

Project Feedback Process Workgroup

Meeting Notes 9/19/2024

Page 1 of 3

Committee Members: (14 members, 8 = Quorum)

- | | |
|--|---|
| X Dave Johnson Co-Chair, General Contractors | X Art McCluskey, Owner General Public |
| X Jeff Gonzalez, Co-Chair, Owners State | X Karen Mooseker, School Districts |
| X Kurt Boyd, Specialty Subcontractors | X Mike Pellitteri, Specialty Subcontractors |
| Marvin Doster, General Contractors | X Irene Reyes, Private Industry |
| Lekha Fernandes, OMWBE | X Linneth Riley Hall, General Owner |
| X Bobby Forch, Jr., Disadvantaged Businesses | X Robynne Thaxton, Private Industry |
| X Thomas Golden, Design Industry-Architects | X Olivia Yang, Higher Ed |

Guests:

Monique Martinez, DES Staff
Talia Baker, DES Staff
Sharon Harvey Hughes, Proxy for Lekha Fernandes
Ananda Gordon-Peabody, MFA

Co-Chair Jeff Gonzalez called the meeting to order at 11:02 a.m. A quorum was established.

1) Review and approve agenda - Action

Co-Chair Gonzalez reviewed the agenda and asked the group for any edits before proceeding.

Mike Pellitteri moved, seconded by Irene Reyes, to approve the agenda. The motion was approved by a voice vote.

2) Approve minutes from 6/20/2024 – Action

Co-Chair Gonzalez asked the group for any edits to the meeting minutes from June 20, 2024.

Mike Pellitteri moved, seconded by Thomas Golden, to approve the meeting minutes. The motion was approved by a voice vote.

3) Review of Preventative Measures approved by the PRC – Discussion\Action

- a) Co-Chair Gonzalez provided an update on the pre-incident questions that had been approved by the PRC on July 25, 2024. The questions were largely unchanged, aside from minor wordsmithing. These questions should be incorporated into new applications. Irene Reyes suggested a minor edit, but Co-Chair Gonzalez and Johnson reminded the group that these are the approved questions, and any edits would need to go through another approval process. It was suggested to leave them as is.

4) CPARB presentation of approved Post-Incident Process – Discussion

- a) Co-Chair Dave Johnson discussed feedback they received for the post-incident process. The main feedback they heard was that there was a lack of closing the feedback loop with the party who made the complaint or had the issue. Additionally, they noted needing to discuss a means for registering the complaint, such as a link on the website, as well as an issue log. These are two details that need to be refined by the committee. Additionally, Co-Chair Johnson noted that CPARB did not approve the process immediately as they wanted time to review it first. Co-Chairs Johnson and Gonzalez mentioned wanting to add that feedback loop into the process prior to the next CPARB meeting, where it would hopefully be approved.
- b) Co-Chair Gonzalez reminded everyone that this committee is not an enforcing body for the RCW. He then opened up the floor for questions, noting that if there were none, he and Co-Chair Johnson could start to address the comments. Mike asked about the timeline for completion, and Co-Chair Johnson noted that the expectation was that it would be discussed again at the next CPARB meeting and hopefully approved at that point.

Project Feedback Process Workgroup

Meeting Notes 9/19/2024

Page 2 of 3

5) Discuss Forum for issues other than violations of RCW 39.10 – Discussion

- a) Co-Chair Gonzalez moved the group towards addressing the forum for other issues, noting that this is an item that had been discussed quite a bit and asked for suggestions or comments. Irene asked if this had been approved and had to go to CPARB. Co-Chair Gonzalez clarified that the Post Incident Process did not go to CPARB, it was approved by this workgroup and then presented it to CPARB last week—it is under review. However, this topic is different and is about issues other than RCW 39.10.
- b) Linneth Riley-Hall brought up that the GC/CM best practices document is currently being circulated and suggested that it might be advantageous to identify issues that could be added to it. She noted that they had a short window to add to it because it hadn't been presented to CPARB yet. Co-Chair Gonzalez agreed with this point. Linneth added that Mike had sent her suggestions and she had forwarded them to Nick Datz. Ideally he will be able to give an update at the October CPARB meeting. Linneth suggested that someone make sure that the best practices that were discussed in this group be added to the GC/CM document. Co-Chairs Johnson and Gonzalez said they would take on that action.
- c) Co-Chair Johnson noted that the PRC would be the best place to discuss other issues, and he suggested adding time to the agenda to discuss anything industry related. Robynne Thaxton brought up time constraints, noting that it might be best to give owners an opportunity to respond in private before being brought into a public forum. Co-Chair Johnson clarified that these would be generic and anonymous issues, but Robynne cautioned again that only hearing one side is difficult. She suggested perhaps vetting issues as a subcommittee prior to them being aired in a public setting. Mike disagreed, noting that perfection may be the enemy of progress here. Irene agreed with Robynne, saying that an inclusive subcommittee could be a good idea, though had questions about how it would be implemented. Robynne was unsure but suggested reading the bylaws. Kurt Boyd questioned how this would work, but thought it sounded like a good idea. Co-Chair Johnson clarified that this would not be part of the application process and would specifically be part of the post-incident process.
- d) Linneth added that CPARB had been discussing a strategic plan and that they wanted to review the current committees to ensure that they were aligned with the plan. Because of this, she was hesitant to create another subcommittee. She wanted to make sure that there was fair representation on the strategic plan subcommittee and that the RCW was being followed. Olivia Yang suggested having a similar process to the RCW violations but having different people presiding over the process, e.g. not having the AG be involved; she disagreed that a separate subcommittee would be efficient.
- e) Co-Chair Gonzalez questioned how big of an issue best practices are because this group has been meeting for a while and has seldom heard much. He questioned whether this was because they just weren't hearing it, or if it wasn't as big of an issue as they thought. Irene clarified that she was unaware of the strategic planning element and rescinded her support for a subcommittee, and instead supported an ad-hoc group. Robynne added that the reason the violations of RCW were separated from best practices was because it was based off of legal violations, which are different than best practices, which, she suggested, should be more informal. She agreed with Linneth that it could be covered by strategic planning; Co-Chair Gonzalez agreed. Olivia agreed and added that it was important to note that they are advisers and should be acting in a counseling role for best practice deviations.
- f) Co-Chair Gonzalez asked Linneth to brief the group on the strategic planning process and its next steps. Linneth added that the next steps are for the Board Development Committee to meet and then to select members for the strategic planning meeting, which would hopefully happen at the next CPARB meeting. Talia Baker and Irene clarified that the Board Development Committee meeting and CPARB meeting had been moved to adjust to new needs.

6) Parking Lot Items – Discussion

- a) **Respect**—Linneth addressed respect in meetings and highlighted the importance of leaving personal issues at the door. She emphasized that it was important to create a safe space for these committees. Olivia strongly agreed with this and identified that some behavior came across as bullying.
- b) **Closing Out**—Co-Chair Johnson noted that once feedback is heard from CPARB about the post-

Project Feedback Process Workgroup

Meeting Notes 9/19/2024

Page 3 of 3

incident process, they're going to look at potentially sunsetting this committee as they have done a lot of the work they set out to do. Olivia agreed with this.

7) Next Meeting Agenda – Discussion

- Welcome & Introductions
- Approve Agenda
- Approve Minutes from 9/19/2024
- Review Post-Incident Process
- Determine action items that could be transferred to other committees
- Report out from CPARB Meeting
- Next Meeting Agenda
- Adjournment

8) Action items

- a) Co-Chairs Gonzalez and Johnson to address comments for the post-incident process.

9) Meeting Adjourned at 12:06 p.m.