

Location: via Teams

Meeting ID: 245 443 935 94 **Passcode:** tKAuFM

Committee Members: (12 members, 7 = quorum)

x	Linneth Riley-Hall (Transit), Co-Chair		Tom Zamzow AGC (Walsh Construction), Co-Chair
	Bob Armstead, MBE	x	Santosh Kuruvilla, Engineers
x	Lekha Fernandes, OMWBE	x	Stuart Moore, Atkinson Construction
	Bobby Forch, MSPW		John Salinas II, Specialty Subcontractors
x	Metin Keles, WBE	x	Robynne Thaxton, Private Industry
x	Joseph C. Kline, WSU	x	Janice Zahn proxy for Jessica Murphy, City of Seattle

Guests:

x	Arthur Antoine, Axiom	x	Jessica Letteney, MFA
	Talia Baker, DES/CPARB Staff	x	Ping Liu, Flatiron Corp
x	Thomas Brasch, WSDOT	x	Terrence Lynch, WSDOT
x	John Chi, WSDOT	x	Monique Martinez, DES/CPARB Staff
x	Gregory Cook, WSDOT	x	Art McCluskey, WSDOT
x	Nancy Deakins, DES/CPARB Staff	x	Geoff Owen, Kiewit
x	Larry Larson	x	Curt Winningham, WSDOT

The meeting began at 3:19 p.m.

Call to Order and Roll Call for Quorum

A roll call of members confirmed the meeting quorum. Co-Chair Linneth Riley-Hall welcomed everyone to the Capital Projects Advisory Review Board (CPARB) WSDOT Project Delivery Method Review Task Force (TF). Members and guests introduced themselves.

Approve Agenda

Co-Chair Riley-Hall requested any suggested changes to the agenda; none were forthcoming.

Robynne Thaxton moved to approve the agenda, and Lekha Fernandes seconded the motion. The agenda was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

Approve Minutes from 05/22/2024 Meeting

Co-Chair Riley-Hall requested that the group voice any edits or approve the minutes from the 5/22/2024 meeting.

Stuart Moore moved to approve the minutes of the May 22, 2024, meeting, and Robynne Thaxton seconded the motion. The motion to approve the minutes was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

Feedback on the Report

Co-Chair Riley-Hall said that the report was submitted on time to the Washington State Legislature. Janice Zahn said that CPARB did not receive any comments, but a few sentences were edited at the last minute. Nancy Deakins confirmed that there has not been any feedback. Janice said that, in the past, there has not been feedback for other reports. The TF may hear some feedback as it gets close to the start of a new session.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall requested that someone reach out, as the next legislative session starts in November and the report is due in December.

Janice said that it would be possible to reach out. She noted that there had been a change to the report in the final days, but the change was something that had been discussed in the TF meetings, left out of the initial draft of the report, and then added back in.

Art McClusky said that the change was in Section 6, Recommendations. Section 6.4 was recommendations to the legislature, but an item wasn't worded properly. He noted that Tom Zamzow came up with a replacement statement, which was what was included.

Metin Keles elaborated that it was a clarification about the \$10 million threshold and that WSDOT had to wait for approval.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall reviewed that the TF's major recommendation for the SR 18 project was that WSDOT should continue with the Design-Build (DB) project delivery method. The next set of projects are all Design-Bid-Build (DBB) and fully designed, at 100%. The TF needs to evaluate the delivery methods even though the projects are fully complete. The TF's major task is to decide whether to change the delivery methods or move forward.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall asked for other comments or feedback on the report that was submitted. None were offered.

Remaining Projects to Review and Process to Address Remaining Projects

Terrence Lynch noted that the North Spokane Corridor (NSC) project in the proviso (WSDOT Project M00800R SR 395 North Spokane Corridor) is a series of projects, and they are at different stages of design.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall said that the TF will follow a process that is similar to the process for the SR 18 project: WSDOT will present the projects and members can ask questions. She invited thoughts or comments on the proposed process.

Robynne Thaxton had the following suggestions:

- Issue a schedule for the meetings with presentations.
- Follow the rubric used for SR 18, evaluating the project delivery method for (1) Fitting the statutory requirements (2) Fitting the type of project, then reviewing the delivery method selection process for each project. Use one meeting for project and discuss TF member suggestions. After evaluating each project, the TF can refine the overall recommendations for WSDOT that are in the final report.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall suggested that members review the research contributed by Arthur and Robynne that is posted on the TF web page. She wants to discuss the major research findings in a future meeting.

Stuart suggested that the TF look at projects in two batches: first, the 100% design projects and then the NSC projects because there may be more to discuss for projects not in final design.

Robynne, Co-Chair Riley-Hall, and Arthur Antoine agreed.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall likes the idea but suggested a discussion about research before the TF starts diving into individual projects. She agrees that talking first about projects at about 100% design makes sense; there should be less to discuss. She reviewed the process for project discussions:

- WSDOT will provide project information in a presentation that will include the schedule for each project and a review of the delivery method.
- The TF will discuss the project recommendations.
- The TF will discuss the recommendations that members decided not to include in the SR 18 report just submitted. Some ideas from this subsequent set of meetings would be in a final report.

Art asked whether the TF is planning to submit one report with recommendations on all of the other projects or whether a recommendation might be issued prior to the December report.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall said that the TF is not likely to do a separate report because of the level of effort involved, but she is open to the idea.

Robynne said she is open to the idea of an interim report. She suggested that the TF go through the analysis process on the first batch of projects then decide whether to do an interim report.

Janice asked WSDOT staff whether an interim report would be helpful.

Art responded that interim recommendations would be helpful, but WSDOT is also acting on the legislative directions that all project dates are in question now so they have assumed the projects would be held until recommendations are made. It would benefit WSDOT to maintain some semblance of the current schedule for the projects. The SR 26, SR 526 / Marsh Road, and SR 9 projects were scheduled to be advertised in August and September this year. And some NSC projects are scheduled for December. But if the TF deems that it is not feasible to issue interim recommendations, WSDOT will be as cooperative as possible.

Curt Winningham added that WSDOT did push out the dates for SR 9 and SR 526. But if there is an interim report, WSDOT will move forward.

Janice observed that there is a CPARB board meeting in September and one on October 10. If an interim report were available, the CPARB briefing would be in the September meeting and the board vote would be on October 10. So WSDOT would gain a little over two months.

Curt noted that WSDOT will defer to what the TF decides, but interim recommendations would help WSDOT with obtaining environmental permits on the SR 9 bridge.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall noted that the TF process may take longer than anticipated.

Larry Larson said that the Stage 3 project could be ready before December and one NSC project ready to go in the fall so that if there were an interim report, they would hope for TF consideration of that project.

Art noted that it depends on the project; there are actually six NSC projects. Any that are at 100% would be included in the first batch, which could be a mix of Western Region and Northern Region projects.

Larry noted that the State Street project could be ready before December and NSC projects could be ready in the fall.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall suggested that WSDOT be prepared to present all projects that are at 100%, including the delivery method chart that they shared for SR 18 and the schedule.

Art responded that this information is in a package that WSDOT shared early in the process, and staff will present by project to the TF.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall confirmed that the TF will start with the 100% design projects at the next meeting and, if there is time, could discuss what to do about issuing an interim report or just continue. She solicited comments and said that she's hoping that guests will contribute by raising their hands or voicing their thoughts on the process to address remaining projects.

Schedule of Project Reviews

Robynne said she is not sure that the TF needs to rush into reviewing the research that she and Arthur contributed. She believes the TF may want to get the first batch off their plates. The recommendations based on research will be in the final December report.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall requested that Robynne and Arthur provide recommendations about which studies the TF members should focus on. Reviewing the key studies may help influence the TF project discussions or they may just provide umbrella recommendations for the final report.

Robynne recommended bringing in Keith Molenaar (from the University of Colorado) and Doug Gransberg (from Georgia Tech) to discuss current research on, and best practices for, project delivery.

Arthur noted that he would like to hear from TF members about the studies that they are most interested in so he can coordinate the research and prioritize the list. For example, they talked about studies on the accuracy of Engineer's Estimates to bid prices. He will create a quick list of the topics.

Stuart suggested that the TF look at non-NSC projects first as a way to move quickly through the initial list.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall said the TF will leave it to WSDOT to decide which projects they present and when.

Art noted that there could be three projects at 100% design, SR 526, SR 9 Marsh Road, and one project under NSC—Sprague Ave to Spokane River, referred to as Stage 3. The presentation on SR 18 was 25 minutes; it is possible that WSDOT could present all three fully designed projects at the next meeting.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall asked WSDOT to clarify how many additional projects to discuss after the three that are at 100%.

Art said that there are five additional projects, all are within the NSC listing in the proviso language.

Identify Next Steps

Co-Chair Riley-Hall noted that WSDOT will present the three projects at 100% design. She requested that WSDOT share the schedules for all projects so that the TF can plan the subsequent meeting discussions, which will follow the same process as was used for the SR 18 project and report. The TF will decide at the end of the next meeting on whether they will do an interim report unless the discussion on the projects at 100% extend into a subsequent meeting. She recommended having a discussion about when to review the research, pending the availability of guest speakers. The decisions about DB projects that are at 100% may go quickly because it is difficult to change to a DBB delivery method when a DB project is at 100%. For the other projects, having discussion about the research will be helpful.

Next Meeting Agenda – Discussion

The agenda for the July 24 meeting will include the following:

- Review and approve notes from the July 10th meeting.
- WSDOT presentation on SR 526, SR 9 Marsh Road, Stage 3 projects.
- Discuss when to review current research.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall solicited comments from TF members through a roll call. All members were in agreement about the path forward and next action items.

Janice said she will coordinate with Robynne on speakers on project delivery. The current chair of the Project Delivery Committee is with Minnesota DOT, and a lot of the research from Keith Molenaar and Doug Gransberg came out of that committee.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall adjourned the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:13 p.m.

Next meeting: July 24, 2024, 3:00 p.m.

Action Items

1. Janice Zahn will reach out to members of the legislature to find out whether an interim report from the WSDOT PDM TF would be seen as helpful.
2. Robynne Thaxton will contact Keith Molenaar at University of Colorado and Doug Gransberg from Georgia Tech to find out whether they would be available to address the TF.
3. Janice Zahn will coordinate with Robynne on speakers on project delivery.
4. Arthur Antoine will create a quick list of the topics covered by the research studies.
5. TF members will review the resources and topic list and provide feedback on their interest in the topic.

Resources

- [WSDOT Project Delivery Method Review Task Force Homepage](#)
- RCWs [47.20.780](#) and [47.20.785](#)
- RCWs [39.10.300](#) and [39.10.340](#)
- [GCCM Certification Application](#)
- [WSDOT Cost Estimating Manual for Projects](#)
- [CPARB Legislative Report Part 1 – SR 18; July 1, 2024](#)