Plans Review Peer Exchange |MINUTES

May 17th, 2016 | 9:30a.m. -3:00p.m. | Meeting at Bullfrog maintenance facility

Meeting called by John Donahue

Type of meeting Bi-Annual Peer Exchange

Invitees:
Joe Rooney, Lorraine Sagdahl, Joe Long, Bill Donald, Brie Ledbetter, Scott Vestal, Steve Thomson, Dave Bellinger, Dennis Moreland, Greg Elder, Mike Seaward, Marie L'Heureux, Tim Beaudry, Brett Johnson, John Donahue, Thomasa Hume, Denys Tak, Jenna Fettig, Oma Venable, Dan Wisner, Chris Schroedel

AGENDA TOPICS

Time allotted | 9:30.m. – 3:00p.m. | Agenda topic: *Plans Review Peer Exchange Meeting*

Plans Review Support:

Estimate Security –
WSDOT's policy timing for disclosure of the Engineer's estimate; information for reporting if there is suspected fraud occurring and update on revision being made to the EBASE system to increase estimate security.

Practical Design and Plan Review –
Overview of recent revisions to the Design manual that reflect WDOT's practical design efforts. Update on the accompanying training efforts around the state an upcoming opportunities to attend training.

Constructability Reviews -
Chris Schroedel presented the constructability review process, the purpose of these reviews and quality assurance. Additionally resources and tools for conducting constructability reviews

Construction Office Topics:

Reviews and the Construction Office Value Added -
Denys Tak – "Are we doing the right things right?"

- Construction office reviews the P.doc, Special Provisions and Addenda and some plan sheets for consistency and biddability. And poses to the group, are they finding value in these reviews and should the construction office continue with what they are currently doing or work more closely with the design office to conduct more thorough reviews of the ps&e?
  - Get special provision to construction as they are being drafted
  - Regions need to communicate their needs and feedback to the Construction Office so they may be addressed
- HQ Review, bring it back ? Maybe targeted project reviews?
- Quality is very important, without quality reflected in our project plans & specs with good solid designs and a thorough QA/QC process, the projects suffer and we lose credibility.

General comments: There continues to be less time and less resources to conduct reviews, but the Ad dates are not being allowed to be adjusted – Quality Suffers

NWR –

- Construction Office review occurs too late. Is there a possibility that the review can be added to the schedule to occur earlier?
- There is inconsistency in the review received depending on who is reviewing. Is it possible to have more consistency in the Construction office review process?
- A culture shift is needed, the AD Date should not be a measure of success for the Project Engineer.
- Reviewers are currently overwhelmed, and lack the necessary time to ensure quality reviews. It would be a good idea to have HQ Review back. Dedicated project review ensures consistency and reviewers build expertise.

SWR -

It would be very helpful to have a second set of eyes look at the plans sets to help ensure quality.

NCR / ER –

Designers work with construction for early special reviews as they are working on them.
OR -
Having access to Construction reviewers to clarify intent would be beneficial.

Contract Ad & Award Topics:

Kerry Andrews -

- More items showing up out of sequence, please check for these.

Dollar amount and qty for L.S. EST and CALC items, please check for this. Bid correct items sequencing and missing dollar amounts causes errors to occur in BidX which causes an automatic 2 week bid delay.

- GSP's - make sure yours are current, use the docs on the W:/ drive, locally stored documents are susceptible to being out of date. Use Rebecca Howe as your resource for Specifications.

Jenna Fettig –

- Check job for the crack sealing item 5703/5707 – make sure the unit of measure is consistent and correct for the item being used.
- Please do not include Ad & Award in the addendum approval process until the actual addendum is issued. It is still ok to give us a "heads up" when there is a large addendum in the works.
  - (NWR suggests maybe watermarking addenda documents with "DRAFT" until final)
- There is a recent (unknown) change that is holding up funding approval with program management. They seem to be now waiting to see if the apparent winning bidder will actually be the awarded bidder prior to resolving all outstanding issues, but this is not occurring in a timely manner.
- Small Works process is the same as for any HQ project except there is not public Advertisement. Contractors are directly solicited to see if they would or would not like to receive bid documents. Small works opportunities are given to all contractors, they may "opt out" if they are not interested in this work.
  - Small works projects cannot exceed $300,000 – watch the Engineer's Estimate, if it is very close to or exceeds 300k, the project may not qualify for small works.
- All the files in the Plans & Specs folder are part of the Contract.
  - NWR suggests moving some of the contract appendices to the reference area.
  - NWR – It should be indicated whether reference files information is actually part of the contract for those very large reference files.
  - Jenna: only the appendices will be printed.

Dan Wisner – CPDM

Project Management and Reporting system & Electronic Content Management

- How PMRS can support the Plans Review Effort
- Communicating information in a consistent manner
- Enterprise (or Electronic) Content Management (ECM) manages important documents and unstructured information. This system supports key word and full text search across multiple repositories.
- Support & Training for PMRS & ECM

Region Exchange -

Round Table: Plans Office perspective on Quality assurance, News and views for across the state, current and on-going challenges in the Regions, lessons learned.

NWR –

Local agencies are hesitant to issue permits until they know who the contractor is and have a solid schedule, as a result projects are go out without all the permits in hand.

- Suggestion that we add a clause that the Environmental Coordinator will update the plan exibit and it will be accurate in the Ad copy.

NCR -

We need a Standardized Review Period

Project timelines need to include the necessary time for review.

OR -

Looking into Electronic signatures and stamps for electronic submittals

SWR -

Coordination of Combined projects

SCR -

- Review Period flow Chart
- Having some issues with contract assembly – Training is needed
- Need more information/training on how to handle Emergency Projects.
- Having increasing difficulties with Local Agencies wanting their standards incorporated on projects they are participating in. This is causing problems in the contracts with Order of precedence.

ER -

- Organizing reminders to Plan the Review meetings.
- There is a need for experienced personnel to help with the reviews.

Next Meeting: Tele Conference October/November 2016

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
EBASE – Look into the possibility of having EBASE automatically enter the unit price as $1.00 for all L.S., EST. & Calc. items except MOB	Tomi	October 2016
Create PRPE web site	Tomi	Done
Small Works information – post on PRPE web site	Tomi	Done
instruction for GSP Use and reference file handling	Contract Ad & Awd	October 2016
Can the Amendment package be something that is automatically inserted in the contracts by the Ad & Award office ?	Jenna	October 2016
Contacts and Information on Emergency Project Process – Post on PRPE web site.	Tomi	Done