**Innovative Contracting Advisory Committee**

**Meeting Minutes**

**August 30, 2012**

**Attendance**

* Nabil Haddad, CDOT Innovative Contracting
* Randy Jensen, FHWA
* Mark Scholfield, Wilson & Company
* Randy Furst, CDOT Region 6 Program Engineer
* Dave Watt, CDOT Region 2 Resident Engineer
* Richard Zamora, CDOT Project Development Branch Manager
* Tim Maloney, CCA, Edward Kraemer & Sons
* Jim Moody, CCA
* Elizabeth Kraft, The Dye Management Group
* Ken Szeliga, AECOM (Colorado Bridge Enterprise)
* Ben Acimovic, Region 1 Project Engineer
* Katherine Williams, CDOT EEO Office
* Laura Zamora, CDOT Area Engineer
* Keith Molenaar, CU Boulder
* George Tsiouvaras, ACEC, TSH

**Summary of Discussions**

* Subcommittee Updates:
* CMGC subcommittee: Ben Acimovic
  + Next Meeting: September 18, 2012
  + RFP revisions, approach to cost
  + Sections 1 & 4 very little change
  + Sections 2& 3 Change Cost & Fee piece
  + Incorporate CCA Recommendations
  + Discuss the Regulations with Map-21
  + Send Survey to Contractor’s, Consultants, and ICE consultants that have been involved
  + Each project should document what has worked and what has not worked
  + Looking at proposals/plans for the procurement phase discussed the difference or issues with Contractor’s asking for documents but it must be CORA. Important to provide training and feedback/debriefings
  + Ways to better approach debriefings were discussed
  + Developing a feedback form or evaluation feedback progress. The person giving the feedback needs to be very open and transparent
  + More on training probably needed, do a training before 17th of December
  + In order for proposers to look at a winning Proposal, they must submit a CORA request. Winner is responsible for defining the confidential docs and defending them if the issue comes up.
  + If there are additional topics for CMGC, submit to Ben by Sept 8th.
  + MAP-21 promulgate rules
* SDB subcommittee: Dave Watt
  + Compiling ITP and Book 1 feedback by November 1st.
  + Includes Lessons learned and Best Practices from Region 2 Powers and I-25/PPIR bridges
  + Please get this in writing by the Summit meetings by the end of September
  + Instead of sending out the comments have a team meeting and discuss this as a team. You’ll get better and more transparent feedback.
* Quality Programs subcommittee: Elizabeth Kraft
  + Monday meeting NCHRP 10-83
  + Elizabeth Kraft can provide a copy
  + Feedback from industry similar to project selections matrix on how you quality roles are assigned
  + Quick Guide/Placemat shows 5 fundamental organizations
  + Tool to aid state DOT’s to select most appropriate organization
  + Looking for volunteers on testing this tool without one-on-one guidance from Elizabeth. Is it written clear enough to do without facilitation from Elizabeth and Keith?
  + Concepts are similar to Project Delivery Selection matrix
  + Varies on staffing and contracting method
  + Use when you make the delivery decision
  + Think about it early
  + Thanks for reviewing the document and suggestions and input.
  + The report has detail on each of the organizations and expands on things to look for and work toward
  + Written for the Owner/Agency and their perspective
  + Suggest try keeping track of who is doing each of these organizations.
  + If you want a presentation, let Keith and Elizabeth know
  + General conclusion is that it is project specific on which organizations/model to use.
  + Factor that came out high was Industry trust. Some of these methods only work if there is that Industry Trust.
  + 5 years ago, it was observed that many RFPs were silent on Quality roles and responsibilities
  + The goal is now to get agencies to think about quality early in the process.
  + Will be ready in early 2013
  + Promote it for the larger complex projects
  + Tracking the users of this tool is important
  + Use just as you finish selecting the project delivery method. It helps make informed decisions, and it brings up issues to consider and watch out for
  + Keith volunteered to present the findings to CDOT if there is a need

**Miscellaneous/Open Discussion**

* July 10, 2012 Project Delivery Selection Matrix WASHTO Presentation (Keith & Nabil)
  + Very well received
  + Bias in the matrix a discussion in the past and the feedback is that overall they didn’t see any bias in pointing towards one delivery method
  + Excellent feedback from 4 national folks on clarifying
  + All additional feedback is welcome
  + It always depends on the projects and other factors
  + Keith and his staff will update the Project Delivery Selection matrix by October 1, 2012
* Innovative Contracting Staffing Needs/Business Plan
  + PD Branch came up with a business plan for IC staffing needs. Looking at adding additional staffing. CMGC - Nabil primary contact and Ben will support.
  + Jeff Wassenaar will help with the guidelines and craft a skeleton for CM/GC Manual
  + Maybe one more person
  + Looking at immediate and long term needs
  + Look at consistency in putting out the RFPs for D-B and CM/GC. Being more active at the project level, and implementation through the pre-construction phase.
* Setting Goals White Paper Workshop
  + David Downs could help
  + David Watt will follow up
* Project Delivery Selection Matrix: Elevating “Cost” to a 4th Primary Factor
  + Cost elevated to that status on recent project delivery workshops
  + For CM/GC: There are differing opinions about the cost effectiveness of CM/GC, but it is a unique sole source cost negotiation process that the owner should be aware of before deciding on CM/GC
  + Elevating cost in the delivery selection matrix to primary factor instead of a secondary factor
  + There are different cost components that can factor in
  + Cost won’t necessarily affect selecting CMGC and
  + There are differences in to develop pricing
  + As long as we don’t get hung up on the fact that we are choosing a method only on cost
  + Be careful to look at these cost factors first. Look at other methods without being influenced by costs
  + Try not to be concerned about costs effectiveness first
  + First look at risks and then determine costs
  + Maybe wait to determine after pooled fund study is complete
  + It was agreed that it was too early to elevate cost to become a 4th Primary factor and to wait on this decision and see how cost will integrate with procurement methods in the new project delivery selection matrix

- Should we add HTPE to this group meeting?

- Develop a training plan for innovative contracting

- The project delivery selection matrix specific for each project will be posted on the project website

* Next Meeting: November 1, 2012, CDOT HQ Bridge Room 107B

Future Innovative Contracting topics (not prioritized):

* + Celebrating Successes (Awards, Public Information, Outreach, Sharing Lessons Learned, etc…)
  + Local Agency and other stakeholder involvement and training on Innovative Contracting Projects (Major Utilities, Railroads, etc…)
  + Staffing Requirements for Innovative Contracting Projects
  + Consistency among all CDOT Regions

Updating Manuals and Guidelines (D-B, SDB, CM/GC, and Innovative Contracting)