

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY REVIEW BOARD

Minutes

1500 Jefferson – Presentation Room

Olympia, Washington

November 13, 2014

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Representing</u>	<u>Members Absent</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Ed Kommers (Vice Chair)	Specialty Contractors	Vince Campanella	General Contractors
Christopher Hirst	Private Industry	Vacant	Senate (R)
Mark Riker	Construction Trades Labor	Alexis Oliver	OMWBE
Steven Crawford	School Districts	Rep. Vincent Buys	House (R)
Bill Frare	DES	Vacant	Engineers
Robert Maruska (Chair)	Washington Ports	Walter Schacht	Architects
Senator Bob Hasegawa	Senate (D)	Vacant	Construction Trades Labor
Rep. Kathy Haigh	House (D)		
Helaine Honig	Cities		
Alan Nygaard	Higher Education		
Gary Rowe	Counties		
Ty Heim	Public Hospital Districts		
John Ahlers	Private Industry		
Greg Fuller	Specialty Contractors		
Charles Horn	Insurance/Surety Industry		
Andrew Thompson	General Contractors		

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 9:00 a.m.

A meeting quorum was attained.

Everyone present provided self-introductions.

Approve Agenda

John Ahlers and Christopher Hirst arrived.

Bill Frare moved, seconded by Ed Kommers, to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried.

Approve September 11, 2014 Meeting Minutes

The following correction was requested to the minutes:

- On page 11, within the first sentence of the ninth paragraph, revise the sentence to reflect, “Chair Maruska added that CPARB action resulted from a Legislature directive to complete the study.”

It was clarified that the last sentence within the 4th paragraph on page 9 was intended to convey the following intent, “The focus of the work item is developing guidance procedures for agencies designating a GC/CM project to be considered a Heavy Civil construction project.”

Ed Kommers reminded members that the authority of the CPARB includes appointment of members to committees rather than to subcommittees. He recommended maintaining consistency in all motions by ensuring the language speaks to appointments to committees rather than to subcommittees.

Gary Rowe moved, seconded by Alan Nygaard, to approve the September 11, 2014 minutes as amended. Motion carried unanimously.

Public Comments

Chair Maruska encouraged public comments throughout the meeting.

Project Review Committee

September Meeting

Linneth Riley-Hall, Chair, PRC, reported via telecon the results of the September 25 PRC Meeting.

PRC members welcomed new member Yelena Semenova, representing the Owner-State position.

Members participated in a brief discussion on CPARB's request for the PRC to forward a recommendation on whether it's appropriate for agencies with minimal in-house GC/CM experience to utilize consultants to obtain agency certification. The PRC plans to present its recommendation during a future CPARB meeting.

The PRC reviewed three applications:

1. The University of Washington (UW) submitted a Design-Build (DB) recertification application. The UW completed several DB projects, including progressive DB projects and is considered one of the leaders in the industry for alternative public works projects. Members approved the recertification application.
2. Central Valley School District submitted a GC/CM application for the Evergreen Middle School renovation and addition project with a budget of \$32 million. The application was unanimously approved by a PRC panel.
3. Central Valley School District submitted a GC/CM application for two schools, Chester and Greenacre Elementary Schools for renovation and addition projects to take advantage of a single GC/CM contract for a project budget of approximately \$39 million. The application was unanimously approved by a PRC panel.

The next PRC meeting is on December 4 to consider the following applications:

- Washington State Convention Center Facility Expansion (GC/CM)
- Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Ferries Division, Coleman Dock Project (GC/CM)

Representative Kathy Haigh and Senator Bob Hasegawa arrived at the meeting.

PRC Membership

Chair Maruska invited PRC applicants to provide self-introductions.

Ato Apiafi reported he is the owner and principal of Ato Apiafi Architects (AAA). He also is an advocate for minority owned businesses and is currently enrolled in a GC/CM class. He has the knowledge and experience required for alternative public works delivery.

Chair Maruska reviewed the three applicants for Higher Education: Jeanne Rynne, Jon Lebo, and Chuck Davis.

Alan Nygaard noted the PRC has two Higher Education vacancies. The CPARB is fortunate to have three highly qualified candidates.

Phil Lovell spoke in support of Jon Lebo, University of Washington. He has known Mr. Lebo for over 20 years and has worked with him on many projects. Mr. Lebo has been at UW for over 20 years and is currently a major leader within the capital facilities project office.

Mr. Kommers remarked that Mr. Lebo and Chuck Davis represent the kind of experience required on the PRC in terms of alternative public works projects. Both applicants have a significant amount of experience. The purpose of the PRC is to determine whether an applicant understands the process and knows how to utilize the tools of alternative public works delivery. Mr. Lebo and Mr. Davis have the necessary experience.

Senator Hasegawa commented on the benefits of selecting a representative from the community college system. He supports the selection of Mr. Davis. He questioned the University of Washington's sensitivity to minority contractor opportunities within its system, as a recent report reflects that since affording UW some leniency on alternative contracting processes, UW has essentially not afforded any contracting to minority contractors. If the applicant representing UW is selected to serve on the PRC, he is hopeful the applicant is sensitive to those issues when evaluating applicants.

Ed Kommers moved, seconded by Ty Heim, to appoint Jon Lebo and Chuck Davis to fill the two Higher Education positions on the PRC.

Nancy Deakins provided additional clarification on the listing of applicant names on the pre-read lists. The community college system does not have any contracting authority. Subsequently, the Department of Enterprise Services (DES) manages all community college contracts.

Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Maruska reviewed the applicants for Owner-School District. Steve Crawford is the incumbent serving on both the PRC and the CPARB. The second applicant is Gregory Brown.

It was pointed out that the Mr. Crawford's term was extended at the last meeting followed by reappointment action. No action is necessary at this time.

Chair Maruska reviewed the applicants for Owner-Counties.

Gary Rowe spoke in support of appointing incumbent Jim Burt.

Gary Rowe moved, seconded by Ed Kommers, to appoint Jim Burt to fill the Owner-Counties position on the PRC. Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Maruska noted the vacancy for Cities remains unfilled as no applications were received. He invited everyone to contact eligible applicants and encourage them to apply.

Chair Maruska reviewed the applicants for Design Industry – Engineer.

Mr. Kommers commented that applicant, Mark Gaines is an employee of WSDOT. PRC membership is intended to represent the private industry and while Mr. Gaines appears to be a well-qualified applicant, he is employed by a public agency. He supports reappointment of the incumbent, Shasta McKinley.

Frank Lemos agreed a public agency applicant shouldn't be considered for the position.

Ed Kommers moved, seconded by Steve Crawford, to appoint Shasta McKinley to the position of Design Industry – Engineer position on the PRC. Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Maruska invited comments on the two vacancies for Specialty Subcontractors.

Mr. Kommers supported the appointments of Darron Pease, the incumbent, and the appointment of Kurt Boyd, who has been involved in a number of GC/CM projects and who is familiar with alternative public works. He is not acquainted with the third applicant, Sanjay Gupta, who also appears to be well-qualified. He supports the appointments of Mr. Pease and Mr. Boyd.

Greg Fuller noted that Mr. Pease is a general contractor rather than a specialty contractor. Andrew Thompson currently represents General Contractors. He questioned the appointment of two individuals representing general contractors. Mr. Kommers explained that a similar question was addressed during the initial appointment of Mr. Pease. Mr. Pease was appointed because of his work as a subcontractor to GC/CM's on projects. Based on his familiarity of the GC/CM process, the Board appointed Mr. Pease based on the number of applicants. Mr. Fuller asserted that Mr. Pease does not represent specialty contractors.

Mr. Kommers recommended pursuing separate actions on the two appointments.

Ed Kommers moved, seconded by John Ahlers, to appoint Kurt Boyd to the Specialty Subcontractor position on the PRC. Motion carried unanimously.

Bill Frare asked about Mr. Pease's specialty. Mr. Kommers said Mr. Pease's company, Pease and Sons Piping is a member of the Mechanical Contractors Association as a specialty contractor and has performed work on a concrete portion of a GC/CM project as a specialty bidder.

Christopher Hirst asked for input from current PRC members on Mr. Pease's participation and engagement in the PRC process.

Mr. Lovell, PRC member, reported he has served on several panels with Mr. Pease. Mr. Pease is a very good participant on the PRC. He supports his reappointment. Mr. Pease has a PRC member since May 2007.

Ed Kommers moved, seconded by Mark Riker, to reappoint Darron Pease to the Specialty Subcontractor position on the PRC.

Mr. Kommers agreed it's important to solicit candidates for potential appointment to the PRC.

Mr. Rowe noted the Board extended the appointments of some incumbent positions until the positions were filled. Chair Maruska clarified that the motion reappoints Mr. Pease to another three-year term.

Steve Crawford noted the recruitment was opened in April with applications due by the end of July.

Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Maruska reviewed the six applicants for the open position of Construction Manager:

- Dan Chandler, Michelle Leviant, Matthew Walker, David Beaudine, Jeff Jurgensen, Bill Dobyns

Mr. Kommers asked about the status of applicant, Howard Hillinger, who was included in the pre-read list.

Staff indicated that computer issues inadvertently led to the exclusion of Mr. Hillinger's name on the list of candidates. Mr. Kommers requested the inclusion of Mr. Hillinger for consideration for the Construction Manager position.

Mr. Thompson spoke in support of Mr. Hillinger because of his endorsement of the Construction Management Association and local construction managers. He's participated in the Heavy Civil Committee and was instrumental for the inclusion of construction managers and design engineers.

Andrew Thompson moved, seconded by John Ahlers, to appoint Howard Hillinger to the position of Construction Manager on the PRC.

John Ahlers expressed support of Mr. Hillinger having worked with him on the Heavy Civil Committee. Mr. Hillinger was an active participant and shared many good ideas.

Mr. Kommers acknowledged the work of Dan Chandler, who has served the PRC well. He thanked Mr. Chandler for his work and for his participation in various training programs.

Mr. Hirst echoed similar comments about Mr. Hillinger and Mr. Chandler.

Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Maruska reviewed the two open positions for Minority/Women Owned Business. The six applicants include Arthur Jackson, Deborah Todd, Mahwah Armand, Daisa Britt, Vicki Barron Sumann, and Ato Apiafi.

Mr. Apiafi said many members and some members in the audience know of him personally and that he is a strong advocate for the bidding environment as an architect. His passion is bringing forward his knowledge of the issues involving small businesses and he believes he would provide value on the PRC.

Senator Hasegawa spoke in support of Mr. Apiafi, who has demonstrated an interest in participating on the PRC. His resume is impressive as an architectural graduate from Yale who also completed a master's program.

Mr. Apiafi shared information on his educational and professional background.

Mr. Ahlers supported Ms. Sumann as the second applicant based on her resume and work experience.

Mr. Fuller supported Mr. Apiafi's candidacy.

Bill Frare moved, seconded by Andrew Thompson, to appoint Ato Apiafi to the position of Minority/Women Owned Business on the PRC. Motion carried unanimously.

John Ahlers moved, seconded by Bill Frare, to appoint Vicki Barron Sumann to the position of Minority/Women Owned business on the PRC.

Mr. Lovell supported the appointment of Ms. Sumann.

Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Thompson asked about the future candidacy of Mark Gaines as an employee of a public agency. Chair Maruska said the positions on the PRC include an Owner – General Public, which could be filled by a public agency employee. Mr. Thompson noted that WSDOT is currently evaluating next steps in alternate procurement delivery systems. WSDOT staff members are contacting and engaging in the alternative delivery process. He asked PRC Chair Riley-Hall to consider extending an invitation to Mr. Gaines to participate in a future Heavy Civil designated project for GC/CM at the PRC. Ms. Riley-Hall agreed that WSDOT is making efforts to reach out to other owners, as well as to the CPARB and the PRC to become involved more in alternative project delivery methods. She affirmed that she would extend an invitation to Mr. Gaines to attend future meetings of the PRC.

Mr. Kommers added that the PRC is at liberty to request CPARB authorization in securing particular expertise based on project applications. The CPARB has the authority to appoint members to satisfy needed expertise. The PRC was developed as a forum to provide the expertise to evaluate the type of projects eligible to apply under the alternative delivery methods. It's important the PRC is represented by experienced members to evaluate those proposals. If the PRC believes it's appropriate to include additional expertise as more Heavy Civil project applications are submitted, it would be appropriate for the PRC to request that CPARB advertise and appoint members with that expertise.

Ms. Riley-Hall added that Mr. Thompson assisted the PRC during a review of the first Oak Harbor Heavy Civil GC/CM application. The PRC will continue to utilize external expertise when there is a need.

The meeting recessed from 10:02 a.m. to 10:19 a.m. for a break.

Committee Updates

Chair Maruska reported the briefing provides a review on the status of each committee.

At the September meeting, the Board created a CPARB Operating Procedures and Bylaws Committee to develop bylaws. The task hasn't been completed. Additionally, Ms. Sullivan-Colglazier is no longer providing legal support to the Board, which necessitates appointment of new legal counsel to the Board by the Attorney General's Office. A draft of the bylaws should be available by the January meeting. The Operating Procedures are also scheduled for amendment to clarify the issue of continuing discussions when a meeting loses a quorum.

The Small Public Works Committee was created to review small public works issues. Review has been deferred until early next year because of the complexity of issues.

Chair Maruska noted Dave Myers changed positions creating a new appointee from the Governor's Office for the position of Construction Trades Labor.

Mr. Kommers reported on the appointment of Lee Newgent to Mr. Myer's former industry position. Ms. Deakins said Mr. Newgent is required to apply to the Governor's Office for appointment to the CPARB to complete Mr. Myer's term.

Mr. Riker offered to serve on the CPARB Operating Procedures and Bylaws Committee in place of Mr. Myers.

Ed Kommers moved, seconded by Bill Frare, to appoint Mark Riker to serve as Dave Myers' replacement on the CPARB Operating Procedures and Bylaws Committee. Motion carried unanimously.

Robert Maruska moved, seconded by Bill Frare, to amend the membership of the CPARB Operating Procedures and Bylaws Committee to remove Ms. Sullivan-Colglazier as a member and replacing her position with a representative from the Attorney General's Office. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Hirst asked for consideration of a motion to amend the CPARB Operating Procedures allowing the Board to continue with discussions in the event of losing a quorum during the meeting with no actions allowed.

Chris Hirst moved, seconded by Helaine Honig, to amend the CPARB Operating Procedures allowing the Board to immediately continue with discussions in the event of losing a quorum during the meeting with no actions allowed until the Committee acts on a recommendation to the CPARB.

Mr. Rowe asked about minutes reflecting the Board's discussion when a quorum is lost. Chair Maruska advised that the meeting would continue to be recorded and minutes would be developed for the entire meeting.

Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Deakins recommended assigning committee leads to ensure each committee progresses in moving forward.

Chair Maruska offered to serve as interim chair of the CPARB Operating Procedures and Bylaws Committee.

Mr. Nygaard volunteered to serve as the interim chair of the Web-Based Data Collection Committee.

Ms. Deakins reviewed the task of the Web-Based Data Collection Committee. A review of the meeting minutes assisted in addressing the status of the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee (JLARC) recommendations in its report reauthorizing the alternative public works law in 2013. Based on the formality of JLARC recommendations, agencies and the Board are required to report on progress until completed. One of the recommendations was reevaluating the type of data to collect that would be important to the Board to assist in formulating policy recommendations to the Legislature.

Chair Maruska advised that the Board was required to respond to JLARC with a status update on the three recommendations JLARC presented to the Legislature. A response was prepared and forwarded to JLARC as well as to each member.

Mr. Lovell reported on his extensive discussions with former member Olivia Yang and Vince Campanella involving data collection. Data collection could be termed an annual stumbling block for GC/CM training

when covering the section on administration and reporting. The issues needs some attention and he recommends simplifying the reporting format and utilizing the application format owners submit to the PRC for project approval to avoid reinventing a new reporting process. The format is currently available and could be utilized for data collection.

Mr. Kommers commented on the complexity of defining data which conclusively supports alternative public works delivery methods and which data is non-anecdotal.

Mr. Lovell suggested the distinctions between alternative works delivery and conventional Design-Bid-Build (DBB) are subjective in nature. His proposal pertains to milestone points in a project where subjective data could be recorded documenting the advantages of using the alternative works methodology. Some opportunities are available for obtaining some objective/anecdotal observations and experiences of stakeholders for each type of the project within the evaluation forms. Those valid components should be considered.

Mr. Thompson offered to serve on the Web-Based Data Collection Committee as the mission of the committee is based on the recommendations by the JLARC. Chair Maruska affirmed JLARC encountered difficulty drawing reasonable conclusions from the data and recommended the Board review and revise its data collection. Ms. Deakins said the JLARC Report also recognized alternative public works methods as effective and valuable. The issue surrounds the type of data for collection.

Ed Kommers moved, seconded by Bill Frare, to appoint Andrew Thompson to serve on the Web-Based Data Collection Committee. Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Maruska noted that Olivia Yang has agreed to continue serving on the committee although she is no longer a member of CPARB.

Bill Frare moved, seconded by Greg Fuller, to appoint Senator Hasegawa to serve on the Web-Based Data Collection Committee. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Kommers noted that the committee is able to appoint other stakeholders to the committee with confirmation by the CPARB.

Mr. Thompson asked whether there are any requirements for data to be web-based data collection. Chair Maruska said the Board has authorized DES to prepare some web-based pages based on input the Board received; however, it's doesn't need to be exclusively a web-based process. The committee will forward recommendations for the Board to consider. Mr. Thompson suggested DES should remove the current webpage at this point until the recommendations are finalized. Ms. Deakins affirmed the request.

Chair Maruska reviewed other potential committees that haven't been established at this point.

The Life Cycle Cost Study follow-up was requested by Representative Haigh with Representative Dunshee because the Board recommended no further action. Mr. Kommers has since met with Representative Dunshee.

Mr. Kommers reported he met with Representative Dunshee, Larry Stevens, and Steve Massey. The conversation included a review of the Life Cycle Cost Analysis Study completed by the Board in 2013 in response to the Legislative directive. He encouraged members to review the study, which is posted on CPARB's website. The study represents an incredible amount of work by Walter Schacht and others. One immediate action was a recommendation for legislation to clarify life cycle costing requirements for DB

projects, which was an element of legislation adopted in 2014 and now in statute. Representative Dunshee is not anticipating the CPARB to advance any new legislation in 2015 because it's understood many entities including DES, Office of Financial Management (OFM), and others are working on life cycle costs analysis and how it aligns with public procurement. Representative Dunshee asked that the Board discuss and consider challenges public agencies face in completing early life cycle analysis on projects. His concern is that capital dollars are appropriated for capital projects. If the life cycle cost analysis is not appropriately completed and the funds are not available for long-term decisions for public buildings, public agencies will continue to request adequate funds for those buildings. He asked for the Board to consider those challenges associated with requiring the completion of life cycle cost analysis regardless of the delivery method for a project. The group agreed to consider the request at the beginning of the new year. At this time, the work doesn't warrant assignment of a committee.

Chair Maruska said the discussion on the Heavy Civil best management practices concluded that Ms. Riley-Hall and several others from the work group would continue to monitor projects to determine if there is a need with no committee formed at this time.

Ms. Oliver had requested forming a work group of interested individuals to work on developing a proposal to the Board for consideration of Progressive Design Build Performance Measures.

The Board previously deferred formation of a Public-Private Partnerships Committee. Chair Maruska asked for feedback on forming a committee. Mr. Ahlers affirmed that there is interest by the contracting community; however, he's unsure of the legislative climate for potential legislation.

Representative Haigh suggested the Legislature should take the lead from the CPARB and its work. Because of the assorted variety of public-partnerships and various opinions, she suggested the Board should explore options; however, any proposal should be specific to the Legislature. Much work is completed in government through public-private partnerships. If there is interest by the Board, she encouraged the Board to pursue a proposal.

Mr. Ahlers offered to serve on the committee because he's aware of other individuals who have indicated a willingness to participate. The purpose and mission is drafting legislation allowing the state to procure public works through a public-private partnership basis similar to other states that have successfully implemented similar programs.

Mr. Kommers recommended Mr. Ahlers should continue exploring with constituents what they would like to accomplish through legislation. Mr. Ahlers offered to work with other stakeholders and draft some language for review by the CPARB.

Chair Maruska deferred discussion on feedback from the design community on alternative methods because of the absence of Mr. Schacht.

Mr. Nygaard referred to the discussion on progressive DB performance measures and indicated that there are a number of progressive DB projects underway. His concern is the effort may be untimely to secure the information that might be desired. He suggested either moving forward or eliminating current projects because asking a contractor mid-way through a project to perform additional data collection or performance measures likely would result in a missed opportunity for gleaning the information the effort is attempting to capture.

Mr. Frare asked about the status of some current progressive DB projects. Mr. Nygaard reported two projects are underway with construction contracts scheduled in March 2015. Some opportunities are available to impact those projects, but time is running out if the effort is delayed much longer.

Mr. Lovell said he believes Mr. Schacht is moving forward as he's been contacted to join a committee he is establishing to evaluate alternative works contracting on civil projects.

Chair Maruska confirmed that Mr. Schacht would be contacted to provide an update to the Board in December.

JOC Data Collection Report

Mr. Frare distributed information on data collected for fiscal years 2011 through 2014 for Job Order Contracting projects. The next report will include data from 2008 to provide a comprehensive trend analysis on JOC.

Over the last four years, the trend on JOC has increased with the number of public agencies increasing, as well as the number of contracts and work orders over the last four years.

Mr. Frare displayed a graph outlining the total contracting authority by public agencies versus the actual value in work orders. The trend of JOC under contract has increased at a higher rate than the actual use in work orders. For example, a public body might have a JOC for \$4 million while work orders totaled \$1.2 million, which appears to be the practice for many of the contracting authorities. The larger report documents the contracting authority and usage rates.

Mr. Rowe asked whether all JOCs are captured in the data. Mr. Frare affirmed all JOCs are included within the State of Washington.

Mr. Hirst said some entities are nearing existing authority, which the data doesn't appear to reflect. Mr. Frare affirmed that the overall trend reflects sufficient authority with some individual agencies, such as DES consistently reaching its authority and unable to utilize the contract for the final four or five months of the contract.

Mr. Frare said the number of work orders is increasing with the average value increasing. The average number of change orders is not reflective of any type of change in trend over time.

According to the statute, 90% of the work must be subcontracted. Data reveals that trend reflects adherence to the statute with a dip of 1% in 2013. Since data collection are based on a fiscal year, some of the information fluctuates on a calendar basis. Subcontractor value is trending upward along with the total value of JOCs. The number of firms has increased as well over time.

Chair Maruska questioned the basis for establishing the percentage of work subcontracted. Mr. Frare said the percentage is the amount of the constructed value.

Mr. Frare reviewed DES JOCs from 2011 to 2014. According to industry information, JOCs is a good way for prime contractors to contract with small and minority firms because it enables smaller and different firms to engage in the industry. The trend reflects somewhat of a downturn in FY 2014. Staff is continuing data collection efforts to ensure accuracy of data, which reflects an overall upward trend in unique subcontractor counts.

The number of subcontractors receiving five or more work orders for DES projects reflect a variance allowing for a competitive environment and new contractors for JOC.

Chair Maruska asked whether DES data were compared with the trend analysis of other agencies. Mr. Frare said staff was able to compile DES data at this time. Chair Maruska asked whether similar data have been collected for other entities. Ms. Deakins referred members to the spreadsheets for information on all entities.

Mr. Frare reported MBE and WBE participation on JOC is strong and is trending upward, which is calculated on construction value.

Chair Maruska asked whether data are reflective of certified firms. Ms. Deakins noted DES did not verify whether the firms were certified. Previously, when firms were checked, there has been some difference in the number of firms actually certified from those reported as certified by an agency.

Chair Maruska said the JOC report to the CPARB is required by the statute each year.

Mr. Thompson asked whether DES staff collects the data. Ms. Deakins affirmed staff collects the data on behalf of CPARB. Mr. Thompson asked whether the collection constitutes a full-time effort and whether staff members are available to assist the CPARB. Mr. Frare described the process and efforts by staff. Chair Maruska said the statute requires public owners to provide data to the CPARB. The CPARB approved the type of data for collection of JOC including data required by the statute. One goal was providing a web-based system affording public owners the opportunity to enter the data as the work orders are completed to minimize the amount of effort. At this point, the web-based application hasn't progressed to a functional operation.

Ms. Deakins added that a review of previous minutes is necessary to ascertain if the Board approved the web-based application. However, some discussions during the JOC users group centered on public bodies using JOC and job order contractors reviewing the issue and whether there would be any recommendations on whether data would be changed. The group continues to have discussions. DES is not willing to move forward and develop a web-based program until the identification of the data to be collected has been determined. It's hopeful that the JOC user group forwards a recommendation to the Board at some point.

Mr. Nygaard asked for an inclusion of a footnote to reflect the variance in some of the data based on fiscal versus calendar years.

Ms. Deakins reported that the original statute required public bodies to report on a contract year regardless of the calendar year. Later it was changed to reflect reporting on a fiscal years basis, which includes overlapping contract years. A database system would be preferable to help differentiate between contract years and fiscal years, which was one of the recommendations from the JLARC Report.

Chair Maruska recessed the meeting from 11:24 a.m. to 12:16 p.m. for lunch.

Representative Haigh left the meeting at the beginning of the lunch break.

Mr. Kommers shared how Representative Haigh was the founder of the CPARB. The Board continues to exist thanks to the efforts of Representative Haigh when the alternative public works oversight committee was disbanded and RCW 39.10 existed without any oversight or governing body. Consequently, elected officials were visited by members with an assortment of issues with arguments ensuing. It required skill and expertise to determine the status of issues. Representative Haigh realized the value in having an oversight board and moved forward to create the CPARB through legislation to enable a body to advise the Legislature and vet

issues. Representative Haigh was the Board's stalwart in the House of Representatives. He's also appreciative of the efforts of Senator Hasegawa. Because of the Board's efforts and those of the elected officials on the Board, better projects have been delivered to the taxpayers of the state. He is disappointed that Representative Haigh was not reelected by her constituents, as many likely didn't recognize the value that she provided across the state in delivering public works that are more effective. This Board will miss her. She has advised the Board to work on identifying her replacement. He urged members to send Representative Haigh a note of thanks expressing appreciation for her work on behalf of taxpayers in the State of Washington.

Discussion on Bills/Legislation for 2015 Session

Chair Maruska asked members to describe proposed legislation or issues with acknowledgement that some of the proposals are in various stages of development. Members should also consider whether the proposal falls within CPARB's purview and whether the proposal is supported by the majority of the Board or whether another method should be pursued to provide input during the hearing process. Because of the previous work the Board has completed to establish its credibility and a process for vetting issues by ensuring all sides are represented, it's important the Board attains consensus when presenting proposed legislation.

Mr. Frare described problems DES is encountering when it reaches the maximum authority of JOC. In the short-term DES was able to address the issue only to face the same circumstance several months later. Because the problem continues, DES is unable to serve the needs of client agencies or JOC capacity within existing legislation. DES is a public works contracting authority for most state agencies and for 34 community and technical colleges. DES appropriates funds for large and small projects and contracts for public work contracting and project management to ensure projects are completed. DES manages approximately \$600 million in contracts annually with a large portion comprised of smaller projects ranging from \$35,000 to \$300,000 with large contracts representing only 8% of the total number of contracts administered by the department. Clients recognized that at the end of the biennium, and in some cases, at the end of the fiscal year when the appropriation is nearing expiration, that they needed an efficient process for contracting with a contractor to complete the work prior to the end of the fiscal year of the biennium. DES has discovered JOC is an effective way to complete that work in a short lead time. The issue is the lack of legal funding capacity to complete the contracts and construction phases.

Mr. Frare distributed information on the history of DES Job Order Contracting. Generally, the authority for JOC exceeds the actual value of the contract on a general basis. For DES, it's the opposite. Within the last year, DES encountered two experiences whereby the department met its contracting authority within seven months of a year-long contract. In many cases, DES has reached the \$4 million limit. Once the limit has been attained, DES cannot move forward with any additional contracts resulting in client agencies not moving forward or using a different contracting method. His objective is increasing the dollar value and the number of contracts to enable DES to serve the interests of client agencies who utilize DES as a contracting authority. DES has submitted proposed legislation through the Governor's Office allowing the department to complete six contracts rather than four and increasing the authority from \$4 million to \$6 million. He requested the Board's endorsement and invited feedback on the proposal.

Senator Hasegawa commented on the comparison of information on the contract history with information from previous presentation and asked about the department's plan to ensure a percentage of contracts are awarded to WMBE's. The City of Seattle is experiencing success in locating many WMBE contractors/subcontractors. It appears that the two owners are contracting differently. Mr. Frare replied that DES has initiated inclusion plans based on the City of Seattle's efforts and is working with contractors to increase small and minority business participation. While not as successful as the City of Seattle, DES is working to adopt similar methods and increase participation over time.

Mr. Kommers said the request for CPARB's support is appropriate in this case as JOC is included in RCW 39.10. Typically, mechanical contractors have not been supportive of expanding JOC in all cases and some have been very concerned. Many believe there is a lack of transparency in JOC because the contractor negotiates the work with a group of subcontractors. However, many of the contractors have done a good job of engaging other companies. He is however, reluctant to approve the expansion of JOC.

Mr. Ahlers expressed a preference to review the proposal with his constituents rather than rendering a decision at this time. Chair Maruska said the Board could render its decision at its December meeting.

Mr. Riker spoke to previous off-line conversations about meetings to enable him to understand the issues and clarify any reservations prior to voting. He questioned how the department completes the work when it has reached its authority. Mr. Frare responded that the work is completed under traditional methods or other JOCs are substituted. The department is currently managing four JOCs. In most years, the department meets the limit on each of the contracts. DES administers the program through regions throughout the state. Regions exceeding the limit require DES to contract with a JOB contractor from another region, which reduces cost efficiencies and increases timelines.

Helaine Honig reported King County successfully sought and received an increase in limits because similar to DES, the county handled central contracting. Within the last several years, there hasn't been any allocation to the Seattle Public Library, which needs a public works contracting authority as it has 26 branch libraries requiring the library to utilize DBB for all small works projects. There has been some resistance to an overall expansion. However, it would be helpful in moving forward to understand the totality of the issues to focus on developing some specific criteria that could be used by jurisdictions or other entities.

Mr. Hirst pointed out that JOC is one area where participation can be increased by historically underutilized businesses. That is a high priority to him personally with respect to other competing interests. He suggested the Board should seriously consider acting, as there is an identified need because it speaks to perception and whether the Board is serious about increasing the utilization of small and minority-owned businesses.

Mr. Fuller agreed with Mr. Hirst's comments because it would help to increase opportunities for smaller contractors.

Chair Maruska asked whether the intent is increasing the percentage amount of work completed within the JOC by small or minority businesses or increasing the authority level while the percentage for small and minority businesses remains the same. Mr. Hirst replied that his comments were generalized, as more agencies would use the mechanism more than it has current capacity. There is a demonstrated track record where JOC can increase participation by historically underutilized businesses. It's important to consider that concept as discussions center on competing interests from different constituencies.

Chair Maruska asked Ty Heim to share the hospitals' perspective even though the proposed legislation doesn't account for public hospital districts to ensure all elements are considered when the discussion is expanded to include all constituents. Mr. Frare agreed as he and Mr. Heim have discussed the issue and although DES moved forward with specific legislation, the intent is partnering for future cooperation.

Mr. Heim said the hospital districts are scheduled to discuss contracting during an upcoming conference to include JOC, which speaks to the lack of input from the broader group at this time. However, the association is supportive of as many tools as possible to ensure projects move quickly within the hospital environment because many are service-line driven and projects must be completed quickly. The hospital environment is different from other types of public projects requiring tight controls with as much knowledge as possible.

When undertaking hospital projects, it's important to have as many tools as possible. Many of the projects are within the \$50,000 to \$150,000 price range and when utilizing the small works venue, many of the companies are not interested in completing the project because of the intricacies involved. That may occur with JOC as well. A middle of the road mechanism would be preferable for hospitals because of the difficulty in delivering projects. That's the interest at this time. Many of the hospitals are small and do not have sophisticated construction departments. They might see value in an interlocal agreement to administer projects through a JOC mechanism with a large contract in place to ensure projects are completed.

The Board agreed the proposed DES legislation falls within the purview of the Board and that it would be appropriate to consider the proposal.

Chair Maruska asked for input from the Board as to whether a recommendation should be forwarded to DES to combine legislation for cities and hospitals in one bill or pursued individually. Mr. Ahlers recommended considering legislation individually because of the different type of need for different entities. There could be less resistance if it was limited to one entity type.

Mr. Rowe asked whether the CPARB would craft the bills or whether the CPARB would support bills drafted by other entities. Chair Maruska said the direction appears to be bills drafted by other entities and not by the Board. However, the Board could consider supporting the bills and testify in support during session hearings. Mr. Rowe suggested it would be up to DES whether the bills should be combined.

Mr. Frare added that DES submitted the bill because of timing and the Governor's schedule for submission of legislation. DES is amendable to either process and is moving the bill forward, as well as inviting cities and hospitals to participate. If time allows, the proposal could be crafted into one bill if there is adequate support to ensure passage of the bill.

Mr. Crawford agreed the issue should be addressed as it continues to be a topic of discussion especially prior to the reauthorization bill. He questioned the prospect of the bill if there is no support or recommendation by the CPARB.

Mr. Kommers agreed that the proponents would have to consider how it uses CPARB for supporting the bill. The CPARB has opposed legislation with consensus.

Mr. Ahlers said it would be beneficial to have support from the CPARB; however, it's important the Board debates the bills regardless of whether the Board is unable to obtain unanimous support.

Chair Maruska recommended deferring discussion until the December meeting to afford time for members to discuss the proposal with constituents. The Board could then consider a motion.

Chair Maruska reported another issue concerns counties.

Mr. Ahlers said the proposed legislation is supported by the Utility Contractors Association of Washington, the American Council of Engineering Companies, and the AIA. An existing statute pertains to the filing of lawsuits against counties. Current statute allows the filing of a lawsuit against a county in the judicial district bordering the county of dispute. The counties have included provisions within public works contracts requiring the party to file lawsuits in the county where the project is located. The proposed bill prohibits counties from including venue provision within public works contracts inconsistent with the statute allowing the filing of the lawsuit in either of the two neighboring counties. The Utility Contractors Association would like to present the bill to the CPARB in December to discuss the merits of the legislation. Some

representatives from the association have met with county representatives, but the status of those discussions is unknown. Because the bill pertains to public works contracts, the association believes the CPARB is the appropriate forum for the debate.

Chair Maruska asked whether the existing statute applies only to public works. Mr. Ahlers said the existing status pertains to any legal action. Proposed legislation would only pertain to public works contracts and speaks to counties being precluded from including a venue provision in public works contracts that doesn't allow the contractor to file the lawsuit in either of the two neighboring counties. It should be up to the plaintiff to decide where the lawsuit is filed.

Mr. Hirst left the meeting.

Senator Hasegawa asked whether the issue pertains to the Growth Management Act. Mr. Ahlers said the issue pertains to construction contracts and engineering design contracts, which is the primary interest. Senator Hasegawa said he's aware of similar concerns under the Growth Management Hearings Board decisions where the concern by some counties are consideration of growth management issues within a county that are considered by another county.

Mr. Rowe said the issue appears not related to alternative bid processes as it relates to lawsuits. Counties have opposed the legislation in the past for a number of reasons primarily due to the practicality of processing a lawsuit in another county. The counties oppose the proposal for a number of reasons.

Chair Maruska invited feedback. He added that RCW 39.10 is not exclusive to alternative public works and includes the requirement for the CPARB to forward recommendations to the Legislature on conventional contracting as well as DBB.

Mr. Kommers said that from a contracting perspective, he favors the proposals but is unsure of whether the CPARB should provide a position. When the Board strays outside of RCW 39.10 other entities threaten to disband the Board and without stalwarts such as Senator Hasegawa and Representative Haig, the Board could be vulnerable. He is concerned with straying outside the statute especially with legal issues. He prefers to review the proposal with his constituents.

Chair Maruska agreed from a public owner's perspective the extra cost incurred in pursuing legal action in another county. The issue is what problem the legislation is attempting to solve.

Mr. Ahlers added that public policy has established that the claimant has the right to file a lawsuit in the neighboring county. The Legislature codified that policy. He questioned how counties could legally change legislative policy in the state by adding provisions within contracts that is contrary to public policy. He asked the Board to consider the presentation at the next meeting.

Ms. Honig said it appears the statute couldn't be public policy otherwise, the contract provision could have been voided and prohibited. Obviously, some public policy allows counties to include the provision in contract language. She suggested the issue is much broader than other focused issues the Board has considered.

Chair Maruska recommended offering the opportunity for the parties to present more information at the December meeting.

Mr. Thompson asked about other venues for advocating for changes in limits or venues. He asked whether the Board is considered one of the main venues for considering legislation. Chair Maruska said in terms of public works, anyone can introduce bills and there is no requirement to engage with the CPARB. However, the Board is a venue where all interests are represented to afford an opportunity to discuss, negotiate, and forward recommendations to the Legislature on a particular subject matter. However, the Board is not an exclusive arrangement requiring a review. The value is the combined interest in one location to ensure all issues have been resolved prior to submission to the Legislature.

Mr. Nygaard recommended preparing some pre-reads on the issue to clarify the intent of the proposal. Mr. Ahlers said the proposal pertains only to public works contracts. He has requested additional information for the Board prior to the next meeting.

Chair Maruska reported another issue was addressed by Doug Levy, Lobbyist, City of Kent, during the September meeting. The Board considered the request, expressed concerns, and offered input on possible additional revisions for the Board's consideration.

Mr. Levy said since the September presentation, he and Allison Hellberg, Association of Washington Cities, have had a number of conversations with several members. The issue involves a 2009 bill, which was initiated from a CPARB bill that evolved in the Legislature and ended up with code cities receiving less authority on bid limits than prior legislation. The proposal was correcting legislation, which was drafted in 2014 and passed the House but did not move through the Senate. Current statute gives the cities of Kent, Bellevue, and Renton the same bid limits that the small city of Tonasket has. The unintended consequences of the 2009 bill resulted in extreme irregularities between jurisdictions. It may make sense to assist in remedying the legislation. The issue is presented to the Board because it makes sense for the Board to vet the issue. The initial proposal should have been presented to the Board prior to the 2014 session.

The proposal increases bid limits on single and multi-craft projects to a similar level in prior legislation based on today's costs. He asked the Board to consider endorsing legislation remedying a flaw in the statute.

Chair Maruska asked whether the language in the bill was revised to reduce the gap for second class cities. Mr. Levy advised that the language could be revised and he is willing to work with a committee of the Board. The language was not redrafted to afford an opportunity to review the legislation with the Board first.

Mr. Kommers said after a review of prior notes and activities, it was determined that the initial proposal originated from the CPARB and it should be subject to a vote of the Board. However, mechanical contractors would like the limits reduced for the other cities to the proposed limits offered by the City of Kent rather than increasing bid limits.

Mr. Ahlers said he's not understanding of the concern regarding the Board's outreach beyond the statute. The statute is authorized to consider traditional as well as alternative delivery methods. He's not necessarily in agreement with Mr. Kommers conservative point of view in terms of the statute limiting the Board's reach. Mr. Kommers clarified that the Board is not limited to a broad realm. As a practical matter, it's different because stakeholders and the community view the Board as an authority on RCW 39.10 and any venture away from the statute could erode the Board's credibility with some stakeholders. The further the Board ventures, it's becomes a judgment call as a matter of practice. Mr. Ahlers acknowledged the difficulty of presenting legislation versus presenting a proposal to the Board represented by an aggregation of all interests. It appears logical that the Board is the proper forum for vetting proposals regardless of whether the Board elects to render a recommendation. The process is helpful to stakeholders who are crafting legislation.

Larry Stevens, Lobbyist, representing the National Electrical Contractors Association and the Mechanical Contractors Association, said the proposal is not an appropriate subject for the Board to consider. The issue has been an ongoing concern before the creation of the CPARB. The subject is not under the purview of capital projects as it's an issue of the contracting community and public owners. The CPARB has never had a discussion on bid limits pertaining to capital projects under the Board's purview. The issue shouldn't be considered by the Board. An unintended consequence has occurred and less construction work is performed in-house by public agencies. However, the associations do not believe any unintended consequences have occurred.

Chair Maruska requested clarification of whether the issue is the amount of work that can be performed by the public body. Mr. Levy said the proposal essentially involves restoring the bid amounts of \$90,000/\$45,000 for multiple crafts and single crafts from \$65,000/\$45,000 for code cities, which was changed in the 2009 statute. After tracing the initial legislation, CPARB was determined as the body originally submitting the bill, which had undergone some revisions during legislative hearings.

Mr. Crawford asked whether the sponsor was identified of HB 1847, which reduced the limits enabling the smaller cities to have the same authority as larger cities.

Chair Maruska said the issue is whether the intent of the bill was to reduce the amount or whether the reduction was an unintended consequence.

Mr. Kommers noted that HB 1847 was a replacement bill, which wasn't a CPARB sponsored bill. The original legislation changed substantially.

Mr. Crawford said the bill reduced the bid limits and eliminated the 10% limit on the amount of work that could be performed in-house.

Mr. Levy pointed out that the proposal includes restoring a percentage limitation.

Mr. Fuller asked whether the cities hire qualified craftsman with proper licenses to complete the work or whether the cities utilize craftsman with outdated licenses. Mr. Levy said the majority of the work would continue to be bid. Mr. Fuller said he's often has to redo some of the work completed by school electricians because the craftsmen completing the work are not qualified. He's not necessarily in favor of the proposal because of the improper work performed by unqualified craftsmen. Mr. Levy recommended having the questions answered by someone who is aware of the actual practice. The proposed bill that failed to pass was HB 2618.

Mr. Levy said the proposal is not for the CPARB to lobby or advocate for legislation but rather the request is whether it's logical to remedy the statute to ensure jurisdictions have higher bid authority commensurate with the size of the jurisdiction.

Mr. Kommers recommended preparing material for placement on the agenda to enable all members to have access to the information. Chair Maruska asked that Mr. Levy provide some revised language as part of the agenda material for the December meeting. Many members are likely supportive of providing some input.

Chair Maruska clarified that the issue surrounds the existing statute. The proposed change could also eliminate other cities not covered by the statute. The proposal may help code cities, but it eliminates any bidding authority for other cities.

The next meeting is on December 11 and the deadline for posting materials is a week prior to the meeting.

Chair Maruska referred to a final issue for consideration by the Board.

Amanda Migchelbrink, Assistant Director of Legal and Policy, Washington State Office of Minority and Women's Business Enterprises (OMWBE), briefed members on proposed legislation. OMWBE is considering legislation during the 2015 session to increase the waiver for OMWBE certified businesses for some bonds. Currently, under RCW 39.19.170, certified businesses can have a waiver up to \$25,000. In Washington State under RCW 39.08.020, a bond is required for projects of \$35,000 or less. The proposal would increase the bond limit for certified businesses to \$100,000 allowing those businesses to enjoy the benefit of being certified and having a bond waiver available to them while meeting certain qualifying factors under the statute.

Mr. Ahlers asked whether the proposal only pertains to general contractors and not to subcontractors. Ms. Migchelbrink said she understands the proposal could potentially affect both categories.

Chair Maruska asked whether the proposal changes small works to recognize that if the company were an OMWBE certified firm, it would change the bond limits. Ms. Migchelbrink said the discussions are still ongoing in terms of determining the best avenue to consider to avoid problems or conflicts. Chair Maruska suggested it might be helpful for the Council to brief the Board on the proposal.

Mr. Ahlers said the proposal places the risk on taxpayers for the non-payment or default of the company since the company is not bonded.

Chair Maruska questioned whether the proposal places the risk on small ports that might not have the financial means to support the risk. He asked about options for accepting the risk if ports elected to pursue limited public works.

Mr. Ahlers said it could be argued that the cost of the bond is no longer part of the cost of the procurement, which would result in some savings over the course of many projects.

Chair Maruska asked whether the proposal applies to cities. Ms. Migchelbrink said the bill was updated to include all public agencies based on feedback from those stakeholders.

Mr. Horn offered that the language within the bond stipulates that the OMWBE or other agency electing to make the decision is essentially assuming the role of the bond underwriter.

Mr. Ahlers pointed out that if the agency decided that the entity didn't have the appropriate financial resources, the agency wouldn't underwrite the risk or pursue awarding the contract. Mr. Horn said his point is that the company likely wouldn't be qualified. He supports MWBE's and possibly not having bonds, but magnifying the issue on a larger scale could lead to some problems.

Mr. Fuller said his company is a small contractor that often is faced each year whether to pay \$6,000 to \$7,000 for proper accounting to satisfy the bonding company. Each year, he must determine in December whether to secure a bond for the following year based on an estimate of jobs. The proposal would assist companies.

Mr. Horn said he doesn't believe the OMWBE has the staffing necessary to review financial statements to make a bonding decision. A company must secure a CPA and complete an audit. Any contractor that cannot secure a \$100,000 bond should likely not be allowed to perform work.

Mr. Ahlers pointed out that bonding is the only method affording security for performance or payment and that there should be some alternatives allowed for smaller contractors. He agreed there are issues, as it appears much of the business is to large insurance companies to issue bonds when there could be other avenues of ensuring performance other than through a bond.

Mr. Fuller replied that there are other avenues and often people assume the higher risk. However, he pays approximately 2.5% of the contract amount.

Ms. Honig left the meeting.

Chair Maruska said when the Board pursued reauthorization to raise the limited public works from \$35,000 to \$50,000 to \$100,000 many parties had some concerns with the ability to waive bonding. He's supportive of public owners determining whether to waive bonding requirements that could be broadly applied beyond just OMWBE certified firms.

Mr. Kommers said most public bodies do not have the ability to evaluate whether a firm has adequate financial resources.

Mr. Crawford agreed that most public agencies do not have the resources to research the financial background of small contractors. Willingness to assume a \$25,000-\$35,000 risk is certainly different than a \$100,000 risk.

Mr. Nygaard asked whether certified companies mean that the company is pre-qualified. Ms. Migchelbrink advised that it doesn't mean the company is pre-qualified. Mr. Nygaard advised that since it's a two-step issue he agrees securing a determination is a decision necessary for each individual project whereby a bidder who might not meet the qualifications could have the option of providing a bond. He asked if the proposal precludes the option of asking for a bond if the agency doesn't believe the firm is pre-qualified as an alternative. Ms. Migchelbrink said she believes it's possible.

Mr. Horn reviewed the benefits of securing bonds.

Discussion ensued on the cost of securing bonds.

Ms. Migchelbrink said a survey of firms by OMWBE indicates many firms are encountering roadblocks in achieving the bonds necessary to complete a project. The proposal pertains to bonds of \$100,000 rather than expensive bonds because data indicates the high-risk bonds are not the concern. The proposal assists firms with the ability to compete, as most are disadvantaged in contracting for public works.

Mr. Thompson suggested the proposal helps support the entry of firms into public works but over the longer-term, the firm might not be successful if it lacks a bond.

Chair Maruska asked whether the agency is willing to consider the Board's input and present a revised proposal for the Board's consideration in December. Ms. Migchelbrink affirmed the agency's interest in returning to the Board in December.

Set Agenda Items for November Meeting

Agenda items for the December meeting include:

- Report from the CPARB Operating Procedures and Bylaws Committee
- Report on Public-Private Partnerships

- Report on DB Performance Measures
- Four Legislative bills:
 - JOC bid limit
 - County venue
 - OMWBE bond limits
- Information on UW Critical Care legislation
- Potential PRC update on public agency/consultant experience for certification

Approve 2015 Meeting Schedule

The proposed 2015 meeting dates include:

- Thursday, February 12
- Thursday, May 14
- Thursday, September 10
- Thursday, November 12
- Thursday, December 10

Ed Kommers moved, seconded by Steve Crawford, to approve the 2015 meeting schedule as proposed. Motion carried unanimously.

Adjournment

Ed Kommers moved, seconded by John Ahlers, to adjourn the meeting at 2:03 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Staff & Guests

Nancy Deakins, DES
David Mahalko, KCDA
Brian Buck, LWSD
Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Frank Lemos, WA Minority Bus. Adv. Council
Dick Lutz, Centennial Construction
Phil Lovell, PRC
Dan Seydel, Platinum Group, LLC & PRC
Aleanna Kondelis, City of Seattle
Danelle Bessett, DES

Ato Apiafi, AAA
Linneth Riley-Hall, PRC & Sound Transit via telecon
Nicole Brown, LWSD/DAC
Larry Stevens, MCAWW NECA
Jerry Vanderwood, AGC
Tom Zamzow, Parsons
Doug Levy, Lobbyist for City of Kent
Ginger Eagle, Washington Public Ports Association
Amanda Migchelbrink, OMWBE

Robert Maruska, CPARB Chair

Prepared by Valerie L. Gow, Recording Secretary/President
Puget Sound Meeting Services,