ACEC/NHDOT CONSULTANT QUALITY INITIATIVE (CQI) Meeting

<u>Meeting Minutes – January 17, 2024</u> 1:30 -3:00 PM

Meeting Location: NHDOT, Room 211 – Kancamagus Room and via Teams

In Attendance:

Tobey Reynolds, NHDOT (Chair) CR Willeke, NHDOT Chris Mulleavey, HTA Rob Faulkner, CHA Jennifer Reczek, NHDOT Kevin Nyhan, NHDOT Darren Blood, GM2 (Co-chair) Marty Kennedy, VHB Loretta Girard Doughty, NHDOT Alex Koutroubas, ACEC JoAnn Fryer, F&O (Scribe)

Unable to attend:

Nickie Hunter, NHDOT Jim Marshall, NHDOT

1) December CQI Meeting Minutes were accepted.

2) Topics for Discussion:

a) CQI Subcommittee Updates

- i) General Discussed collaboration and sharing subcommittee responsibilities consistently between consultant and Department subcommittee members for all subcommittees. We will consider options and discuss them at the next meeting. Suggestions included involving subcommittee consultant co-chairs at CQI meeting on an annual basis for goal setting; subcommittee consultant co-chairs attending a CQI meeting to provide updates after quarterly meetings; and collaboration in preparing agendas.
- ii) Contracts Draft standardized Scope of Work (SOW) for preliminary design (Part B) has been completed and will be sent around for review by the CQI members. Comments due by February 13. Members should focus on high-level comments on major issues; consider if this will be more efficient than how it is being done now. Subsequent to the meeting a BlueBeam Revu session was set up to collect comments. Thank you to Darren, Kevin, Jennifer, Loretta, Tobey & Marty in their time and effort to put this together. Article 1 is also being reviewed to streamline and reduce any overlap.

The intention is that the standardized SOW should capture 80-90% of normal projects in development. Yellow highlights are to be edited for each scope to be project specific. This should eliminate the separate Consultant SOW on every project. Future work may include developing a "read me" page with instructions, such as:

- (1) Roll up sections that you won't have in your project.
- (2) Keep section numbering the same from project to project (section #'s note "N/A" if this won't be done for the project). Fee matrix (future development) could then align with the sections.

- (3) Additional services should be added to the end of the applicable section or at the end total so that the standard matrix would apply to all (numbering).
- (4) This format can be used for both stand-alone contracts or task order assignments.
- i) **Bridge** The subcommittee has not met since the last CQI meeting. Jennifer noted that the new DOT website will not host documents older than 2 years; so the minutes from 2021 and earlier are not there. We agreed these could be posted on the ACEC website. Jennifer and Alex discussed maybe reworking the Agenda for the subcommittee meetings to allow a format for information and feedback from both the Consultants and Department members. Alex noted he would look at other State Bridge Committee Agendas to compare.
- ii) **Highway** Darren spoke with Jim briefly last week, who is on board with the discussion about OpenRoads Designer (ORD), and the difficulties the software presents in preparing deliverables. Consensus between the Department and consultants is that we need to establish ORD user group. This will be discussed at the next Highway Subcommittee meeting.

User group membership criteria: someone who understands the program and operations but also understands the business side of how it all comes together. Leadership of the users' group will need to review the efficiency of implementing ORD to contract plans level. This could potentially be done at the Highway Subcommittee level. Two issues: 1. Practices & shortcuts – implementation of using ORD to get a serviceable product. 2. Decision making on what is economically feasible and sustainable to implement in constructability.

b) Environmental Subcommittee Composition:

- i) Kevin and Christine Perron are coordinating a meeting that will also include Jon Evans and Jennifer Riordan (GM2) to discuss composition and guidelines. Kevin expects to have a more detailed report at the next CQI meeting.
- c) **February Tech Conference Update:** Over 100 people signed up, which may be tight on space. Expect that some of these folks will move to virtual.
- d) **April Technical Transfer Conference Update:** Alex has gotten a quote to have an outside company come in to do all the AV to improve the sound. Agenda is mostly completed.
- e) **NASTO in NH this year!** It will be in July in Manchester at the DoubleTree. Expecting a big turnout. Andre Brier Deputy Commissioner is the lead from DOT side. Expect many DOT staff to go and volunteer. No current need for help from ACEC.
- f) CQI Committee Goals for 2024 to improve process and delivery, discussed the following:
 - i) Review 2023 goals and develop score card.
 - ii) ORD plan for efficient implementation.
 - iii) Review of the "Planned Project Summary".
 - iv) Contracting process efficiencies: revisit the process and approvals to identify potential areas for streamlining or improvements.
 - v) Standard Blank Matrix for Preliminary Design.
 - vi) Interim check-ins on the changes / implementation of streamlining of the process.
 - vii) Final Design Standard SOW for end of 2024.

3) LPA Topics:

- i) LPA Project status report: Posted on-line LPA project PM and design consultants hired. Projects noted as in design with no consultant are dormant projects.
- ii) Solicitations were sent out for updated qualifications and new on-calls. There has not been a lot of interest from communities for DOT-led LPA projects, so they have reduced to two contracts.

4) Discussions for next time:

- a) Bentley platform development of base plans from survey, dwg deliverables.
- b) Updating the potential projects list for the website expect the notice will come out through email. Anticipate these would be updated in January and July. Tobey will be doing this update. Request sent out internally to PMs and expect to post before the end of the month.
- c) On-call contracting use. DOT is considering an expansion of on-call contracts with a larger value, more consultants with on-calls; and a more robust selection process within the on-call of who gets the project. Reduces risk of stand-alone projects and can tailor SOW and cost to portions of the scope vs. the entire preliminary design. Discussed how other states use on-call agreements and selections, as well as differences in funding (some use state and some use federal funds for design contracts) as well as internal state processes that differ. Request consideration and discussion of best practices within other states, pros/cons from consulting perspective as well as hurdles for NH process of contracting.

5) Next Meeting – Wednesday February 21, 2024