

Committee Members: (11 positions, 6 = Quorum)

x	Keith Michel (General Contractors) – Co-Chair	x	Mark Nakagawara (Cities) – Co-Chair
	Liz Anderson (WA PUD Assoc)	x	Diane Pottinger (Water District Representative)
x	Linda De Boldt (Cities)	x	Steve Russo (UMC, Specialty Contractors)
	Roger Ferris, Fire District Representative		Mark Riker (Labor)
x	Bruce Hayashi (Architects)	x	Michael Transue (MCA)
x	Sharon Harvey (OMWBE)		Vacant, Private Industry
			Vacant, Higher Education

Guests & Stakeholders:

	Eric Alozie	x	Monique Martinez, DES/CPARB Staff
	Logan Bahr, Tacoma Public Utilities		Scott Middleton, MCAWW
	Talia Baker, DES/CPARB Staff		Roe Pulalasi-Gonzalez
	Randy Black, Lakewood Water District		Paul Richart, Alderwood Water & Wastewater District
	George Caan, WA PUD Association	x	Janice Zahn, CPARB
	Bill Clark, WA PUD Association		Josh Swanson
x	Joren Clowers, Sno-King Water District Coalition		Abigail Vizcarra Perez, MetroParks Tacoma
x	Nancy Deakins, DES/CPARB Staff	x	Rob Wettleson, Forma Construction
	Brandy DeLange, Assoc. WA Cities		Maggie Yuse, Seattle Public Utilities
x	Jack Donahue, MFA	x	Ryan Spiller
	Judi Gladstone, WASWD		

The meeting began at **11:31 a.m.**

Welcome & introductions

Co-Chair Keith Michel welcomed everyone and thanked them for attending.

Review/Approve Agenda – Action

Michael Transue motioned to approve the agenda, seconded by Bruce Hayashi. The motion passed through a voice vote.

Approve Meeting Notes from 8/13 – Action

Monique Martinez noted that edits from Linda de Boldt have been included.

Michael Transue motioned to approve the meeting minutes, seconded by Sharon Harvey. The motion passed through a voice vote.

Feedback Report on Action Items – Discussion

Michael pulled up the edited document, and said he worked to ensure that he captured all of the changes suggested from the last meeting. He mentioned that he tried to ensure that “labor” included all labor, according to the suggested changes from the last meeting.

He mentioned that there were some technical difficulties with the track changes in the document, but he tried to make sure each party was included in a different color. The editors changed the language in order to ensure “in-house” personnel were referred to, rather than “day labor”. The edited document was included as a pre-read.

Minutes prepared by Jack Donahue, Maul Foster & Alongi, Inc.

Linda De Boldt pointed out that Subsections A and B on page 6 of the document may be unnecessary given there are RCWs that govern situations when competitive bid waiving can be done. Michael said that the goal was not to repeat the same things, but also to be mindful of the conversations from the past meetings. He wanted to ensure those passages were spelled out and not merged. Linda said she understood but added that the exigency language was aligned with the use of city crews, and that they shouldn't be conflated.

Co-Chair Michel weighed in, saying that the inclusion begs the question of how public owners can do both in-house and non-competitive bid awards. Linda added that they are making the distinction between exigency and emergency circumstances, and that it seems confusing to have the language introducing "exigency" in situations of competitive bidding. Michael agreed, and recommended they remove the language around competitive bidding, but he argued that the other language is important because it illustrates the process.

Nancy Deakins asked Michael to clarify what languages he hoped to delete from the passage. Michael explained that it was only the references to competitive bidding. Linda and Nancy questioned whether that was necessary, and Michael said he thought it was important to lay out a process there. Nancy recommended removing the language around awarding a contract, as well. Linda said that would make it workable. Michael said he would make those changes.

Co-Chair Michel referred to a passage on Page 5, about the publication of work at the annual threshold. After reaching that threshold, agencies must start going for competitive bids on their projects. He suggested steering agencies to the small works roster, or other tools that already exist.

Sharon noted in chat that the threshold should be \$75,500, not \$75,000. Michael said that he noted that and will swap the values.

Nancy and Co-Chair Michel questioned why the process needed to be included, when it was based off of other RCWs. Michael answered that making contractors refer to other documents presents difficulty for contractors, citing the same thinking as the reason for the small works roster.

Michael proposed that the group accept the current tracked changes and start a new document for the next round of edits. Ryan Spiller expressed agreement with that and said that a rough draft would be easier for him to bring back to his constituents.

Co-Chair Michel referred back to the action items from the last meeting and said that he wanted to make sure they had all been addressed. Michael said that he never found an established reporting mechanism that applied to all cities, only one that applied to first-class cities. Co-Chair Michel asked if there was a template that already existed and asked Co-Chair Nakagawara if he had a template. He said he had shared it before and would find it.

Michael pointed out the language on reportage on page 8 and read from it as a basic guideline. Linda said that for first-class cities, there was not a universal form for reportage. She argued that it should be left up to each individual city to develop their own process for doing that. They decided that the action item had been covered.

Ryan asked how many meetings the committee planned on having in the run-up to the legislative session, Co-Chair Michel noted his plan was to not disband the committee but pause regular meetings through the passage of the bill. He stressed that the committee should be ready to meet, but that these meetings would occur on an as-needed basis.

Ryan asked if his association was against the bill, whether he would vote no or include a minority report with the committee's recommendation.

Co-Chair Michel reiterated the importance of finding consensus on the bill, because otherwise the recommendations will really struggle. Ryan said he understood that, and he would love if his association was able to vote in favor of it, but he could not guarantee how they would vote.

Diane asked Co-Chair Michel to confirm whether Janice Zahn was listed as CPARB chair still, Co-Chair Michel said that she had been replaced in that position but was still involved and would help guide this bill through the CPARB review process.

Co-Chair Nakagawara spoke up and said that while a lot of the language for these recommendations came from cities and labor, it was important to ensure that municipalities were also in agreement on the language. He said it would be difficult to find universal language across the board.

Ryan said that Prudent Utility Management worked for water, sewer and fire districts, and that adding that in would allow them to get on board with it. He acknowledged that it would raise objections everywhere else, but thought it was worth consideration. Co-Chair Michel said that he understood that perspective, but much of the committee found the definition to be vague, and he was glad that the committee had put together some language on when it could be used.

Diane asked Co-Chair Michel to walk through the calendar. Monique mentioned the draft report's soft due date of 9/12, which the committee won't be able to hit. Linda mentioned that she would be out of town the first two weeks of September, and asked if there was any possibility that they could meet after she returns. Michael suggested moving the next meeting to 9/17, and the committee agreed to move the meeting to then. Co-Chair Michel suggested that the committee provide the rough draft and the beginnings of a report at the CPARB 9/12 meeting.

Establish Next Meeting Agenda

Welcome & Introductions

Review/Approve Agenda

Feedback Report on Action Items

The meeting ended at 1:00 p.m.

Action items:

1. Michael Transue will create a new, cleaned-up version of the tracked changes document, to be presented at the next meeting.
2. Co-Chair Michel will present the rough draft language to CPARB at their 9/12 meeting.