

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY REVIEW BOARD

Virtual Meeting Minutes

February 13, 2025

MEMBERS PRESENT	REPRESENTING	MEMBERS ABSENT	REPRESENTING
Linneth Riley-Hall (<i>Chair</i>)	Transportation	Senator Bob Hasegawa	Senate (D)
Keith Michel (<i>Vice Chair</i>)	General Contractors	Kara Skinner	Ins./Surety Industry
Robert Blain	Counties	Rep. Mike Steele	House (R)
Garett Buckingham	Public Hospital Districts	Rep. Steve Tharinger	House (D)
Lekha Fernandes	OMWBE	Senator Judy Warnick	Senate (R)
Bobby Forch Jr.	Disadvantaged Businesses		
Erin Fraser	Counties		
Bill Frare	Dept. of Enterprise Services		
Bruce Hayashi	Architects		
Santosh Kuruvilla	Engineers		
Karen Mooseker	School Districts		
Mark Nakagawara	Cities		
Irene Reyes	Private Industry		
Steven Russo	Specialty Contractors		
John Salinas II	Specialty Contractors		
Robin Strom	General Contractors		
Robynne Thaxton	Private Industry	Vacant	Ports
Olivia Yang	Higher Education	Vacant	Construction Trades Labor

Staff & Guests are listed on the last page

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL FOR QUORUM

Chair Linneth Riley-Hall called the virtual meeting of the Capital Projects Advisory Review Board (CPARB) to order at 8:00 a.m. A meeting quorum was confirmed.

WELCOME BOARD MEMBERS & INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Riley-Hall welcomed everyone to the meeting.

APPROVE AGENDA – *Action*

Lekha Fernandes moved, seconded by Olivia Yang, to approve the agenda as published.

A voice vote approved the motion unanimously.

APPROVE MEETING MINUTES - December 12, 2024 – *Action*

Olivia Yang moved, seconded by Steve Russo, to approve the December 12, 2024, meeting minutes as presented.

A voice vote approved the motion unanimously.

INVITATION FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS – *Information*

There were no public comments.

CHAIR REPORT

Chair Riley-Hall thanked members for participating in committee, legislative, and owner meetings to discuss legislation. Legislative action has moved forward requiring many Board members to attend various meetings. She and other members met with staff from the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT). WSDOT drafted legislation in accordance with the Board's recommendation from the WSDOT Project Delivery Method Review Task Force. The legislation would allow WSDOT to include other alternative delivery methods within the RCW specific to WSDOT to enable WSDOT to complete GC/CM, Progressive Design-Build, and Heavy Civil GC/CM projects. Several versions of bill language are being pursued with language that CPARB would review all WSDOT GC/CM projects over \$100 million in cost. Essentially, WSDOT projects over \$100 million would be subject to review by the Project Review Committee (PRC). Testimony to legislators in response to the language explained that reviews of WSDOT projects over \$100 million are not the charge of the Board. Representative Janice Zahn (*former Board member*) testified to language that spoke to CPARB reviewing alternative delivery projects and that for GC/CM projects, WSDOT would be required to present an initial three GC/CM projects to the PRC, and if successfully completed, would no longer be required to submit projects for review to the PRC. She shared that her concerns surrounding WSDOT's proposal for project reviews by the PRC was because of the lack of an opportunity for the Board to review the proposal prior to submittal to the Legislature. She was also uncomfortable supporting language for the Board to review all WSDOT projects over \$100 million without the benefit of discussing the proposed language with the Board.

Bobby Forch joined the meeting at 8:09 a.m.

Vice Chair Michel added that there are separate bills proposed by the House and the Senate. As the two bills move through the legislative process, the Board can track progress. Many interests are collaborating around the legislation to move the bills in the right direction to support the process for WSDOT.

Olivia Yang asked about the timing of the discussion on the proposed legislation. Chair Riley-Hall advised that the conversation could be included during the discussion on legislation of interest.

Chair Riley-Hall clarified that under WSDOT's current statute, WSDOT is authorized to complete Design-Build projects with no review required by CPARB\PRC. The proposed change in the House bill would require WSDOT to seek PRC review for three GC/CM projects and if successfully completed, WSDOT would no longer be required to review projects with the PRC. The Senate bill version requires that all WSDOT projects over \$100 million regardless of the delivery method be reviewed by CPARB\PRC.

Members acknowledged the lack of a representative from WSDOT to speak to the proposal. Ms. Yang offered that the Board could discuss the proposal with leadership meeting later with WSDOT to share input from the Board or defer the conversation until a representative from WSDOT joins the meeting.

Vice Chair Michel commented that the issue concerns the two new legislative proposals. Current [RCW 47.20.785](#) states that WSDOT is "...strongly encouraged to use the Design-Build procedure for projects over \$2 million..." and over with the proposed language stating, "Consider the use of any of the alternative delivery methods." The uncertainty speaks to whether WSDOT must seek PRC approval or whether WSDOT is a certified agency by default. Proposed House bill language recommends WSDOT seek approval of three GC/CM projects. If WSDOT meets PRC thresholds for all three projects, WSDOT can utilize the delivery method without further review by the PRC. The Senate version seeks CPARB consultation after WSDOT selects a delivery method to coordinate, discuss, and validate the choice and offer feedback to WSDOT if another method would be better. It would be WSDOT's discretion to change the method regardless of the Board's position. Both bills are proceeding through the legislative process.

Robynne Thaxton joined the meeting at 8:15 a.m.

Chair Riley-Hall recommended continuing the conversation on the Board's role with respect to reviewing WSDOT projects. The task force recommended that all delivery methods should be added to WSDOT's RCW, which has been accomplished. The second component is whether the Board should have a review role with respect to WSDOT projects, which was not discussed by the task force.

Santosh Kuruvilla commented on the thorough discussion by the task force as members developed recommendations to the Board. He asked whether the next logical step is for the task force to review and provide feedback to the Board on the bills.

Chair Riley-Hall commented that the bill is moving forward, and time is of the essence. If the Board approved deferring the issue to the task force, the task force would need to meet and CPARB would likely have to schedule a special meeting to review the task force recommendation.

Irene Reyes joined the meeting at 8:19 a.m.

Ms. Yang spoke to the House version specific to three GC/CM project reviews and the possibly of streamlining that process by enabling a presentation by WSDOT to PRC on how WSDOT intends to implement GC/CM, which would enable PRC to offer recommendations to ensure WSDOT was on the right track to complete the project appropriately.

Chair Riley-Hall said the WSDOT discussion also included an option of WSDOT working with the Board to develop a process rather than pursuing legislation dictating CPARB's role and enabling the Board time to develop a process. However, WSDOT was not supportive of the suggestion.

Bruce Hayashi pointed out the magnitude and number of projects WSDOT anticipates to pursue would fall within the cost threshold. A Board review in conjunction with Board and committee tasks could entail a significant amount of time to vet projects thoroughly.

Chair Riley-Hall responded that she queried WSDOT representatives as to the number of projects WSDOT anticipates completing to help identify the impact. According to representatives, WSDOT would pursue three projects a year.

Robynne Thaxton commented on WSDOT's process to select a contracting method. The cycle for Progressive Design-Build took over a year to establish. It is unlikely WSDOT would quickly initiate GC/CM projects as WSDOT intends to contract with consultants to assist staff in designing the GC/CM project process. Additionally, not all task force recommendations were included in the Senate bill.

Ms. Yang reiterated her concerns of reviewing WSDOT's selection of a project delivery method because it would not position WSDOT for success. She recommended establishing a process for a conversation on GC/CM and Heavy Civil GC/CM delivery methods with WSDOT prior to WSDOT's selection of a delivery method.

Chair Riley-Hall queried the Board on suggestions for moving forward and the role of the Board.

Bruce Hayashi offered that it might be a good opportunity for the Board to become more informed about how WSDOT functions with respect to project outcomes and performance to avoid over burdening the Board. It could entail taking advantage of existing information that speaks to a project's process and outcome.

Ms. Yang supported the proposal by Chair Riley-Hall for leadership to work with WSDOT to develop a process to avoid burdening both the Board and WSDOT.

Mr. Hayashi shared information on WSDOT's process for projects. A meeting would be an opportunity to engage with a large public entity to become better informed about outcomes because many challenges occur during any contracting method.

Several members conveyed support of the recommendation for leadership to collaborate with WSDOT.

Irene Reyes commented on the importance of transparency by WSDOT to share information on challenges encountered as well as the outcomes. The discussion should convey the Board's expectation to ensure the efforts are collaborative and effective.

Discussion ensued with several suggestions on next steps such as pursuing the House bill and providing an amendment to reflect the Chair's proposal that speaks to CPARB and WSDOT developing a process to review project delivery methods for project or collaborate with WSDOT to develop its GC/CM processes and provide a report to the Legislature by January 1, 2026. It was noted that there might be a misinterpretation of the bill language as the intent is for CPARB to provide delivery method choice consulting.

Chair Riley-Hall advised that for the benefit of Art McCluskey with WSDOT, it appears there is agreement that WSDOT should be able to utilize all delivery methods. The role of CPARB has been the subject of the discussion.

Mr. McCluskey advised of his late arrival as he was meeting with WSDOT counterparts on HB 1970. Comments from WSDOT are due to the Legislature by Tuesday, February 18, 2025. The language modifies RCW 47.27.785 authorizing WSDOT to pursue Design-Build as well as Progressive Design-Build and GC/CM with another provision stipulating that the first three GC/CM projects after July 2025 would need to be reviewed by CPARB with no further reviews necessary. Essentially, the language subjects WSDOT to the requirements of RCW 39.10 for the first three GC/CM projects.

Chair Riley-Hall inquired as to WSDOT's position on the Senate bill. Mr. McCluskey said he was unsure because he was unable to review the bill thoroughly. The Senate version appears to be different than the subject of the discussions earlier between CPARB representatives and WSDOT staff. Chair Riley-Hall advised that the Senate bill delegates more oversight to CPARB for WSDOT projects. Mr. McCluskey responded that he would follow up with WSDOT staff responsible for tracking legislation. Chair Riley-Hall cited language in the Senate bill that speaks to any WSDOT project over \$100 million subject to review by the PRC for the delivery method until 2030. Mr. McCluskey said a staff member mentioned similar language; however, the group was reviewing HB 1970. The issues speak to two bills whereas WSDOT staff has only reviewed one bill.

Bill Frare advised that the Senate bill has not moved forward and only proposed language was reviewed during the meeting with the Legislature. The language in a proposed bill is under consideration by the Senate Transportation Committee. No bill number has been assigned at this point. WSDOT representatives attended the meeting with legislators and were informed of the Senate proposal.

Members discussed a proposal by Ms. Reyes to include language that states that the CPARB review should include review of procurement delivery input and output as they represent two different scopes of any procurement. It was noted that the statutes address the procurement process and that CPARB has developed best practice guidelines to guide owners and

contractors on the procurement process. Ms. Yang offered alternative language of CPARB assisting WSDOT in developing the procurement decision matrix for GC/CM.

Vice Chair Michel referred to the most current draft of the Senate version that was emailed to him on February 10, 2025. Language proposed for the Senate version states, *"The Department shall consult with CPARB to review the selected delivery method for that project and provide recommendations or feedback for the Department to consider. The Department and CPARB will collaboratively coordinate developing and implementing the details of this engagement."* The Senate had requested feedback, which was provided by several CPARB members. The intent is positioning CPARB to be nimble and flexible and would work with WSDOT rather than defining specifics in the current bill. He anticipates DES staff receiving the email for distribution to members and recommends moving forward on the agenda in the interest of time.

Robert Blain questioned whether the discussion is to add language to existing language.

Chair Riley-Hall explained that the intent is to avoid an onerous process for CPARB, PRC, and WSDOT. The proposed language drafted by Ms. Thaxton might infer that each time WSDOT considers a project for GC/CM, WSDOT would work with CPARB through the process. She is unsure whether that was the intent of the proposed language. Ms. Thaxton responded that the proposal was not intended to reflect that intent.

Chair Riley-Hall recommended Mr. McCluskey share the Board's feedback with WSDOT staff as staff tracks and reviews the legislation. She stressed the importance of WSDOT monitoring the bill and providing input based on the Board's discussion.

Mr. Frare supported the recommendation as WSDOT initiated the bill and Mr. McCluskey has received the Board's feedback reflecting the Board's desires to serve in a consulting role to help WSDOT succeed at the onset of a project to avoid an onerous process. One consideration is that the Board is a deliberative body and receives feedback from multiple sources. By nature of those deliberations, progress can be slow. The Legislature is only in session for three months and renders quick decisions. This session's policy legislation cut-off is Saturday, February 22, 2025, followed by fiscal bill cut-off at the end of the month. Formalizing a decision on a legislative bill is likely not required because Mr. McCluskey is aware of the discussion and can share it with his organization.

Vice Chair Michel recommended some minor reordering of the agenda to meet the meeting schedule.

Keith Michel moved, seconded by Chair Riley-Hall, to move Legislation of Interest to follow Committee & Workgroup Reports. A voice vote approved the motion unanimously.

COMMITTEE & WORKGROUP REPORTS

Board Development Committee - Information

Co-Chair Bill Frare reported the committee continues to discuss challenges facing the Board, its role moving forward, and groupings of challenges. They include owner readiness, creating a feedback loop for process improvements, streamlining the reauthorization process, reimagining PRC as an oversight body at the project level, defining CPARB's value for public works, achieving outcome-oriented decisions, conveying and highlighting the successes of CPARB over the years as a value tool, and standardizing decision-making in committees for legislative reports and recommendations.

BE/DBI Committee – Information

Co-Chair Lekha Fernandes reported on the formation of two workgroups focused on change orders and retainage to improve efficiencies and best practices and explore potential legislation. Both workgroups meet every other Monday. Board members are welcome to participate. The workgroups have a project timeline in the event legislation is proposed. The efforts are a result of work completed on prompt pay. Change orders and retainage were issues that did not achieve consensus and required additional exploration and discussions to determine if consensus could be achieved or whether legislation would be required. The committee plans to release one survey on change orders and retainage later in the year. She encouraged members to complete the survey and distribute the survey to stakeholders.

Project Feedback Process Workgroup – Information/Action

Co-Chair Dave Johnson reported the workgroup continued to move forward with finalizing the process for post incident issues for alternative delivery. The workgroup finalized the process for posting on the CPARB website as well as the complaint form. The Co-Chairs worked with staff to identify a location on the website to include the information. The work represents the final step in implementation of the process. The request to the Board is to sunset the workgroup.

Co-Chair Jeff Gonzalez noted that CPARB acted at the December meeting to finalize the process and sunset the workgroup. At the last workgroup meeting, members approved disbanding the workgroup. Another task was developing some questions for PRC applications for owners to consider as they prepare for presentations to the PRC. The questions were added to the February update of the PRC project applications. Other discussion topics were on the feedback loop and owner preparedness, which were deferred to the Board Development Committee.

Chair Riley-Hall thanked the Co-Chairs for leading the committee and completing the assigned tasks.

Project Review Committee – Information

Chair Jessica Murphy reported on the results of the January meeting. Members reviewed and approved six GC/CM projects and one Progressive Design-Build project. The projects ranged in size and cost as well as some larger bundled school projects.

The business meeting prior to project reviews included discussions and updates. Twelve PRC positions are expiring in June. Filling the positions will take some time by the Board. Other discussion topics included activities in the industry and concerns that the size and bundling of GC/CM projects are too large to attract new and smaller contractors.

The next meeting is in February, which is an additional meeting because of the number of spring applications in 2024. However, actual applications submitted include a certification, recertification, and one project application.

Vice Chair Michel commented that owners are bundling more projects regardless of the delivery method. Occasionally, there are jobs within a bundle that may or may not qualify for alternative delivery. The technique of bundling appears to enable applicants to blend the risk and complexity of its bond program while simultaneously reducing participation and completion for various projects. He appreciates the awareness by PRC members of the bundling technique and tracking the activity.

Co-Chair Murphy said the issue is salient and although the PRC has not produced any formal opinions other than observations, there could be unintended consequences of bundling with PRC planning to continue to monitor those projects. Additionally, the issue could be included within the Board Development Committee conversation on strategic planning. The intent is to ensure there are opportunities across the industry rather than producing a finite pool of contractors who can pursue alternative delivery methods.

GC/CM Committee – Best Practices Update – Information

Chair Nick Datz reported the committee held several meetings in December to continue to reconcile all 124 public comments received during the summer. The committee did not achieve a quorum to take final action on any proposed changes in response to comments. The next meeting will include reviewing final changes and approving the final draft document.

Chair Riley-Hall asked whether the committee's efforts identified any potential legislative changes to propose for the next session. Chair Datz said the first task of the committee was to propose legislative changes, which was completed several years ago. Adjustments to the best practices are based on the last set of legislative changes. No specific changes were identified for future legislation.

Chair Riley-Hall encouraged members to read the draft guidelines to prepare for a discussion and action to approve the guidelines.

Job Order Contracting Evaluation (JOCE) Committee – Information

Co-Chair Aleanna Kondelis said the committee continues its work and recently completed a survey utilizing the City of Seattle resources to complete JOC surveys targeted to diverse businesses. The survey results were interesting in terms of recommendations and conclusions. One major recommendation spoke to the lack of information about the benefits and opportunities of using JOC. The committee's workplan for the next several months includes refreshing the JOC Best Practices Guidelines and adding some statutory language and other practices that have been emerging while focusing on the outreach, notification, and engagement section within the Best Practices Guidelines based on survey recommendations.

Bobby Forch disconnected from the meeting at 9:33 a.m. and rejoined the meeting at 10:04 a.m.

Co-Chair Kondelis reported the committee plans to present a workplan to the Board identifying assignments for the work. The committee is recruiting for public owner representation on the committee. She asked the Board to share information with public owners who may be interested in serving on the committee.

Chair Riley-Hall recessed the meeting at 9:35 a.m. to 9:41 a.m. for a break. A meeting quorum was reconfirmed.

LEGISLATION OF INTEREST - Information

Ms. Baker displayed and reviewed a spreadsheet of legislative bills.

HB 1970 was referred earlier to the House Transportation Committee. HB 1950 appears to be on prompt pay and was referred to the House Capital Budget Committee. HB 1966 is a bill based on the recommendation from the SHB 1621 Review Committee. HB 1967 is another new bill on modifying the bonding requirements for design for Design-Build proposed by Representative Zahn.

Chair Riley-Hall added that a payment and performance bond is required for both the design and the construction portions of a Design-Build project. Proposed HB 1967 removes the requirement for a payment and performance bond from the design portion of a Design-Build project since no construction occurs at that time.

Mr. Blain referred to SSB 5176 on prompt pay. His office is reviewing the bill as there appears to be many changes and it is uncertain how the proposed bill will affect the industry. He asked for confirmation that the proposal was from the Board. Ms. Baker affirmed the proposed bill was drafted from the recommendations provided by the BE/DBI Committee.

Mr. Blain asked about the effective date of the bill. Several different dates of July 2025 and July 2026 were offered. Ms. Fernandes said she believes the bill would be effective on July 1, 2025.

Ms. Yang offered a recommendation for the Board to request an effective date of the bill as July 1, 2026, to afford time for the Board to reconcile the provisions of SSB 5176 with forthcoming recommendations from the BE/DBI Change Order Workgroup.

Ms. Fernandes said she has attended the bill hearings. The bill sponsor and the committee were very receptive to accept modifications. She asked if anyone from the Board has contacted the committee or the bill sponsor for a date change, as all parties have been receptive to modifications and changes when requested.

Ms. Yang suggested the Board could consider asking Senator Hasegawa and Senator Valdez to change the effective date to enable CPARB to reconcile SSB 5176 with the results of ongoing discussions by the BE/DBI Workgroup.

Workgroup Co-Chair Russo agreed because one intent of SSB 5176 is to absorb the RCW on change orders. Some of the language was revised and new language favors owners on notification timelines. It would be prudent to enable more time to review the provisions.

Ms. Fernandes noted that the bill was drafted by the bill sponsor based on the language forwarded by CPARB. The bill sponsor took the recommendations and adjusted language as he felt was appropriate. However, the bill sponsors have been willing to adjust language as necessary when interested parties share feedback. The issue is the timing for the Board to vote on any issues rather than contacting the bill sponsors directly with a request.

Bill Frare asked whether a delay in implementation from summer 2025 to summer 2026 is for owners to have an opportunity to review their respective processes and implement processes or whether the intent is to enable the workgroup to develop ideas relative to change order processing to achieve the milestones established in that section of the bill. He questioned whether the intent is to ensure owners pay on time or for the Board to develop comprehensive options centered on change orders.

Ms. Yang affirmed that the answer to the questions is yes to both options. Owners need time to review the bill and understand the provisions, as well as consider other recommendations from the workgroup that might evolve as part of the workgroup's efforts.

Ms. Fernandes commented that she would not support delaying the bill by another year because the Legislature established a deadline, and the Board satisfied that deadline and provided the requested information. It is almost certain that the work by the BE/DBI workgroups will result in additional modifications. As consensus was not achieved on change orders or retainage, she would be hesitant to a delay in addition to considering how the bill sponsors might respond if the Board requested a postponement. She recommended that if any modifications are necessary, interested parties should work with the Legislature to secure the modifications, as legislators have been willing to work with interested parties.

Chair Riley-Hall asked whether there was any opposition by members to the modification proposed for HB 1967.

Mr. Frare said he does not oppose the change. He acknowledged the efforts by former Chair and current House Representative Zahn for her efforts in introducing bills important to the industry.

Ms. Thaxton encouraged willing members to voice support for HB 1967, as Representative Zahn would be appreciative as the bill moves through legislative committees.

Chair Riley-Hall queried members on any opposition of removing the bonding requirements in HB 1967 for the design portion of a Design-Build project and feedback on contacting Representative Zahn and conveying that despite no formal vote by the Board, members did not voice any concerns about HB 1967. Several members voiced support of the proposed action.

Chair Riley-Hall invited comments on other bills. Erin Frasier referred to House Bill 1549 and **Senate Bill 5061** as priority legislation for construction trades labor. She offered to answer any questions and asked for the Board's support for both bills.

Chair Riley-Hall welcomed Ms. Frasier to her first meeting as a member of the Board. She asked Ms. Frasier to share information on the bills.

Ms. Frasier advised that HB 1549 would help increase education, awareness, and resources for contractors to meet apprentice utilization requirements on public works projects. The bill helps to prevent many existing issues. Instead of creating penalties or requirements, the intent is to create transparency, provide more educational resources, and provide opportunities for apprenticeship programs to connect with contractors to help meet utilization requirements. Apprentice utilization requirements are viewed as a small ask of support from the state to provide opportunities for apprentices to enter the workforce. The programs are private investments by the employer and employee. For programs to be successful, jobs are necessary for apprentices. Apprentice utilization requirements assist in establishing job sites for apprentices to complete their programs. Another provision ensures access to public works training.

Ms. Frasier said SB 5061 applies to an existing RCW covering workers on public works projects with wages frozen at the time of bid regardless of the length of the project. The proposed legislation ensures worker wages escalate throughout the project otherwise there are situations where workers will leave public works projects to work on another project to receive wage escalation. Multiple years are a long time for a worker to commit to public works project when colleagues are receiving wage increases in other spaces. The proposal is intended to be a solution to ensure workers receive appropriate wages on public works projects.

Chair Riley-Hall invited feedback on other proposed legislation.

Vice Chair Michel conveyed concerns about HB 1256 concerning products manufactured in the United States requiring public works projects receiving more than \$500,000 of state capital funds to use iron, steel, aluminum, and manufactured products used or supplied in the performance of the contract, or any subcontract to be manufactured in the United States, unless otherwise exempted. It appears the proposed bill is a condition for receiving any public funds for public works. He has concerns with the blanket application of requiring U.S. manufactured goods as it could create impacts on availability and pricing because of market conditions and price escalation and volatility.

Mr. Frare said the provision specific to U.S. steel is of concern because of the penalty. It could entail a contractor that incorporated foreign steel into a project being disbarred for a number of years. A public owner would need to complete considerable due diligence in accepting the materials covered by the bill and would require additional field inspections. Most materials are verified through submittals, invoices, and spot checks by architects and engineers. However, the bill appears to require strict compliance. DES issued a fiscal note about the compliance of ensuring no foreign steel was incorporated within any DES project. He also prefers not being placed in a position of rendering a false claim against a contractor that would result in the contractor disbarred. Should he be in a position whereby a contractor included foreign steel, he would want solid documentation attesting to that fact. He is concerned by the U.S. steel requirement and not with the concept of buying American products, as the application of the provisions would be onerous.

Mr. Kuruvilla underscored the support by the design community of HB 1967.

NEW BUSINESS

Member Ideas/Discussion Time – Information

Chair Riley-Hall acknowledged, thanked, and complimented Janice Zahn for both her membership on the Board and her new position as a Representative of the House. Representative Zahn contributed much over the years to CPARB. She

encouraged members to meet with Representative Zahn and convey any concerns or support for any of the proposed bills. The Port position is now vacant on the Board. She welcomed new members Robert Blain representing Counties, and Erin Frasier representing Construction Trades Labor. Garret Buckingham recently rejoined the Board representing Public Hospital Districts. She encouraged members to engage in the Board's committees.

Vice Chair Michel commented on the upcoming 12 vacant PRC positions. He suggested reviewing the appointment process to ascertain any changes to create some efficiency in the appointment process.

Chair Riley-Hall agreed the PRC appointment process can be lengthy. She plans to discuss options with Mr. Frare as part of the strategic planning efforts to review the possibility of developing a streamlined appointment process. It is important that PRC members are knowledgeable in alternative delivery methods. She encouraged members to contact experienced candidates to apply if they have the capacity to attend PRC meetings to evaluate applications.

Ms. Baker referred to general recruitment information posted on the CPARB webpage under the PRC current recruitment page and on the PRC page. To date, she has received two applications. She has encouraged PRC members to send out the recruitment information to their respective stakeholders with a request to return applications as soon as possible to afford the possibility of the Board appointing positions over several months rather than at one meeting.

Ms. Thaxton noted that some of the vacant positions have staggered terms. She suggested developing a schedule of appointments for specific positions if the Board intends to appoint positions over the span of the April and May Board meetings. It will be important for candidates to know the term of service for the position.

Chair Riley-Hall supported posting a schedule of specific positions the Board will be interviewing during April to afford candidates time to submit their applications for positions under consideration during the April meeting.

Chair Riley-Hall advised that she and Vice Chair Michel would review the list of vacant positions and develop a list of positions for appointment at the April and May CPARB meetings.

Ms. Baker reminded the 10 Board members whose terms are also ending this spring, to submit their CPARB application sooner rather than later if they plan to reapply for reappointment to the Board. The selection process for appointments is uncertain under the new Governor. For those members who do not plan to reapply, she urged them to contact their respective stakeholders who may be interested in serving on the Board.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Budget Report *(Update included as a pre-read)*

Ms. Deakins noted the budget forecast reflects an overrun attributed to staff support and preparation of committee meeting minutes.

Vice Chair Michel asked whether two contractors are preparing Board minutes. Ms. Deakins advised that only one contractor prepares the CPARB minutes. Ms. Baker added that another contractor prepares committee meeting minutes with expenditures anticipated to decrease with recent action by the Board to sunset three committees.

Chair Riley-Hall asked about the status of assigning mentors to the new members. Vice Chair Michel affirmed his responsibility to follow up with new members to assign a mentor. He encouraged Mr. Blain and Ms. Frasier to contact him.

Ms. Baker recalled a prior conversation with Chair Riley-Hall about the possibility of disbanding inactive committees. Chair Riley-Hall asked Mr. Frare to address the issue with the Board Development committee in terms of committees that are no longer required or have fulfilled their respective mission. Ms. Baker cited the Legislative Writing Drafting Committee and the Local Government Public Works Study Committee as no longer active and eligible for disbanding. Chair Riley-Hall recommended adding the committees to the Board Development Committee meeting agenda.

Recap of Action Items – Information/Action

- Board Development Committee to review inactive committees who are no longer conducting CPARB business.
- BE/DBI to solicit participation by the Board to complete survey on change orders and retainage and distribute the survey to stakeholders.
- The Board is scheduled to review GC/CM Best Practices either in April or May.
- JOCE Committee is recruiting public owners to join the committee to participate and share information on lessons learned as the committee updates the JOC Best Practices Guidelines.
- PRC recruitment:

- Chair Riley-Hall and Vice Chair Michel to review list of expiring PRC positions.
- Ms. Baker will update with schedule for submittal for April and May with each position's term limit.
- Members were asked to reach out to their respective stakeholders to seek PRC applicants.
- Members were asked to contact the Governor's Office if they plan to reapply for their expired position or seek other applicants to apply.
- New members to contact Vice Chair Michel for assignment of mentor.
- Monitor legislative activity and engage in the legislative process.
- New legislative task assigned to CPARB to review RCW 39.04.154 on construction cost escalation data for the state and render recommendations to the appropriate legislative committee on any adjustments to the contracting thresholds for small works.

April 10, 2025 Draft Agenda

Chair Riley-Hall and Vice Chair Michel will review and draft an agenda based on action items, committee reports, and other issues.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Riley-Hall moved, seconded by Olivia Yang, to adjourn the meeting at 10:38 a.m.

A voice vote approved the motion unanimously.

Staff & Guests

Talia Baker, Department of Enterprise Services
Michelle Connor, GLY
Nick Datz, Sound Transit
Nancy Deakins, Department of Enterprise Services
Bill Dobyns, Turner & Townsend | Heery
Mason Elliott, Faber Construction
Jeff Gonzalez, Department of Enterprise Services
Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services

Dave Johnson, Hoffman Corporation
Aleanna Kondelis, Hill International
Monique Martinez, Department of Enterprise Services
Art McCluskey, Washington State Dep. Of Transportation
Jessica Murphy, City of Seattle/PRC
Gina Owens, City of Seattle
Charles Wilson, Department of Enterprise Services