He recommends his appointment.

***Neil Hartman was elected with 13 votes.***

Ms. Deakins reviewed the five candidates for one Private Sector position:

- Rusty Pritchard
- Jeff Jurgensen
- Tom Peterson
- James Lynch
- Scott Ireland

Tom Peterson spoke to his application for consideration of the Private Sector position. He is an original founding member of the PRC. He did not apply for the General Contractor position as he believes new members should be seated on the PRC, as well as ensuring continuity on the committee. He brings continuity and experience, as he's been involved in the PRC since its establishment. He also led several training sessions for PRC members and would like to share that knowledge with other members. Phil Lovell, who previously occupied the position, decided not to submit an application.

James Lynch reported he is a construction lawyer representing Ahlers & Cressman in Seattle. His qualifications are summarized in the letter of interest. He is in his ninth year of practice and has a client base of general contractors and specialty contractors both large and small. He also represents several public and private owners for various projects. He applied for PRC membership as members have extensive experience on D-B and GC/CM projects. Those interests are well represented by general contractors and management, design professionals, and owner members, whereas his representation would offer a fresh perspective because he's been involved in multiple GC/CM and D-B projects in different places within the contracting chain. He has served as a consultant both at the beginning and at the end of projects. He has helped resolve issues. He differs from other PRC members because he often assisted in identifying where projects could go wrong or identified risk areas. He is hopeful that he can provide the PRC with the ability to help avoid some of those issues to the extent possible.

Scott Ireland, KBA, Inc., reported that his background is in heavy civil construction. He has been with KBA for the last several months and previously worked for WSDOT. His first exposure to alternative project delivery was on the Tacoma Narrows Bridge project as the Bridge Field Engineer for the project. From there, his career progressed to serving the department in the administration and delivery of alternative delivery projects. Most recently, he's been an Assistant State Construction Engineer. His background is in the practice of D-B, as well as leading the development of project delivery method selection guidance as the Assistant Construction Engineer. The guidance was implemented statewide within WSDOT. The guidance is a tool and policy for evaluating projects that WSDOT is scheduled to deliver based on the attributes of the project, opportunities, risks, as well as the statutory requirements for selection of the alternate delivery method. He was also responsible for furthering the development of WSDOT's D-B program in terms of policy guidance, tools, resources, and training required by an agency to be successful in using alternative delivery methods. He could contribute that knowledge

and experience to the PRC during review of project proposals. During his career, he's served on a number of committees associated with alternative project delivery and served as the co-chair for the WSDOT AGC/ACEC Design-Build Subcommittee. He submitted his letter of interest with strong support from the AGC and ACEC, as well as from Chris Christopher, WSDOT's Construction Division Director. He acknowledged the number of strong candidates, but challenged members to find anyone with more energy and commitment to serve on the PRC.

Walter Schacht asked for additional information on what entails the Private Sector representative because of the wide array of experience demonstrated within the applications. Chair Maruska said the position should reflect the membership of the CPARB. A comparable representation equates to a private industry representative on the CPARB. The position doesn't define "private" because the intent was to afford a mix of all interested parties, to include private parties on the CPARB, as well as on the PRC. Previously, the Board has conceded that a member of PRC who is employed in a public sector position could represent another category, such as an Engineer position as a practicing engineer. The category of "Private Sector" reflects a broad definition of private entities.

Mr. Thompson said he considered the position filled by Phil Lovell and the role he's played in reaching across many different areas. He foresees this position as similar to Mr. Lovell's service.

Ms. Deakins added that initially when the position was created, the intent for the Board and the PRC was to attract private sector contractors or owners to provide a private sector contracting perspective.

Mr. Schacht agreed diversity is important on both the Board and the PRC because the industry tends to focus inwardly between public owners and design professionals and contractors.

Chair Maruska opened the floor to nominations for the Private Sector position.

***Mike Shinn nominated Tom Peterson. Mark Riker seconded the nomination.***

***Brent LeVander nominated James Lynch. Ty Heim seconded the nomination.***

***Joaquin Hernandez nominated Scott Ireland. Steve Crawford seconded the nomination.***

Primary vote results for the Private Sector position:

***Tom Peterson received 3 votes***

***James Lynch received 8 votes***

***Scott Ireland received 6 votes***

***James Lynch and Scott Ireland advanced to the general vote.***

***Private Sector position:***

***James Lynch received 8 votes***

***Scott Ireland received 6 votes***

***James Lynch was elected to fill the Private Sector position with 8 votes.***

Rebecca Keith remarked that the process makes a difference when candidates are available to speak to their respective experience and qualifications. She inquired as to whether those applicants who are based in eastern

Washington had been afforded an opportunity to speak via phone. If not, she asked the Board to consider accommodating applicants from eastern Washington in the future.

Several members supported the recommendation to ensure graphical diversity because of the challenge some applicants encounter to attend Board meetings. Mr. Schacht added that many applicants often do not understand the competitiveness of the selection process as well as the importance of attending. Only those applicants appearing before the Board were successful in receiving a nomination. Applicants representing eastern Washington should be afforded an opportunity to participate by telephone. Ms. Reyes agreed with the importance of learning about a candidate through their respective testimony.

Mr. Gimmestad said he spoke with many of the candidates and recommended their attendance to the Board meeting. He spoke of the challenges of attending Board meetings, as well as the PRC meetings because it's often a challenge for the PRC to obtain a meeting quorum. If an applicant is unable to attend and support their respective application, it may be reflective of the inability to attend PRC meetings regularly. PRC membership is a commitment of time.

Staff added that information is conveyed to each candidate about the importance of attending the Board meeting to support their respective application. If unable to attend, applicants are asked to provide references. Staff reinforces the importance of attending as well as sharing information on the commitment involved in PRC membership.

**Agency Certification Review 39.10.270 – Information**

At the request of Mr. Gimmestad, Chair Maruska deferred discussion on the Agency Certification Review 39.10.270 to a future meeting.

Mr. Gimmestad advised that John Palewicz is assuming the position of Chair of the PRC in July.

*Chair Maruska recessed the meeting from 10:48 a.m. to 10:54 a.m. for a break. Charles Horn left the meeting during the break.*

**CPARB Chair/Vice Chair Nomination/Election - Action**

Chair Maruska confirmed his intent not to seek an additional term as Chair. He thanked members for their support, as it's been an honor and privilege to serve the Board over the years. He thanked members for the opportunity to serve.

The election of either a public owner or private sector representative determines the representation for the Vice Chair position. Chair Maruska said he previously provided members with information on the duties of the Chair. Members were previously asked to submit letters of interest. Staff received two letters of interest for Chair and one letter of interest for Vice Chair.

Chair Maruska invited candidates who submitted a letter of interest to speak to their interest in serving as the Chair.

Bill Frare reported he is Assistant Director, Engineering and Architecture, Department of Enterprise Services (DES). He has 25 years of experience in public works contracting and has been a member of CPARB for the last 2-1/2 years. He's appreciative of his membership, has learned much about the Board's function and relationship with the Legislature, and understands the importance of having an opportunity to review issues by a diverse body representing all factions of construction. His vision as Chair is to ensure the Board continues to serve as an open body to welcome new ideas and to ensure opportunities for discussion in an open forum and

vetting of information benefitting the industry at-large rather than any one special interest. The integrity of the Board should be used as a conduit to the Legislature to submit ideas for successful legislation. He has experience in testifying before the Legislature on a number of issues and looks forward to serving as the Chair.

Alan Nygaard said he serves as the Director of Business Services within the Capital Planning and Development Office at the University of Washington. He shared how honored he is to be a member of the Board especially after participating in the nominations for PRC positions and reviewing the quality and caliber of the applicants attracted to serve the organization. One of the key components of the position is leadership and continuing movement within the organization. The Board completes much work associated with public works; however, the ultimate outcome is ensuring projects are completed. It's important to focus on the ability for public owners, contractors, and others involved in the process to move forward on project completions. The Board represents many different organizations, which speaks to the University, as the University includes many different organizations on campus involved in many different activities. Being part of that process and experiencing an array of input and interests has helped him gain experience to serve as Chair to represent the many different interests. His organization also supports his intent to serve as Chair because there is a significant amount of time commitment. He would be honored to serve as Chair and welcomes the opportunity to represent all members.

Chair Maruska opened the floor to any additional nominations. No additional nominations were offered.

***Mike Shinn nominated Alan Nygaard to serve as Chair. Rebecca Keith seconded the nomination.***

***Santosh Kuruvilla nominated Bill Frare to serve as Chair. Irene Reyes seconded the nomination.***

Chair Maruska closed nominations for Chair.

Chair Maruska called for the vote:

***Alan Nygaard received 6 votes***

***Bill Frare received 7 votes***

***Mr. Schacht abstained from voting***

Mr. Schacht spoke to his reason for abstaining from the vote. Both candidates are very qualified, intelligent, experienced, and skilled. Both individuals by temperament would serve the Board well on behalf of the agencies they represent. He would have difficulty selecting one over the other.

Ms. Keith agreed the choice would be challenging but she also believes it's appropriate to select the Chair regardless of the difficulty. All members represent organizations and often wear many hats while serving on an advisory board advising on policies that are best for the industry. It might be more challenging for a legislative body that is often involved in moving legislation forward.

Chair Maruska noted some of the challenges of ensuring representation of the entire Board when providing testimony or participating in other activities as a representative of the Board.

Mr. Thompson added that he has worked with Mr. Nygaard during committee work. He's assumed leadership and moved actions forward effectively. He's also worked closely with Mr. Frare. As the potential Vice Chair supporting the Chair, the situation is interesting for him personally. He could support either candidate as he has full confidence in both individual's capabilities and leadership. He acknowledged that the Board would face challenges without the leadership of Chair Maruska and Ed Kommers.

Mr. Shinn pointed out how DES, as Mr. Frare's employer, is also tasked with providing staff and administrative oversight of the Board meetings. As Chair, it appears that the Board might lack fair representation. He would support Mr. Frare's nomination if he worked for another organization.

Mr. Hernandez acknowledged the comment but also believes each individual would be able to distance themselves from their respective organization while serving as Chair. Chair Maruska has done a very good job of speaking on behalf of the Board as a whole. He doesn't view Chair Maruska as representing the Port of Seattle when he serves in his capacity as Chair. Either candidate would also have the same ability to represent the Board rather than their respective agency.

Mr. Crawford asked about the term of service for officer positions.

Chair Maruska said the term of office is two years with elections occurring in even years.

Mr. Frare conceded that Mr. Shinn brings up a good point. However, the position is more than representing the Board versus the organization because DES was afforded the responsibility to provide staff support for the Board. He considered that aspect prior to submitting his letter of interest, as he was concerned that he might have more influence over the operational aspects of the Board. His position on the Board was the result of an appointment by the Governor. His position as a DES employee is an appointed position and part of the Executive Branch of state government. His position within the capital program of DES is the reason for his membership on the Board. The Legislature afforded the responsibility to DES to provide staff support to the Board, which is independent of his position as a member of the Board. Ms. Deakins reports to him and staff is responsible for the administration of the Board through an appropriation included in the operating budget within the General Fund. The Board's budget is approximately \$50,000 annually. Staff support to the Board and the PRC is in excess of the budget. As Chair, he would bring his direct vision to support the Board, as well as oversight of the budget. He plans to submit a proposal to increase the budget amount based on true cost information provided by DES. Serving as Chair would also afford some efficiencies between staff members and because of proximity. He acknowledged that with that inherent efficiency, there could be an opportunity to interject too much influence over the process. Those are issues the Board should consider when rendering a decision for the selection of Chair. He added that he would be able to separate the issues and submitted his letter of interest because of that ability.

Mr. Shinn asked whether Mr. Frare would consider the Vice Chair position. Mr. Frare noted that the bylaws require officer positions to be represented by both public and private members. Public entity members' serving as both Chair and Vice Chair is not permitted.

Mr. Kuruvilla suggested affording another opportunity to each candidate to state what they intend to accomplish while serving as Chair.

Ms. Reyes requested information from each candidate about their respective plan for inclusion of small minority companies.

Mr. Frare reemphasized his vision to afford an open forum of the Board providing vetted recommendations to the Legislature on proposed legislation. The Board's ongoing work with existing committees represents good work and he would continue those efforts. He doesn't have a specific agenda at this time but all members are aware of the agency's involvement in developing inclusion plans and becoming a leader in minority business and women-owned business inclusion within the state. DES has provided similar guidance to other entities. Legislation for the small works roster prompted by DES last year is an example of those efforts by pursuing

some issues on small works legislation that wasn't effective and submitting proposed concepts to include small businesses. The proposal was submitted to the Legislature and did not pass.

Mr. Schacht cited some of the language in the bylaws pertaining to elections whereby, "The Board shall elect a Chair by the majority vote of the voting members." Chair Maruska affirmed the attendance of 14 members with one abstention. Neither candidate received a majority vote.

Mr. Nygaard spoke to his vision of leadership as helping the Board move forward while cognizant of the purpose and intent of the legislation creating the organization. It's important to ensure the Board is focused on those issues the Board oversees while moving forward in a proactive manner. Some of the issues require a leader both in front of and behind the scenes. Sometimes having difficult private conversations are just as important as public presentations. He skill set speaks to both aspects but he is also able to speak his mind in a manner that results in a positive outcome. All members serve on the various committees and each member has a constituency to represent. He continually practices that within his organization in terms of focusing on specific issues while also acknowledging that everyone is a member of a community within the state. That aspect is important to the Board because it leads to discovering common ground. Finding a resolution on issues requires a view as a citizen to act accordingly. It provides an opportunity to have common ground at the onset while working through issues as a statewide organization that represents and makes recommendations. It's important for members to represent their respective organizations while also recognizing each member is a citizen of the state. In recent history, the Board has become more diverse and attuned to what is required to attain diversity for both business equity issues and the types of businesses represented. If the Board continues to focus on singular issues, the same results will occur. The inclusion of new members on both the Board and the PRC is important. Leadership within the organization should remind members prior to voting that diversity is important to an organization.

Mr. Crawford stressed the importance of the Chair and the Vice Chair representing the entire industry and ensuring alternative delivery methods are successful. Sometimes it can be confusing to him when DES and the Board propose different legislation that is sometimes conflicting.

Mr. Thompson asked whether there has been a previous situation where a DES employee served as Chair. Chair Maruska said he believes John Lynch with DES served as Chair in 2006. During his tenure, Mr. Lynch did an excellent job of chairing; however, some difficulties occurred when the Board worked diligently on a number of bills that were introduced to the Legislature creating some difficult situations for Mr. Lynch to support because of the DES structure at that time. Several of the bills were good legislation but controversial to the department. He is unsure whether the organization has changed in terms of the ability for staff to work independently with the Legislature on behalf of the Board.

Chair Maruska called for a second vote on the nominations:

***Alan Nygaard received 6 votes***

***Bill Frare received 6 votes***

***Mr. Schacht and Mr. Thompson abstained***

Mr. Thompson commented that if the Board is to be effective (with due respect to Mr. Frare), the Board's best ability should not be tied to the personal capability of Mr. Frare but because the Board could possibly be more effective with Mr. Nygaard as the Chair. He has worked with both individuals. A tremendous amount of work is accomplished by the Board that results in simple conversations at the legislative level. If there was a perception that DES is not as effective, he would err on the side of either abstaining or voting for Mr. Nygaard.

Chair Maruska offered to consider serving another two years as Chair if it's the preference of the Board.

Mr. Schacht said the issue is not the lack of capable candidates. The problem is with the Board selecting one of the qualified candidates.

An unidentified attendee commented that based on other observations, those types of issues are often resolved after a delay. He suggested deferring the vote to later in the meeting.

Mark Gaines asked about the definition of “voting members” because he’s unsure if that means all members who elect to vote. He asked whether the interpretation of “voting members” pertains to those members present who choose to vote and not to those members who abstain. Chair Maruska clarified that the statute defines voting members as 19 members of the 23 positions on the CPARB. Voting members at the meeting constitute “voting members.” If all members were present, a majority of 10 votes would be required to elect a Chair.

Conversation ensued on the different interpretations of the bylaws for “voting members” and whether that includes members in attendance. The bylaws do not define “voting member.” The Board currently has 19 voting members, which would require 10 votes to elect.

Mr. Schacht cited a provision in the bylaws stipulating passage of a motion must secure 10 affirmative votes.

Following additional discussion, Chair Maruska offered to continue serving as Chair until the next meeting to afford an opportunity for more members to vote on the nominations.

Mr. Crawford suggested calling for a third vote. If the vote fails to produce the required number of votes to elect a new Chair, the default would retain the current Chair. Representative Buys recommended deferring action until the next meeting of the Board.

Chair Maruska called for a third vote on nominations for Chair:

*Alan Nygaard received 7 votes*

*Bill Frare received 5 votes*

*Mr. Schacht, Mr. Thompson, and Ms. Keith abstained*

*Representative Buys moved, seconded by Andrew Thompson, to suspend the bylaws for the election of Chair and Vice Chair. Motion carried unanimously.*

*Bill Frare moved, seconded by Rebecca Keith, to defer Chair and Vice Chair elections until the next scheduled meeting on September 8, 2016.*

Mr. Thompson commented on the possibility of some members unable to attend the September meeting leading to similar results. He inquired about the possibility of members participating by telephone. Chair Maruska affirmed the possibility as a voice vote by telephone is acceptable.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

*Joaquin Hernandez left the meeting.*

Chair Maruska reviewed the remaining agenda items.

Representative Buys asked whether nominations are closed and whether the Board would allow nominations for the two positions during the ensuing months. Chair Maruska said his interpretation of the motion is deferral of the nominations to the September meeting and that would entail opening the floor to nominations and voting. He recommended forwarding a notice to the Board acknowledging that the letters of interest stand and if the applicants remain interested, it's unnecessary to resubmit, as well as opening the floor to nominations during the September meeting.

**Public-Private Partnerships Committee Report – Information**

John Ahlers reported on the Public-Private Partnership Committee's effort to formulate a statute for effective public-private partnerships (P3) in the state. He introduced Dr. Ahmed Abdel Aziz, University of Washington, who provided an overview of P3s. The committee reviewed various statutes from other states and determined none would be effective for Washington. The project delivery method for P3 projects is Design-Build-Finance-Operate-Maintain. The proposed statute is intended to apply only to public assets and not private assets. Construction is financed through either public or private funds or a combination of both. P3 project construction is a public works project that is bonded, requires prevailing wage, and small business and DBE inclusion plans, as well as a PRC review of P3 projects as to whether the project is appropriate for the P3 method and whether team members have the required experience to complete the project. Next steps include the Board's review of the draft for discussion and feedback at the next meeting. At some point, the goal is to obtain the Board's support to pursue a legislative bill.

Mr. Ahlers reported that in addition, the committee is forwarding another recommendation pertaining to the GC/CM statute requiring subcontractors to be bonded. The industry has requested consideration of subcontractor default insurance in lieu of bonding. Mr. Ahlers provided members with a copy of the proposed revision to RCW 39.10.380 for review and feedback.

Mr. Ahlers reported that Dr. Aziz is an active member of the committee. Dr. Aziz's presentation will provide an overview of P3 projects. He added that the presentation contains information that is broader than the existing statute.

Dr. Aziz reported he has been working in public-private partnerships within the industrial arena for several years. His presentation agenda included:

- P3 Projects, Worldwide Presence, USA Market
- P3 Definition, Benefits, and Systems
- P3 Project Options Analysis
- P3 Procurement Process & Transaction Design
- P3 Project Finance
- P3 Payment Mechanisms
- P3 Oppositions and Implementation

P3 projects enable an agency to design, construct, finance, operate, and maintain projects for an extended period ranging from ten years to 99 years.

Dr. Aziz displayed several examples of P3 projects:

- Channel Tunnel between France and England costing \$16 billion with a concession period of 99 years.
- Confederation Bridge in Canada costing \$1.2 billion for a concession period of 35 years.

- I-595 Corridor Roadway Improvements project at a cost of \$1.8 million.
- British Columbia North Cancer Center costing \$70 million.
- British Columbia Britannia Mine Water Treatment Plant at \$27 million.
- Okanagan Correctional Centre at a cost of \$192 million.
- Denver Transit Eagle project at \$2.1 billion for a concession period of 34 years.

Dr. Aziz reviewed statistics on the number of worldwide, public-private partnerships completed to date by sector.

In the United States, 33 states have statutes allowing P3s for transportation facilities, including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. Last year, Congress included the allowance of P3 projects in the Surface Transportation Reauthorization & Reform Act. Public support is gaining momentum. Common reasons for a slow growing market include:

- Robust \$3.7 trillion municipal bond market (tax-exempt)
- Public stakeholders opposition and/or involvement in P3 decision making
- Significant cost incurred in proposal preparation
- Possibility of changing law and not adequate legislation
- Negative publicity and public not informed about the benefits of P3

States using public-private partnerships on many projects include Florida, California, Texas, and Virginia. Based on the experience of transportation partners, the Texas Facilities Commission developed a guide on successful practices for P3 projects. The guidance released in March, describes how to implement P3 projects successfully. Beyond transportation projects, Texas passed laws to enable P3 projects for different types of facilities beyond transportation. In Florida, the Management Services Department allows all types of P3 projects.

Mr. Ahlers noted the proposed statute includes language expanding P3 for any public works project and not just for transportation projects.

Dr. Aziz reported the system demonstrates P3 works, as there were some concerns in terms of public financing costing less than private financing. However, when considering the lifecycle of a project, a number of projects with public works financing has documented the benefits in cost and time for P3 projects. P3 projects involve a contractual arrangement between the public agency and the private entity through which:

- Skills and assets of each agency are shared in delivering an asset or provision of service
- The private sector takes additional risks in design, finance, operation, maintenance, or revenue
- Used for monetizing existing assets, developing new facilities, or expanding facilities/services
- Remuneration is linked to performance, and made over the life of the long-term agreement
- Means to raise additional funds.

Dr. Aziz described details of the contractual arrangements for risk assignment, performance metrics, and measures for non-performance.

P3 could also be described as an alternative procurement system. Potential projects could be delivered as D-B, GC/CM, traditional, or as a private-partnership project. Each potential project should be assessed to determine the best delivery system. Many of the jurisdictions consider P3 projects as a way for government to focus on forecasting policies, planning, and regulations while leaving the day-to-day operations to the private sector. P3 projects can foster new solutions for governments facing aging/lack of facilities/infrastructure (lack of funds), or requiring more efficient services or seeking efficiency gains.

Benefits of P3 are more than finance as P3 is a long-term relationship between public and private sectors to deliver an output (performance). Many methods are available with pros and cons that are based on:

- Payment upon delivery (no delivery no pay)
- Risk allocation (who does what best)
- VFM whole life costings
- Competition to get best value
- Useful in complex projects susceptible to cost increase. Provides efficiencies in integrating D/B/O/M, and reduction in lifecycle cost
- More risk transfer to the private party: cost of design, construction and OM, market demand, facility service
- Provides better operating efficiencies, better services, and compliance with regulations
- Accelerate the delivery (fast track ) of public projects
- Expands the financial capacity of public agencies (private equity), increase total debt capacity (legal limits to issue more debt, and closes financial gaps

P3 projects require establishing the objective of the project and what the public entity wants to achieve, such as receiving funds from the private sector versus management and skills of the private sector in the operation of the project. It's important to weigh the objectives and establish a system to determine if the objectives are being achieved and whether the project would provide better value for the taxpayer. It's important to assess potential P3 projects to determine if it would be a good fit.

Dr. Aziz reviewed P3 financing and numerous considerations that must be weighed and assessed before moving forward with a P3 project. It's important to define allocation of responsibilities, allocation of risk, financing and developer's returns, revenues, price settings, payment mechanism, security package, project duration and termination, and dispute resolution and settlements.

Mr. Ahlers commented on the many observations that point out the ability to finance projects at less cost through a municipal bond rather than financing offered by a P3 project. However, when considering the entire lifecycle model and the costs to taxpayers, in many instances the P3 project may cost less. He cautioned members to consider those factors as he has received many kneejerk reactions over the last 12 months about pursuing a statute for P3 when those projects would compete with municipal bonds. Other states have asked the same questions.

Dr. Aziz described the selection process for P3 projects. Typically, the process is a multi-staged project initiated by a Request for Qualification (RFQ) and Request for Proposals (RFP). P3 projects could also include unsolicited proposals (not included in the proposed legislation). Criteria are established to assess all the proposals.

Dr. Aziz reviewed the responsibilities and risks of each partner in a P3 project. All partners to include the lenders are linked with a security package for performance and default by the parties. He reviewed project financing packages. Project financing considers the assets of the project, such as the future revenue stream, and federal government funding. Today, private activity bonds are being used more by states for transportation projects. In a P3 project, risk is assigned to the private party not only to the construction and design, but also for the long-term lifecycle of operations and maintenance. Risk assignment must be considered when considering the financing package, as well as the lifecycle of the project to determine if P3 is the appropriate method. The U.S. Treasury Department issued a report on P3 project risks identifying the ability for P3 projects to manage projects

more cost effectively. P3 projects may be able to save money for taxpayers while delivering a higher quality or reliable service over a shorter timeframe. P3 projects may benefit taxpayers by lowering long-term project costs and improving the quality of service – or both.

Dr. Aziz reviewed programmatic, performance, financing, and technical requirements and specification of public-private projects. Provisions also include safety payments to cover any accidents.

Dr. Aziz reported on some instances of opposition to P3 projects and court cases pursued by professional engineers in California that were unsuccessful. Many states and the federal government are moving forward with P3 projects to utilize both the financing models as well to gain cost efficiency. For successful implementation in the state, legal review of the draft legislation is required as well as the possibility of an assigned P3 office to administer the planning and procurement of P3 projects with approval of P3 projects remaining with the jurisdiction.

Mr. Ahlers added that the draft legislation does not include a recommendation for establishing a P3 office. Dr. Aziz noted that the establishment of an office would be beneficial especially if there is a large pipeline of P3 projects in the state.

Mr. Ahlers advised that the draft of the proposed statute is flexible to the extent possible to ensure financing options are not 100% from the private sector or from public entities. The committee was asked to ensure that projects are public works projects, as well as designating P3 projects as public assets.

James Lynch, Ahlers & Cressman, asked members to review the draft and identify what might be lacking. The first section of the draft includes definitions, which includes a broad definition of P3 Design-Build-Finance-Operate-Maintain method. Owners may choose what components to include within a project. Financing is the unique component to P3, but it's not necessary. Several sections in the statute specify competitive procurement processes similar to D-B or GC/CM. The application process is much more extensive and includes more information the owners would need to provide to secure approval of a P3 project. The last section of the legislation establishes a specialized subcommittee of the PRC with expertise to review P3 project proposals. Another section affords flexibility to the owner in terms of provisions while also including a list of owner decisions that must be included in the contract.

Mr. Lynch noted that as previously mentioned there have been concerns that P3 projects privatize what should be a public project. Several provisions in the statute identify P3 projects as public projects and are subject to prevailing wage, bonding requirements, and provisions for disadvantaged minority, veterans, and women-owned businesses. Another provision stipulates that the legislation does not affect a public body's abilities under existing law, such as long-term leases and other methodologies.

Chair Maruska encouraged members to review the draft and be prepared to provide feedback and ask questions at the September meeting.

Mr. Ahlers referred to the proposed legislation for subcontractor default insurance for GC/CM. He invited members to contact him if they have questions.

Mr. Nygaard inquired as to the whether the committee's task has been completed or whether additional information would be presented in September. Mr. Ahlers advised that the committee has completed its work at this stage with the draft pending the CPARB's review and direction.

Mr. Thompson thanked Representative Buys for attending the meeting, as the proposal will likely be forwarded to the Legislature next year. If the proposal is to be successful, it will be important for the Board to clarify the finer points to ensure legislators have a good understanding to offer comments in support or opposition of the proposal.

Mr. Schacht asked about the mechanism for forwarding questions to the committee for preparation for the September meeting. Mr. Ahlers encouraged members to forward questions to him via email.

Representative Buys reminded the Board that all comments should be included in the public record. Chair Maruska recommended sending all questions to staff to forward to Mr. Ahlers and the committee. Mr. Ahlers added that dependent upon the number of questions and comments, the committee might schedule another meeting to help prepare responses for the September discussion. Ms. Deakins encouraged members to submit comments no later than mid-July to meet scheduling deadlines.

**M/E-CCM Best Practices Committee - Information**

Scott Middleton, General Counsel, Mechanical Contractors Association, provided the update on behalf of Ed Kommers, Chair of the committee. The committee has held three meetings with good attendance and representation by public bodies, general contractors, and specialty subcontractors. The next meeting is scheduled in June. The committee's objective is developing a best practices white paper with statutory recommendations and presenting the information to the CPARB in the fall.

*Mark Riker left the meeting.*

Mr. Shinn questioned the process to review the information prior to presentation to the CPARB. Chair Maruska advised that staff would post the information on the website in a table format to track comments.

**Design-Build Best Practices Committee Update – Information**

Mr. Schacht reported the committee plans to finalize the initial draft within the next week for the committee's next meeting. The intent is to present the draft at the Board's September meeting.

**JLARC Review & Annual Report of UW Council Care Roster - Information**

Mr. Nygaard noted the deferral of the update. However, the report will be submitted and would be electronically distributed to CPARB members.

**Data Collection Schedule Update – Information**

Ms. Deakins reported DES is considering the addition of data collection to the agency's project management system that is currently being implemented. The assessment of the process will likely be later in the year and she's uncertain whether the assessment would be available by the September meeting. She also received information that the Job Order Contracting format is nearing completion and likely would be distributed in June.

Chair Maruska questioned the timeline for enabling online data collection. Ms. Deakins replied that it's dependent upon whether the system is tied with the DES project management system. The IT project manager did not offer an estimated timeline.

Chair Maruska advised members that DES is not currently requesting public owners to submit data. He has received several questions from public owners about submission of data.

Danelle Bassett reported public owners have been advised to retain the information and check periodically with DES on the status of the online reporting system.

Mr. Thompson commented on the delay in the ability for public owners to input information. There is interest industry-wide for data. The OMWBE is working on a disparity study and the information would be helpful for that study. The collection of data is of statewide importance. He asked about the possibility of contacting IT to determine the next steps to implement online data collection.

Mr. Frare acknowledged the request.

Ms. Deakins requested clarification of the request. Mr. Thompson commented that the Board should be informed about the issue because many owners have queried Board members regarding the status of data collection. Up to this point, members have instructed owners to hold the information, which is unacceptable. If the process includes identification of a system that the Board has already determined is necessary, it's important to have discussions with IT staff to determine why the data collection process is not working.

Mr. Frare offered to meet and discuss the delay with Mr. Thompson. Chair Maruska supported the offer because of the importance to determine how data collection will proceed.

#### **Other Business – Information**

Mr. Frare reported on a budget proviso directing DES to work with the CPARB to develop recommendations on project delivery methods to include research on high performance criteria with incentives for architects, engineers, and contractors to meet performance measures. The request is to establish and appoint committee members at the September meeting.

#### **Set Agenda for September Meeting - Action**

The following agenda items for the September 8 meeting include:

- PRC Report
- Agency Certification Review Discussion with PRC
- CPARB Chair and Vice Chair Elections
- P3 Draft Legislation Review and Comments
- UW Critical Care Roster Briefing
- Presentation and Review of the Design-Build Best Practices Draft
- Establishment of High Performance Committee and member appointments
- Presentation of report by DES Disparity Subcommittee (Governor's Diversity Subcabinet Report on minority businesses)

Members discussed the length of the September meeting agenda and agreed to schedule the September 8 meeting to begin at 8 a.m. rather than 9 a.m.

#### **Adjournment**

*Alan Nygaard moved, seconded by Mike Shinn, to adjourn the meeting at 12:23 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.*

**Staff & Guests**

Nancy Deakins, DES  
Danelle Bassett, DES  
Jim Dugan, Parametrix  
Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services  
Dick Lutz, Centennial Construction  
Mike Bell, Walsh Group  
Curt Gimmetstad, Absher Construction & PRC  
Scott Middleton, MCAWW  
Mark Gaines, WSDOT  
Jed Olafson, Johnston Construction Company  
Scot Ireland, KBA, Inc.  
Nona Snell, Office of Financial Management  
Amy Engle, University of Washington

Brett Earnest, Clark Construction  
Mark Ottele, Granite Construction  
Kaelin Paulson, WA Conf of Mason Contractors  
H. Donald Laford, CMAA  
Larry Stevens, NECA  
Jerry Vanderwood, AGC  
Jen Masterson, OFM  
Tom Peterson, Hoffman Construction  
John Ahlers, Ahlers & Cressman  
Garrett Buckingham, University of Washington  
Dave Johnson, Hoffman Construction  
James Lynch, Ahlers & Cressman  
Ahmed Abdel Aziz, University of Washington

---

Robert Maruska, CPARB Chair

Prepared by Valerie L. Gow, Recording Secretary/President  
Puget Sound Meeting Services, psmsoly@earthlink.net