

# 2020.0710 ACEC/WSDOT PD Meeting

Friday, July 10, 2020

9:04 AM

## Staff Updates

- Mike Fleming & John Donahue
  - Craig McDaniel/Construction retired John Deffenbacher filled spot
  - John Nisbet - not filled
  - Kara Larsen - not filled
  - On hiring freeze, have backfilled a few critical positions with approval of Assistant Secretaries
- Manuel Feliberti
  - WSDOT furlough - mostly under DB so not affected
- Steve Olling
  - Some furlough impact - some confusion 80% this week then 95% following weeks, looking at it by contract
  - Overall holding steady, not actively recruiting
- Ben Hoppe
  - Same as Steve mentioned
  - Open to opportunities
  - Mostly not affected by furloughs
- Suryata Halim
  - Multiple TO's on 520 - some
  - All-inclusive (80% furlough interpretation)
- Chuck Meade
  - Steve Kim, Traffic Engineer hired, temp backfill Manual Abarka, rotation with Sara Barke, 6 month rotations
  - ROW Manager - retiring - looking to backfill, likely look internally at least initially
  - Dave Ziegler is retired, distributing responsibilities internally
- Larry Larson
  - Had a few E3/E2 vacancies that were on the verge of filling that are on hold
  - Staff getting tired of situation
  - Telework is a blessing and curse, people like but not efficient for workflow and communication at full time
- Lisa Reid
  - Steady
  - Furlough - all project interpretation

## PD Team Membership

- Lisa - Reaching out to increase the ACEC membership, has some calls out and will hopefully have a few candidates for next month

## Miscellaneous Updates (Training/Workshops/Policy)

- John Donahue - Manual Updates
  - Major annual updates for DM (out now) and Std Plans (mostly complete)
  - 300 - Design Documentation - brand new because reorg and others
  - 1600, 1610 - Roadside Safety - clear zone immediately adjacent to but not in the clear zone, simplistic guidance on where to install what barriers, embedded discussion of test levels

- Adapting to action plan for guardrail review with FHWA last year, gaps in guardrail runs, pavement leave outs, eliminate gaps so don't have end treatments
- Talking with Lisa - want to make sure you're aware of a process, want to formalize a bit how we're disseminating info, consolidate comments coming back, Lisa is POC for ACEC and will consolidate feedback, ACEC good candidate - falls within the expectations of this group to review instead of more random one-off consultant reviews
- Suryata - sounds great to capture the greater audience, 520 program has been good disseminating reviews and consolidating info, per John that works too
- Standard Plans - about 50 updates, about a dozen new plans, mostly new F shaped barriers and transitions to other barriers, a few will make it to standard plans and some will be in the plan sheet library as they are becoming full details - removing 27 plans in total (mostly related to barriers again, and cleaning up things that aren't necessarily standard, noise walls that have barriers integrated into them - weren't tested in MASH TL3 and TL4, coming up with the minimum offset for the standard generic walls
- In terms of reviewing standard plans, are we getting those through other channels, typically Bill relies on the SME and staff they know, will be reaching out to AGC, could offer to this group as well, Suryata - thinks that it is relevant to this team)
- At end of the std plan cycle now so won't see for a while.
- Mentioned plan sheet library - use for transition of retired std plans and others that aren't available yet - categorized, roadside safety will not have CAD plans, HQ will stamp and provide as needed, f-shape barrier will be available there too
- Training and workshops
  - Starting conversations of getting back to some type of in-person training, if can put the proper precautions in place and limit numbers believe it's feasible approach
  - John - specifics PD process, schedule trainings (virtual delivery), right now working on scheduling and specification writing, looking at quality management and combined or separate from constructability
  - If we have workshops coming up may want to push them up the line for approval. Don't shy away from pursuing them - part of our mainstream delivery even if it means a new contract
- Budget
  - Latest news (yesterday) - thinking this biennium won't be as bad as initially thought, don't think we'll need to take as drastic measures as assumed
  - Next biennium - won't have advantage of underspent budgets so believe there will be a greater impact
  - Fed stimulus - still on the table but no movement yet
  - More likely than not - no special session this year to fill gaps
  - Pulled into conversations related to federal funding uncertainty - how states plan and use it - WSDOT 30% of our funding from feds - biggest source for preservation - if you look at historical funding from feds there is some volatility - did a survey of all states and 6 are making a deeper dive including WSDOT
  - Suryata - asked about next biennium - isn't the budget supposed to be starting planning in Sept or so this year - are there expectations of listings of projects being impacted
  - Mike - yes - some relying on the federal stimulus element. Will have impacts on operations and capital budgets, planning starts about now and can only make assumptions until fed picture clears - can make assumption of what to do if feds don't do anything - likely similar to the pause list at least for projects. Need to figure out the split of reductions on operations/capital impacts (regions hearing the same). More to come in future.

### State furloughs/Related consultant letter

- 4-days in July, then a day a month until the end of the year. Reviewed the WSDOT letter. Equates to a 20% reduction in July then a 5% reduction afterward. Thought is partners (consultants) are feeling the same. Would add that if there is something that is mission critical, then there is likely some latitude. No additional information. Contracts vs projects - more holistic approach looking at the entire month. Consensus that it doesn't apply to DB.

### Final consultant evaluation form/process revisions

- Word and PDF shared this week - PDF is the cleaned up version
- Any additional concerns?
- Larry - do instructions match the existing criteria - looks like it's not as simplified as the form? Mike thinks they were revised accordingly
- Superior, Above Standard, Meets Standard, Below Standard, Poor ratings remain
- Need justification for anything outside standard and standard + above/below ratings.
- There should be an explanation that standard is expected - not a C grade. Would bring consistency statewide. Subjective statement still per Mike because situational because of different teams.
- Larry - how do you make teams feel like
- Lisa - maybe something like 80% of teams will be meets standard
- Mike is wary - don't want to set expectation that its ok sometimes to be below standard
- Larry will craft a sentence today and send to team:
- Suryata - perhaps on the overall rating after #7 have a field to add a comment
- Manual chapter will need to be simplified with this. Team generally liked the one-page approach combined with the form. See what CSO wants to do with the appendix
- Planning to get turned over soon for implementation  
The evaluator and the consultant should understand and discuss at the beginning of the work and during the evaluation process that a "Meets Standard" score should be interpreted as a positive score.
- It simply means that the product was delivered as expected and that it meets the requirements of the work. As a reference, a "Meets Standard" score would indicate that the product was similar to what WSDOT would expect from a typical design team from WSDOT. | I

### Future focus areas/next steps

## Focus Areas

- Design Build Design Approval
  - Conceptual Design Approval (DA) – **In Progress**
  - DA Package at Proposal Stage in DB Manual – **In Progress**
- Project Delivery Tools
  - Project Delivery Method Selection Guidance revisions - **Complete**
- Design Build
  - Pre-procurement DB Manual Updates – **Complete**
  - DB Template Section 2 Elements Update – **In Progress**
  - DB Selection Process – **Not Started**
- Policy Updates
  - Design Manual Chapter Reviews – **Ongoing**

- DB/AGC team - some concern with the rollout of the DB Design Approval approach. Dean Moon is taking lead with approach to roll-out. Instead of asking the Design builder to come up with the repackaging, were asking the design builder to make info available, then packaging up and making it available in one place - lots of info there, it's just the packaging of it.
- DB Template - Section 2 elements - changed several times, some implemented after sent to construction, some revised again with design approval changes and including edits we had
- DB selection process - what criteria - how scoring - are we looking at the right things - Keep on our list
- Policy updates - ongoing, Lisa working with John

#### ➤ Delivery Process Improvement

- Evaluation of SHRP2 C19 Expediting Project Delivery strategies – **In Progress**
- Measuring Quality – **Not Started**
- Antiquated Documentation Requirements – **Not Started**

#### ➤ CEVP/CRA/VE

- Best Practices and Applications – **Not Started**
- Policy/Guidance Review and Updates – **Not Started**

#### ➤ Electronic Files For Bidding Purposes – **In Progress**

#### ➤ Consultant Evaluation Process Update – **In Progress**

- SHRP2 - weren't a lot that we were not looking at, could drop out or take one last look as a group. Drop from our list
- Measuring Quality - ties to cost estimating and plan quality, we were struggling with metric to measure quality, # change orders, # of addenda, idea - how do we know we're getting a quality project, do we want to retain? Also consistence of QA documentation per Steve Olling. Keep on our list
- Antiquated Documentation Requirements - related to looking at documentation and processes we have in place, (e.g. ICE, CAR... does it all still make sense?) - is it still relevant or something we should look at closer? Not necessarily related to section 300 changes - those are more organizational changes, etc. Take all the documents in 300 that are required, are they still relevant and required? Keep on our list
- CVEP/CRA/VE Best Practices and Applications - came from frustration about the process, maybe related to timing, we have federal process, DB process where we're silent, should we be making policy revisions and how do we apply these tools. We've been encouraging non-traditional, targeted, VE instead of traditional analysis, how can we structure to be more objective to compare alternatives and tradeoffs of alternatives in a more structured format - 2 things - what is the policy /guidance on VE and how is it used. Also ties to quality training and plan that we're working on - streamline into one process. Keep on the List
- Electronic Files for Bidding Purposes - we've been a bit remiss checking in on the projects that have piloted these. Providing the surfaces and alignments during bidding. Need to follow up first with the ad & award office to see where the projects are and with the teams to see what their experience is? What about risk to consultant - one thing we discussed ~2 years ago is the standard language on our bidding and the website for Ad & Award. We don't get the design perfect in surfaces and we post process the surface, would have to do that process before the bidding. Chuck: In Lacey - did use the disclaimer on the DDI advertisement and only got positive feedback - did take a few weeks of effort to clean up files so share ready - was beneficial. Doesn't have to be a big issue for what the contractor is interested in - more big picture. Mike will follow up. Keep on the list

- Anything else to add to our brainstorming list?
- Best Practices for Remote/Virtual Delivery

**Other**

- Annual Meeting cancelled until further notice.
  - Meeting coming up to discuss