

AASHTO SOC Members,

The Contract Administration Section is conducting a survey on State Department of Transportation (SDOT) practices with partnering on construction projects. We will compile the results and send to all SOC members when complete. This will include links to partnering specifications, resources, etc.

(There were a total of 33 states who responded, however these responses are from the 24 states who answered yes to having formal partnering.)

Partnering Questions

1. Does your state have formal partnering? If yes, please proceed.

Yes	100%
No	0%

2. Does your state use consultants to facilitate partnering?

Yes	92%
No	8%

3. What qualifications must consultants have to facilitate partnering?

(OR) We have consultants under contract to facilitate all partnering sessions; they were selected through a competitive process.

(MS) No formal guidelines. DOT and Contractor mutually agree. Qualifications and Experience are closely looked at.

(NV) We do not prequalify.

(RI) Experience as facilitator and working in heavy civil construction and transportation industry.

(MA) Previous partnering experience, working knowledge of engineering and construction. Also look for comments from others who have used the facilitator previously.

(IN) Facilitators need to show prior experience with partnering. They are then reviewed as they perform the process to see how they do.

(NC) Specific qualifications not defined. Jointly review resumes with Contractor to select facilitator.

(WA) Consultants are short-listed by the consultant office based on experience and references.

(SC) They are listed in the RFQ, I do not have them readily available.

(CT) No specific guidelines for qualification of a facilitator. ConnDOT and the Contractor will jointly select a facilitator to conduct the partnering workshops.

(CO) Officially there are no qualification requirements.

(AZ) Skilled in facilitation techniques that promote communication, productive working relationships and issue resolution Knowledge of construction terms and practices"

(TN) They are varied based on project. The Department sometimes opts to self-facilitate.

(FL) Qualification:

Facilitators must have experience in highway construction and must have conducted three (3) or more partnering workshops for highway construction in the past three (3) years. Inclusion will be determined largely on the firm's ability to document the expertise of the individuals they submit for inclusion in the Construction Partnering List."

(AB) Facilitated partnering occurs on some large high risk projects. The consultants hired all have prior experience but no formal qualifications needed.

3. What qualifications must consultants have to facilitate partnering? (Continued)

(MI) Must be from the International Association of Facilitators (IAF) list of Certified Professional Facilitators.

(AK) References from previous clients

(OH) A potential Facilitator must attend the Ohio Department of Transportation's "Partnering Facilitator Standards and Expectations Guide" training held at Central Office.

(VA) Team facilitation skills, preferably highway construction experience including: Partnering Principles, Risk Management Principles, Key Performance Areas, Communication & Decision Making Processes, Issue Resolution & Problem Solving Processes, Team Building, Charter Development, Post Workshop Planning & Tracking, Mediation, Partnering Performance Rating Systems Development

(NY) Experience in this type of facilitation

(CA) No qualifications are required

(ME) Past experience with partnering preferred
Please note - We have not done partnering for 10 - 15 years."

(UT) Must have completed Utah's Phase 1 and 2 Partnering training (4 hrs. each) and have construction experience.

4. Does the partnering effort include periodic sessions during construction?

Yes	88%
No	13%

5. Are the periodic sessions facilitated by a consultant, in-house staff, both, or other?

Consultant

Yes	38%
No	63%

In-house staff

Yes	4%
No	96%

Both

Yes	42%
No	58%

Other

(IN) The periodic sessions are facilitated by the Facilitator, in-house staff and the Prime Contractor. They rotate each month.

(CA) Professional facilitators kick off the partnering and for the majority of our projects facilitate follow up session but in some cases the teams do self-facilitation for follow up sessions.

6. Does the initial partnering session include development of an issue resolution process?

Yes	96%
No	4%

7. Does the initial partnering session include a discussion of lines of authority?

Yes	96%
No	4%

8. What is the typical duration for an initial partnering session?

½ Day

Yes	29%
No	71%

Full Day

Yes	50%
No	50%

Two Day

Yes	0%
No	100%

Other

(NV) Depends on project. 1/2 Day is probably typical.

(KS) Formal partnering is done on larger projects. Informal is done on all projects.

(WA) Varies based on the size of the project so it ranges from one to two days

(CO) "It's either a half day or full day.

(AB) On most projects it is part of the pre-construction meeting between the Department, project consultant and contractor.

(AK) This depends on the complexity of the project. Our sessions run from 1/2 day to two days.

(UT) All projects are partnered. Smaller projects are often self or internally facilitated and last 1-2 hrs. Formal facilitation is reserved for larger projects with sessions 1/2 day+

9. What is the typical duration for periodic partnering session?

½ Day

Yes	67%
No	33%

Full Day

Yes	4%
No	96%

Two Day

Yes	0%
No	100%

Other

(OR) We do not typically have periodic sessions, but will hold on occasion if needed.

(IN) INDOT has monthly meetings that are usually about 2 hours in length. Every third month is done by the facilitator.

(KS) Variable depending on need.

(WA) Only our largest projects with longer durations would have periodic sessions

(AZ) two to four hours

(UT) 2 hours

10. Who typically attends the initial partnering session?

Dispute Review Board

Yes	4%
No	96%

Executives

Yes	79%
No	21%

Sub-Contractors

Yes	79%
No	21%

Utility Owners

Yes	63%
No	38%

Designer

Yes	75%
No	25%

Owner project engineer staff

Yes	96%
No	4%

Owner environmental

Yes	75%
No	25%

Prime contractor

Yes	100%
No	0%

Other

(MS) FHWA (if applicable)

(RI) Project Schedulers

(MA) For DB projects also include DB team designer.

(IN) Local agencies, police and other emergency personnel, testing personnel and others as deemed appropriate.

(AZ) District Engineer, Public Information Staff

(FL) Attendees are generally for the FDOT from District Construction Engineer level down to Project Sr. Inspectors. However, depending on complexity of the project, higher level Department Executives may attend and corresponding contractor Executives attend.

(AB) Department staff, project consultant, contractor and sub-contractors.

(AK) Resource agencies

(OH) Community Leaders, Transportation Entities (i.e., railroads - if applicable), and Public Agencies that have funding or permitting authority.

(VA) Localities, Police, Fire, etc.

(CA) Owner RE and inspectors

(UT) Local municipalities. Executives are considered project management one level removed from on-site staff.

11. Who typically attends the periodic partnering session?

Dispute Review Board

Yes	4%
No	96%

Executives

Yes	38%
No	63%

Sub-Contractors

Yes	58%
No	42%

Utility owners

Yes	25%
No	75%

Designer

Yes	54%
No	46%

Owner project engineer staff

Yes	83%
No	17%

Owner environmental

Yes	29%
No	71%

Prime contractor

Yes	88%
No	13%

Other

(OR) Not typically held

(MS) FHWA (if applicable)

(RI) Project schedulers

(IN) Local agencies, police and other emergency personnel.

(NC) Varies depending on the project and stage of construction

(VA) Localities, Police, Fire, etc.

(CA) Owner RE and inspectors

Other Continued....

(MI) Any new stakeholders identified since the initial partnering meeting.

12. How frequent are the periodic partnering sessions?

Monthly

Yes	8%
No	92%

Bi-Monthly

Yes	4%
No	96%

Quarterly

Yes	54%
No	46%

Other

(OR) Only as needed

(NC) Varies depending on the project.

(KS) As needed.

(SC) As needed. Normally we only use if project is in trouble or having conflict between the parties, so no typical frequency.

(CT) Periods of 3 to 6 months or prior to a milestone date.

(CO) It depends

(AZ) As needed

(TN) They are variable based on project size/scope. Typically, a periodic session is held every 6 months. However, meetings between contractor and Department field staff are scheduled weekly and are not defined as a partnering session.

(OH) ODOT recommends that the periodic partnering sessions be held quarterly but allows flexibility at the discretion of the ODOT Project Engineer and the Contractor Project Manager. The practice of holding monthly progress meetings among ODOT and Contractor personnel is well-established on most ODOT jobs. Therefore, periodic partnering sessions are sometimes held biannually.

(CA) The partnering program recommends meeting quarterly but in many cases it is when the team deems it necessary.

(MI) It is recommended that quarterly sessions be held unless the Engineer and Contractor agree to a different frequency.

13. Do the periodic partnering sessions include one or more of the following?

Employee surveys

Yes	54%
No	46%

Performance measures

Yes	42%
No	58%

Training

Yes	8%
No	92%

Other

(MA) Based on the specific project we normally asked for key issues that need to be addressed.

(NC) Varies depending on the project.

(KS) Review of how things are going and what improvements need to be made.

(CO) Typically it is just a discussion of the current issues.

(AZ) Review of issues and resolutions, lessons learned

(TN) The schedule, progress, milestones, lessons learned to date, and issue resolution updates are presented and discussed in detail with all project partners during the scheduled partnering sessions

(AK) Typically a review of the initial partnering agreement

(VA) Risk Management Plans, Mitigation Plans, etc.

(NY) Lunch-eating together is good.

(CA) Review of the project goals as tracked by the monthly surveys

(UT) Site visits are often performed jointly

(MI) Surveys are being used on the pilot projects in the 2014 construction season.

14. Do the executives have a separate partnering session?

Yes	33%
No	67%

15. Are disputes discussed with the executives?

Yes	87%
No	13%

Note: 1 state did not respond

16. What power do the executives have to resolve disputes?

(OR) Executives are kept informed. Only power would be through normal contract authorities.

(MS) Final Authority

(NV) The Director is the ultimate authority on decisions subject to appeal to him Claims Board if so requested.

(RI) 100% authority

(MA) Issues can be resolved at this level.

(IN) If the dispute resolution process gets escalated to the executive level they would have the power to resolve the dispute.

(NC) Project executives have authority to resolve disputes.

(KS) Executive have power to solve almost all disputes.

(WA) No but they make sure that the issues are moving towards resolution

(SC) Whatever is necessary.

(CN) Only offer suggestions that are non-binding.

(CO) You must define what an executive is. CDOT defines a dispute as a disagreement until it reaches past the DRB level, then it is a claim. Executives are only involved and can resolve claims, but they have no involvement in disputes.

(AZ) "Note for q 14, executive partnering sessions on used on selected projects typically high value projects, alternative delivery projects (design build, CMAR)
The last step in the issue resolution process is at the executive level"

(TN) If a dispute cannot be handled by field and/ or Regional personnel, it is escalated to the Headquarters Division to resolve. Should the dispute remain unresolved, it is turned over to the executive leadership of the Department to provide resolution. Should this fail to resolve the issue, the claims process would begin.

(FL) FDOT tries to have disputes resolved at the project level as a culture and as such have empowered Project Engineer level staff with authority to resolve issues up to certain dollar thresholds. Having said that, Executive level staff has the authority to resolve any disputes.

16. What power do the executives have to resolve disputes? (Continued)

(AK) Provide guidance for the most part.

(MI) Executives may provide input; the Construction Engineer has the authority to resolve disputes for the Department.

(OH) ODOT has a three step dispute resolution process as per our Construction and Materials Specifications. Step one is held at the Project level. Step Two is held at the District level. Step 3 is the Director's Claims Board (Executive Level).

(VA) Decision making authority

(NY) There is a process to evaluate disputes if not resolved at project level.

(CA) If the dispute has risen up through the dispute resolution ladder to the executives, they would have the power to resolve the issues.

(ME) As decided by partnering session

(UT) Technically they could solve all the issues however a majority of the time they simply provide guidance and all issues to be resolved at correct level.

17. Do projects without formal partnering use informal partnering?

Yes	75%
No	25%

18. Do projects with partnering have lower CE costs?

Yes	8%
No	8%
Unknown	83%

19. Do projects with partnering have fewer change orders?

Yes	17%
No	13%
Unknown	71%

20. Is there a measurable benefit to partnering?

Yes	46%
No	4%
Unknown	50%

21. What measures do you use to identify the benefits of partnering?

(OR) No measures in place to specifically measure benefits

(MS) The number of change orders and claims.

(NV) None right now. We are struggling with that.

(RI) "Improved communications during the project
Understanding of the roles of owner and contractor and understanding the needs of each
What motivates Contractor vs. Owner
Greater focus on project completion
Issue resolution at lowest level and timely"

(MA) One of the biggest benefits is getting everyone to know each other and develop better working relationships. Also to be able to resolve issues at the lowest level possible.

(IN) Partnering surveys from those involved in the process as well as a closeout meeting to discuss how things went. A summary of success and failures is published.

(NC) Timely completion, on budget, reduced disputes.

(WA) Employee surveys generally result in tracking perceptions about; safety, project communications, project progress, environmental commitment, dispute resolution, recognition and other general project relationship measures

(SC) Time, Costs (change orders)

(CT) Reduction in claims; improved work relationships and rate of resolution of issues.

(CO) We don't.

(AZ) "Final cost vs. bid amounts

(TN) None currently.

(FL) FDOT has attempted to adopt the partnering philosophy into its culture of project management. As such, it is difficult to say definitively that projects that have lower cost/time overruns were due to partnering. Biggest benefit recognized is establishment of clear communication channels with timeframes and thresholds established so that project issues don't linger.

(AK) Level of clear communication. Volume of letters.

(OH) Partnering became part of ODOT's Construction and Material Specifications in 2011 and claims have been cut in half since 2008 and 2009.

(VA) "Partnering: Communication, Cooperation and Respect, Teamwork, Issue Resolution
Risk Management: Safety, Environmental, Quality, Schedule, Budget, Materials, Utilities"

(NY) Fosters atmosphere to resolve disputes at project level; helps to complete on time and near budget.

(CA) We are administering a research project to identify the tangible benefits of partnering which will be complete in 17 months. Currently we use the partnering award nominations to glean information about the partnering projects such as budget, schedule, safety, quality, cost benefit ratio of partnering cost to project savings.

(ME) We have not done one for 10 - 15 years.

(UT) The only metric we have is the scoring from the project surveys however the general consensus is that partnering is beneficial to the success of every project and has reduced change orders and resulted in quicker project delivery times however how much can be attributed to partnering remains in question

(MI) N/A - Michigan is just beginning to develop a partnering program and is piloting a small number of projects statewide during the 2014 construction season.

22. If your state has posted partnering guidance or guidelines, please provide the web-link to this guidance.

(OR) We call our partnering a "cooperative arrangement" See section 150.05 of our Standard Specifications at http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/SPECS/docs/08book/08_00100.pdf

(MS) No real guidelines. Very interested in what other states have.

(NV) http://www.nevadadot.com/Doing_Business/Partnering_Program.aspx

(IN) <http://www.in.gov/dot/div/contracts/standards/book/sep13/1-2014.pdf>

Please see section 113

We also have a handbook for small and medium sized contracts.

(NC) Special Provision included in all Design Build Contracts. Web link not available but can email file upon request. (Please see attachment)

(WA) <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/NR/rdonlyres/DAF7E8D2-1427-49C3-B5BE-227F9F60AF77/0/PartneringFieldGuide.pdf>

(Borrowed with permission from CalTrans and modified by WSDOT"

(CT) www.ct.gov/dot/Doing_Business_with_ConnDot
CTDOT Owner Special Provision, NTC - Voluntary Partnering

(AZ) www.azdot.gov/business/program-and-partnerships/partnering

(FL) <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/construction/ContractorIssues/Partnering/Partnering.shtm>

(AB) <http://www.transportation.alberta.ca/Content/docType29/Production/PartneringGuidelines.pdf>

(OH) <http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/ConstructionMgt/Pages/Partnering.aspx>

(VA) <https://insidevdot.gov.virginia.gov/div/sc/Const/Part/SitePages/Home.aspx>

(if you have trouble accessing, please contact me and I will send you the files)

(NY) WWW.NYS DOT.GOV

(AR) <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/construc/partnering.html>

(UT) <http://www.udot.utah.gov/main/uconowner.gf?n=15352622382201317>

(MI) N/A - Michigan is just beginning to develop a partnering program and is piloting a small number of projects statewide during the 2014 construction season.

23. If your state has posted an evaluation of your partnering program, please provide the web-link to this evaluation.

(AZ) www.azdot.gov/business/program-and-partnerships/partnering

(FL) <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/construction/ContractorIssues/Partnering/Partnering.shtm>

(OH) <http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/ConstructionMgt/Pages/Partnering.aspx>

(VA) Not on a link (please request and I will send it to you)

(MI) N/A - Michigan is just beginning to develop a partnering program and is piloting a small number of projects statewide during the 2014 construction season.

States Who Submitted Partnering Questionnaire

State DOT	Respondent Name	Email
1) Alaska	Thomas Dougherty	thomas.dougherty@alaska.gov
2) Alberta, Canada	Jim Gavin	Jim.Gavin@gov.ab.ca
3) Arizona	Julie Kliewer	JKliewer@azdot.gov
4) California	Ken Solak	ken.solak@dot.ca.gov
5) Colorado	Mark Staub	Mark.Straub@dot.state.co.us
6) Connecticut	Anthony O. Kwentoh	Anthony.Kwentoh@ct.gov
7) Florida	David Sadler	David.Sadler@dot.state.fl.us
8) Indiana	Gregory Pankow	GPANKOW@indot.IN.gov
9) Kansas	Susan Darling	sdarling@ksdot.org
10) Maine	George Macdougall	George.Macdougall@maine.gov
11) Massachusetts	Mike McGrath	Michael.A.McGrath@dot.state.ma.us
12) Michigan	Brenda O'Brien	ObrienB2@michigan.gov
13) Mississippi	Richard Chisolm	rchisolm@mdot.ms.gov
14) Nevada	Jeff Shapiro	jshapiro@dot.state.nv.us
15) New York State	James Tynan	James.Tynan@dot.ny.gov
16) North Carolina	Ron Hancock	rhancock@ncdot.gov
17) Ohio	Chase Wells	Chase.Wells@dot.state.oh.us
18) Oregon	Jeff Gower	Jeffrey.L.GOWER@odot.state.or.us
19) Rhode Island	Frank Corrao, III	frank.corrao@dot.ri.gov
20) South Carolina	Charles Eleazer	EleazerCR@sccd.org
21) Tennessee	Jason Blankenship	Jason.Blankenship@tn.gov
22) Vermont	David Hoyne	david.hoyne@state.vt.us
23) Arkansas	Teresa Wright	Teresa.Wright@ahtd.ar.gov
24) Ontario	Chris Raymond	Chris.Raymond@ontario.ca
25) North Dakota	Cal J Gendreau	cgendrea@nd.gov
26) New Hampshire	Theodore Kitis	TKitsis@dot.state.nh.us
27) Utah	Josh Van Jura	jvanjura@utah.gov
28) New Jersey	Ronald Maruca	Ronald.Maruca@dot.state.nj.us
29) Pennsylvania	Rebecca Burns	reburns@pa.gov
30) Montana	Kevin Christensen	kechristensen@mt.gov
31) Alabama	Skip Powe	powes@dot.state.al.us
32) Virginia	George Gardner	George.Gardner@VDOT.Virginia.gov
33) Washington	Craig McDaniel	mcdanic@wsdot.wa.gov