

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY REVIEW BOARD
Legislative Building
416 Sid Snyder Avenue SW, Columbia Conference Room
Olympia, Washington
November 8, 2007
9:00 AM

Final Minutes

<u>MEMBERS PRESENT</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>	<u>MEMBERS ABSENT</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>
Daniel Absher	General Contractor	Rep. Dan Kristiansen	House (R)
Rocky Sharp	Specialty Contractors	Senator Rodney Tom	Senate (D)
Ed Kommers	Specialty Contractors	Senator Dale Brandland	Senate (R)
David Johnson	Construction Trades Labor	Gerald "Butch" Reifert	Architects
Cynthia Cooper	OMWBE	Rep. Kathy Haigh	House (D)
Olivia Yang	Higher Education	VACANT	General Contractors
John Lynch (Chair)	General Administration	VACANT	Engineers
Larry Byers	Insurance/Surety Industry	VACANT	Construction Trades Labor
Rodney Eng	Cities	VACANT	Private Industry
Robert Maruska	Ports	VACANT	Private Industry
Wendy Keller	Public Hospital Districts	Nora Huey	Counties
		Dan Vaught	School Districts

STAFF & GUESTS

Nancy Deakins, GA	Rick Slunaker, AGC
Searetha Kelly, GA	Larry Stevens, MCAWW/NECA
Cheri Lindgren, Puget Sound Meeting Services	Pam Johnson, OST
Miriam Israel Moses, Rebound	Pete Crow, WA State Association of Plumbers
Rodger Benson, MA Mortenson, PRC Chair	Stan Bowman, AIA WA Council
Dick Goldsmith, AWP/PHD	Dick Lutz, Centennial Construction
Karen Barrett, JLARC	Dan Galvin, AGO
Fred Tharp, WSDOT	Greg Guedel, Foster Pepper PLLC
Steve Clair, Tacoma Housing Authority	

Welcome & Introductions

Chair John Lynch called the Capital Projects Advisory Review Board (CPARB) meeting to order at 9:12 a.m. A meeting quorum was attained. He introduced new Office of Minority and Women's Business Enterprise (OWMBE) Director Cynthia Cooper.

Chair Lynch reported Ed Kommers was recently reappointed to the Board. Senator Rodney Tom is replacing Senator Phil Rockefeller. Everyone present provided self-introductions.

Approval of Agenda

Dave Johnson moved, seconded by Ed Kommers, to approve a revised agenda moving *Training Update* to follow the scheduled break and consider the *Strategic Plan* before *Membership of Board and PRC*. Motion carried.

Approval of October 11, 2007 Meeting Minutes

Dave Johnson moved, seconded by Olivia Yang, to approve the October 11, 2007 minutes as presented. Motion carried.

Chair Lynch noted a copy of the public body DB certification determination letter mailed to Gerald Schlatter, Washington State University (WSU), was provided in Boardmember meeting packets.

Public Comments

There were no public comments offered at this time.

Project Review Committee Report and Issues

Project Review Committee (PRC) Chair Rodger Benson provided the Board with a summary of the committee's October 25, 2007 meeting. PRC unanimously approved General Administration's (GA) public body certification request for General Contractor Construction Manager (GC/CM) and Design Build (DB) Alternative Public Works (APW) delivery methods. A supermajority of the committee denied Seattle Public School's public body certification application for GC/CM. He reviewed the committee's primary reasons for denying the certification request. Formal decision letters have been mailed to the public agencies.

PRC voted to extend current Chair and Vice Chair appointments to June 30, 2008. The next PRC meeting is scheduled for November 29, 2007. Agenda topics include public body certification for GC/CM for Lake Washington School District No. 414, a project application for GC/CM for the City of Kenmore's new city hall, and clarification of application instructions and attachments. Applicants who have been unsuccessful obtaining certification have been critical about evaluation components. Several vacancies still exist on the committee. There are now only three public sector members to choose from when forming individual project review panels. Darlene Septelka recently left her position with King County.

Discussion ensued about whether larger member entities could appoint alternates to serve on the committee in the interim. Copies of decision letters and approved certification and project applications are posted on CPARB's website.

Ms. Deakins reviewed current PRC and CPARB vacancy positions.

Mr. Kommers reported a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) was advertised on October 17, 2007 in the *Journal of Commerce* for the Tacoma Housing Authority's (THA) Modular Design Build Services for the Hillsdale Heights project. He said he doesn't recall whether THA requested project or public certification approval from the PRC for the proposal. Project scope includes 60 attached multi-family modular rental units, 50 attached modular homeowner town houses, a community center, leased office space, and all site infrastructure, common areas, and improvements. RFQ's are due on November 16, 2007. This is a large project. Mr. Kommers reported he contacted the THA and was told that statute 39.10 doesn't apply and that they are exempt from the DB part of the law. He asked that GA staff schedule the matter for discussion. It was his understanding that "all public bodies" meant "all public bodies."

Ms. Deakins reviewed background information and Assistant Attorney General Larry Sheehan's response detailed in a document included in the meeting packet titled, *CPARB Project Review Committee Issues*. Mr. Sheehan's response is that [X] Housing Authority falls within the purview of the new APW law. If they want to contract for an APW they need to comply with the provisions of the new law. There are two conflicting opinions: Mr. Sheehan's conclusion that APW laws apply to housing authorities; and whether housing

authorities are exempt from APW based on Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 35.82.070 (10) that states, “no provisions of the law with respect to the acquisition, operation or disposition of property by other public bodies shall be applicable to an authority unless the Legislature shall specifically so state.”

Mr. Eng said Mr. Sheehan summarized the matter well. The intent of the statute is that public bodies mean all public bodies that want to use 39.10 for APW procurement. Approval from the PRC is required.

Discussion ensued about whether housing authorities that want to use 39.10 can create their own process and Design Bid Build (DBB) procurement procedures.

Chair Lynch asked Mr. Kommers whether the law is ambiguous or unclear and needs to be clarified, or is it a matter of entities misinterpreting the law. Mr. Kommers replied Mr. Sheehan concluded that the law applies to [X] Housing Authority and that the CPARB should take action to alert THA that it needs to refute that determination. If the statute created an inadvertent loophole or exemption, the matter should be remanded to the drafting subcommittee to tighten up the language.

Mr. Benson explained King County’s Housing Authority’s (KCHA) legal counsel pointed out to the PRC that the statute extends an authority to procure services and KCHA is precluded from APW legislation elsewhere. However, KCHA chose to go through the PRC process because it couldn’t afford any delays, and seeking approval was not a cumbersome process.

Ms. Deakins noted KCHA was partnering with the school district on that particular project.

Mr. Slunaker offered two options that the Board could request a formal legal opinion about the matter or the Board could make a policy decision where housing authorities are defined as public bodies and refer the decision to the drafting subcommittee.

Greg Guedel, Foster Pepper PLLC, Seattle, representing THA, introduced Steve Clair, Senior Project Manager for THA who is specifically responsible for the Hillsdale Heights project. THA presented information on the Hillsdale project and why its particular construction technique, the modular pre-fabricated construction, is specifically exempt from section 200 and not subject to review by PRC. He also provided statutory background on how housing authorities operate and view the current regime concerning interaction with the committee.

Mr. Guedel explained that he attended the PRC meeting as counsel for KCHA. It was an unusual situation because the owner of the project is not the housing authority but the Puget Sound Education District (PSED), which is a public body. The role of the housing authority in that project is to provide construction management services for the PSED. It’s becoming more common for larger cities and counties to look to housing authorities because of their broad and extensive construction expertise. However, the housing authority is not the contracting agency.

The housing authority’s basic position regarding the applicability of the new APW statute is when reviewing previous laws passed by the Legislature; housing authorities were placed in a special category for public procurement. The Legislature stated that the mandate of housing authorities is to provide the greatest dollar value for low income housing as possible. Housing authorities have been exempted from any other public bidding or contracting statutes that do not explicitly identify housing authorities. RCW 35.82.070 outlines the mandate for how housing authorities are to operate. The overarching goal is to deliver the greatest value for its projects. Subsection 10 of 070 states that no provision of any public contracting law in the state of Washington is applicable to housing authorities unless it specifically identifies itself as applied to housing

authorities. Interpretation is unless the statute specifically lists and enumerates public housing authorities in the applicability section, they are not part of a general all public bodies or agencies definition. The Legislature made a specific point to do this in RCW 35.82.070. Subsequently, in RCW 35.82.910 it indicates that any statute previous or post to the enactment of the housing authority statute that is contrary is trumped by the housing authority statute.

Mr. Guedel reported he disagrees with Mr. Sheehan's opinion with applicability primarily because his colleagues at the Attorney General Office (AGO) that have reviewed public bidding and contracting statutes in the housing authority context prior to this, disagree with the legal opinion. Copies of two opinions from the AGO office were provided to the Board. The memorandum states that those types of statutes do not apply to housing authorities unless there is a specific act by the Legislature that enumerates housing authorities. If further legal review is requested by CPARB, the legal opinions provided during the meeting should be taken into consideration.

Mr. Guedel said housing authorities were not included in the process, consulted, or asked to participate when the new APW statute was researched and drafted. Housing authorities probably do as much or more construction work as any other public body and possess significant expertise. Future review and/or clarification of the statute should include Washington State Association of Housing Authority (WSAHA) involvement.

Housing authorities are in a special category also because of the nature of funding they receive, such as federal funding through the Department of Housing and Urban Development. If a project contains any federal funds, the federal agency providing funding asserts jurisdiction. The receiving agency is mandated to follow federal statutes preempting any state regulation.

Mr. Guedel explained why the Legislature created exemptions for housing authorities. There is only so much any agency can deal with in terms of regulatory participation and still deliver a successful project. Housing authorities operate with extensive oversight. He encouraged Boardmembers to review prior legal opinions from the AGO.

Mr. Clair provided additional details on the Hillsdale Heights project. He explained that he delayed procurement to research House Bill (HB) 1506. In addition to points made by Mr. Guedel, the project is a modular prefabricated construction. HB 1506, section 200, specifically states that owners are not required to seek approval for prefabricated modular projects.

Mr. Kommers said he appreciates THA's response. He asked if the statute governing housing authorities trumps the Board's policy decision that housing authorities were included in the new statute. Mr. Guedel replied that if the Legislature had included a specific line item that the statute applies to housing authorities, the new APW law would apply.

Mr. Kommers asked Mr. Guedel if the Board's process to negotiate the new APW statute was a public process. Mr. Guedel replied that it was. Legislators didn't think about housing authorities at the time and didn't want to do anything that would impede housing authorities' ability to conduct business and deliver housing.

Discussion followed about whether the WSAHA was specifically requested to attend or was invited to subcommittee and/or Board meetings when the new legislation was being drafted.

Mr. Johnson commented that the Board conducted an extensive open public process to amend the statute. Information was available to those interested in participating. He asked if THA doesn't believe the statute

applies to them if that also means prevailing wages do not apply. Mr. Guedel replied state prevailing wages do apply to housing authority projects funded by state funds. When operating under federal funding, housing authorities are required to pay prevailing wages pursuant to the Davis-Bacon Act.

Discussion ensued about a fabricator source for the modular units. Mr. Clair said THA is working to identify a source through the procurement process. There are at least three fabricators within the Pacific Northwest region.

Mr. Johnson asked if THA has experience constructing modular facilities. Mr. Clair answered THS has not completed a modular project, as the construction method is new in the Pacific Northwest. The housing authority will realize a cost savings of approximately 20% to advances its mission to provide affordable housing.

Chair Lynch asked if THA has an architect or engineering firm designing the site work and setting up foundations and infrastructure prior to modular buildings coming on site. Mr. Clair replied he's unsure at this time about the team(s). DB procurement is asking for design and build that consists of both site work and the modular units. He described funding sources for the Hillsdale Heights project.

Mr. Kommers said the issue should be addressed; however, he's not asking the Board to propose a specific direction at this time.

Mr. Clair said he would like to be more comfortable moving forward with procurement of the modular construction.

Chair Lynch thanked Mr. Guedel and Mr. Clair for attending the meeting.

Mr. Absher thanked THA for attending. The issue before the Board is whether the CPARB intended to exempt housing authorities from the new law and, if not, what the Board's next action is. He said he's familiar with modular prefabricated buildings. Every building has some element of prefabrication and perhaps a review of the definition is needed. To literally have an entire prefabricated modular building is impossible. Portables such as those on school sites are generally the intent for modular-type construction. If THA is exempt, it's because housing authorities are exempt and not because of the proposed modular construction element.

Chair Lynch provided some background on the issue dating back to the APW committee when it looked specifically at DB and the initial 39.10 statute.

Mr. Absher said he doesn't see a need for the Board to take an action concerning the project and suggested an approach to determine whether the Legislature intended to include housing authorities as a public body and tighten up the definition of prefabricated modular buildings.

Mr. Johnson added that he doesn't necessarily disagree with Mr. Absher's perspective. Labor's understanding of a prefabricated building is that it is completely engineered and basically a DB methodology. It is appropriate to define whether or not housing authorities are public bodies and included under the statute.

Chair Lynch said the information presented by THA is new information to him. The Board might want to request a formal legal opinion from the AGO.

Mr. Eng said that asking for a formal AGO opinion about how a public body is defined in the statute is a good idea. The Board or Representative Haigh could make the request. When drafting new legislation, it was CPARB's intent that all public bodies are covered by the definition of a public body.

Rodney Eng moved, seconded by Dave Johnson, to pursue through appropriate channels a formal legal opinion from the Attorney General about the scope of a public body and specifically whether the definition includes public housing authorities.

Discussion followed about a Board decision concerning the Hillsdale Heights project and providing a clear message to THA.

Motion carried unanimously.

Wendy Keller moved, seconded by Olivia Yang, to take no action on the Hillsdale Heights project.

Mr. Kommers said taking no action might be appropriate for the Board; however, there might be individual groups interested in asking additional questions.

Ms. Moses agreed there might be other organizations that may wish to take further action. She suggested the Board should be clear that not taking an action on the Hillsdale Height project does not convey a particular position for similar projects in the future.

Mr. Johnson offered a friendly amendment to the motion for the CPARB to take no action on the Hillsdale Heights project, *and is not setting a precedent for future projects*. The makers of the motion accepted the friendly amendment.

Mr. Eng referred to the initial motion, and that the AG will inform the Board of its authority regarding the matter. He said he's not sure an amendment to the motion is necessary.

Mr. Johnson and Chair Lynch said perhaps the initial motion is unnecessary. Chair Lynch added that a motion to do nothing is the same as taking no action.

Mr. Johnson said another concern is the argument that housing authorities are exempt from APW methodologies based on their vast experience. However, modular construction is a newer construction method and THA is not experienced with that particular delivery model.

Ms. Keller said the intent of the motion is not to take an action on this project but it does not preclude the Board from taking action on future projects.

Mr. Johnson emphasized he would like the intent of the motion included in the record.

Mr. Bowman expressed concern about the motion in its entirety because the Board is likely setting a precedent. The Board should wait for the Attorney General to respond regarding the CPARB's authority.

The makers of the motion withdrew the motion as amended.

Ms. Deakins said another issue concerns whether modular construction is exempt from the statute and whether this type of project and the legislation should be clarified.

Chair Lynch suggested the Board consider modular construction later in the meeting as part of the Strategic Plan discussion and whether to include modular building exceptions to the list of issues.

Chair Lynch recessed the meeting from 10:26 a.m. to 10:45 a.m.

Brief Reports from Subcommittees

Expansion Subcommittee – Olivia Yang

Ms. Yang referred members to the CPARB issues document dated November 8, 2007, specifically items 1 through 13 (APW issues) and Expansion Subcommittee recommendations:

1. Design Build threshold/demonstration. Revise 39.10.250(4) to read: “(4) review and approve, up to five projects annually, with a total project cost between two and ten million dollars in RCW 39.10.300(5) and seek to authorize the DB contracting procedure among more than one public body.”

Ms. Yang explained that subsequent to the subcommittee’s November 2, 2007 meeting, there have been discussions about how to refine the language. She asked whether the Board agrees to the concept as stated.

Ms. Keller indicated she likes the proposal, especially that anyone can compete and projects are distributed among owners.

Discussion followed about why the Expansion Subcommittee identified five projects annually.

Mr. Kommers reported Specialty Contractors initially were not going to stand in the way of the proposal. He asked if there are any other inadvertent gaps and expressed concerns about the DB piece. Ms. Yang said the purpose of bringing the issues to the Board is not necessarily to approve the language, but whether there is agreement on the concept and advancing it to the drafting subcommittee. The Board would take a separate action concerning the precise language.

Mr. Absher said he’s not ready to accept the concept at this time. Stakeholders spent significant time agreeing to a \$10 million threshold and he would like to have time to consider the matter prior to taking an action.

Mr. Eng spoke in favor of the concept. He said it’s his understanding that the \$10 million threshold included a caveat to look at the concept of permitting demonstration projects.

Ms. Keller echoed Mr. Eng’s comment.

Rodney Eng moved, seconded by Wendy Keller, to approve the DB threshold/demonstration concept as outlined in the Expansion Subcommittee meeting notes with the drafting subcommittee directed to work on language for the Board’s consideration and action.

Mr. Absher said if he opposes the motion it doesn’t mean that he’s not willing to consider it further. He said he’s not sure he likes the five projects annually component.

Conversation followed about approving the concept, which doesn’t necessarily mean the number of projects is limited to five.

Mr. Absher asked whether the intent of the motion is to approve the concept of pilot projects under DB and not a specific number of projects. Ms. Yang answered that’s correct.

Mr. Stevens asked if demonstration projects will require PRC review and approval. Ms. Yang confirmed that is the case, and that the PRC will distribute demonstration projects among public owners as a pilot program whether or not a public owner is certified.

Mr. Johnson indicated he will vote with a majority of Boardmembers to advance the concept. However, there is the potential for larger DB construction companies with experience to ask for demonstration projects that smaller contractors could have access to. He asked that the minutes include labor's concern that there is the potential to limit the number of contractors for demonstration projects.

Motion carried unanimously.

9. DB – Negotiations, sections 202 and 204. The subcommittee recommended deleting section 202 as part of the legislation clean up for the 2008 session. The proposed change should be distributed to the subcommittee prior to being added to clean up legislation.
10. DB – Best and final proposal/offer, section 204. The subcommittee agreed that language as currently written should stand. It was recommended that the CPARB sponsor DB training, possibly with the Design Build Institute of America (DBIA).
11. DB – Honorarium payments, section 204(5). The subcommittee decided to accept the proposal to delete the reference to “best and final proposal” from section 204(5) and substitute “responsive” in its place.

In response to a question from Chair Lynch, Mr. Eng described the proposed changes outlined in 9-11 in further detail.

Chair Lynch asked if the changes have been put into a bill format. Ms. Yang replied not at this time. Chair Lynch said if the Board agrees with the concepts outlined by the Expansion Subcommittee concerning items 9-11, the drafting subcommittee could propose language for action at a future meeting.

Mr. Eng moved, seconded by Ms. Yang, to approve concepts #9, #10, and #11 as outlined in the Expansion Subcommittee meeting notes and direct the drafting subcommittee to present language for the Board's consideration and action. Motion carried.

Ms. Deakins noted there is no change recommended for item #10.

Ms. Yang reported the subcommittee agreed to withdraw item 3a, GC/CM contract award - section 303; item 4, GC/CM Maximum Allowable Construction Cost (MACC) – section 304(1) negotiations; and item 5, GC/CM MACC – section 304(2) major bid packages.

Ms. Deakins reported the Board previously took action to advance issues 3a, 4, and 5. She suggested members formally delete the issues from the planning list.

Rodney Eng moved, seconded by Ms. Yang, to remove items 3a, 4, and 5 from the strategic planning list of issues. Motion carried.

The Expansion Subcommittee did not discuss items 3b (open public bid openings for GC/CM), items 6 and 7 related to Job Order Contracting (JOC), and items 12a and 12b concerning new APW methods best value and competitive negotiation. The subcommittee will try to address those issues at its December meeting. Subcommittee members are considering addressing item 3b with the 2008 session and best value in 2009.

The Expansion Subcommittee also discussed item 2, Design-Build-Operate-Maintain (DBOM). Current status is to allow two DBOM demonstration projects for the life of the legislation. Demonstration projects must go before the PRC and guidelines must be developed prior to review of any DBOM application by the PRC.

Rodney Eng moved, seconded by Wendy Keller, to ask the subcommittee to continue work on DBOM based on the concepts outlined in the meeting notes, and provide the CPARB with a specific language proposal. Motion carried.

Discussion followed about reconvening the previous drafting subcommittee. Ms. Deakins said a strategy is to have the drafting subcommittee work on language changes or recommend to Representative Haigh that a couple of volunteers work with Marsha Reilly to draft language. She volunteered to talk to Ms. Reilly.

Mr. Eng expressed a concern about the DBOM issue, as there is no specific language at this point. Suggestions prepared by Ashley Probart with Association of Washington Cities (AWC) were good.

Ms. Deakins noted an issue is that the Expansion Subcommittee did not have an opportunity to review a draft proposal for DBOM.

Ms. Yang, Mr. Eng, and Ms. Deakins volunteered to work with Ms. Reilly and draft language to present to CPARB in December.

Chair Lynch complimented Ms. Yang and the Expansion Subcommittee for its work this past month.

Further dialogue concerning proposed changes to DBOM followed.

Training Update

Mr. Kommers reported the Associated General Contractors (AGC) Education Foundation has a waiting list of 40 people interested in GC/CM training. The AGC Education Foundation is in the process of distributing a flyer announcing a two-day GC/CM training opportunity for January 31, and February 1, 2008. He said he plans to work with the AGC Education Foundation to confirm an agenda and prepare training materials. The faculty is in place for both days. It would be helpful if another public owner could attend the session, particularly the second day when MACC items will be discussed. Feedback about previous training sessions has been very positive.

Chair Lynch indicated he would follow up with Mr. Kommers about General Administration attending the training as a public owner.

Ms. Yang thanked Mr. Kommers for his work to coordinate and participate in training opportunities.

Discussion followed on working with the DBIA to coordinate DB training.

Strategic Plan

Members discussed industry-wide and "other" issues on the strategic planning list, target dates, and the Board affirming focus on items proposed for the 2008 legislative session. Ms. Deakins noted that the Industry-wide Subcommittee has not met the last two months.

Mr. Johnson said he's interested in addressing in-state preferential bidding (item 4). The Industry-wide Subcommittee has spent most of its time over the last few months working on suggested guidelines for bidder

responsibility. Decision papers discussing different approaches have been drafted concerning in-state preferential bidding.

Chair Lynch stated there is some work being done on the notice provisions (Mike M. Johnson). Recommendations from the Industry-wide Subcommittee to the CPARB concerning item 4 and other industry-wide issues is needed in December to meet a 2008 legislative session target.

Mr. Maruska suggested item 6, discuss unsupported claims, could be bumped to 2009.

Chair Lynch asked that the Industry-wide Subcommittee discuss the issues at its next meeting and bring back what can be addressed in 2008. A goal is to include trench excavation with another language package so that it's not overlooked.

Ms. Yang offered that the Expansion Subcommittee could work on drafting language for issues discussed previously in the day, and discuss "other" issues that consist of clean up language: JOC – new construction versus renovation language; trench excavation; small works limit – update; and PRC public body certification.

Mr. Johnson asked to bump the prevailing wage (public/private partnerships) issue up to industry-wide issues proposed for the 2008 session.

Discussion followed on adding the housing authority matter to other issues that could be considered in 2008.

Mr. Eng said a concern is some items consist of clean-up language changes while others are more substantive in nature. Combining the two could affect adoption of any changes to the APW law. He suggested waiting until the Attorney General issues a formal legal opinion prior to making a decision about changing the statute as it relates to housing authorities.

Chair Lynch agreed drafting two separate bills, one for non-controversial clean up items, and one for stand-alone or a group of more significant issues, is a good strategy. It appears that subcommittees will determine respective priorities unless CPARB wants to provide some guidance.

Discussion ensued about adding "modular building exception" to the "other issues" section, how subcommittees are established, and DB elements with prefabricated buildings.

Mr. Johnson agreed the modular building exception should be placed on the strategic planning list.

Rodney Eng moved, seconded by Chair Lynch, to add "modular building exception" to the list of "other issues" category. Motion carried.

Daniel Absher moved, seconded by Dave Johnson, to approve items slated for the 2008 legislative session, as identified on the strategic planning list, and that the subcommittees should focus on those items. Motion carried.

Mr. Eng and Mr. Kommers left the meeting. A quorum was no longer present.

Membership of Board and PRC

Ms. Deakins reviewed CPARB vacancies. She reported she spoke with the Governor's Office about filling the vacancies. Five applications were submitted for consideration - two for general contractors, one representing

CPARB FINAL MINUTES

November 8, 2007

Page 11 of 11

engineers, and at least one for construction trades labor. Staff from the Governor's Office will follow up on reviewing the applications and forwarding a recommendation to Governor Gregoire.

Chair Lynch encouraged Boardmembers (specifically those representing cities, counties, and labor) to continue to actively recruit additional applicants. He noted Butch Reifert is leaving the Board and that an architect is needed as well. Related to PRC membership, he commented that GA has experienced project managers working with community colleges and other state agencies. He asked whether the Board is willing to create slots on the PRC for those types of agencies. He conveyed he's confident he could persuade individuals to apply representing community colleges, Department of Corrections (DOC), and Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS).

Members suggested the Board should consider appointing additional public owners if there are candidates available to fill those positions. Larger organizations likely possess a wealth of construction expertise.

Ms. Deakins said she would provide members with a list of vacant PRC positions at the December meeting.

Set Next Meeting Agenda

- Board and PRC membership
- 63-20 financing presentation, including what it means for project management
- Brief reports from subcommittees
- PRC report

Adjournment

With no further business, Chair Lynch adjourned the meeting at 12:03 p.m.

John Lynch, CPARB Chair

Prepared by Cheri Lindgren, Recording Secretary
Puget Sound Meeting Services