

ACEC/ITD Liaison Committee

Meeting Notes from 2-7-2018 Quarterly Meeting

ATTENDEES:

Monica Crider/ITD	Tracy Ellwein/HDR
Mike Cram/ITD	Jim Porter/JUB
Kevin Sablan/ITD	Bryan Foote / Horrocks
Bill Russell/T-O	Rex Hansen/American Geo.
Jason Giard/FHWA	Ryan Olsen/Terracon
Justin Walker / Keller	Paul Wasser / Strata

ABSENT: Vance Henry / Lochner

PREPARED BY: Paul Wasser and Tracy Ellwein

MEETING DATE: February 7, 2018

The agenda for this meeting focused on the following topics:

Old Business

1. WAQTC certifications/training and reciprocity requirements – Bryan

Set up meeting for Feb 22 at 1:30 PM to brainstorm on expediting the certification process and if there may be ways for reciprocity. Attendees: John Bilderback, John Stone, Rich Kinder, Kyle Holman, Bryan Foote and Garth Newman.

2. Sharing of meeting notes on ProjectWise or other outlets – Mike Cram

Notes are posted on the ITD website, under "Doing Business with ITD". In the future Mike will send out a link for the agenda that is posted on the website.

3. ACEC National initiative for lump sum (LS) contracting – Bryan/Vance

Bryan gave an overview of LS contracting experience when he worked in Colorado. Key's for LS projects: well defined scope of work and budget. CDOT was pushing this process. Primary benefit was in the invoicing process. The real savings comes in the direct costs by not having to chase receipts and back-up. There is a lot of effort in preparing a detailed invoice on a CPFF contract. This would greatly reduce the invoicing review process and potentially reduce overhead rates. It also minimizes scope creep.

The percent complete invoicing is determined by milestones in the scope of work and schedule.

There was a discussion regarding cost benefits and potential overhead reductions.

Questions was asked if this is something that CAU can consider.

Monica asked if LS really is a benefit or if the real problem is the current invoicing process. She asked the ACEC committee to gather information from the CDOT experience or other experiences. She would like to see what the parameters for LS contracting would be. She is concerned that this would be limited by ITD's current financial systems.

Jason Giard was not aware if FHWA has LS contracting. However, he did note that FAA does allow for LS contracting.

Committee committed to provide some case study information on examples from CDOT or others. Monica also expressed a desire to track metrics that would demonstrate the benefits in a pilot program.

New Business

1. ITD Program Delivery Conference – April 2-4. Tracy/Bill

ITD has invited ACEC to do a roundtable panel discussion at the upcoming conference in April. The ACEC group met to brainstorm some topics and suggested the panel discussion be centered around these 3 areas: 1- Project startup, 2- Project execution, 3- CE&I.

ACEC to provide a panel (4-5) to present this information and those members to represent a diversity of experience, firm size and ages. Group discussion led to this roundtable being more of a conversation without a set agenda to include discussion between the ITD attendees and the panel. Many of those attending will have less than five years of experience with ITD in their current role. On the consultant side – project managers are more likely to have 10 to 15 years of experience. Monica agreed to be the moderator and ACEC will have a co-moderator. The moderators will have questions ready to initiate the dialog. Discussion proceeded regarding how to make the session more interactive. The idea evolved into keeping it closer to a dialogue; following the project development (scoping), execution (for both design and construction projects) and then the actual construction of the project. Once the members of the panel are picked, Tracy/Bill to get with Monica.

The Social Mixer following the panel discussion– proposed to be 1.5 hour and ACEC member firms will sponsor some light appetizers. We have 17 firms committed to sponsor the social. ACEC expressed concern of low attendance by ITD staff. Committee members asked if ITD could emphasized this event in the earlier sessions and encourage ITD staff to attend. ITD suggested placing the roundtable at the end of the day, prior to the social hour so that conversations from the roundtable can move into the social. A suggestion was made to have a raffle at the end for a few door prizes.

2. New CADD standards coming – Mike

Beau Hansen has new CADD standard in works. New guide book anticipated April 1, 2018. Mike was not aware of the extent of the revisions. Jason Giard stated that it would be an example plan set.

3. ITS projects & ETS involvement – Kevin

Big challenge is getting ITS connected to the network for projects. Enterprise Technology Services (IT group for ITD) is referred to as the ETS. Any projects that include ITS connections must include ETS staff at scoping of the project. This includes items such as CCTV, counters, weather stations, traffic signals, etc. ETS determines what is available at the project site for the connectivity. This often is a last-minute effort. Monica suggested that ETS needs to be involved at scoping and scope items need to be include to address this early on in the project. ETS' responsibility is connectivity, not signal timing or timing changes. Mike noted that all ITD IT staff will be rolled into one group – ETS. The ITD Project Manager to include ETS and consultant PM's need to be aware of the need.

4. MASH Guardrail memo – Kevin / Mike

The memo has been distributed to ACEC members firms. MASH terminals will be required for all FY19 projects. Tracy noted the Bridge Rail conflicts. Jason Giard stated that standard drawings will not be available until next year. All FY19 projects that are submitted must use MASH terminals.

5. New Conflict of Interest policies coming – Mike

ITD is moving toward allowing the same firm to perform both design and CE&I on the same project. No specific date has been established, but Mike hopes to have it

implemented in the next 2 to 3 months. QBS will still be followed for both design and CE&I agreements. A question was asked regarding the Consultant Resident Engineers. Monica stated that the federal regulations require the State to be in responsible charge and the ITD RE's are ITD's assigned member with responsible charge. No other states are doing this. This will likely require a certification on every project regarding the Conflict of Interest policy. This will not change the direct select process for design.

6. Accessibility to Project Record information to Consultants (as-builts, bridge inspections, GPR and FWD, materials reports) – Justin

Justin mentioned that some states actually post this type of information to the general public. If this is not a heavy-lift effort could this be done by ITD?

7. Specifications Update - Jason. Jason stated that updates are being made to the spec book – Special Provisions will not be in the Spec Book. First meeting is Feb 14th. The new spec book will come out in April. A question was asked about how will this impact on-going projects? Monica stated that this needs to be coordinated with the roll-out schedule. Suggestion was made that this be an effective date, and that it be the same each year. This will be another significant change, similar to 2017. Jim will send the draft 2018 Spec Book to the committee. He asked for our feedback for the 14th meeting.

8. District Engineers and other operations staff joined in the meeting for 30 mins.

Self-introductions were made. The following topics were discussed.

- a. Expediting the procurement process to get under contract to meet accelerated project schedules. ACEC suggest some ideas to help get projects under contract and started faster and efficient. A pre-NTP to start survey, geotech, cultural resources right out of the gate at notice of award. This is needed on almost every project, so get consultants started while we develop the detailed scope. A \$30k to \$50k pre-NTP on a large project. At times, ITD staff want to revise the scope during consultant scoping due to budget or unknowns and this delays the process. It would be helpful to get the project started and then work through the unknowns in supplemental agreements. Scope the project in phases, like through Concept or Preliminary. District are doing early identification of project needs and could

potentially put this out through the Term Agreement to accomplish it prior to individual project selection and scoping.

- b. HQ Environmental transition and document reviews with Sue Sullivan retiring and Nicolle Brasspennix. (Corps) transfer to N. Carolina. An announcement is out for Sue's replacement and there are other senior environmental planners to review documents and Cat Ex. All others permitting will still need to go to Corp of Engineers. It will take 4 or 5 months to fill Nicolle's this position. In the interim, work with local Corp representative. The challenge is that they are not a dedicated resource. This may impact project schedules since ITD has no influence over speeding up this process.
- c. Topic Ideas for the Program Delivery Conference. Group reviewed the topics discussed earlier in the agenda with the District Engineer's (DE) and Operations staff. ITD gave an overview of the PDC and ACEC's involvement and ACEC gave an overview of the topics ACEC's group has developed along with how the session would be structured. ITD had done with AGC last year and that it was a great session that was is beneficial for AGC, but also ITD and the general public. ITD asked if there are things that ITD does that simply complicate the project process for consultants, please share those so we can all work better together.
- d. What are consultants doing well and what can we do better for you.

The ITD staff shared these items.

- Very appreciative of the staff augmentation
- Consultants have been very responsive to accepting challenging time frames
- Like the partnerships that have been formed lately
- The public outreach has been impressive
- The willingness to walk step-by-step with staff and wants consultants to help with transfer of knowledge to his staff
- Identifying potential project issues early on
- Consultants have been very responsive to focusing on the RFPs and less work on the Term Agreement, including the need to increase the limits.
- Find ways to reduce sheet count while providing the required info

- Changes coming to the ITD 771 form that should provide better and timelier feedback on consultant performance.
- e. DE's asked ACEC for input/suggestions and these items were shared.
- Special provisions and how plans are presented, varies by District
 - Getting legacy soil/rock information would be very helpful and avoid additional work.
 - Having access to those responsible for upcoming/future projects. DE's noted that some are limiting contact to the engineering managers because it can eat up a lot of time for their staff to discuss projects with numerous consultants.

2018 2nd quarter meeting date to be set.