

Indiana Transportation Team Meeting Notes

Partnering

- A. What are the top things that can be done to add value to partnering?
1. Ensure appropriate stakeholders are given the opportunity to attend and participate.
 2. Relationship building between designer/contractor/INDOT construction management (and other stakeholders...utilities, regulatory agencies, emergency management, locals, etc.)
 3. Includes respect, comfort, trust, confidence.
 4. Establish project expectations with entire group.
 5. Understand everyone's role(s) on project.
 6. Don't focus on the checklist.
 7. More discussions. Includes tough conversations.
 8. More diversity in partnering options.
 9. Don't make the partnering meeting about surprise issues.
 10. Get designers involved!!!
 11. Keep everyone involved from kickoff meeting through project to end.
 12. Any challenges issued through partnering – find a way to bring it full circle and show it was accomplished. Example – designer follows up with construction after project lets.
 13. Spend more time on relationships/partnering goal agreement statement at pre-cons.
 14. Interactive feedback loop – make website more public; way to ask questions and get answers.
 15. Invite designer to construction status meetings.
 16. Make pre-cons more inviting – donuts/coffee/snacks; more a conversation than a list of rules.
 17. Constructability review by design consultant's construction inspection groups.
 18. Consultants and INDOT have good relationship. Contractor and INDOT have good relationship. Consultants and Contractors have bad relationship.
 19. Involve Consultants with change orders.
 20. As-builts to Consultants.
 21. Have a design pre-con meeting, 2 months after award to discuss project – INDOT/Consultant/Contractor.
 22. Design/constructability discussion – informal following pre-con meeting.
 23. Bring Consultant to pre-final meeting.
 24. Expand/enhance pre-con conference.
 25. Initiative to bring utilities on board.
 26. Establish/assign expectations and accountability.
 27. Incentivize.
 28. Expand/enhance progress meetings.
 29. Responsiveness/timeliness on issues.
 30. Expand Design-Build.
 31. Expand/Enhance pre-bid Q & A.
 32. Allow flexibility/discretion.

33. Open lines of communication.
34. Accountability for job. Do what you say you are going to do.
35. Trust and transparency (no hidden agenda).
36. Responsiveness to issues.
37. Same level of expectations, understanding of work being done.
38. Conflict resolution, understand we all are trying to get to the same finish line.
39. Contractors need to be compensated for work completed in a timely manner.
40. Mutual respect on both sides.
41. From Contractor, streamline decision making.
42. More frequent networking.
43. Create a way for Contractors to perform or add input during constructability reviews. Would eliminate their bidding possibility, but if they could receive compensation for this work, it would help find errors/omissions in projects and reduce construction changes/change orders.
44. Have it be a way of doing business.
45. Know who is running the job prior to pre-con.
46. Not have too much excess time required, be efficient and effective with time spent.
47. Communication and burying old problems (previous contracts).
48. Bringing specification committee into the partnering group.
49. Built-in flexibility for innovation. Going through the standards committee is a long process.
50. Communicate early to suppliers (update project schedules) when dates move. Sliding a large project by 2 months could have a huge impact on a supplier.
51. Continue to establish lines of communication/expectations for responsiveness.
52. Copy designer on change orders (not consistently happening).
53. Establish consensus project priorities at outset.
54. Establish accountability.
55. Potential collaboration with Consultants scoring potential future Design-Built partners.
56. Start with an even playing field. Do not have any pre-conceived notions about past relationships or working experience.
57. Good/proactive communication outside of partnering meetings/sessions to fully commit to partnering between design, construction and contractor.
58. Try to incorporate several experienced individuals into the process to add different points of view.
59. Establish requirements for and make sure facilitator follows them, have "prequalified" list or require training before they can facilitate, recommend that they have construction experience in their past.
60. INDOT and contractor required to go through training on partnering, official partnering requires them to lead once every three months.
61. Encourage more interaction outside of work. Eat meals together, talk about other people's families, etc.
62. Establish ground rules, "recovery" process if things start going poorly on full partnering and "unofficial" partnering.

63. Communicate!
64. Discuss job performance on an ongoing basis so there are no surprises at the end.
65. Clearly defining responsibilities and roles of the team.
66. Clearly communicate.
67. Establishing schedules and timelines, due dates.
68. Accountability. Take ownership of the project.
69. Establishing respect, trust, honesty. Everyone is a stakeholder.
70. Have an open mind. Check the ego.
71. Assigned arbitrator to resolve differences.
72. "Right size" partnering effort/scope.
73. Be respectful of team members time. Balance the needs of project.
74. Have decision makers at the meeting and formal decision-making process. Quality stakeholders, committed to project and partnering.
75. Structured meetings with agenda published well ahead of time and prompt follow up with minutes/record of decisions.
76. Make time for developing commitment to team/project/partnering. Make meetings more than just progress meetings.
77. Improve relationship and accountability with utilities. Utility conflicts cause most issues.
78. Incorporate the designer into partnering handbook.
79. Incorporate project history or transfer of knowledge in the pre-con meeting, with contractor from the designer.
80. Improve connection between PS and designer, by spending the time in direct communication.
81. EOR/representative should be at every pre-con job.
82. Having decision makers present (all stakeholders).
83. Having knowledgeable reps at the meeting.
84. Partnering start between INDOT and designer before contractor is known.
85. Create flow chart of who can answer related questions – a list of who to go to if a situation arises.
86. Partnering agent may need to step up outside the meetings to chase down unresolved issues/questions from the decision makers – help speed up any unresolved issue/concern.
87. Determine the uniqueness of each project, they're not all going to fit into same mold.
88. Consistent attendance by "decision makers" at partnering meetings.
89. Continue facilitated sessions to keep topics balanced.
90. Consider utilizing not only on high \$ jobs, but on those complicated urban jobs, including LPA work where appropriate.
91. Identify high-importance, unique elements – discussion about mindset of USPS at the onset of the job.
92. Collaboration up front, email for documentation as issues are resolved – communication.
93. More robust pre-con meetings to address, even if partnering isn't utilized.
94. Meet onsite for progress meeting.

95. Discuss both current schedule and future schedule, early and often.
 96. Include foremen, HTs and laborers in project discussions.
 97. Continuously update schedule with minimal changes.
 98. Get appropriate players to progress (partnering) meetings.
 99. Decide if onsite or office meetings are appropriate – adjust if necessary.
 100. Solution focused when issues arise, don't point fingers.
 101. Progress meetings – add designers to meetings.
 102. Facilitator for meetings.
 103. Let people know when projects are going well, not just when they have problems.
- B. Relative to project size or complexity, how could partnering be scaled to make it appropriate for the project?
1. Project scope specific - # of participants could / will vary.
 2. Establish “right” meeting frequency based on size / complexity / scope.
 3. So partnering is not only for larger jobs?
 4. We can use the partnering concepts with lower level personnel.
 5. W/O facilitators if people buy into concepts.
 6. We should really be doing this on every job.
 7. Timely transparency in the field all the way up the chain.
 8. No more wasted time for decisions from INDOT to Contractor to Design and then back.
 9. Set realistic conflict resolution timelines depending on project complexity and stick to them.
 10. Complete partnering goal statement for each project at minimum.
 11. Always have discussion at pre-con meeting, at least one touch point during project, and pre-final meeting.
 12. More involvement for big projects.
 13. Partnering should be scaled by risk, not size.
 14. The number of stakeholders on a specific contract.
 15. Cost relevant based on contract amount.
 16. Based on the location.
 17. Based on size/complexity/location of project, reduce number of decision makers.
 18. Utilize social media more to get input from the public. Project specific “posts/groups/threats” to provide open communication between Project and Public.
 19. Identify scale of project during constructability reviews. Label projects as a certain size and request level of partnering required.
 20. Make the most of the pre-con and progress meetings to include partnering.
 21. Include it on time sets again?
 22. Difficult to decide prior to award sometimes because it depends on who gets the contract.
 23. Partnering is not scalable - Chris Serak
 24. Use partnering meetings for large projects.
 25. Establish flexible process that can be scaled to project size.
 26. Provide guidelines/recommendations regarding scaling.

27. Incorporate partnering into progress meetings on smaller scale projects.
 28. Add partnering goals statement development to pre-con for small and medium sized contracts.
 29. Large projects, scale down meeting, have more “stock”/general template and make it job specific during the meeting.
 30. On larger projects, identify communication lines and pass information to everyone.
 31. Establish roles, define roles.
 32. Smaller projects, have individuals take on multiple roles. Larger projects assign votes/responsibilities appropriately.
 33. Make documents available to the team for sharing and collaboration. Use collaboration software.
 34. Establish clear schedule and set appropriate progress meeting schedule.
 35. Means for communicating “hot issues” and assessment of impacts to stakeholders.
 36. Frequency related to complexity.
 37. Count of people/type of people need to be appropriate for relevant topics.
 38. Set expectations at pre-con.
 39. Facilitator once a certain complexity/scale is reached or conflict is anticipated. For lesser projects, designated team member as a partnering lead to set meetings, run meetings, but not serve as a “final” arbitrator of discussions.
 40. Format of meetings. Conference calls, face to face, etc. Use as appropriate.
 41. EOR/representative at pre-con meetings, the scale shall size with the meeting, small contract = small meeting.
 42. EOR/representative shall be required to be at pre-con and provide summary of project highlights/issues.
 43. Revisit of the team, per phase during construction for larger jobs. Figure out the frequency of meetings per project. Varies per size and complexity.
 44. On larger projects, start partnering before letting.
 45. Contract size or complexion may affect who is needed at partnering meeting.
 46. Create a matrix to determine who the players are.
 47. Regardless of project size, some mention/discussion of partnering in every pre-con, make this part of the agenda.
 48. A conscious decision during design/contract prep about whether partnering is appropriate. Opportunities for contractors to request during letting.
 49. Adopt the mindset of “is partnering NOT needed?” partnering in this context = pay item
 50. Progress meetings with everyone involved.
 51. Being fair.
 52. Get to know people on a personal level.
 53. Everyone go to lunch, less formal environment.
 54. Solution focused and working with people.
- C. What is the right forum to establish project specific objectives / goals for partnering?
1. Initial kickoff meeting immediately after pre.
 2. Led by strong and effective communicator / facilitator.

3. Initial outreach is important.
4. Allow everyone to provide input, but limit decision makers.
5. Preconstruction conference.
6. Meetings like this (what does each rep Design/INDOT/Contractor want/expect from partnering?)
7. Post construction / lessons learned partnering meetings with all kickoff attendees.
8. Pre-cons.
9. Start partnering at kickoff meetings. Design/Construction/CPM
10. Pre-con meeting
11. Kickoff/partnering meeting before pre-con.
12. Item must be included "pre-bid".
13. Getting together more frequently in smaller groups.
14. Face to face, open communication format, actually meeting people in person.
15. For the Contractor:
 - i. At bidding, line up suppliers and subs and haulers
 - ii. Q&A input
 - iii. Possibly at constructability review
16. For INDOT:
 - i. At pre-con
 - a. Did the Contractor bring all submittals and come prepared?
 - b. Honest schedule with open expectations about changes.
17. Progress meetings should be partnering meetings.
18. Through discussion with parties at outset, establish consensus goals for specific project. There are common management techniques to accomplish this without a partnering consultant.
19. Contract information book, progress meetings
20. Discuss partnering/goals at pre-cons or hold mini sessions after pre-cons with design, construction, contractors.
21. Pre-con for small/medium sized contracts, large contracts would require a separate meeting, but recommend shortening the length.
22. Have a shared/collaboration space such as Microsoft Teams.
23. Flexibility and willingness to use different forums.
24. Maintain face to face time on a regular basis, but do not meet just to meet.
25. Allow all stakeholders to weigh in.
26. Problem solving meetings.
27. Team leaders to direct.
28. Not pre-con, needs to be a separate meeting.
29. Environment needs to foster trust and personal relationships.
30. Make goals personal.
31. Goals sized to be proactive.
32. Initial partnering meeting. Establish a "contract".
33. Intermittent use of teleconferencing, especially for follow ups. Primary partnering should be face to face when updating partnering tasks as opposed to project tasks.

34. For smaller, most jobs, have a window inside the pre-con meeting. For larger projects, separate meeting, potentially for just utilities. Separate engineers from utilities.
35. Focus on how to have value to meeting, by planning who meets when.
36. Kick-off meeting, to deliver contract structure.
37. Each project is unique, each set of goals may not fit the cookie cutter mold.
38. Designers and contractors each need to prepare a "list" for discussion at either the pre-con or at the pre-bid if scheduled.
39. Pre-construction meeting or pre-mobilized meeting.
40. Meetings
41. Lunch informal, different setting
42. Redo pre-con meetings, more efficient so there is time for partnering.

Performance Review Process

- A. What adjustments need to be made to project delivery and construction to adjust to the new CR2 / CPE scoring system?
 1. Attempt to minimize scoring / rating subjectivity, make it more objective.
 2. Can rating criteria / evaluation be modified to a particular project?
 3. Provide the INDOT and INDOT representatives, PE/ PS, AE, consultant, training on evaluation criteria.
 4. Attempt to incorporate measurables with contractor submittals. E&SC inspection reports, MOT reports, QCPs, extra work / change order time and estimate justification.
 5. Are the current (93) CPE questions all needed? Some redundant?
 6. Input from contractors regarding recommendations/concerns with CPE scoring questions.
 7. Designers/CPMs continuing to work toward better/common sense letting dates, project delivery on-time.
 8. Designers/CPMs continuing to minimize plan errors as much as possible, on-time on budget.
 9. Don't be afraid to ask letting questions.
 10. Allowing Contractor to review Stage 2 plans and honestly provide comments, setting aside bid advantages.
 11. Not let jobs with ROW and utility exceptions.
 12. Criteria for scoring CR2 and qty of questions; redundancy in some questions.
 13. Eliminate zeros from scoring.
 14. Add half points to scoring (0.5, 1, 1.5, etc.)
 15. Relevant scaled consequences for non-conformance/negative scores.
 16. Condense/group questions – similar to ¼ questions on design evaluations, matrix for sections.
 17. Require comments on each evaluation.
 18. Link quality adjustment pay items to evaluations.
 19. Transparency of Contractor average score to compare against average.
 20. Transparency about how the scoring works.

21. Removal of subjectivity should be a priority; this shouldn't be a punishment.
22. CPE should be written like a C.O., facts, not opinion.
23. Don't hold Prime responsible for sub issues. Score Prime on how they handle the mistake, not the mistake itself.
24. Perform CPEs quarterly (more frequently).
25. Discuss evaluation criteria with Contractor, make sure expectations are understood.
26. Like the scoring as-is.
27. Make sure only scoring items PEs oversee.
28. Add question about adherence to schedule.
29. Too subjective.
30. Need clearer scoring guidelines, perhaps training on scoring.
31. Progressive scoring for multi season projects.
32. Make +1 the average or expected score. Replace Zero, it's just our human nature optics issue so fix it.
33. Need to add a category/area to more adequately evaluate upper contractor management personnel.
34. Make interface more user friendly based on data.
35. On jobs with multiple disciplines (bridge crews/road crews), there should be a way to evaluate crews differently. Right now, one score applies to entire company.
36. Add section relating to testing/failed materials to indicate contractor's ability to provide quality products.
37. INDOT evaluators must be more willing to fully evaluate the contractors, provide good input, both positive and negative.
38. Require meetings at CPE review time to build relationship (at least with primes).
39. Our table has no experience with this and is not sure what CR2/CPE really is.
40. Don't use abbreviations, not everyone knows.
41. Make information/questions available on website.
42. Utility companies should be scored as well.
43. There are many binary "yes/no" questions but the scoring is on a range. The concern is that the "meets expectations" is all that a contractor can achieve so there is no incentive to do better.
44. Trace overage/trends in scoring by evaluator.
45. Prefer more objective evaluation criteria.
46. There needs to be a measurable way to evaluate INDOT Project Supervisors (PSMs) – NEW
47. Contractor should not have to have their prequalification questioned, reviewed for 1 project with negative score.
48. More objective measurements versus subjective, of the contractor.
49. Aggregate score for multiple projects for contractor, opposed to individual projects.
50. Simplify scoring, so reviewer invests the time.
51. Interim CR2s.
52. Scoring is subjective to individual personalities and yesterday's numbers.
53. Needs to be data driven and eliminate personal feelings.
54. Some option to "rate the day" on dailies to help develop the overall evaluation.

55. Incentivize positive scores with some type of recognition, whether it's via awards or short list opportunities.
56. Meeting with contractor/designer/INDOT to discuss interim review.
57. Discuss issues early and often at progress/partnering meeting.
58. Send preliminary draft notes out for review.
59. Include plan issues/defects CPE consideration for contractor performance.
60. Have project debrief before final CPE.
61. Give intermediate, not just final.
62. Contractor relies on foreman and INDOT project personnel to communicate daily.

B. How will performance scoring impact project delivery and construction?

1. Bad scores can lead to improved performance from Contractors.
2. Can limit efforts from Contractors to only specific CPE criteria.
3. Closing gap between field/project/AE level regarding CPW rating criteria. i.e. most field contractor personnel probably are now aware of anything regarding the CPE process.
4. Develop a reward-based evaluation system to encourage better work by Contractor.
5. Apply a risk matrix to bids with a factor based on performance scores.
6. Quality based selection.
7. Needs to be tied to bidding to have an impact.
8. Reduction in bidding capacity for future work.
9. Prequalification issues.
10. Increased capacity for future work for positive scores.
11. Motivation of Contractor.
12. More frequent scoring could cause better results, quicker. (positive reinforcement or negative impacts)
13. Option for more frequent designer evaluations by construction personnel during construction.
14. Hopefully Contractors will do a better job in field, so they don't get negative scores.
15. Low scores cause only short-term improvement.
16. If continually poor CPE scores, contractor has less bidding ability/amount.
17. Potentially have weighted scores on performance (multipliers at bid time).
18. Hopefully contractors will take the evaluations seriously, responding to both positives and negatives.
19. Should improve quality.
20. Setting expectations.
21. Scoring only affects the prequalification of the contractor.
22. How can the performance be incentivized? Projects are won by low bid, by Fed law.
23. For designers, higher scores open designers to more opportunities.
24. We're unsure, with the effort we're spending on this, there should be some influence.
25. Zero scores are not motivating.
26. INDOT needs to score CPEs thoughtfully.
27. Positive scores imply good work – good contractor – top contractor.
28. Better communication

- C. What myths surround the performance review process that need to be addressed?
1. "No one looks at these"
 2. All/any negative scores = prequal automatically.
 3. They (CPEs) don't mean anything from INDOT and Contractors perspective.
 4. All zero ratings are bad (Contractor).
 5. The opinions of one contract impact scores of another contract.
 6. Reviews are subjective.
 7. Seems overly complicated and too many questions.
 8. Not effective.
 9. Carryover from prior contracts / should be independent of prior opinions of Contractors.
 10. Using CR2 (CPE) as threat.
 11. What happens after the review is complete?
 12. Scores don't matter.
 13. The scores don't matter, or contractors won't be punished.
 14. A negative evaluation (single) does not automatically send to prequal.
 15. The pre-qual guys are not out to "get" contractors; they want to work with contractors.
 16. That one bad score otherwise sinks a good/fair evaluation.
 17. There isn't an opportunity to dispute scores.
 18. Too subjective.
 19. Personnel let personal feelings (animosity) affect the scoring.
 20. Zeroes are satisfactory for contractors.
 21. Not really a myth, but a poor set of plans definitely affects a contractor's no/no-go decision.
 22. Being honest with feedback in your evaluation gains the evaluator more work.
 23. Zero is average contractor, or not a positive to the contractor.
 24. That a zero is good. (designers)
 25. Scoring is subjective (consultants and designers)
 26. Consultants scoring consultants
 27. Contractors can't score INDOT or designers
 28. Intermediate CPE contractors

Misc:

- A. We need a memo explaining and laying out the steps for submitting and approving construction changes.