

Meeting Minutes
 Prevailing Wage Advisory Committee
 June 24, 2010 Attendees:

Prevailing Wage Advisory Committee Members: Dave Johnson (Building & Construction Trades Council), Randy Loomans (Operating Engineers Local 302), Lee Newgent (Seattle-King County Building Trades), Randy Dubigk (Washington State Dept of Transportation) and Bruce Chattin (Washington Aggregates & Concrete Association).

L&I Staff: Steve McLain, Nathan Peppin, Ann Selover, Dawn Gast, David Soma and Frank Fazekas

Others Present: Cody Arledge, Aaron Bailey, Larry Lovelady, Jennie Kordenat, Bob Abbott, Roselynn Littlejohn, Dave O’Meara, Miriam Israel Moses, Tom George, Gary Fasso, Danny Robbins, Jim Christensen, Bill Cavin, and Rebecca Johnson

Agenda Item	Discussion	To-Do
Opening Remarks Introductions	The meeting was opened by David Soma at 9:35 a.m.	
Review and approve minutes from last meeting	Lee motioned to approve the minutes from the December 4, 2009 meeting and Randy Dubigk seconded the motion.	
Budget Update	David Soma stated that Prevailing Wage is looking good. Prevailing Wage has a nice fund balance due to work done in the last three legislative sessions; first fee increase since 1993 has put Prevailing Wage in a solvent situation and the Prevailing Wage unit has expanded and at the moment, Prevailing Wage is most of the construction work available creating a significant rise in Intents and Affidavits. Prevailing Wage has brought on temporary staff to help with the processing of the increased Intents and Affidavits. Prevailing Wage was able to hire four (4) temporary staff thanks to Steve McLain and Judy Schurke. Online processing times are currently at 24-48 hours and paper forms are 3-5 business days. Prevailing Wage Intents and Affidavits processing is back to scorecard timeframes. One of the temporary staff has been assigned to Certified Payroll to help with the backlog. The allocation of money given by the legislature to Prevailing Wage leaves	

	<p>Prevailing Wage with a projected biennial ending fund balance of \$26,000. David Soma is watching the fund balance closely. Prevailing Wage is forwarding a budget request to convey how each online transaction costs of 11 cents plus 2.2% in credit card fees. This has resulted in a six (6) figure credit card charges bill. Automation has saved numerous FTEs but credit card fees are significant and the Department of Labor & Industries is looking at how to impact on the credit card bill.</p> <p>Bruce Chattin- Is credit card issue a problem with other agencies?</p> <p>David Soma- I can't answer that. They may have recognized the issue sooner and already have fixed it.</p> <p>There were no further questions from the committee or the public.</p>	
<p>Personnel Update</p>	<p>Prevailing Wage was able to hire four (4) temporary staff thanks to Steve McLain and Judy Schurke.</p> <p>The legislature has approved two (2) FTEs (Customer Service Specialist 2) due to the increased Intents and Affidavits. Prevailing Wage is in the processing of hiring. The job posting closes today, June 24, 2010 at 5:00 pm. Prevailing Wage will then interview and hire. The FTEs will process Intents and Affidavits and Certified Payroll.</p> <p>Randy Dubigk- Is the furlough affecting the workload?</p> <p>David Soma- The furloughs should have little impact. Prevailing Wage was fortunate among the agencies and was only issued two (2) single furlough days. With the current rate of incoming Intents and Affidavits Prevailing Wage should be able</p>	

	<p>to keep the turnaround times around 24-48 hours and 3-5 business days. If Prevailing Wage had to take ten (10) furlough days there would have been more of an impact. There have been many complaints from other agencies about the furlough days and the Prevailing Wage staff has not complained at all.</p> <p>Prevailing Wage has another Customer Service Specialist 2 position open and is working on filling the position.</p>	
<p>Scope of Work Update</p>	<p>Scope of work meeting at 1:00 pm. Prevailing Wage has a full agenda with significant issues. Scopes of work identified for subcommittee discussion: Truck Driver, Electrician-Motor Shop, and Modular Buildings.</p> <p>Dredge Worker- voted out, moving to CR101 and should be published July 20, 2010. All the dates are tentative.</p> <p>The Scope Subcommittee is doing really good work.</p> <p>Dave Johnson- I thought we had a Metal Fabrication scope.</p> <p>Dave Soma- There has been a request to change the scope.</p> <p>Steve McLain- Meeting with the iron workers and sheet metal workers today to start the conversation. Not looking for a resolution today, but to figure out the next steps.</p>	
<p>Legal Update</p>	<p>Ann- Bethlehem Construction- Employees sued employer for prevailing wages due. Bethlehem is suing Labor & Industries. Prevailing Wage is deep in discovery mode. AAG says case is coming to a head soon.</p>	

	<p>Boss Construction- Prevailing wage violation in wastewater treatment. Parties reached an agreement. Received checks; waiting for court approval in order to distribute.</p> <p>Caicos- See Director's Orders packet. This is a PW lien action for approximately \$65,000 in wages for constructing a marina in Port Townsend. Action was filed in Jefferson County Superior Court; employer attempted to file late appeal from NOV; need to exhaust administrative remedies on appeal issue.</p> <p>Dublin Painting, Successor of Borders Painting- AAG talking with counsel to pursue possibility of prime paying part of the wages and Border's former officers paying the rest.</p> <p>Legacy- The issue is whether Legacy owes prevailing wages for construction of Grant County Fire District building; AAGs are negotiating settlement.</p> <p>McClure and Sons- This is an action to perfect lien on retainage and performance bond. AAGs are working with counsel to obtain missing records.</p> <p>Merlino- The case involves an NOV issued regarding SeaTac Airport improvements; worked out settlement agreement and the reasonableness of the settlement agreement was challenged by interested party. We are awaiting a decision on a motion concerning whether the interested party has authority to challenge the settlement agreement.</p> <p>Larry Lovelady- What is the McClure and Son's specific project?</p> <p>David Soma- I believe it is the Breakwater project.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Northstar Sheet Metal and Construction-PW issued an NOV for failure to file Certified Payroll. The Employer appealed, asking for leniency on the penalty. The Employer withdrew appeal and agreed to pay \$500 penalty.</p> <p>Oliphant Golf Construction- This involves an NOV for unpaid prevailing wages and penalties for false filing, failure to file Certified Payroll and 20% for failure to pay prevailing wages. We are deep into depositions.</p> <p>Pacific Northwest Regional Carpenters- This is pending judicial review of Director’s Order reversing ALJ’s grant of partial summary judgment in favor of Carpenters and remanding for full hearing at OAH. AAG filed answer on 5/3/10.</p> <p>West Coast Landscaping- The Director issued an order on 6/35/09 that reversed the ALJ’s Proposed Decision and affirmed the department’s NOV. The Director ordered the payment of wages and overtime to workers as well as civil penalties under RCW 39.12.065, a strike under the statute and \$4500 in penalties; before Superior Court for review.</p>	
<p>Legislation Update</p>	<p>EHB 2805 This is a statute for gathering data regarding Prevailing Wage projects over one million dollars utilizing off-site, prefabricated, nonstandard, project specific items manufactured out of state. The data is gathered by way of Affidavits and Labor & Industries reports the data to CPARB. If a contractor violates provisions of the statute more than once, under RCW 39.04.350 the contractor will not be “considered a responsible bidder and qualified to be awarded a public works project.” The legislation covers contracts entered into between 9/1/2010 and</p>	

	<p>12/31/2013. Failure to report is not a violation of RCW 39.12.050.</p> <p>ESSB 6468 This legislation applies to low income weatherization projects. It expands work performed under that funding to include moderate to significant rehabilitation and repair to extend the life of the home.</p> <p>EHB 1690 This concerns alternative Public Works Contracts Procedures for Housing Authorities, and clarifies that the requirements of chapter 39.12 RCW apply to housing authority public works except where specifically preempted by federal law or federal regulation.</p> <p>Dave Johnson- This is a good bill for Prevailing Wage and workers.</p> <p>ESHB 2836 This refers to the Capital Supplement Budget and the “Jobs Act” providing energy improvement grants to K-12 and higher education facilities. We will be meeting in July with GA, Commerce and OSPI regarding implementation.</p> <p>David Soma- We want to get ahead of the curve with the energy funds so we don’t have the same issues as before with weatherization.</p> <p>Randy Loomans- There is a “Drinking Water Revolving Fund” that needs to be watched. The state gets 50 million dollars from the feds and gives the money to the community to allocate. 2 million dollar projects being done. The Department has determined prevailing wages were not required due to the money being a loan and there is no cost to the state. The state manages the loans once they are allocated. I will follow up with Dave but Prevailing Wage needs to watch out for this issue.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>President Obama said all ARRA money is subject to prevailing wages.</p> <p>Miriam Moses- The public agency will provide LID (Local Improvement District) money for the water issues. These are big projects that are largely paid for by the government.</p> <p>Bob Abbott- The loans are being set up for water projects. Without the money the projects would not happen and without the state involvement the project would not happen.</p> <p>Randy Loomans- The loans state “may be subject to prevailing wages. Call Labor & Industries.” I will share my file.</p> <p>Bruce Chattin- Question about the LIDs. What happens when the citizens have to pay?</p> <p>Dave O’Meara- The loans were not subject to prevailing wages. There was an administrative cost to the agency but not a direct cost to construction.</p> <p>Dave Johnson- We need to look at the issue.</p> <p>Randy Loomans- We need to get with the committee and get everyone together. Right now the right hand doesn’t know what the left is doing. Instructions for the application are confusing</p> <p>Bob Abbott- I’m leaving it up to the attorneys to make their own determinations whether a project is subject to prevailing wages.</p> <p>Randy Loomans- I sent an attorney the guidelines for applying for these funds.</p> <p>Lee Newgent- Motion to move this issue to a subcommittee.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Dave Johnson seconded the motion.</p> <p>David Soma- Grants from public money requires prevailing wages.</p> <p>Miriam Moses- You have to do a lot of digging to find out where the money is coming from.</p> <p>David Soma- When we are told that the money being used is a loan, we ask for an affirmation that it is a bona fide loan.</p>	
<p>Rule Update</p>	<p>On June 3, 2010 a notice of proposed rulemaking (housekeeping) hearing was sent to the listserv.</p> <p>Proposed Rules Hearings: June 28, 2010 in Tumwater at 1:00 p.m. June 29, 2010 in Tukwila at 10:00 a.m. July 1, 2010 in Spokane at 10:00 a.m.</p> <p>Written comments due July 1, 2010. Information provided in packets.</p> <p>Timeline for rules adoption August 17, 2010, effective date October 1, 2010.</p> <p>David Soma- Anyone not on the Prevailing Wage listserv, and wants to be, needs to send Sean Anderson an email requesting to be added to the listserv. Sean's email: anse235@lni.wa.gov</p> <p>Dave Johnson- Usually there is a stakeholder meeting to discuss the rule changes. This did not happen here. Why?</p> <p>David Soma- Prevailing Wage put together the rule changes and emailed them a couple of times and brought changes to the committee and let the committee know that Prevailing Wage was going to make the changes. If the notification process needs to be modified I am open to suggestions. It is a public process.</p>	

	<p>Ann Selover- The proposed changes were brought to the committee a year ago.</p> <p>Randy Loomans- I remember Laura talking about the rule changes.</p> <p>Steve McLain- I was here. Prevailing Wage asked for comments. If the committee would like to be informed more, that can be done.</p> <p>Dave Johnson doesn't remember being informed of the changes.</p> <p>Miriam Moses- Remembers the rule changes being put out a year ago. Before the changes go to CR102 will there be open discussion? Even if the changes are only housekeeping, she expected there would be discussion with the stakeholders. The stakeholder's feedback is unknown. This is not how the WACs have been done. If this is how Labor & Industries will be doing things then the stakeholders need to change expectations. Important to have interaction with as many stakeholders as needed before CR102.</p> <p>Steve McLain- Did Prevailing Wage get comments?</p> <p>Ann Selover- Yes and Prevailing Wage responded to those groups who submitted comments.</p> <p>David Soma- Public Hearings are for everyone to come and comment. This process meets the APA standards. WAC 018 was a much different process and felt it was the appropriate thing to do. I feel like the process is more than sufficient but if there are comments, issues, or a problem, that's what the public hearings are for. If someone from the committee wants to change the process then a meeting needs to be set with Labor & Industries.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Miriam Moses- Will comments from meetings be available to the stakeholders? Requesting a Public Disclosure takes a long time. Once the changes get to CR102 all the stakeholders should know where everyone stands. A lot of corrections are made at the stakeholder meetings.</p> <p>David Soma- Thank you.</p> <p>Ann Selover- Minutes state that the rules and comments were provided in the December 2009 meeting.</p>	
<p>Surveys Determinations</p>	<p>Nathan stated that the Construction Site Surveyor survey will end Saturday, July 31, 2010. Prevailing Wage will then compile the results. Group 5 results are in and the numbers have been reviewed. Prevailing Wage plans to have the Carpenters results out July 6, 2010. There will be a 3 week period to make comments prior to publication. Rates will go into effect September 1 or 2, 2010. Group 2, 3 and 4 comments have been reviewed and Prevailing Wage is working through the issues.</p> <p>Wage update questions or concerns need to be submitted by June 11, 2010.</p> <p>On August 2, 2010 the PWIA data base will change and Prevailing Wage will have to verify every wage in place to verify the data is correct. This is a massive undertaking and this is why the deadline is set. Mid July we may be able to start updating information received. July 15, 2010 PDF of screen shots and instructions will be provided. The new page will significantly improve long term for stakeholders.</p> <p>Dave O'Meara- When is the new Wizard database for Intents and Affidavits going to be done?</p>	

	<p>Nathan Peppin- December. Right now Prevailing Wage is only working on the wage update.</p> <p>Bruce Chattin- Can we get a copy of the PDF to help communicate to other agencies?</p> <p>Steve McLain- Can we send it to the committee before publication?</p> <p>Randy Loomans- Can we do a practice run with the committee before publication?</p> <p>Bruce Chattin- Anything to help communicate to the agencies.</p> <p>Dave Soma- Prevailing Wage will send the PDF to the committee as soon as it is available.</p> <p>Bruce Chattin- Does the committee need to do a walk through?</p> <p>Nathan Peppin- Changes made are so low level. The only changes are what you see when looking up rates. A walk through wouldn't be of use but if the committee would like to do a walk through, that is not a problem.</p> <p>David Soma- Anyone interested in doing a walk through will be allowed. This is not a problem.</p> <p>Steve McLain- Can we set up date to invite anyone who is interested to see what changes are being done?</p> <p>David Soma- Yes</p> <p>Miriam Moses- Can an update be made to the wage update form? The six (6) month wage update form has the word "survey" on it.</p> <p>David Soma and Nathan Peppin stated this</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>can be changed.</p> <p>Steve McLain- Issue came up in December on what is the department doing about looking at survey process. Specifically with group 2 and 3 and what forms are accepted and not accepted. Ernie LaPalm, David Soma, Nathan Peppin, others on staff and I are going through thorough review of the process, looking at what has been done historically and what is being done now, gathering information from other states and from the federal level. Prevailing Wage is taking a broader look at this to decide how to get the surveys done in a better way. Once we get a handle on that, which should be done very shortly, we will look at it from a state-wide level, consolidate what's been done in other states and bring together a subcommittee from PWAC to go over what we may want to change. The challenge we're facing is the locality issue. The locality requirement has been in our law for a long, long time. The question now is whether it needs to be in our law. Other states and the feds do things differently. We will consider this and other aspects of the process collaboratively.</p> <p>Bruce Chattin- Why create a subcommittee and not go over the process at the PWAC meetings?</p> <p>Steve McLain- Having a full committee with a full agenda would make it difficult to get a draft created. Would like subcommittee to meet before the next session starts.</p> <p>Miriam Moses- Will this subcommittee be limited to PWAC members or will the public be allowed?</p> <p>Steve McLain- Good question for the committee. I understand the value to have the issues discussed broadly but the</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>information needs to be discussed in a smaller group. We need input from the PWAC and/or whoever is recommended.</p> <p>Randy Loomans – Steve, anything you do you will probably be brought back here for comment.</p> <p>Steve McLain – I need your help as committee members or others you recommend as people to participate in the process. I don't care who's included, but need a small group.</p> <p>Lee Newgent- A manageable group is a good idea. We should have people who deal with the surveys on a daily basis be a part of the sub-committee.</p> <p>Dave Johnson- The PWAC is a manageable number. We should bring the survey process outside the PWAC to get input from those who have had issues with the survey process. A group slightly larger than the PWAC should be appropriate.</p> <p>Bruce Chatten- As long as we report benchmarks along the way a subcommittee might be best to report to the committee at large. Can a summary of what is being proposed be available for Kathleen?</p> <p>Dave Johnson – We should not be so aggressive to get ready for the next session. It would be much better to get it right rather than push forward.</p> <p>Steve McLain- My interest is that whether we do a scheduled survey or a rate, we have new scopes of work that need a survey. We need a tool and a process that we can be comfortable with. I am with you, I want to get it right, but also move it so we have something we can work with. We will be working with folks this afternoon on scopes we will need a rate for. I want to be successful with moving forward to getting</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>a conclusion as quickly as we reasonably can. Would like to have an update by next PWAC. Yes, Prevailing Wage can provide a summary for Kathleen.</p> <p>David Soma- Will poll members of the committee, and ask who is interested, and who else they might recommend to be on the sub-committee, one or two others. Will take all the names of those interested and pare down to a manageable number that Steve McLain finds appropriate.</p> <p>Steve McLain – As soon as this report that I get from our internal folks is available I will share it with you for information. It doesn't provide all the answers but it is information you should see as a place to start.</p>	
<p>Cont. Scope of Work Update</p>	<p>David Soma- There have been two (2) requests to delete two (2) scopes of work.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Laborers in Utility Construction 2. Utilities Construction (Underground Sewers and Water Lines) <p>Dave Johnson- Who requested these?</p> <p>David Soma- The Laborers requested the Laborers in Utility Construction and the Power Equipment Operators requested the Utilities Construction (Underground Sewers and Water Lines).</p> <p>Randy Loomans- Would like to hold off on moving forward with this request until feedback is received. Needs to be looked at further. I had conversations with Nathan Peppin.</p> <p>Dave Johnson- Motion to table Underground Sewer and Water Lines request until the next PWAC when more information is given.</p> <p>Lee Newgent seconded the motion.</p>	

	<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Randy Dubigk- What's driving this?</p> <p>Bob Abbott- Would like to clarify that this motion is only for the Operator's request.</p> <p>Bruce Chattin- Can information be distributed on penalties?</p> <p>David Soma- Yes, we don't have it here but we can provide the information.</p> <p>Randy Loomans- Can anyone say pull a scope and it gets pulled?</p> <p>David Soma- No, but everyone does get the opportunity to request repealing a rule.</p> <p>Randy Loomans- Discovery is needed before pulling a scope. Are we removing a scope without knowing what is being voted out? Why?</p> <p>Bob Abbott- Removing a scope still goes through the rulemaking process.</p> <p>David Soma- There is no ability for this committee to take a rule off the table. It is a process in statute. The process is exactly the same as rulemaking but backwards. The process set in statute must be adhered to.</p> <p>Steve McLain- Any party can request rulemaking by the department, which the director has authority to do through the legal process. Anything the PWAC decides is only advisory to the Director, and not a decision-making process.</p> <p>Bruce Chattin- A WAC needs to be added to delete a scope of work?</p> <p>Dave Johnson- Motion should include both requests per Randy.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Bruce Chatten- Do you (Dave Johnson) want to amend the motion?</p> <p>Larry Lovelady- The reason I requested deletion is the skill level doesn't go down when you do underground utilities work. As a matter of fact, the skill level goes up when doing trench work. I am constantly fighting to get wages up with the work we do. It doesn't make sense to have the wages lower when the skill is equal or higher.</p> <p>Miriam Moses- I am guessing that when we eliminate a scope, that there is anticipation that the language will be added to another existing scope that says utilities construction is within that scope. If that would create a sub-classification, I think that you would want that classified as such.</p> <p>Lee Newgent- I would like to call for a vote. All in favor of Dave Johnson's motion?</p> <p>All in favor</p> <p>Bob Abbott- Laborers in Utility Construction request comes from the Laborers. It is covered under the Laborer scope and is not necessarily useful or productive.</p> <p>Lee Newgent- Is there a representative that would like to speak on the motion?</p> <p>David Soma- Yes. Bob Abbott</p> <p>Bob Abbott- Thank you for looking at this request. Laborers can work on other areas of project that isn't utilities. This creates issues for the contractor to separate work out when it is the same "work". Duplicate survey process for the same type of work. How to keep records separate for three (3) years. There used to be other agreements that had Utility agreements just for utilities</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>work that haven't been in place for over twenty (20) years. That is the issue for us. We should be surveyed under one survey and not multiple surveys. I wrote a lengthy letter to the department and don't mind if the department shares the letter with anyone.</p> <p>Dave Johnson- Would starting the rule process have an impact on any other scopes?</p> <p>David Soma- It would only affect the existing Labor scope of work.</p> <p>Dave Johnson- It is specific to Laborers and laborers are asking to be removed to simplify the survey process? Can we be sure this doesn't affect other trades?</p> <p>Miriam Moses- Plumbers and Pipefitters have asked me to express their desire to have a discussion on this process because underground work has specific language about pipes under pressure. They want to make sure that language remains intact and asked me to express their desire to have a stakeholders meeting on this issue prior to moving forward.</p> <p>Bob Abbott- Would ask that be addressed in the rulemaking process.</p> <p>Bruce Chattin- Does this establish any precedent? Is it extraordinary, deleting scopes of work? Will it lead to others? Is it the responsibility of the requesting party to flush out any possible turf wars that might bubble up?</p> <p>David Soma- The statute is very clear. Anyone can request rulemaking and it is the Director's decision. This is an advisory body, you get to advise. This is clearly the director's decision to make. The committee does not get to make decisions. The statute gives the requestor certain</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>rights that Bob Abbott just invoked and the PWAC doesn't get to stop the process. Judy will make a determination; she has no choice once an individual makes a request for rulemaking. The statutory guidelines must be followed.</p> <p>Bruce Chattin- Then what is the PWAC for?</p> <p>David Soma- The agency believes the committee has value. Judy and Ernie and Steve and I are interested in feedback and input from the PWAC. The PWAC is advisory, but it is valuable and necessary. The reason the proposal is here before you is so that you can give us your input and we can take it to Judy. I thought Steve did a fine job of explaining this. Judy gets the final decision but does take the advice from the PWAC in consideration.</p> <p>Bruce Chattin- What is Judy looking for?</p> <p>David Soma- A recommendation.</p> <p>Randy Loomans- I didn't know this was going to be voted on today. How can a recommendation be made without having enough information?</p> <p>David Soma- More information can and will be provided. Dave Johnson made a motion and the motion was allowed. Judy will make the decision. It is statutory. Whatever the PWAC decides will be transmitted to Judy.</p> <p>Randy Loomans- To get a scope there is a process and to delete a scope there should be the same process.</p> <p>David Soma- No one is arguing with Randy's concerns. The motion will be taken to Judy and she'll do what she'll do. I and the PWAC have no control over what Judy does.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Steve McLain- Randy, are you asking what information supports this request? Stakeholders have looked at the request and have gotten feedback to Prevailing Wage to bring for recommendation. A copy of the request was provided to the PWAC.</p> <p>Randy Loomans- No</p> <p>Steve McLain- What more are you looking for?</p> <p>Randy Loomans- I would like the department to take the same thoughtfulness to remove a scope as it does to add a scope.</p> <p>Bob Abbott- We have been working on this for quite some time now and have spent half a million dollars to complete a survey. Not worried about other work.</p> <p>Dave Johnson- Didn't know this was coming up. It is statutory to move this forward.</p> <p>Bob Abbott- It was supposed to come up the last PWAC. We agreed to extend the process to be able to bring to PWAC but the last PWAC got canceled.</p> <p>David Soma- May need to meet with Randy Loomans on the process of rulemaking. There are timelines that have to be met. If you do not want to comment, that is your right but comment or not it will go to Judy.</p> <p>Steve McLain- When the PWAC recommends a new scope a slightly different process is followed.</p> <p>Bruce Chattin- Thinks Dave Johnson's motion is right on. Would like more information but doesn't want to prolong request.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Dave Johnson- The hearing process flushes out if this affects other scopes. Does this impact other scopes? We were told no. If this is the case, and the request needs to move forward per statute, I motion to move the request forward to rulemaking. Just heard about monetary problem the two (2) different scopes is causing during the survey process. Enough information provided to move to hearing for discussion.</p> <p>Miriam Moses- Stakeholders would like copies of the request letter.</p> <p>Dave Johnson motioned to move the Laborers in Utility Construction request forward to rule making.</p> <p>Lee Newgent seconded motion.</p> <p>All in favor.</p> <p>Utilities Construction (Underground Sewers and Water Lines) request tabled until further information is provided. There was no discussion on this request.</p> <p>December 2010 PWAC meeting needs to be moved from Tukwila due to Judy Schurke needing the room. The meeting will need to either be in Tumwater or someone will have to volunteer to host the meeting.</p> <p>Lee Newgent will try to find a public room in Seattle.</p> <p>Steve McLain- There is a new regulation for State agencies to follow. The agency must receive approval from OFM before using another facility.</p> <p>Once there is a date and place confirmed, we will send out notices to the committee and the listserv.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Bruce Chattin- Cannot attend the scopes meeting but wants to know if the Truck Drivers scope will move forward before or after the survey process is defined.</p> <p>David Soma- Anything for the good of the order?</p> <p>Nothing</p> <p>Adjourned at 11:55 am</p>	
<p>Dates and Locations for upcoming meetings</p>	<p>Next meeting will be:</p> <p>September 15, 2010 Tumwater – Room 119 9:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.</p> <p>Scopes 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.</p>	