• Welcome/Introductions/Opening Comments

• Meeting Notes
  o IN Transportation Team Updates
    ▪ Leadership Rally and Steering Committee Meeting (8/26/19) – Complete.
      See Attached Notes
    ▪ Greenfield District Steering Committee Meeting (9/25/19) – Complete.
      See Attached Notes and those below
      • Group discussion occurred specific to comments and the timing of the comments being made. Discussion also occurred around the process of addressing comments and appropriate/reasonableness of the comments. In order to get earlier contractor feedback on design and improve constructability, and as a result of the 360 effort, INDOT is considering posting plans before RFC. It will be up to the construction industry to provide comments on a voluntary basis. INDOT is also considering hiring retired people from the construction industry to review plans.
      • Partnering meetings are being planned and discussed. The format of the meetings is under development. INDOT is also revisiting their partnering handbook.
      • Greenfield and Ft Wayne Districts are teaming up to share 360 implementation ideas on Nov 8th.

  o Forward Together Update (9/4/19 Meeting)
    ▪ E-Invoicing for On Call Contracts
      • INDOT is looking into problems previously identified by consultants. If anyone is still having problems with E-Invoice, let Toby know specifics.
    ▪ Geotech On Calls vs Project Specific
      • Progress has been made. The root of the problem appears to be the INDOT PM not knowing about the designer already having certain team members already engaged. The industry needs to continue to help INDOT by communicating to the INDOT PM early on about the team members for a project. In the meantime, please send all specific examples to Rick Olson who is sending them directly to Travis Underhill at Travis’s request.
    ▪ Lump Sum On-Call Assignments
      • No changes are expected. This subject is being tabled.
    ▪ On Call Contracting Language
      • Toby thanked the committee for participating in assisting INDOT with modification of their proposed language.
      ▪ A member asked if the Forward Together group could continue the conversation of simplifying the LOI submittals on multi-des RFP’s. Specifically noting on a multi-des RFP, Consultants in the past were only asked to give approach to 1 or 2 of the projects. INDOT has seemed to go back to making
Consultant address all the projects in the LOI.

- **Observations since last meeting:**
  - **New Subcommittee – Traffic Standards**
    - Tasked to work with Dave Henkel from CHA who represents ACEC on the INDOT traffic standard committee. Great opportunity to present any concerns/input/feedback on the lighting/signage/signals/ITS/pavement marking standards. Provide comments to Rusty Holt so he can see that comments are discussed at the subcommittee and forwarded on to Henkel.
      
      **Subcommittee Members:**
      Rusty Holt (WSP) – Chairman
      John Berry (BLN)
      Hardik Shah (Structurepoint)
      Matt Miller (HNTB)

      Beth will see that the meeting minutes from the INDOT Traffic Standard Committee get posted for industry review.

  - **Environmental Collaboration Subcommittee**
    - Numerous issues that are impacting INDOT’s schedule and costs on projects were discussed with Travis Underhill at a meeting on 10/23/19.
      
      **Subcommittee Members:**
      Troy Woodruff (RQAW) – Chairman
      Joe Dabkowski (RQAW)
      Beth Hillen (Metric)

      The DNR committee is discussing similar issues. Beth Bauer wants to make sure all ACEC committees are coordinating. IDEM (environmental) committee coordination is also needed. A member suggested, and as a means to get something started, that we help INDOT and their districts by providing a uniform message/list of issues so that the industry and INDOT have continuity and consistency. Eliminating subjective comments will help streamline environmental review. **Send specific examples of needs for improvement to Troy Woodruff by Dec 1.**

- **Old Business / Committees**
  - **Selection Subcommittee (M. Guzik)**
    - No report. No response from Jeff Clanton yet.
  - **Team Indiana (B. Bauer)**
    - No report. Emphasis shifting toward Forward Together.
  - **Revised Prequalification Rule - 105 IAC 11-2 through 3 (C. Canfield)**
    - No update.
  - **Design Build Best Value Policy Change (T. Randolph)**
    - No update, no INDOT response.
  - **Legislative Summer Study Groups (B. Bauer)**
    - Stormwater task force has published their final report. ACEC is working on a package to get into the legislative agenda for the coming year.
• Clean up of public works statutes. ACEC’s goal has been to take Titles 4, 5, 8, and 36 and consolidate for consistency. A previous effort to clean-up the statutes inadvertently made substantive changes to the intent, and so, that effort was scraped. In 2021, we hope a “public works” document will be ready for legislative review and action.
• PVC pipe – ACEC is working with key legislators to ensure that this legislative proposal does not advance. National ACEC efforts to oppose such mandates need to be at ALEC and NCSL (American Legislative Exchange Council and the National Council of State Legislatures) where the source of such mandates is typically found.

o New Business
  ▪ Topics to have INDOT discuss at next meeting
    • INDOT has been invited to the Dec. meeting. Toby asked for the group to provide topics to populate the Dec. agenda.
    Suggested topics:
      Environmental review
      Long term planning/Corridor-wide studies in the future
      Swapping federal for state funding for all MPO’s (and protecting QBS, inspection services, designer certification)
      Update of economic benefits of bundling
      Making the IDM a policy document instead of a methodology document, update on IDM rewrite
      Proprietary items – streamline it for recurring items.
      Has INDOT seen increased costs because of supply and demand reaction to volume of work
      Lack of project specific RFP’s, on-calls still dominant
      Clarify changes on the Get-Well/Small Business program

  ▪ Engineers week is in February. We need volunteers.

  ▪ IN Transportation Team Annual meeting April 22, 2020

• Next Committee Meetings – all at HNTB’s office:
  o December 19, 2019 – 10-12pm
  o February 20, 2020 – 10-12pm
  o April 23, 2020 – 10-12pm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Substitute (please print)</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aikins, Paul</td>
<td>USI Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:paikins@usiconsultants.com">paikins@usiconsultants.com</a></td>
<td>317-637-3563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauer, Beth</td>
<td>ACEC Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:bbauer@acecindiana.org">bbauer@acecindiana.org</a></td>
<td>317-997-5099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books, Jeremy</td>
<td>Butler, Fairman, &amp; Seufert</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greg Kiciuk</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jbooks@bfsengr.com">jbooks@bfsengr.com</a></td>
<td>317-408-7103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfield, Cash</td>
<td>American Structurepoint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ccanfield@structurepoint.com">ccanfield@structurepoint.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero, Tom</td>
<td>S.E.H. Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:tcicero@sehinc.com">tcicero@sehinc.com</a></td>
<td>219-688-0441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clodfelter, Jon</td>
<td>United Consulting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jonc@ucindyd.com">jonc@ucindyd.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook, Josh</td>
<td>HNTB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ilcook@hntb.com">ilcook@hntb.com</a></td>
<td>317-417-5340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dagley, Doug</td>
<td>CHA Companies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ddagley@chacompanies.com">ddagley@chacompanies.com</a></td>
<td>317-554-7569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalal, Imtiyaz</td>
<td>Janssen &amp; Spaans Eng.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:idalal@jsengr.com">idalal@jsengr.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleming, Steve</td>
<td>Lochmueller Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:SFleming@lochgroup.com">SFleming@lochgroup.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gottschalk, Michelle</td>
<td>CDM Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:gottschalkmm@cdsmith.com">gottschalkmm@cdsmith.com</a></td>
<td>317-829-9635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guzik, Michael</td>
<td>Lawson-Fisher Associates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mguzik@lawson-fisher.com">mguzik@lawson-fisher.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidenreich, Kurt</td>
<td>Engineering Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:kurt@eri.consulting">kurt@eri.consulting</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetrick, Kevin</td>
<td>Clark Dietz</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hans Peterson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kevin.hetrick@clarkdietz.com">kevin.hetrick@clarkdietz.com</a></td>
<td>317-808-3136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornsby, Scott</td>
<td>GAI Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:s.hornsby@gaiconsultants.com">s.hornsby@gaiconsultants.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huria, Rajiv</td>
<td>SJCA P.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:rhuria@sjca-pc.com">rhuria@sjca-pc.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Laurie</td>
<td>DLZ Indiana, LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cris Kika</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ljjohnson@dlz.com">ljjohnson@dlz.com</a></td>
<td>574-904-7221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longest, Jim</td>
<td>Beam, Longest &amp; Neff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ilongest@b-l-n.com">ilongest@b-l-n.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinney, Duane</td>
<td>WSP USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Duane.mckinney@wsp.com">Duane.mckinney@wsp.com</a></td>
<td>317-287-3407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport, Trent</td>
<td>CrossRoad Engineers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:tnewport@crossroadengineers.com">tnewport@crossroadengineers.com</a></td>
<td>317-780-1555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph, Toby</td>
<td>Parsons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:tobias.randolph@parsons.com">tobias.randolph@parsons.com</a></td>
<td>317-616-4676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape, Marc</td>
<td>Strand Associates, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:marc.rape@strand.com">marc.rape@strand.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sondles, Scott</td>
<td>Burgess &amp; Niple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:scott.sondles@burgessniple.com">scott.sondles@burgessniple.com</a></td>
<td>317-237-2760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigger, Mike</td>
<td>Earth Exploration, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mwigger@earthengr.com">mwigger@earthengr.com</a></td>
<td>317-214-6023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodruff, Troy</td>
<td>RQAW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:twoodruff@rqaw.com">twoodruff@rqaw.com</a></td>
<td>812-881-6521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Greenfield District Steering Committee Meeting (9/25/19) Notes

a. Constructability
   - Designer involved in Construction
     Specific list of designer discussion items for the pre-construction meeting.
     Mandatory for the designer to be involved in at least one progress meeting
     after the pre-con since the progress meetings. More open communication.
     Better attendance by the designer at the pre-final meetings for the projects.
     Post project reviews to discuss lessons learned information to the designers.
   - Mid and/or end of project review of the design could be performed by the
     Contractor in order to give feedback and lessons learned.

b. Review of Stage 2 Plans
   - Contractor review comments should be anonymous and not answered by
     INDOT/designer. This should allow contractors to be more open to give
     comments while not giving out proprietary information. INDOT may also hire
     recently retired contractor personnel to help with project review. We think
     the sharing of the Stage 2 plans can just be done thru the same system as the
     bidding.

c. Partnering
   - Assume level of partnering will be selected by INDOT and should be subjective
     since it may not follow along the lines of cost or type of project. Area
     Engineer could decide with approval one level up?
   - High level – use same system as currently used with a partnering consultant
     involved throughout project
   - Medium level – include partnering at start of pre-con agenda and list goals/
     contract resolution names/deadlines. Perhaps have AE lead partnering
     throughout project progress meetings or can alternate with volunteers from
     INDOT/design/contractor.
   - Low level – include partnering at start of pre-con agenda and list goals/
     contract resolution names/deadlines.
   - Suggest that the existing INDOT Partnering Handbook be reviewed as it
     perhaps can be followed for at least portions of the Medium and Low

D. Next Steps
   - Set up another meeting to meet with another district committee that has
     similar tasks from the email below in order to review and compare
     comments/ideas.
   - Idea of a winter conference and perhaps could be by region (north, central,
     south) to combine districts.
   - Use Road School either as part of the above or to hold additional meeting(s) for
     continued 360 platform.
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Question #1: What does an excellent relationship look like?

Most common responses:
1. Trust
2. Mutual Respect
3. Open & Honest behavior and action (Transparent)
4. Commit to develop and value relationships for the long term
5. Accountability (do what you say you will do, when you say you will do it)
6. Compromise and collaborate (win/win/win)
7. Give & Accept constructive criticism (Behave professionally; don’t take it personally)
8. Admit mistakes/forgive each other (live by the “Golden Rule”)
9. Be part of the TEAM-commit to shared goals

All responses:
1. Trust leads to better performance which leads to more productive outcomes
2. Start with belief that all have good intentions
3. Vulnerability is okay- that is how trust is built
4. Relationships take time, take work, require some face to face time
5. Learn each other’s strengths and weaknesses
6. Talk to each other even when there is nothing wrong
7. Understand the motivation and needs of the other partners, step into their shoes, understand “why”
8. Conduct side by side training to understand the role of the other partners and see whole picture
9. Understand and respect roles and boundaries
10. Listen, listen to understand/don’t assume a fight
11. Set expectations up front and agree to it, get commitment, all accept and “buy in”
12. It’s okay to agree to disagree and still have mutual respect, quit blaming each other
13. Your answer is not the only one
14. Work through unforeseen conditions
15. Do the opposite of what is “broken”
16. Use HARD Communication: Honest, Assertive, Respectful, Direct
17. Don’t hold back needed information or be afraid of result, focus on doing what is right
18. Solve problems at lowest level possible, don’t use titles over people, don’t get overconfident
19. Leave your ego at the door
20. Value diversity and inclusiveness of team, have patience with people new to the industry
21. Resolve conflicts timely, respond timely
22. May lose a battle but win the war together
23. Everyone wants success in their own way
24. Build each other up
25. Treat each other like family, not all business but personal relationship, too
26. Make sure this information is passed all the way down into your organization/firm//company
27. Measure Progress and come together again next year
QUESTION #2: What has to be overcome to get there?

Three questions that kept coming up

1. What is there and beyond there?
2. Set goals to come together – set expectations (ICI/ACEC/INDOT)
3. Project is the only winner

Other key items

- Communication/Interaction
  - Honest
  - Respect roles/partners
  - Don’t get lost in the daily Grind → FOCUS
  - Recognize and initiate early
    - Don’t turn little items into big ones (don’t let them build)
  - Right time
    - Won’t be fixed over night

- Leadership
  - Work on EGO
  - Remove us vs them mind set
  - Make change a priority; it is hard but make it a priority
  - Find a way to train all three teams’ staff together
  - Don’t hold onto the past issue (change the status quo)
  - Be the salesperson or champion for this
  - Get New people into this at the lowest level (top to bottom)
  - Leaders walk the walk
  - Do what is right
  - Empower Staff
  - Cultural Change → self-reflection
  - Simplify think fresh/new ideas → learn from the past
  - Don’t get lost in the daily grind → FOCUS
  - Assume the best not the worst → all are Human
    - Overcome conflicting interest

- Money
  - Cost/industry needs to make money to survive

- Mind Set
  - Program is growing understand we need to work together/grow together
    - Roles and responsibility
  - Consistency in state
  - Build trust
  - Easy goal → sell it
  - What is winning
    - Can’t win every time
    - Don’t have to have a winner
  - Reward projects that show good teamwork
  - Find a way to be able to admit when wrong and work together to fix it
QUESTION #3: What do I have to do, on my part, to help create an excellent relationship?

Every discussion point goes to Communication.

1) Practice Honest Communication – Say what I think but do it with respect and without fear of repercussion
2) Listen and Learn – Practice empathy
3) Focus on what’s right not what “we’ve always done”, and lead with ethics
4) Display a willingness to change; even a willingness to lose. Introspection is important
5) Commit to being a change agent. Set the tone as a champion of the cause. Be a part of the solution by promoting initiative AND follow up
6) Take ownership of your actions and reward good behavior through language and recognition. Words matter so use ones of positive reinforcement
7) Educate the decision-makers, whichever side they are representing. They may not have all the answers (you may not either!) and may be operating from a position that lacks full knowledge
8) Understand the WHOLE program. Be supportive of those who have to consider and work with people charged with delivering the entire thing
9) Ask for feedback after the fact. How could we have done this better?
10) Display behavior that comes from a place of “we”. Don’t jump to conclusions, avoid automatically going on the defensive
11) Involve young people/new personnel in problem-solving. Sometimes it’s a matter of empowering them and then getting out of their way. Provide vision and let them lean into their natural inclination to collaborate
12) Of course, pick up the phone and call instead of sending an email but, JUST AS IMPORTANT, answer the phone instead of avoiding those calls
QUESTION #4: If (name your issue) was fixed, all of my problems would go away.*

Communication – better communication within and external to our own organizations, particularly about:

- Establish and follow chain of command and appropriate points of contact
- Clearly defining who holds the information needed to deliver the project – throughout all phases
- Distribution of information to all of those who need it, thoroughly and consistently
- Commitment to building relationships
- Sharing lessons learned, both positive and negative

Collaboration

- Understanding your role in the job and the financial impact of your decisions
- Doing what is best for the project, which may or may not be the easiest or most obvious thing at your phase of the project lifecycle. Consider constructability, O&M, priorities for the client
- Reducing claims – problem solving together, managing and minimizing claims and taking responsibility for your role in the issues, and including the designer

Consistency – in all categories but also related to:

- Between districts and breaking down the fiefdoms
- Managing the distribution of changes

Accountability

- Clear definition of scope and purpose & need
- Defining expectations and providing opportunity to explain why things may have changed which prevented full delivery of expectations

Let’s be real…

- Fear of liability – in owning up to issues too quickly can be a barrier to open communication
- “Faster / Better / Cheaper” – No. You really can’t have it all, but you can usually get 2 out of 3. What is the owner’s priority?
- All of these improvements will take time, money, training, and more people
- Workforce is a challenge
- Safety should be a priority on every project
- Excellence in delivery does not equal perfection

*(Note, the question was written “If (name your issue) was fixed, would all of my problems go away?”, but we all actually answered the question above.)
Question #5: How can INDOT get better quality at better prices?

Most common responses:

- More time in design development and in construction through time sets
- Better scoping of projects to reduce changes
- Being willing to inconvenience the traveling public for safer projects like the closures.
- Consistency with design review and develop and specification interpretation
- Bundling

All Responses:

1. Competition
2. Innovation
3. Closures
4. Understand that sometimes quality and price are not related initially as the value -maybe over all life cycle
5. Longer time set for construction or focus on the right time set duration
6. Quality scoping
7. Reduce & talk about risk
8. Open Specifications to other ideas like life cycle costs
9. Identify and minimize risk
10. Contractor receiving the quantity calculations pre-bid for better understanding
11. Project closeout feedback for both good and bad
12. Same practices in INDOT Districts on project development, specifications, and environmental process
13. Incentive for construction
14. More constructability review
15. Early coordination in development
16. Relook at Bundling and the value they have
17. Look at more inconvenience to the traveling public for better construction, speed, and safety
18. Define Quality more
19. Finding more time
20. Plan review process consistency
21. Being flexible, not completely rigid
22. Back briefs – tell me what I told you to verify understanding on both sides
23. Reward quality
24. Building the right team for the specific project
25. Find technology opportunities for building and designing better projects
26. Lump Sum contract format use
27. Consultant selection too heavy focus on faster schedules
28. Common sense bundling
29. Time does equal money
30. Clear right-of-way and utilities
31. Can the contractor be the one doing quality control and INDOT quality assurance
32. Pre-Con or Pre-Bid Meeting for better understanding
33. More investment on the design and planning (less $) than during construction (more $)
34. Evaluating the delivery process to eliminate not needed elements; Purposeful abandonment
35. Eliminate Federal requirements
36. Standardize deliverables
QUESTION #6: How does Indiana get better quality?

RESPONSES:  * = Number of mentions

*** Need to define “Quality”. Is it
  * Time?
  * Cost?
  * Performance?
  * Service Life?
  * What is poor quality?
  * Realize quality may be defined by public perception

* Continuous Feedback (to designers/specifiers)
  ** Contractor Involvement in Project Development
  *** Pre-Bid Constructability Reviews
  *** Post Construction Reviews
  *** Designers Attend Project Progress Meetings
  * Design Build Project Delivery/Guaranteed Savings

* Establish Expectations – Emphasize Quality During Construction
  * Set Expectations at Project Level
  * Take Pride in Product
    Designs/Plans
    Construction
  * Improve Cost Reduction Incentives
    * Focus on Labor (Time) Savings vs Material Savings

* Build a Culture of Quality
  ** Establish a System to Manage Quality
  * “Don't Inspect for Quality, Build for Quality” – Ford

** Construction Pre-Qualification
  * Focus on Contractor/Subcontractor Improvement
  * Increase Number of Pre-Qualified DBE Subcontractors

** Means & Methods – Execution - Identify & Require Use of Best Practices

** Better Scoping – Scope Accurately then Follow

* Multi-Discipline Cooperation
  *** Training Together

* Challenge Standard Details
  Is There A Better Way?
  Are New/Better Products Available?
QUESTION #7: How does INDOT get better designs?

Most Frequent Responses:

1. Better defined scope of work
   Designers feel the scope of a project should be better defined, and INDOT should be more open to options presented by designers

2. Reasonable cost expectations for speed and quality of design
   Designers feel INDOT should have reasonable expectations for the quality of design, the schedule of design, and the estimated budget for the project based on the budget provided for design. In short, "you get what you pay for"

3. Early contractor involvement
   This was mentioned by every group

4. Earlier utility coordination

5. Post mortem review w/ contractor, designer, and INDOT
   This was mentioned repeatedly, along with some forum to share lessons learned with the industry

6. More training in design industry for younger talent, with mandatory field construction exposure
   Designers feel the younger talent is not getting enough exposure to construction, and mentoring talent with field exposure is getting thinner

All Responses:

1. Early contractor involvement
2. Better defined scope of work
3. Clarify purpose and need but be open for options suggested by designer
4. Designer conduct mandatory field checks, in the field, during design
5. Independent third-party review by designers or contractors
6. Area Engineer input for major projects.
7. Reasonable cost expectations for speed and quality of design
8. Earlier utility coordination
9. Early and regular stakeholder involvement
10. Scope uncertainty leads to a large number of changes late in the design process
11. Contractor feedback to design through the duration of the project
12. Better training in the design industry, especially with younger talent
13. More clarity in the design manual
14. More consistency in interpretation of the design manual
15. Designer familiarity with specifications needs improved
16. Designer engagement through completion of project, designer must get exposure to construction
17. Post mortem project review with contractor, designer, and INDOT
18. Annual “Lessons Learned” event, with open forum conversation, perhaps at Road school
20. Comparative best practices with neighboring DOTs
21. More lump sum design contracts vs. hourly contracts
22. More geotechnical and subsurface investigation
23. Funding should not limit the proper scope required
24. Designer must have realistic expectation for their available resources
25. Consistent application of standards across all districts
26. Embrace new technology and alternative construction methods
QUESTION #8: How does a contractor help INDOT get better designs?

- Construction Reviews
- Input on Past project successes
- Early involvement
- Feedback during construction
- Inspector debriefs to designers
- After completion debrief
- Subcommittee on constructability
- Standards/Spec review by construction
- Contractor integration at field check
- On call contractor constructability review
- Add an ATC session during delivery
- Review change order history for consistencies
- Mandatory pre-bid
- Give examples of what contractors believe is good quality plans
- Tell us what are good/bad details
- Contractor feedback during design
- Contractors opinion on design best practice
- ICI/ACE's brother/sister relationship
- Pre-bid meetings - consultants, contractors, INDOT
- Post project debrief
- Contractors review consultants - plans, constructability
- Early involvement
- Contractor input in scoping
- Contractor hire designer for construction engagement
- Contractor adapt teaching philosophy
- Post project debriefs
- Post project success stories
- Contractors debrief on Contractors Basis of design at pre-bid
- Research & Development - sharing theirs
- Up front contractor review of plans for constructability - safety - schedule - philosophy
- Contractor feedback about design during construction
- Ask questions without concern of losing perceived advantage
- Post project debrief
- During project debrief
- Early collaboration
- Pre-bid construction reviews by contractors
- Retired contractors committee for constructability
- Get involved sooner. Scoping, pre-bid
- Current project feedback
- Feedback about what better plans are
- Contractors define what they want to see
- Good/Bad detail
- Tell INDOT/designers what info is needed or not
- Ask for pre-bid basis of design meeting
- Ask questions
- Speak up
- Ask pre-letting Q's
- Teach lessons in field
- Comment on standards/specs
- Ask Q's without concern of lost advantage
- Have association; ask if concerned
- Don't ask tricky leading questions
- Post project risk assessment
- Teach when/why things went wrong way
- Early and often constructability reviews
- Be honest of market weaknesses - including available labor
- Share research and innovation ideas
- Share invites to trade meetings
- Teach us at Road School
- Tell us what you can or can't do
- Share expectations of what capabilities they have
- Share trends outside of INDOT
- Share ideas from other places
- Teach us about means and methods
- Feedback of common problems
- Ask Q & A
- ACEC / ICI roundtables - Issues & Answers
- Tell what is broke
- Teach how risk interpreted
- Ask to learn Engineering Basis of Design
- Attend and ask for pre-bids
- Early involvement
- Plan Review
- Plan Review Scoping
- Plan Review pre-bid
- End of project review
- During contract review
- Good and bad
- Good vs. Bad info
- Post project debrief
**QUESTION #9: How does the designer get involved in construction?**

**ENGAGEMENT**

1) Go to the progress meetings  
2) Answer the phone  
3) Attend pre-cons  
4) Visit jobs during construction  
5) Ask questions on construction  
6) Personal touch  
7) Accept Community feedback  
8) Area Engineers should ask for scheduling commitments  
9) Invite designers to pre-finals

**TASKS**

10) Keeper of the rules and regulations that we do not know about  
11) Provide ideas  
12) Have a “real” pre-con  
13) Eliminate low-hanging fruit change orders  
14) Document and share information  
15) Establish a master list of e-mails to denote milestones to stakeholders  
16) Implement good ideas  
17) Get “live” feedback, not just at the end of the job  
18) Have the designer explain the purpose and need at the pre-con and how they arrived at it  
19) Have the designers attend partnering meetings  
20) Designer involvement at key decision points

**PROCESSES**

21) Have the inspector call the designer before changes are made  
22) Secure funding for designers to attend meetings or make changes as appropriate  
23) 2-month reminder on construction  
24) Have regularly scheduled check-in meetings on purpose maybe even without known issues on the job  
25) Lessons learned meeting  
26) Establish a feedback loop during construction  
27) Constructability concerns known earlier in the process  
28) Denote what worked and what did not work in construction  
29) Read only site for change orders on designer’s jobs  
30) Establish a checklist of key design issues similar to the one that does environmental commitments  
31) Reevaluate and scope design services. Give tasks to do with the process.  
32) Investment in cross-training  
33) Construction folks spending some time in design

**OPPORTUNITIES**

34) Use site visits for networking and mentoring all 3 parties  
35) Eliminate conflict of interest perception  
36) Encourage cross-training  
37) RFP (credit for time in construction of design staff)  
38) Establish a certification or credentialing for designers in construction to force the issue. (Hands on-site)  
39) Temporary sheeting on plans for example  
40) Scratch 39 to allow contractor innovation and means and methods  
41) Truthful discussion of conflict of interest.  
42) Get sister agencies to INDOT to understand constructability concerns  
43) Right size the inspection phase funding for designers to visit jobs  
44) Designer intent, does everyone know what we are trying to do?  
45) Cross training between industries similar to INDOT’s GEDP