

Board Development Committee

Meeting Notes 11/12/2024

Page 1 of 4

Co-Chair Bill Frare called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m. A quorum was established.

Welcome and introductions

Committee members in attendance unless otherwise noted:

Bill Frare, <i>Co-Chair</i> , Owner State	CPARB
Linneth Riley-Hall, <i>Co-Chair</i> , Owner Transit	CPARB
Lekha Fernandes, OMWBE	CPARB
Santosh Kuruvilla, Owner Engineers	CPARB
Jessica Murphy, PRC Leadership	PRC
Irene Reyes, Private Industry	CPARB
Olivia Yang, Owner Higher Ed	CPARB
Janice Zahn, Owner Ports	<i>Absent</i> CPARB

Other attendees include:

Talia Baker, CPARB Staff
Jeff Gonzalez, DES
Scott Middleton, MCAWW
Colleen Newell, MFA
Mike Pellitteri, Specialty Subcontractors (PRC)
Steve Russo, Specialty Subcontractors (CPARB)

Review and approve agenda – Action

Co-Chair Frare reviewed the agenda and asked for any comments or amendments.

Olivia Yang moved to approve the agenda, seconded by Irene Reyes. The motion was passed by a voice vote.

Review and approve minutes from 10/29/2024 – Action

Co-Chair Frare asked the group to review and provide any edits to the minutes from the meeting on October 29, 2024.

Co-Chair Linneth Riley-Hall had a couple of comments. The first item, located on the third page in the second paragraph, was regarding the word “auditor” as it relates to WSDOT’s participation in the strategic planning process. She asked if that was the correct term or intended use of the word. Co-Chair Frare clarified that auditor was meant in the sense of how someone audits a class. Olivia Yang suggested changing it to “stakeholder,” and the committee agreed with that change.

The second item Co-Chair Riley-Hall brought up was about the consideration of having a member who was in the private industry. She asked where that was indicated in the notes. It was clarified that the General Contractor and Specialty Contractor were specifically noted, and then there was going to be an “other” position, which would be determined by CPARB.

Olivia Yang moved to approve the minutes, as amended, from October 29, 2024, seconded by Linneth Riley-Hall. The motion was passed by a voice vote.

Invitation to the public to participate – Information

Co-Chair Frare noted this committee meeting is open to participation from non-committee members.

Strategic Planning Startup & Structure

Co-Chair Frare provided an update on the action items that he had on his plate. The first was talking with Heidi Loveall to get more information about bringing on a facilitator, as well as getting guidance on their structure. He reported that Heidi has been busy and has not been able to help. Co-Chair Frare said he also had committed to reaching out to Art McCluskey to see if WSDOT could designate a person to be a stakeholder on the

Board Development Committee

Meeting Notes 11/12/2024

Page 2 of 4

committee. The last assignment was to talk to the General Contractor and Specialty Contractor representatives on CPARB to prepare them on the intent relative to the format of the committee and what it is they are recommending relative to membership. Co-Chair Frare said that, due to time constraints, he has not been able to get to any of these items.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall said she would help take one of these action items off of his plate and offered to reach out to Art McCluskey with WSDOT.

Olivia pointed out that Steve Russo, CPARB's Specialty Contractor representative, was in attendance at this meeting. This may eliminate one of the other action items on Co-Chair Frare's list.

Steve Russo stated, on behalf of Specialty Contractors, he recommends Mike Pellitteri to be a member of this committee. Co-Chair Frare invited Mike to share more about his interest in being on this committee.

Mike said he has been involved with CPARB since 2018 when he was asked to be on the reauthorization committee, and he has been on the PRC for three and a half years. He noted that he brings a perspective to the table that the committee needs – someone who is doing the work and bidding on the contracts.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall asked Steve if he would recommend anyone else for this committee or whether Mike is the person they would bring to CPARB for consideration. Steve clarified that Mike was the only one.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall asked Co-Chair Frare whether this committee would support and bring this recommendation to CPARB or whether Steve would be bringing this forth to CPARB. Co-Chair Frare responded that, in his estimation, there are only eight people on this committee, and they need more people. He noted they are cognizant of the fact that many people are interested in the strategic planning process. At the last meeting, this committee identified representation that was missing and needed to come forward. This committee also identified a fair process, which would be taken to CPARB and the representative from those stakeholder groups are asked to identify possible incumbents for CPARB to consider, and then CPARB would make the recommendations. He noted this committee is not hand-picking individuals, but rather putting the responsibility on the CPARB members who are responsible for representing those specific groups.

Co-Chair Frare noted that this committee knows they would like to bring in a Specialty Contractor and a General Contractor, and that they would also like to bring in a member at large. He asked if they would like to recommend an individual or how this committee would like to fill that last position.

Talia Baker asked whether these members would be added to the Board Development Committee or whether there would be a sub-committee. At one point this committee had discussed creating a sub-committee that would focus on strategic planning. Co-Chair Frare clarified that had been a consideration. However, his concept today is that there are eight people on the committee right now, plus three positions that have been identified, that would be doing the strategic planning core work.

Olivia Yang asked Talia to review the current members on the committee. Talia pulled up on screen the current members and noted that the General Contractor, Private Industry and Architects are vacant. Steve is putting up one name for the Specialty Contractors position. It was noted that the current person holding the Architects position on CPARB, Bruce Hayashi, has expressed an interest in being on this committee. Olivia noted on the General Contractor side there is also interest from Curt Gimmestad. There was a question about the at-large or "other" position and who would be doing the nominating for that position.

Irene Reyes asked for clarity around the process, specifically about whether this group is collecting names for who would be nominated, and whether this committee would be voting on additional members. Co-Chair Frare responded that the process is to let the General Contractor position on CPARB select a General Contractor individual and bring that nomination forward to this committee and then CPARB would officially approve it. He noted that this committee needs to determine how they will take care of the third position.

Irene noted confusion around the categories of the positions, noting that Architects and Labor are not the same thing. Talia said that the committee can keep Architects or recommend that it be changed to a labor position. Whichever they think should be the representative, but until CPARB changes the representatives, these are the current official positions.

Board Development Committee

Meeting Notes 11/12/2024

Page 3 of 4

Co-Chair Riley-Hall said that Private Industry/Specialty Contractor may or may not represent the same groups. For Private Industry, for example, Robynne Thaxton had asked the question about who she would go to for questions or comments.

Olivia said the strategic plan for CPARB should engage those stakeholders that are directly affected in contracting. Owners are impacted, and architects, engineers, contractors, and specialty contractors, should be involved. When referring to private industry, as it's envisioned in the PRC, it's actually owner's representatives. Owner's representatives do not have a "grade-A" stake in the game because they are working on behalf of the owner. Currently, there are several owner positions on this committee. If private industry, meaning owner's representatives, have a problem, then there are several owners that they can come to.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall said she liked the rephrasing of owner's representatives rather than private industry. They should be able to approach any of the owners on the committee and vice versa.

Olivia asked what the big issues are that they are hoping to tackle with the strategic plan. Co-Chair Frare agreed that it's good to start documenting what those are. Olivia reiterated that owner readiness is something that has been discussed at various committees. If this could be a focus it would inform much of the work that CPARB is doing. Speaking from the perspective of the owners, Olivia noted that the owner has to be ready and accountable. The goal is for owner readiness and owner accountability to be delineated without making CPARB or PRC the '*public works police*'. This also brings into consideration how it would help streamline the PRC. It was noted that there is no feedback loop and no accountability. Figuring out owner-readiness in terms of owner/stakeholder readiness would help with being effective and responsive.

Co-Chair Frare noted he likes the word accountability and transparency. This dovetails into value-added, and what value-add there is to CPARB or alternative public works. The question is how to identify whether there is a value-add and what sort of performance metric is necessary to identify it. As CPARB builds trust with the legislature and establishes accountability and transparency, then reauthorization becomes unnecessary. The goal may be to get through the next one and then it is not needed again because there is transparency and trust with the legislature. Co-Chair Frare said he likes the feedback loop not just for accountability but for lessons learned.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall observed typically a strategic plan is for a set number of years with measurable goals in between. She suggested that their strategic plan be a seven-year plan with the goal of removing reauthorization at the end of those seven years. There could also be short-term goals in between. She noted one goal for her is regarding the value-add of the PRC. When an owner goes to the PRC, she asked if it's just a matter of checking a box. The question is what they are responding to, what they are getting out of it, and how they are held accountable through the current PRC process. As this group is thinking about measurable items, one focus should be about terms.

Co-Chair Frare said this could be a reimagining of the check and balance of the PRC to ensure owners are ready. This is while the PRC still exists. The PRC will not go away tomorrow, so the question remains what can be done today to help raise owner readiness.

Santosh Kuruvilla noted that whatever strategic plan is being set, it needs to be actionable and have an outcome. Various voices and perspectives need to be brought together. He suggested this can be incorporated with a strategic planning exercise as an actionable once a year event. This would be more of a check-in big tent idea—an actionable outcome-oriented once-a-year review.

Olivia pointed out that the value of reauthorization is to pull people together and determine what is and is not working. There is not a need to go through JLARC reauthorization to determine what's working. This can be done with the strategic plan and that assessment. CPARB is comprised of both public and private members. The public members that are state abide by Ethics Board rules. However, there's an interpretation that if you're on CPARB and in a position of public trust, those ethics considerations apply to you, whether you are public or not. The input of private stakeholders is valued but the focus is on determining how they provide feedback and input without running afoul of what the ethics considerations are. This also applies to owner's representatives—not pushing policies that come back and benefit them personally but pushing policies that benefit members. There is a fine line and it's important to figure out how to avoid the perception of being bad.

Board Development Committee

Meeting Notes 11/12/2024

Page 4 of 4

Lekha Fernandes asked how they can make sure they are building enough space for things that happen. For example, this past session CPARB has taken on prompt pay, WSDOT projects, and SHB 1621. It takes a lot of time and commitment to fulfill these requests and obligations from the legislature. She is worried about the obligations of strategic planning. CPARB is here to support the legislature, and it's important to consider this in the strategic planning effort.

Lekha also pointed out that the Board Development Committee has done a lot of work to nail down membership parameters, and sometimes participation level can be a detriment, specifically to small and diverse businesses. She asked if this committee could look into paying individuals to participate, looking at the state's compensation guide to more actively ensure that they have participation from diverse stakeholders and that it's not the same individuals each time.

Jessica Murphy echoed what everyone had said so far. Regarding reenvisioning the PRC, it's important that the strategic plan outlines what the goal is that they'd like to achieve. If the goal is not to go to JLARC, then they will need to set tangible steps. She thought the strategic plan needs to focus on the interim middle steps. There is a need to identify priorities—the must haves and would like to haves, etc.

Co-Chair Riley-Hall said, from general observations, there are only a handful of people who are on various committees. When these things come up, it's the same people who are on the committees. The question they will need to ask in this strategic planning effort is what the value of CPARB and the PRC is.

Lekha said this group needs to think about what the Board has accomplished and what has helped and supported the mission and vision of CPARB. Understanding what those are and the impact would be helpful. There is a need to consider why CPARB was created and how we can better support, as well as understand what we've done that's driving the mission. It is also good to consider who has participated in these items.

Jessica seconded Co-Chair Riley-Hall's point about looking at the value of CPARB. For example, how many hours does CPARB spend on appointing PRC members.

Scott Middleton reiterated what was discussed at the beginning of the meeting and noted that the MCAWW fully supports Mike Pellitteri. Answering Lekha's question regarding what was working and not working, he referred back to the JLARC studies done at the last two reauthorizations. Those studies might help inform what was trying to be improved upon and whether we've gotten there.

Co-Chair Frare posed the following questions for consideration: what is CPARB's role in diverse business inclusion, alternative public works and regular public works and what can be done to further discussion around barriers into the public works contracting realm? There are a lot of issues, and it will be important to identify those discrete barriers and what CPARB can do as a legislative advisory board to remove those barriers and make it easier for small and diverse businesses to enter into the public works contracting world.

New Issues

New issues will be discussed at the next Board Development Committee meeting.

Next meeting Agenda

- December 3, 2024, 3:30 – 5:00 p.m.
- Agenda
- Minutes – November 12, 2024
- Strategic Planning Startup & Structure
 - Stakeholdering
 - Scope of Strategic Planning Effort
 - Expectations of Committee Membership
- Next agenda

Action items

1. Co-Chair Bill Frare will continue efforts in bringing a facilitator on board.
2. Co-Chair Linneth Riley-Hall will reach out to Art McCluskey to see if WSDOT could designate a person to be a stakeholder on the committee.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:30 p.m.