

# Every Day Counts (EDC) Arizona Local Public Agency (AZLPA) Stakeholder Council Meeting Minutes

**Thursday, September 8, 2016**

**TIME: 10:00AM - 2:00PM**

**Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) – 302 N. 1<sup>st</sup> Ave, Phoenix, AZ 85003**

---

## **Welcome and Introductions**

ADOT Local Public Agency Section welcome by Jodi Rooney.

## **Meeting Summary and Follow up from our July 14, 2016 Meeting**

Topics covered were scoping and submitting complete plans, specifications and estimates (PS&E).

## **Council Network Feedback from the July 14, 2016 - Discussion Topic: SCOPING and SUBMITTING PS&E**

- Provide a complete and accurate scoping document based on engineering data. Consultation from local construction and maintenance jurisdictional personnel should be included within document details.
- Scoping document should not be deferred for long periods of time before construction takes place. The cost of projects can increase dramatically when construction takes place. This could occur due to inflation.
- Use the most accurate data for scoping, such as rain fall data, or adjusted data based on the year of construction, and not on the aging data used during the scoping.
- Never minimize the scoping process of a project to fit the budget. An LPA will be responsible for the overrun for a project.
- Comments from Individual Members:
  - Sun Corridor MPO – A Transportation Enhancement (TE) project was given to an experienced consultant for estimation, and the final estimate was over the budgeted amount for that project. Detailed scoping is a must to achieve a good estimate and to stay within budget.
  - City of Kingman:
    - Bids from Hogg Signal projects were higher than estimated, by more than 7%, ranging from \$230,000 - \$250,000, which made the project very expensive to build.
    - Power house pathway bids were two times higher than the estimated amount of the project, which ended up dissolving the project.
    - Detailed scoping is as important as a detailed estimate. If the budget does not support the estimate, then the budget must be adjusted or scoping can be reduced.
  - FHWA – FHWA allocated \$3000 for scoping. This is not enough to do detail scoping. FHWA to reevaluate.
  - ADOT:
    - Shared with the group the ADOT methods of projects' estimation process. ADOT's Contract & Specification (C&S) section collects and utilizes the most recent bidding information from recent bids and uses this information to estimate upcoming projects. Then, C&S uses the new bid prices, based on the regions where the work will take place and quantities to estimate the new projects. The larger the quantities are, the less the contractor will bid on it and in opposition to that, the lesser the quantities, the more it will cost to bid. When the design engineer submits his estimate to C&S for review, C&S uses the criteria above to modify the engineers estimate and based on that the engineer decides whether to seek more funding for his project or if his existing budget is sufficient to construct the project.

- Meeting discussion also included the Multi Pathway project. Concerns include:
  - Construction problems at Prescott Valley due to an insufficient scoping document, where the design placed only one 18” pipe at the bottom of a 19% down grade slope.
  - Unusual weather activities that season generated an unexpected rainfall where the 18” pipe did not handle the flow down the slope, which resulted in over topping the walkway and washing almost \$20,000 of private property landscaping.

#### **LPA Participation on a Federally Funded Project – What is the Expectation?**

- Central Yavapai MPO:
  - What does the public see? It looks like an ADOT project, when it’s actually an LPA project. Marketing is needed.
- Pima Association of Governments:
  - Be a team member. Each stakeholder has a role and responsibilities.
- City of Kingman:
  - Advocate for the LPA to be written into the partnering resolution process. The District Engineer can speak to the Resident Engineers, but LPA should be involved as well, from planning to closeout.
- ADOT emphasized to the LPAs, that it is your project that ADOT administers it for you. Get involved and when you do observe that something is being done incorrectly, bring it up to your ADOT Resident Engineer and if not corrected, escalate up the chain of command of ADOT.
- Project Management Design Review (PMDR) fees are on the rise by ADOT staff and their consultants. LPAs believe that multiple reviews by different sections are unnecessary. ADOT is modifying the internal review section and planning to sub out a contract to consultants to do a compliance review of all projects. (Three different Geotech personnel charging to the same project are unacceptable).
- ADOT should not impose their methodology on the LPAs. If they are using MAG standards, or any other approved national method, ADOT should continue to support the LPAs with whatever they use.
- LPAs should evaluate if using federal funds for small projects vs. using cities or towns’ money.
- Pima County explained that Title 41 applies to cities and towns when federal funds are sought and title 34 applies to State. However, Title 41 may be a two-step process while utilizing federal funds when the State (ADOT) oversees the project administration per the stewardship agreement with FHWA. This may add to their process which may be 8-10 additional steps for the LPA to comply with, which intensifies the process for LPAs. The LPAs are requesting to simplify the process and find a median streamlined between the two Titles 41 and 34.
- LPAs raised a question as to whether ADOT can ban a contractor who performed badly on previous LPA projects from bidding again on future ones. Unfortunately, ADOT cannot do that and that is against the law. Arizona is a low bid state and the contractor (as long as he can secure a bond along with meeting the minimum state requirements as a contractor) can continue to bid on projects as long as he wants.

#### **Working Lunch – Meeting Guest – Steve Boschen, ADOT Division Director, Infrastructure Delivery and Operations Division**

It’s Your Way – It is your facility that you have to maintain. ADOT should not be prescriptive. We are going to put out a Design and Compliance Review to hire a consultant team. In January 2017 it should bring the Project Management Design Review (PMDR) fees down.

**Lean Stakeholder Survey Feedback**

Handouts were presented to all attendees and were reviewed by the team. Set of handouts included three responses from LPAs.

**Roundtable**

- Recommendation by the LPAs: ADOT needs to invest in improving their accounting system. The suggestion is for all computers to be uniform and use the same ledgers internally, and matching externally the same ledgers the LPAs are using. So, everything can be consistent among all stakeholders.
- Discussed feedback from 3 local agencies. ADOT handed out the original survey used to solicit discussions for round table topics.
- LPA section handed out a copy of the original survey sent to LPAs in 2013 that identified hot topics.

**Announcements**

ADOT – Gave an overview of the LPA inspector training “Boot Camp” program. The class was completely full before the deadline of August 5, 2016. The group was informed that ADOT created a web page called Inspector Training “Boot Camp” and can be accessed via the ADOT LPA section website.

**Next meeting**

December 8, 2016 at MAG

**Adjournment**

September 8, 2016 at 2:00 pm

---

**Attachments:**

Handouts and Sign-in sheet

- LPA Inspector “Boot Camp” training – Handout
- September 8, 2016 Sign-in Sheet
- LPA Participation
- Survey feedback

# Everyday Counts - Arizona Local Public Agency Stakeholder Council

Thursday, September 8, 2016 • 10:00 PM – 2:00 PM

Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) • 302 N. 1<sup>st</sup> Ave, Saguaro Conference Room • Phoenix, AZ 85003

Completion of this sign-in sheet is completely voluntary and helps the project team keep an accurate record of meeting attendees. Under state law, any identifying information provided below will become part of the public record and, as such, must be released to any individual upon request. Please print clearly.

NAME	AGENCY	PHONE	EMAIL
Sadi Rooney	ADOT LPA	602/206-3534	srooney@azdot.gov
Said Asad	ADOT LPA	602-712-8884	Sasad@azdot.gov
Nathan Barrett	Pima Assoc. of Govts	520-792-1093	nbarrett@PAGRegion.org
Frank Marbury	City of Kingman	928-753-8134	fmarbury@cityofkingman.gov
Irene Higgs	SunCorridor MPO	590-705-5143	ihiggs@scmpo.org
CHRIS BRIDGES	CMPO	928-925-9213	cmbr@cmpr.org
Yvonn Knight	CMPO	928-453-8824	knights@cmpr.org
Matthew Reddy	ADOT Central Dist.	602-412-8965	MReddy@azdot.gov
RANDY EVERETT	FHWAA	602-382-8989	randolph.everett@dot.gov
Emice Chan	FHWAA	602-382-8965	emice.chan@dot.gov
Rick Ellis	Pima Co. DOT	520-724-6585	rick.ellis@pima.gov
Debbie Albert	Glendale	623/930-2939	dalbert@glendaleaz.com
Steve Boschen	ADOT		

**ADOT**

Paul Tartare

ADOT

**ADOT** Arizona Department of Transportation

**Offer**

# LPA Inspector Training “Boot Camp”



An inspection training program is in the process of being developed for Local Public Agency (LPA) staff to be able to inspect their own projects when using Federal funds. Completion of the training program will certify the LPAs inspectors to be in compliance with Federal and State requirements.

**September 26 - 29, 2016**

**8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. each day**

**Human Resource Development Center (HRDC)**

**1130 N. 22nd Ave. Phoenix, Arizona 85009**



## TOPICS TO BE COVERED:

### Level I (LPA Material Testing):

- ACI Concrete Field Testing Technician Grade 1
- ATTI (Field) Certification
- ATSSA Traffic Control for Technician

### LPA Level III (On-the-job Training)

The LPA inspector will be placed on an active ADOT construction project to work with the ADOT inspectors under the supervision of the Resident Engineer (RE) within their own ADOT District.

### LPA Level II (LPA Inspection) “Boot Camp” classes:

- Integrating Requirements
- Bituminous 305-Asphalt Paving
- 102-Earthwork Excavation & Embankment
- 103-Earthwork Pipe Placement
- 202-Incidental Concrete Structures
- 203-PCCP Paving
- Pay Item Daily Diary Documentation
- Pen Base 5.0 System
- Force Account Documentation for Inspectors

### Online classes:

- TCCC Daily Diary
- Quantlists for Inspectors



For more information contact **Said Asad** at: [sasad@azdot.gov](mailto:sasad@azdot.gov), and to register contact LTAP at: [ttraining@azdot.gov](mailto:ttraining@azdot.gov). Deadline for registration is August 5, 2016.

## **Local Public Agency Feedback (3) – Handout for discussion purposes**

### **Topic – LEAN STAKEHOLDER SURVEY FEEDBACK**

We appreciate this opportunity to provide feedback to ADOT. At the City of X we appreciate the relationship we have with ADOT. We work with ADOT staff on many levels and have some thoughts in regard to improvements that could be made:

1. When coordinating capital projects constructed by ADOT, the City often enters in to an IGA with ADOT when the City includes certain funded improvements to City facilities as part of the ADOT project. Recently the City received numerous invoices related to some of these IGA's that were several years old, some over 10 years old. Also, we have discovered that there are many cases where easements and permits that should have been issued as outlined in these IGA's have not been completed, many years after the project is complete. We ask that more effort be made to process invoices fulfill these IGA requirements in a timely manner.
2. The City is currently in the process of recertifying our Certification Acceptance. This has been a long process and we appreciate the help provided by ADOT staff. However, the amount of oversight and other requirements makes us wonder if there is value in being certified. Often it seems that we are being asked to follow an ADOT process that may not be required to fulfill the federal requirements. Any help that can be provided to simplify the processes and requirements would be appreciated. Also, ensuring that communication protocols are followed that have been put in place to simplify the exchange of information for this process through the designated liaison would help minimize confusion.
3. One idea that has been discussed at times would be to reinstitute the HURF Exchange. My understanding is that in the past ADOT would trade state HURF funding for federal funding so that the local agency that has a small federal grant could use the state funding and not have to follow the federal process. The federal funding would then be used by ADOT for their projects. This would reduce the number of staff needed to manage the federal process and reduce the time needed to complete these projects. Nebraska uses this on all local grants so that the local agencies don't get bogged down with the federal process. Even doing this for a few projects to start out would be a benefit for local agencies and ADOT.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide feedback to ADOT and we look forward to our continued relationship.

---

## **Local Public Agency Feedback (3) – Handout for discussion purposes**

### **Topic – LEAN STAKEHOLDER SURVEY FEEDBACK**

Thank you for this opportunity to provide feedback on the ADOT process. Although I find ADOT personnel generally pleasant to work with, the system is bureaucratic and broken. The worst situations I have experienced are the administration of federally funded local government projects. In order to initiate the project, local governments are required to sign a JPA making the local governments responsible for any cost overages. The problem is, after essentially being given a blank check, ADOT staff have no incentive to control costs. Some of the abuses I have seen or been informed of include:

- Multiple people from the same work group reviewing and charging time against a project. In one situation, three people from the geotechnical group reviewed the same report.
- Reviewers issuing conflicting comments and making no effort to resolve the discrepancy prior to returning comments to the local agency.
- Reviewers asking the local agency to change a detail, and then asking them to change it back again in a later review.
- Multiple people from the same work group attending an out of town meeting in order to charge time against a project.
- ADOT personnel falling asleep or working on other items at a project meeting they are billing time against.
- Multiple inspectors present on the same small job site, sometimes rarely leaving their vehicles or remaining at the site when limited work is occurring.
- Invoices which are not itemized and lack any documentation substantiating the charges.
- Invoices which arrive YEARS after the project is complete and closed-out.

In general, we have found that ADOT administration of a project adds months to the project timeframe and at least 25% to the cost. There are no doubt ways to fix these problems, but it is going to take a lot of time and a lot of effort. I applaud ADOT on its willingness to take the first step.

---

## Local Public Agency Feedback (3) – Handout for discussion purposes

### Topic – LEAN STAKEHOLDER SURVEY FEEDBACK

April 29, 2016

I have contact with various departments at ADOT and 97% of the time the staff that I have interaction with are first rate. Their response is timely and usually detailed. There are areas of ADOT that in my opinion could function better if the computer system were either updated or interactive. For a small MPO streamlining is critical and I try to do that on a regular basis. Below I have identified a couple of areas that I have made my job more time consuming and difficult.

1. E-Stip system: has been a work in progress for at least 4 – years. It processes slow, hard to maneuver through and difficult to understand; and, at this time is not even utilized by ADOT. So my question, why are you requiring COGs and MPOs to use it? My suggestion, until the system is functioning correctly and ADOT & FHWA approve how it functions, remove the requirement. Do not piece-meal as it goes along, wait until it is completely updated.
2. DBE system: I understand the use of DBEs ; however, why go through the process for small studies under \$500,000? When hiring a consultant for a “Study” everything is usually done by the firm, yet at this time ADOT is requiring a DBE. This can be an added expense that in my opinion is unnecessary. The DBE System is cumbersome to say the least. It is very time consuming and if a consultant or their sub-contractor fails to enter required data, the responsibility lies with the COG or MPO to follow up on; those who have the smallest staff. This requirement should be reconsidered for studies. (FYI, the DBE staff is fantastic and tries to help as much as possible)
3. Title VI & Environmental Justice: This is a very important requirement and all COGs and MPOs do prepare Title VI Plans. The problem is there are no defined instructions. The information again is piecemealed out and we have to try and figure it out . It would be helpful if staff that we interact with talk in laymen terms rather than technical terms so we can understand. I would suggest that because this is such a strict requirement (and I agree) it would be most helpful to develop a template with specific instructions and provide group training to COGs & MPOs. Additionally, if there are changes distribute them timely.
4. Federal Aid Balances: There are too many different areas COGs and MPOs have to deal with and report to and yet it appears that all of the computers and individuals do not talk with or even know one another. Example: Ledgers are provided to let us from one department so that we know what our funding is (hard to understand) and when it is available, yet accounting in MPD doesn't have any idea. I have had to provide them my ledger to show my funding has been authorized. The person who enters the funding into ProcureAZ is also not always advised as balances will not show and again we need to provide the information; and, if the information is incorrect that requires more emails and phone calls. This can entail emails and phone calls, which can get time consuming. The solution would be for all computer systems to speak with one another and staff to have a clear understanding of the “start to finish” process.

Thank you for your time and it is important to mention that the majority of the staff is very thorough and provides information timely.

EDC AZ LPA Stakeholder Council- handout for discussion purposes

TOPIC – LPA PARTICIPATION ON A FEDERALLY FUNDED PROJECT

### **What does active participation look like? –**

**While every project is different, here is a picture of what Local Public Agency (LPA) Active Participation may look like in construction:**

- Even when a project is ADOT-administered, LPAs should remain actively involved in all phases to help keep the project on schedule and within budget by:
- Participating in project partnering meetings
- Attending monthly design project meetings and weekly construction meetings, as appropriate
- Reviewing project schedule and costs to ensure that the project stays within scope and on budget
- Notifying the ADOT project manager if changes in the project are desired
- Approving change orders during construction
- Participating in the final walk-through



<https://www.azdot.gov/docs/default-source/business/lpa-manual.pdf?sfvrsn=50>