

Greenfield & Ft Wayne Indiana Transportation Team Joint Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting date Nov. 8, 2019

Minutes

- 1) Constructability
 - a) Base constructability on Stage 2 plans (60%). Stage 2 plans should already be publicly available through NEPA (National Environmental Protection Act) process. Need to make sure there are not any legal issues if plans are released before the NEPA process is conducted?
 - b) Use 18 month letting list to post availability of Stage 2 plans.
 - c) INDOT/Designers could markup Stage 2 plans to solicit input from contractors on certain aspects of the project during constructability review.
 - d) Have input of contractor constructability review be anonymous (no names).
 - e) Need to watch for unintentional bias (i.e. depending on where a particular contractor's plant site is located may influence how they view the best way to set up MOT is).
 - f) There is some concern if Stage 2 plans provide enough detail to allow the contractor to understand the project enough to be able to provide a constructability review. It was mentioned perhaps Stage 3 plans would be better for doing constructability review, but too many things (ROW, Utilities, and Drainage) are already locked in by Stage 3 plans which would make modifications difficult. One suggestion was could there be plans available at some point between Stage 2 & 3 before things are locked?
 - g) INDOT has two primary concerns they would like contractors to focus on during constructability review which are utilities & geotech issues.
 - h) Constructability review should include both identifying issues and offering proposed solutions (i.e. a new sidewalk runs along the ROW offset 1 foot but based on your experience you know you need at least 3 ft. to pour the sidewalk efficiently you propose additional ROW). INDOT mentioned ROW normally gets purchased between Stage 2 & 3.
 - i) Limit constructability reviews to feasible projects one which require permits, additional ROW or present challenges. The group really did not see much need to do constructability reviews on projects like mill & fill.
 - j) Advertise and offer longer Q&A period before bid date possibly 8 weeks. Particularly incorporate this longer Q&A period on major and/or complicated projects. Ideally, having the longer Q&A period would help alleviate the last minute (during final week before bid) type questions.
 - k) Contractors would like to see the heavy letting months (major projects and projects requiring a lot of materials) be let more in the late fall time frame (like they used to be). Currently, these types of projects are let in the winter months (Jan, Feb & Mar) which does not allow much time for planning and material procurement before the construction season starts.

- l) Partnering
 - a) There should be two levels of Partnering. A high level for major and complicated projects. Then a lower level that would cover all remaining projects.
 - b) High level Partnering would incorporate the use of an out facilitator and have structured meeting format & schedule.
 - c) Partnering meeting should be open to the public and participation from local stake holders should be strongly encouraged especially on LPA projects. Ideally on LPA projects the ERC for LPA is the person who attends.
 - d) Two most important thing to include in Partnering is the establishment of an escalation ladder for issues. An escalation ladder will help alleviate tension on various levels (most importantly project level) of the project when a resolution cannot be reached. Second is the involvement of the designer throughout the project.
 - e) There should be a standard template developed for Partnering so the process is uniform across the State. INDOT Area Engineer ideas and support of this template are crucial. This template should include a list of topics that are customizable to each individual projects needs (i.e.CO, time ext., plan errors, estimates, etc.).
 - f) Partnering meetings should be on a bi-weekly basis or as needed should the situation warrant. Ideally Partnering should be incorporated into the progress meeting.
 - g) At completion of a project a review of the design should be provided to the designer. Both the contractor and INDOT should submit a review. In addition there should be a project closeout meeting with the designer present.
 - h) Anything that is part of the Little P process should be automatically incorporated into the Big P process.
 - i) On Little P projects should the situation arise there should be the option for any stakeholder involved to request that an outside facilitator be brought in.
 - j) For all partnering meeting minutes are kept and made available timely to all stakeholders.