

Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No. TX -97/0-1729-S		2. Government Accession No.		3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Evaluation of the TxDOT Partnering Plus Program				5. Report Date October 1998	
				6. Performing Organization Code TECH	
7. Author(s) Douglas D. Gransberg, Howard L. Reynolds, Jack Boyd, and Gokcer Gokdogan				8. Performing Organization Report No. Final Report 1729-S	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Texas Tech University Department of Engineering Technology and Civil Engineering Box 43107 Lubbock, Texas 79409-3107				10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)	
				11. Contract or Grant No. Project 0-1729-S	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Texas Department of Transportation Research and Technology P. O. Box 5080 Austin, TX 78763-5080				13. Type of Report and Period Cover Final Report	
				14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes Study conducted in cooperation with the Texas Department of Transportation. Research Project Title: "Evaluating the Effectiveness of Current and Future Partnering Efforts"					
16. Abstract This project's initial objective was to identify and attempt to quantify the benefits and impacts of partnering on the Department. In January 1997, a major partnering policy directive was issued which requires partnering on all projects. Therefore, the thrust of this project was changed to evaluate the impact past partnering efforts and develop a method the assist TxDOT field personnel to determine whether to formally or informally partner construction projects. Surveys of TxDOT personnel, construction contractors, and external facilitators have been completed. The partnering cost per project has been determined. A project performance database of 408 partnered and non-partnered projects has been built. The data in this database has been reduced and statistical analysis has been completed. It was found that partnered projects that were \$5 million or larger outperformed nonpartnered projects in all categories. Another survey of TxDOT and contractors with regard to informal partnering was to be completed and the results of the entire study was synthesized into a partnering decision making model contained in the implementation plan. The report recommends that TxDOT drop the "formal" and "informal" designations for partnering, and replace them with a single designation of "partnered" to indicate any formal meeting whose purpose is to specifically focus on building relationships for project success. Those projects which are not "partnered" will include the three most valuable portions of the partnering process, issues, issue escalation ladder, and action plans, as a part of the pre-construction conference. The report also recommends that partnering be implemented on projects whose value is greater than \$5 million or where business relationships are new. Additionally, it recommends partnering smaller projects if they are complex, located in an urban area, and take longer than one construction season.					
17. Key Words Partnering,			18. Distribution Statement No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161		
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified		20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified		21. No. of Pages 85	22. Price

Evaluation of the TxDOT Partnering Plus Program

Final Report and Implementation Plan

By:

Douglas D. Gransberg, Ph.D., P.E., C.C.E.
Research Supervisor

Howard L. Reynolds
Researcher

Jack Boyd
Research Assistant

Gokcer Gokdogan
Research Assistant

Report Number: TX-97/0-1729-S
Project Number 0-1729

**“Evaluating the Effectiveness of Current
and Future Partnering Efforts”**

Research Sponsor
Texas Department of Transportation Research

Texas Tech University
Department of Engineering Technology
Box 43107
Lubbock, Texas 79409-3107

October 1998

Implementation Statement

The results of this project provide TxDOT qualitative and quantitative data regarding the effectiveness of the Texas Department of Transportation partnering program. The surveys and databases generated plus attendant analyses provide TxDOT officials positive indicators as to the benefits of partnering and the high level of maturation acquired by TxDOT employees and general contractors in the partnering process .

The major benefits gained from this research include (1) the most extensive database of partnered and non-partnered construction projects accumulated anywhere to date, (2) benchmarks which indicate dollar ranges that offer the greatest potential for benefits to TxDOT, and (3) a flowchart for management which provides an overview of the factors to consider when deciding whether a particular project is to be non-partner, formally partnered or informally partnered. The flowchart can be issued as a supplementary insert of the Partnering Plus handbook or as a stand-alone form.

Disclaimer

The contents of this report reflect the views of the research team who are responsible for the factual content and accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official view or policies of the Texas Department of Transportation. This report does not constitute a standard, specification or regulation.

Acknowledgements

The research team would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the valuable contributions made by the following members of the Texas Department of Transportation:

Doug Dillon, P.E., Project Director, Waco District
Julie Larrimer, former Program Coordinator, Continuous Improvement Office
Manny Torres, Program Coordinator, Continuous Improvement Office
Jose Morales, P.E., CART Chairman, Project Advisor, Odessa District

Without their help, professional guidance and advice, the project's work would have been much more difficult and time consuming.

Prepared in cooperation with the Texas Department of Transportation and the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration.

AUTHOR'S DISCLAIMER

The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors who are responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official view of policies of the Department of Transportation or the Federal Highway Administration. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

PATENT DISCLAIMER

There was no invention or discovery conceived or first actually reduced to practice in the course of or under this contract, including any art, method, process, machine, manufacture, design or composition of matter, or any new useful improvement thereof, or any variety of plant which is or may be patentable under the patent laws of the United States of America or any foreign country.

ENGINEERING DISCLAIMER

Not intended for construction, bidding, or permit purposes.

TRADE NAMES AND MANUFACTURERS' NAMES

The United States Government and the State of Texas do not endorse products or manufacturers. Trade or manufacturers' names appear herein solely because they are considered essential to the object of this report.

METRIC CONVERSION FACTORS

Approximate Conversions to Metric Measures

Symbol	When You Know	Multiply by	To Find	Symbol
LENGTH				
in	inches	2.5	centimeters	cm
ft	feet	30	centimeters	cm
yd	yards	0.9	meters	m
mi	miles	1.6	kilometers	km
AREA				
in ²	square inches	6.5	square centimeters	cm ²
ft ²	square feet	0.93	square meters	m ²
yd ²	square yards	0.8	square meters	m ²
mi ²	square miles	2.6	square kilometers	km ²
acres	acres	0.4	hectares	ha
MASS (weight)				
oz	ounces	28	grams	g
lb	pounds	4.5	kilograms	kg
	short tons (2000 lb)	0.9	tonnes	t
VOLUME				
cup	cup	240	milliliters	ml
fl oz	fluid ounces	30	milliliters	ml
c	cup	240	liters	l
qt	quarts	0.95	liters	l
gal	gallons	3.8	liters	l
cu ft	cubic feet	0.03	cubic meters	m ³
cu yd	cubic yards	0.76	cubic meters	m ³
TEMPERATURE (exact)				
°F	Fahrenheit temperature	5/9 (then subtracting 32)	Celsius temperature	°C

Approximate Conversions from Metric Measures

Symbol	When You Know	Multiply by	To Find	Symbol
LENGTH				
cm	centimeters	0.04	inches	in
m	meters	0.4	feet	ft
km	kilometers	0.6	miles	mi
AREA				
cm ²	square centimeters	0.16	square inches	in ²
m ²	square meters	1.2	square yards	yd ²
km ²	square kilometers	0.4	square miles	mi ²
ha	hectares (10,000 m ²)	2.5	acres	acres
MASS (weight)				
g	grams	0.035	ounces	oz
kg	kilograms (1000 g)	2.2	pounds	lb
t	tonnes (1000 kg)	1.1	short tons	short tons
VOLUME				
ml	milliliters	0.03	fluid ounces	fl oz
l	liters	3.1	quarts	qt
l	liters	1.06	gallons	gal
m ³	cubic meters	35	cubic feet	ft ³
m ³	cubic meters	1.3	cubic yards	yd ³
TEMPERATURE (exact)				
°C	Celsius temperature	9/5 (then add 32)	Fahrenheit temperature	°F





Table of Contents

Implementation Statement	ii
Disclaimer	ii
Acknowledgments	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Tables	iv
List of Figures	v
Report	
Background	1
Work Plan Statement	2
Literature Review	7
Analysis Results	8
Analysis of Project Variance	24
Findings and Recommendations	27
Implementation Plan	29
Appendix A. Quantitative Analysis of Project Performance	A-1
Appendix B. Regression Analysis of Project Database	B-1
Appendix C. Survey Summaries	C-1
Bibliography	Bib-1

List of Tables

Table 1. Partnering’s Impact on Working Relationships	11
Table 2. Qualitative Benefits of Partnering	11
Table 3. Developing a Process for Resolving Disagreements	11
Table 4. Empowered to Make Decisions	12
Table 5. Overall Partnered Projects Improve Quality	12
Table 6. Overall Partnered Projects Improve Safety and Health	12
Table 7. The Respondents from TxDOT and Their Experience in Partnered Projects	13
Table 8. The Respondents from General Contractor and Their Experience in Partnered Projects	14
Table 9. Experience in Partnered Projects	14
Table 10. Chi-Square Probability > 0.1	17
Table 11. Comparison to Previous Results with This Study’s Results	18
Table 12. Statistical Breakdown of Project Parameters by Award Price Range and Total Population	19
Table 13. Statistical Breakdown of Project Parameters by Award Price Range	20
Table 14. Statistical Breakdown of Project Parameters by Award Price Range and Total Population	21
Table 15. Variability Comparison: Partnered and Non-Partnered	25
Table 16. COV Dollar Grouping: Partnered and Non-partnered	25
Table 17. Coefficient of Variance (COV) Analysis	26
Table 18. Contract Time for Projects Between \$1 and \$5 Million	32
Table A-1. Statistical Breakdown of Project Parameters by Award Price Range	A-8
Table A-2. Statistical Breakdown of Project Parameters by Award Price Range and Total Population	A-9
Table B-1. Regression Models	B-2

List of Figures

Figure 1. TxDOT Partnering Flow-Chart	31
Figure A-1. Cost Growth	A-10
Figure A-2. Number of Change Orders	A-11
Figure A-3. Average Change Order Cost	A-12
Figure A-4. Average Change Order Cost as a Percentage of Contract Amount	A-12
Figure A-5. Percent of Projects with Negative Cost Growth	A-12
Figure A-6. Time Growth	A-13
Figure A-7. Additional Days Granted	A-14
Figure A-8. Percent of Projects with Liquidated Damages	A-15
Figure A-9. Liquidated Damages as a Percent of Total Cost	A-15
Figure A-10. Liquidated Damages as a Percent of Total Time	A-16
Figure A-11. Disputes Costs	A-17
Figure A-12. Claims Cost	A-17

Evaluation of the TxDOT Partnering Plus Program

BACKGROUND

The Texas Department of Transportation Continuous Improvement Office launched the Partnering Plus Program in December 1996 (TxDOT, 1996). This program is the embodiment of the decision to implement partnering on a large scale throughout the state. The new program promulgated a policy that required partnering to be used on all TxDOT construction projects. There were two options available for partnering.

- Formally partner the project utilizing a designated facilitator
- Informally partner the project using project personnel to facilitate

As a part of the Partnering Plus Program, facilitators from inside TxDOT and its contractors were trained. Additionally, training for project personnel and others was conducted throughout Texas to ensure that informal partnering sessions conformed to the requirements thought to be necessary to ensure the maximum benefits from the exercise. As a result of this decision, the course of this research was shifted away from creating a decision-making system for identifying projects to partner. The focus was easily moved to the creation of a method to assist the Department in identifying those projects that would benefit from the investment of time and money in formal partnering sessions. The data that had been collected formed a body of knowledge with regard to the performance of partnered projects in comparison to the performance of non-partnered projects. This statistical data has allowed the research team to identify the types of projects that marginally benefit from partnering as opposed to those which displayed significantly enhanced performance.

In the spring of 1998 major leadership and organizational changes were effected within TxDOT that again impacted the partnering research focus, particularly Task 2. TxDOT no longer requires that a construction project be partnered. As the partnering research has shown, the maturation level for both TxDOT and general contractors is very high since the inception of partnering within TxDOT. The decision whether to partner or not is now vested within the TxDOT districts.

Partnering construction contracts is popular throughout US and in certain other countries. The term Partnering evokes different meanings to different sectors of the engineering and construction industries. Among the designers and builders of privately-financed projects, Partnering is a strategic relationship that is developed for relatively long periods of time and for multiple projects. These strategic Partnering projects garner many advantages to their members. The main advantage is the development of an understanding of the partners' motivations, trustworthiness, and means of communication. This understanding allows one partner to gauge the other partner's potential reactions to an impending crisis and encourages the honest sharing of bad news in a timely manner. This permits joint action to avert or minimize damage to the successful completion of the project in question.

Private strategic partnering has an advantage over counterparts in the public sector in that the private entities are relatively free of regulation on the form and the substance of their internal operational activities and contractual relationships. Public agencies must answer to lawmakers, regulators, and the general public. Thus, the freedom to develop a longstanding, strategic Partnership with private organizations is greatly diminished if not eliminated altogether. As a result, agencies like the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) have confined their Partnering activities to single project, team-building seminars and have not yet attempted to establish multiple project Partner relationships with entities in private sectors. TxDOT has also looked for ways to improve their Partnering efforts and has developed the Partnering Plus Program. Under this program, TxDOT and a private contractor join together in a Partnering arrangement to accomplish the work covered by the contract. The Partnering Plus Program provides two ways of Partnering: formal and informal.

In formal partnering, there is a facilitated meeting that covers one or more modules of the Partnering process. Initially the owner and the contractor mutually agree upon an agenda, a location and the format, and the scope and attendees. The contractor and engineer select a facilitator. This facilitator must have technical knowledge to lead and guide discussions. The facilitator will make all the meeting arrangements, meet with the engineer and the contractor, and set the final agenda prior to the workshop. The facilitator discusses all issues presented by either party and is flexible to the needs of the Partnering team. The facilitator also ends the session when both the engineer and contractor agree that the session is not following the agenda or achieving planned objectives. The facilitator acts as a neutral party seeking to advance proactive pre-project planning. In informal Partnering, a non-facilitated meeting is set up which, at the minimum, covers communication issue resolutions and issue escalation processes. The engineer and contractor agree on an agenda and add it to the pre-construction conference.

WORK PLAN STATEMENT

TxDOT's Continuous Improvement Office awarded a research contract with two phases to Texas Tech University, namely, to identify and quantify the impacts and benefits of their Partnering effort and to develop a management tool. The management tool is to provide guidance to project managers responsible for determining the type of Partnering to use (informal or formal). The study addressed the following problems.

- Analysis of the costs and the benefits of partnering on TxDOT projects
- Development of parameters and criteria to measure the effectiveness of partnering
- Use of these parameters and criteria to create a management tool by which future construction projects can be evaluated to determine the appropriateness and potential benefit of using both formal partnering and informal partnering on a case by case basis
- Assessment of attitudinal feelings toward the partnering process within TxDOT and their contractors

The research team used a three-pronged, global approach that is responsive to the six tasks (as amended by the series of policy changes since the start of this research) outlined in the problem statement to solve the problem. First, historical data from TxDOT projects and literature was gathered, sorted, and analyzed from three perspectives (government, contractor, and private business practice) to identify trends and significant differences. These were used to provide project-specific inputs to a database and provide a reliable estimate of a future project's relative suitability for Partnering.

Cost index number theory, fuzzy logic, and neural networks were investigated to achieve this purpose. Fuzzy logic had been successfully used by the Corps of Engineers to quantify qualitative data on potential Design-Build contractors (Paek, J.H., et al, 1992), and it was felt that this approach was very close to the required approach for Partnering. It was found that while cost index number theory will work quite well in this situation, fuzzy logic requires the development of an expert system to be totally effective. Neural networks seemed to provide a promising mechanism for this solution. This was rejected as being too complex and abstract. The focus of the research shifted towards differentiating between formal and informal partnering plus the analysis of historical records as affecting non-Partnered and Partnered projects

The Work Plan roughly followed the six tasks listed in the original research problem statement. Some of these tasks were necessarily amended due to major policy changes implemented by new leadership within TxDOT. The project was divided into six major tasks with which must be accomplished to adequately cover the research topic. This report will briefly recapitulate the task descriptions and describe the work completed on each. The quantitative and qualitative results attendant to these tasks are presented in the analysis of results.

The shift in focus to study a method to determine the type of Partnering to be used on a given project did not significantly impact the project milestones. The one point that caused any concern was the overwhelming response to the detailed Partnering survey questionnaires. While this has given us more data than expected, it bodes well for developing findings with a high degree of statistical significance and the potential for producing the first definitive study on the subject of Partnering. Additionally, it was found that some of the desired data points are not available in digital records. Having to collect data in widely dispersed sets of paper records on over 400 projects was determined to be unrealistic, and the required data set was modified to maximize the use of those records which were readily available in computer searchable form.

The work tasks associated with the research are restated, and a synopsis of the work status is summarized. Analysis and findings are delineated in the analysis of results.

Task 1: This task includes both the literature review and the tabulation of data from TxDOT's records. It consists of the following five subtasks.

Subtask 1A: This subtask is the collection of cost and benefit data to determine the total TxDOT investment to date in its Partnering program.

In actuality, the data was not as readily available as hoped by the research team. It was found that some of the data resided in the Office of Continuous Improvement, and we were able to gather that data. The remainder of the data, specifically the participant cost, is only available in the Districts. Additionally, the actual costs would be difficult to separate inside the basic

accounting system. In discussion with the Project Director, it was decided to conduct a survey of all Area Engineers to determine the cost to participate in an average partnering session. The survey was completed and the results of this subtask appear elsewhere in this final report as Tables 1 and 2.

Subtask 1B: This subtask involves the collection of project cost and schedule performance data on both partnered and non-partnered projects to determine parametric factors for inclusion in the partnering model.

The informal partnering session held in October 1996 was attended by members of the TxDOT Continuous Improvement Office. As a result, data of this nature was quickly located. As is often the case, some of the desired data was unavailable and not constructable. This is specifically true for project information regarding schedule impact factors. Basically, the only data of this nature that we could find was the typical project start and completion dates as well as information on number of days of liquidated damages assessed against each project and the number of additional days allowed. Data collection and reduction on 204 partnered projects and 204 non-partnered projects was completed.

Subtask 1C: This subtask involves sorting cost data to identify trends and possible parameters for partnering model.

All necessary data analyses were completed. The presentation of these results appears in the analysis of results.

Subtask 1D: Subtask 1D includes the analysis of the results and the identification of factors that promote accrued benefits.

This subtask was accomplished using standard statistical analysis techniques. The mean, standard deviation and variance has been computed for all data points. Additionally, projects were grouped by contract amount to give the researchers a feel for the variation of desired data points with regard to project size. The data statistics are presented in the analysis of results.

Subtask 1E: This subtask involves conducting a literature review to ensure that the state-of-the-art is well defined and understood during the course of this research project.

Work on this subtask did not produced expected data with regard to existing systems to quantify partnering benefits. Since the last interim report, no additional inputs were received that could be construed as potential models for measuring partnering benefits.

Task 2 (Amended): Originally and as reported in the last interim report, this task was to explore opportunities to exploit partnering in “nontraditional” contracts and relationships within the Department and among its customers and stakeholders. With the exception of Subtask 2C which was completed at the beginning the research project, initial work on this task was to begin in the late spring of 1998. Before commencement of work, the team reviewed the planned approach in light of information gained in the first year of the project. However, before work was initiated on the remaining subtasks, TxDOT experience major changes in leadership and organization that

subsequently redefined the focus of Task 2. With the policy change in the Spring of 1998 which in essence now allows the decision whether to partner a given project or not to be vested with the TxDOT district, the TxDOT Deputy Director in telephone conversation with the principal research investigator amended this task. Basically the research team was directed to develop a "checklist" which would provide those TxDOT officials responsible for deciding whether or not to partner a given project key factors to consider in arriving at their decision

Subtask 2A: Subtask 2A includes the development of a checklist for use as a management tool for identifying the pros and cons of partnering a given project. The checklist developed is shown in the implementation plan.

Subtask 2C: As research and development contracts are an integral and substantial portion of the TxDOT budget, conduct an experiment in partnering "nontraditional" contracts by formally partnering this research contract.

An informal partnering session was held in Austin during October 1996. The session was well attended by appropriate members of the Department. Two of the three researchers were able to attend. The primary benefit of the session became the clarification of the requirements of this effort by TxDOT. The open channel of communication between the researchers and the Project Advisory Group greatly facilitated the initial efforts in data collection and the development of a Best Practices Survey which is directly responsive to the Project Director and the Departments need for specific information. The other important product of the session was a redesigned schedule of deliverables that will better serve the needs of the Project Director to provide information to Research Management Committee 1.

Task 3: The work associated with this task generally involved the development of survey questionnaires, their distribution, and an analysis of the results.

The focus was in discovering any parameters used by other agencies, both public and private, which could be used to measure the benefit and impact of partnering on their projects. The work was organized in three subtasks.

Subtask 3A: This subtask includes a review of the literature to find surveys of a similar nature that may have been used in previous studies.

The literature review uncovered four primary surveys on this subject. The most valuable was a survey done in conjunction with a Master's Thesis at the University of Texas on early partnering efforts of the Department. There was also a survey completed by the Ohio Department of Transportation. We found surveys done by the Corps of Engineers and the Naval Facilities Engineering Command as well. Information found in the literature was combined with information from this project's informal partnering session to form the basis of the surveys that were developed for subsequent subtasks. Detailed findings of the literature search are presented in the literature review.

Subtask 3B: Subtask 3B was to prepare and distribute a survey that asks the surveyed population to define how they measure the benefits and impacts of partnering.

The content of the survey was coordinated with the data collection plan for Task 1 to ensure that the survey's results could be correlated with TxDOT historical data to aid in the identification of parameters to measure partnering's effect on contracting systems. A two-phase approach was taken to distribute the surveys to public and private agencies. First, a preliminary survey was sent to all possible addressees and its results were used to target those organizations with the best information for the detailed survey. This permitted the team to filter out those agencies who had never used partnering and more importantly, those who had but would not be expected to respond to a detailed survey. It also helped us identify subject matter experts in each organization so that we could direct the detailed, second survey to the correct person who had the requisite information that we needed. The results of this effort are presented in the analysis of results.

Subtask 3C: Reduce the survey output and determine a "best practice" method of measuring benefit and impact. This task was completed, and the results are summarized in the analysis of results.

Ancillary Tasking Resulting from Mini Project Partnering Session

At the initial project partnering session, TxDOT requested that a questionnaire be developed and distributed to a sample of TxDOT field personnel. The purpose of the survey was to assess TxDOT field personnel feelings as to the progress of their partnering effort. The last such comparable measurement of TxDOT personnel was accomplished in January 1995 as part of a research project by a graduate student at the University of Texas (Grajek, 1995). That survey was reviewed. The same questions were repeated in the survey developed by the Texas Tech researchers, particularly those questions assessing attitude toward the various aspects of the TxDOT partnering effort. This approach allows TxDOT to use the Grajek report more or less as a baseline for comparison with the latest survey results.

A copy of the survey was developed by Texas Tech researchers and forwarded to a sample population of TxDOT field personnel, contractors, and external facilitators. A quasi-sampling approach was selected in which ten surveys were sent to every TxDOT District Engineer for random distribution to field personnel. Of the 250 TxDOT surveys distributed, 184 were completed and returned for a 74% response rate. Of 238 contractor surveys, 68 were returned and resulted in a response rate of 29%. 100% of the twelve external facilitator surveys were returned.

Task 4: Due to the fact that no reliable metric for partnering could be found, work on this task could not be accomplished. After discussions with the Project Director, it was decided to substitute a study of informal partnering which follows the same form and format as the survey of TxDOT field personnel and contractors in Task 3. Respondents will be asked to identify the criteria they currently use to select formal partnering over informal partnering. This data was used along with other data analyses to prepare a partnering checklist as a management tool to be used as appropriate for management making this type of decision on future projects.

Task 5: The work associated with this task will concentrate on identifying and quantifying criteria to compare the performance of partnered projects to the performance of non-partnered projects.

A statistically significant sample size for both partnered and non-partnered projects was determined. With this number, projects were randomly selected from among the available pool of projects. Care was taken to ensure the statistical integrity of the process. Additionally, an equal number of projects in both groups were taken to prevent the skewing of data that was apparent in a previous study which used unequal sample sizes. Projects were grouped according to contract amount and unit measure size to permit trends between large and small projects to emerge and become apparent to the analyst. Standard statistical measurements, as previously described in the Work Plan, were used to provide a comparative analysis in the cost and schedule categories. This work and the results are presented in *Chapter 3 – Analysis Results*.

Task 6: This task will synthesize the output from the preceding five tasks in developing a management tool which will can be used by management to decide whether to formally partner, informally partner, or roll-up in the pre-construction meeting upcoming projects. This tool is presented in the implementation plan.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature search shows that the growth of partnering is directly related to the growth in claims and litigation regarding construction contracts throughout the nation (Kubal, 1994). In the late 1980s, the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) led the way for public agencies to begin using this new business practice as a means to avoid disputes and consequently reduce the ultimate cost of delivering public facilities. USACE's official program has largely been one of promoting the concept without any benchmark measurements or definitive performance measurement. The identification of quantitative measures of partnering benefits by public agencies has largely been avoided in favor of a less abstract assessment of qualitative benefits, and analyses of those few attempts to quantify this information is fraught with pitfalls. One of those pitfalls involves the collection, and more importantly, interpretation of statistics regarding partnering. In USACE, there was a tendency to credit partnering for project successes even when there was no tangible evidence of any improvement over the status quo (Gransberg and Ellicott, 1996). This was caused by the intense personal investment public project managers and contractors make during partnering sessions. There is no doubt that enhanced communication greatly improves a project's management/dispute resolution environment.

Most serious studies of the process have failed to identify significant benefits that can be directly attributed to partnering. The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) has reported significant benefits from partnering using a study which found that partnered projects had 2% less cost growth than non-partnered projects (Chapin, 1994). But the method for computing these values seems to be quite arbitrary due to the way they seem to credit this 2% savings on all partnered projects contract price without regard to actual cost growth on each project. This same problem is rather well illustrated by a study done at the University of Texas (Grajek, 1995) where the author found that "...partnering (on 65 TxDOT projects) is not having a statistically significant impact on cost change, change order cost or net change cost." The same study found that partnered projects finished an average of 13.73% ahead of schedule as compared to non-

partnered projects that only finished 9.68% ahead of schedule. The author goes on to equate the value of early completion to the value of liquidated damages as a method to quantify the benefit of partnering. While this appears to show some impact, the fact that most projects finish ahead of the contract completion date indicates that the Department is being conservative in establishing those dates and the study is fundamentally flawed in assuming the value of finishing is equal to the cost of finishing late. While there is nothing fundamentally wrong with the TxDOT's policy for setting contract completion dates, it makes interpretation of actual performance data difficult with regard to schedule. A study conducted in 1994 of Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) projects cited many of the same difficulties in obtaining data (Chapin, 1994). This study based many of its recommendations on questionnaires distributed to ODOT and contractor field personnel. One of the study's prime recommendations is that only complex projects that exceed \$5 million be formally partnered.

USACE found that partnering is most valuable on projects with tight schedules, and techniques such as issue escalation and open communication tend to enhance the efficiency of critical decision making. This allows the contractor the maximum amount of time to react to scope changes and still retain satisfactory progress. Change order time extensions are much more important to a contractor on a project with a tight schedule than on one that has greater schedule flexibility (Kubal, 1994). Thus, the contractor will be more liable to formalize a dispute over a time extension on the former than on the latter (Kane, 1992). This fact further blurs the validity of the apparent schedule improvement on partnered TxDOT projects. The other problem with past studies involves the small relative sample size available to past researchers. This springs from the fact that these studies were initiated at times when the use of partnering was relatively new, and there were comparatively few projects completed to analyze. To avoid statistical insignificance, this study sampled over 200 partnered and 200 non-partnered projects over a five-year period of time. The inferences made from analysis of the reduced data should be definitive.

The above discussion is not meant to cast doubts on the validity of the partnering process, but rather to indicate the importance of understanding the dynamics of the process that produces the contract performance data. Studies done on USACE and Naval Facilities Command (NAVFAC) projects confined themselves to competitively bid, firm fixed price projects (Pina, 1993, Schmader, 1994, and Weston and Gibson, 1993). Since the date of those studies, Best Value selection has been implemented on a broad scale by USACE and to a limited degree by NAVFAC. Best Value selection removes the requirement to award to the low bidder and has changed the dynamic under which partnering was developed in the Federal government (Ellicott and Gransberg, 1996). This approach shows much promise.

ANALYSIS RESULTS

Survey 1: Partnering Survey to States and Other Organizations

In the survey sent to states and other organizations, there were twenty-six responses. Many responses to Partnering were positive ones. Of the responses received, approximately 96 percent of the organizations said that they have partnered before. About 88 percent indicated that partnering improved the project in some way. Out of those who indicated improvement, about 52 percent said that it increased communication.

Initially, the team hoped to be able to directly measure partnering related benefits based on project performance data by using formulas found in other states or public agencies and then modified to fit the TxDOT environment. But no such formulas were found, and a direct measurement was too complex and abstract. Historical records were analyzed and databases developed which provided a basis for quantifying selected parameters. These were analyzed for possible indicators of a project's potential to benefit from formal partnering.

The survey resulted in the lack of responses regarding details of other agencies' methods to quantify or benchmark their partnering effort. With the possible exception of maintaining records of claims and project completion data, there appears to be no effort underway in the nation to quantify this type of benefit. Contacts with other agencies have led to comments that this effort is "too nebulous and of little value." Only two states, Arizona and Kansas, provided evidence that they were measuring partnering benefits, but unfortunately neither of them were willing to share their method of measurement.

In fact, no reliable method for providing a metric to measure partnering benefits has been found. We hypothesize that partnering is really a change in business behavior rather than the introduction of a technical innovation such as A+B bidding. Because partnering has no relationship to the technical aspects of the project, it is difficult to find substantiated improvements in project performance through traditional measures. In fact, it can be argued that project performance success is more influenced by the quality of the design, the environment in which construction must take place, and the technical abilities of both the owner and the builder than on the quality of the relationship inherent to the contract. Most quantified partnering "benefits" seem to be computed by determining the historical cost of contract problems such as claims and then imputing that cost as a benefit accrued by a partnered project if it is completed without a significant contract problem. For example, if the historical cost of construction claims in an agency was \$100,000 per contract, then using this philosophy would impute a \$100,000 "savings" for every partnered project which is completed without a construction claim. The fallacy of this approach is that it neglects the fact that most non-partnered contracts are also completed without a claim and it is blind to the statistical skewing of contract claims cost by the result of one multimillion dollar claim on agency's total program.

Another common attempt to quantify partnering benefits is to track agency supervision and administration costs on partnered projects and compare them to non-partnered projects. This method fails the common sense test because early in an agency's partnering program it tends to only partner large complex projects which, by nature, will have a lower than average supervision and administration cost per contract dollar than the average non-partnered project. It is concluded that there is no reliable medium in use to measure partnering benefits. Any attempt to do was relegated to come from the analysis of the data collected by this study.

The focus turned to evaluate the impact of past Partnering efforts. The data collection started with identifying 204 completed Partnering projects, then proceeded with identifying the same number of non-partnered from a time period that did not overlap the date ranges of the partnered projects. Twenty different data points such as contract completion date, original contract amount, and the number of change orders were collected on each project. All of the data was combined into one single database indexed to any of three data fields: the research team's project

identification number, TxDOT's project number, and a control number. This database contained 408 completed projects worth \$2.1 billion.

In addition to the quantitative project performance data, surveys of both TxDOT field personnel and contractors was conducted. The purposes of the survey were to assess attitudes toward the TxDOT Partnering program and identify factors that could lead to developing criteria for selecting a type of partnering (formal/informal). The last comparable measurement of the TxDOT program was accomplished in January 1995 as part of the research on a project by a graduate student at the University of Texas (Grajek, 1995). That survey was reviewed and, where appropriate, the same questions were repeated in the survey developed by the Texas Tech researchers particularly those assessing attitude toward the various aspects of the TxDOT Partnering effort. This approach allows TxDOT to use Grajek's report (1995) as a baseline for comparison with the latest survey results. A quasi-sampling approach was selected in which ten surveys were sent to every TxDOT district engineer for random distribution to field personnel. Of the 250 surveys distributed, 184 were completed and returned for a 74% response rate. A similar survey was also developed and submitted to a sample of general contractors who have completed partnered-TxDOT projects. Of the 238 surveys mailed to contractors, 68 were completed for a 29% response rate.

Survey 2: Formal Partnering Attitude Assessment and Analysis

In assessing Partnering attitudes of both TxDOT and the general contractor (GC) personnel, the focus in both surveys was to measure experience or maturation levels in the formal Partnering process. The general contractor questionnaire also asked for Partnering experience in non-TxDOT projects. While only 24% of the TxDOT respondents had participated in more than four partnered projects, the general contractor level was much higher at 43% for TxDOT partnered projects and 53% for non-TxDOT partnered projects. However, the maturation level for both groups for two or more TxDOT partnered projects was nearly the same level (TxDOT = 73% and general contractor = 81%). When compared to the Grajek (3) baseline data of 1995, which showed about 50 percent experience level for Partnering, experience has gained about 30 percent in both groups. The result strengthens the credibility of the survey by showing both groups are quite experienced with Partnering and can be expected to provide cogent information based on actual experience.

Question 6 of the survey asked the respondents to rate how Partnering may have affected their work relationships. Only TxDOT, General Contractor, and subcontractor responses are summarized in *Table 1*. The lower trend continues for subcontractors and may indicate as concluded in the baseline study that the partnering process still may not be filtering down below the owner/GC relationship. The 19% decrease in the GC's percentage as affecting their working relationship with TxDOT may show that as GCs become more experienced with Partnering, their expectations for quality of relationship rise. When the relationship does not improve as compared to the last partnered project, the GCs respond in a less positive manner. This also indicates there is probably an effective ceiling on partnering's ability to create a good working relationship.

Table 1. Partnering’s Impact on Working Relationships (Combined Responses for “Somewhat Better” and Much Better”)

Affected Working Relationships With....	TxDOT Survey	General Contractor Survey	Grajek Baseline Study (3) TxDOT/ G.C.
TxDOT	-	67%	86%
General Contractor	71%	-	67%
Subcontractors	37%	42%	46%

Question 14 on the general contractor questionnaire asked the respondents to rank the subjective measures of the Partnering process with 1 being the highest ranking. Table 2 summarizes the results and compares them to the baseline study (question 13). Important changes to note that occurred from the baseline study are in public satisfaction and stronger relationships. Again, perhaps the increased maturation levels of all participants have affected the rearrangements in benefit importance. Certainly the contractors see a greater benefit to TxDOT’s satisfaction than TxDOT perceives to others.

Table 2. Qualitative Benefits of Partnering

Partnering Benefit	TxDOT	General Contractor	Grajek Baseline Study (3) TxDOT/G. C.
Better Communication	1	1	1/1
Better Teamwork	3	4	2/2
Increased Trust	5	5	3/3
Stronger Relationships	7	6	4/4
TxDOT Satisfaction	2	2	5/5
Contractor Satisfaction	6	3	6/6
Public Satisfaction	4	5	7/7

Question 15 on the general contractor questionnaire asked the respondents to rate the project teams developing a process for resolving disagreements. Table 3 summarizes the responses. The baseline study did not have this question in the survey. It appears from the data that the general contractors have a greater expectation for resolution of disagreements.

Table 3. Developing a Process for Resolving Disagreements

Response	TxDOT	General Contractor
Always	34%	35%
Most Times	37%	55%
Sometimes	24%	8%
Never	5%	2%

Question 16 on the general contractor questionnaire and question 18 on the TxDOT questionnaire asked the respondents to rate the project teams attitude that it was empowered to make the decisions it needed to make to complete the project. The baseline study didn't have this question in the survey. The results are shown in table 4. It appears from the data shown in the table that the general contractors perceive a greater authority to make decisions. The difference could be attributable to the organizational structure and culture of each group. The general contractor appears to be organized for more decentralized "field" decision-making authority than TxDOT.

Table 4. Empowered to Make Decisions

Response	TxDOT	General Contractor
Always	14%	15%
Most Times	47%	64%
Sometimes	32%	18%
Never	7%	3%

Question 18 on the general contractor questionnaire and question 21 on the TxDOT questionnaire asked the respondents to rate Partnering as it affects quality. The baseline study did not have this question in its survey. Table 5 illustrates the responses to this important question. A 22% difference between TxDOT and the General Contractor responses on "agreeing that the quality" may warrant further analysis to ascertain why there is a significant difference in perception. However, as the contractors are in a better position to assess actual project quality, the results are very encouraging.

Table 5. Overall Partnered Projects Improve Quality

Response	TxDOT	General Contractor
Agree	60%	82%
Disagree	40%	18%

Question 19 on the general contractor questionnaire and question 22 on the TxDOT questionnaire asked the respondents to rate Partnering as it affects safety and health. The baseline study did have this question in the survey. The results are shown in table 6. A 17% difference between TxDOT and General Contractors on "agreeing that Partnering improves safety and health" may also warrant further analysis to understand the significant difference in perception and again, the contractors perspective provides for an optimistic result..

Table 6. Overall Partnered Projects Improve Safety and Health

Response	TxDOT	General Contractor
Agree	64%	81%
Disagree	36%	19%

With respect to survey perceptions by TxDOT and General Contractor personnel, the most interesting finding is that 60% of TxDOT personnel and 82% of General Contractor personnel believe that Partnering improves the quality of the final project. As the contractors are in a better position to see just how much quality is built to the project, this is a significant finding. It can also be determined that the TxDOT Partnering program is well supported by both parties to the construction contract. Thus, it appears that both parties believe that investing in a Partnering process at the start of a new project greatly enhances the probability of success. To confirm this belief, a quantitative analysis must demonstrate that the performance of partnered projects exceed that of non-partnered projects.

Formal Vs Informal Partnering Survey

One of the primary objectives of this project was to develop a management tool whose purpose is to provide guidance to project managers responsible for determining the type of Partnering to use: informal or formal. A survey of both TxDOT field personnel and contractors was conducted. The purpose of the survey was to collect information from TxDOT districts and general contractors regarding attitudes toward formal and informal Partnering in order to determine parameters in which formal or informal Partnering would be appropriate. The same survey was developed and distributed to both TxDOT and General Contractor personnel. Questionnaires were sent to each of the ten districts. Of the 250 questionnaires sent, 190 were completed and returned for a 76% response rate. The same questionnaires were submitted to a sample of general contractors who have completed partnered-TxDOT projects. Of the 234 surveys mailed to contractors, 43 were completed for a 19 % response rate, notably less than the response rate for the internal TxDOT survey. One of the reasons for the low response rate in general contractor response was surveys returned to researchers by the postal service as undeliverable with no forwarding address provided. This could have been due to the high attrition rate in the general contractor business. However, a wide range of the specialists participated in the survey. The number of respondents and their experience in partnered projects are shown in *Tables 7 and 8*.

Table 7. The Respondents from TxDOT and Their Experience in Partnered Projects

Organization Job Title	TxDOT			
	Respondents		Experience in Partnered Projects	
	Number	Percent	Formal	Informal
Inspector	15	7.7	3.26	6.0
Chief Inspector	41	21.2	1.65	2.63
Project Engineer	14	7.3	13.4	17.5
Area Engineer	50	25.9	0.48	0.62
Construction Engineer	15	7.8	2.66	4.3
District Engineer	5	2.6	3	5
Design Engineer	4	2	3	5
Field Engineer	1	0.06	3	5
Lab Personnel	8	4	4	7.5
Others	54	27.9	-	-

Table 8. The Respondents from General Contractor and Their Experience in Partnered Projects

Organization	General Contractor			
	Respondents		Average Experience in Partnered Projects	
	Number	Percent	Formal	Informal
Superintendent	1	2.3	3	4
Project Manager	3	7.0	2	4
Area Manager	6	14.0	0.5	0.66
Vice President	19	44.0	7.7	7.1
President	6	14.0	2.0	2.3
Admin Staff	1	2.3	0	0
Sub-Contractor	1	2.3	2	4
Mtrl./Equip. Supply	2	4.6	1	1
Others	4	9.3	1	1.75

The average experience dealing with partnered projects of those subgroups was as follows.

Table 9. Experience in Partnered Projects

Subgroup	Average Number of Partnered Projects	
	Formal	Informal
TxDOT Area Engineers	0.48	0.62
TxDOT Project Engineers	13.4	17.5
Contractor Vice-Presidents	7.7	7.1
Contractor Area Managers	0.5	0.66

Survey 3: Formal and Informal Survey Data Analysis

In assessing formal Partnering versus informal Partnering, attitudes of both TxDOT and general contractor personnel, the focus in the survey was to provide guidance to project managers responsible for determining whether to use informal or formal Partnering.

Question 4 on the questionnaire asked the respondents to indicate a dollar value on which to base a threshold for initiating formal Partnering. About 50% of TxDOT respondents have accepted threshold range of \$5 – \$15 million for initiating formal Partnering. Construction engineers (100%) and chief inspectors (73%) approved that range. However, a majority of area engineers (90%) designate the appropriate threshold to be \$1 – \$5 million. The most frequent opinion among General Contractors (47%) is that threshold for formal partnered projects should be \$5 – \$15 million. Presidents (63%) and vice-presidents (65%) of the companies support this threshold. But more than 65% of area managers designate that criterion at range \$1 – \$5 million. While threshold variations exists among TxDOT and General Contractor personnel by job title, the responses for this question indicate a majority by all of the above job titles as supporting the use of a one million dollar and above threshold value for initiating formal Partnering.

Question 5 on the questionnaire asked the respondents if projects involving multiple contracts should use formal Partnering. For projects that integrate multiple contracts, formal Partnering is recommended by 56.7% of TxDOT respondents. Among them, the chief inspectors (80%) and construction engineers (73.3%) are the strongest proponents of the criterion. Only 50% of project engineers adopted the criterion. For General Contractors, 58% accepted the criterion. It is interesting to note that 100% of vice presidents agree or strongly agree while all presidents are neutral, and 100% of area managers disagree or strongly disagree to accept that criterion. TxDOT and General Contractors are overall in the majority as accepting this criterion.

Question 6 on the questionnaire asked the respondents if projects involving unique characteristics and concerns should use formal Partnering. In general, TxDOT respondents agree (46%) and strongly agree (18.6%) that formal Partnering should be utilized because of unique characteristics and concerns of a project. Area engineers (83%) and chief inspectors (75%) firmly support this criterion. However, 72% of project engineers are neutral or disagree to assume the factor in question as the criterion for formal Partnering. Vice-presidents of contractor companies adhere to this (82%), whereas all of area managers do not buy this criterion. Overall, a majority of TxDOT and General Contractors agreed or strongly agreed with this criterion.

Question 7 on the questionnaire asked the respondents if projects involving public impact should use formal Partnering. The factor, impacting of the public during construction, is not approved for initiation of formal Partnering. Only 34% of TxDOT respondents and 23.7% of General contractors assumed the criterion. The level of disapproval is 39% of TxDOT respondents and 38% of general contractors. Nevertheless, area engineers of TxDOT (56%) and Vice-presidents of General contractors accepted, in majority, the necessity of this parameter.

Question 8 “An inability to meet the schedule will have negative consequences, and I should use formal partnering” was approved by 49.1% of TxDOT respondents and 39% of general contractor representatives. The level of disapproval is 25% among TxDOT and 32.5% of General contractors and therefore indicates that the criterion can be considered as desirable. Two groups of respondents – TxDOT area engineers (76%) and general contractor vice-presidents (89%) overwhelmingly approved this criterion.

For Question 9 “There are several parties involved in the project, and I should use formal partnering.”, the survey showed that less than 50% of TxDOT specialists (48%) and General contractors (39%) consider formal Partnering a necessity if several parties are involved in the project. It is concluded that, in general, the respondents are inclined to the criteria because only 29% of TxDOT specialists are against and 23% are neutral answering this question. In addition, the leading groups of TxDOT respondents: area engineers (64%), chief inspectors (55%), and construction engineers (53%) agreed on the criterion.

For Question 10 “TxDOT must closely coordinate with other parties, and I should use formal partnering” TxDOT respondents are not unanimous regarding the requirement to closely coordinate with other parties as a condition for formal Partnering. Generally, TxDOT specialists (47%) and General contractors (37%) supported this condition for initiation of formal Partnering. Three groups of TxDOT respondents expressed a high interest in the criterion: area engineers (66%), inspectors (86%), and construction engineers (53%). Of General Contractors, vice presidents approved the criterion at 78%.

For Question 11 “The project will require close coordination among other divisions within TxDOT, and I should use formal partnering”, the requirement of close coordination among TxDOT’s divisions as a factor for initiating formal Partnering is not approved by the majority of TxDOT specialists. Of them 67% are neutral or disapproved this criterion. One respondent group - vice-presidents of General contractors – voted in the favor of the criterion in question (65%).

For Question 12 “The finished product will be passed onto another governmental entity for operations and maintenance, and I should use formal partnering”, more of the respondents disagree (33.7%) than agree (29.6%) on the idea that transferring the finished product to another governmental entity should be a decisive factor for using formal Partnering. All respondent groups agreed on it.

For Question 13 “The product user (customer) has little or no experience with TxDOT, and I should use formal partnering” a majority of respondents concluded that formal Partnering is desirable if the product user has little or no experience with TxDOT. In general, 53.5% of all TxDOT respondents and 53.4% of general contractors support or strongly support this criterion. The majority of vice-presidents (94%) and area engineers accepted this criterion; although, all general contractors’ presidents are neutral. Rating of approval is 46% among construction engineers.

Question 14 on the questionnaire asked the respondents if projects that involve contractor’s project personnel who have little or no experience with formal Partnering should use formal Partnering. This criterion, experience of contractor’s project personnel with formal Partnering, collected almost the same number of supporters (38.9%) and opponents (39.3%) among TxDOT respondents (the remaining % neutral). The respective numbers among general contractors are 41.86% and 44%. The most representative subgroups of the respondents approved this criterion at the following levels: area engineers (50%), vice-presidents (94.7%). It appears from the overall percentages that support for use of this criterion is inconclusive.

Question 15 on the questionnaire asked the respondents if projects that involve TxDOT project personnel who have little or no experience with formal Partnering should use formal Partnering. This criterion also collected almost the same numbers of supporters and opponents in both of groups. TxDOT and the General Contractor respondents had 36% supporters and 42% opponents and 41% supporters and 42% opponents, respectively. Again, it appears from the overall percentages that support for use of this criterion is inconclusive.

The statistical analysis of response frequencies for the questions demonstrated that the experimental data fit the normal distribution with acceptable Chi-Square Probability > 0.1 (Table 11). It can be concluded that in most cases, the frequencies of the answers were distributed symmetrically. Among the subgroups of the respondents, area engineers of TxDOT and vice-presidents of general contractors were the active proponents of the majority of criteria offered by the survey as factors for formal Partnering initiation. Respectively, TxDOT project engineers and general contractor area managers demonstrated the most conservative approach answering survey questions.

Table 10. Chi-Square Probability > 0.1

Question	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
TxDOT - Chi-Square Probability	0.79	0.67	0.64	0.76	0.56	0.61	0.56	0.73	0.68	0.68	0.89	0.54
General Contractors- Chi-Square Probability	0.92	0.60	0.38	0.72	0.74	0.89	0.71	0.71	0.97	0.89	0.70	0.78

The second survey analysis indicates that in selecting formal Partnering the following criteria merit consideration.

- If the dollar value of the contract exceeds \$5 million
- If the project involves multiple contracts
- An inability to meet negative consequences
- Unique characteristics and concerns
- If the product user has little or no experience with TxDOT.

TxDOT Project Database

TxDOT projects were sorted to match the format of the other two studies found in the literature search. This was done to find out if the trends discovered in the Grajek study continued, and with the Chapin study to see how TxDOT's performance compared to another state's DOT. Comparison of this study's findings with that of Chapin(1994) and Grajek(1995) are shown in Table 11. The other two studies' findings are supported by this study because the sample size was large enough to add statistical significance to the findings and the same trends appear in all three studies.

A statistically significant sample size for both partnered projects and non-partnered projects was determined. With this number, projects were randomly selected from among the pool of projects. Standard statistical measurements were used to provide a comparative analysis. Specific performance parameters such as Cost Growth, Average Percent Increase Per Change Order, Average Order Changes Per Project, Time Growth and Liquidated Damages as a Percent of Total Cost were also computed. Table 11 is a comparison of this study's results with past studies on the same project.

Table 11. Comparison to Previous Results with This Study's Results

MEAN	TxDOT 95 PT	TxDOT 96 PT	ODOT 94 PT	TxDOT 95 NP	TxDOT 96 NP	ODOT 94 NP
Number of Projects	54	204	20	107	204	123
Cost Change (%)	4.12	2.93	1.00	4.51	3.70	4.03
Change Order Cost (%)	3.67	0.19	0.99	4.19	0.38	0.03
Total Change Orders (#)	11.69	16.00	*	12.24	10.00	*
Duration Change (%)	-13.73	-4.70	*	-9.68	10.04	*
Liquid Damage Cost (%)	0.080	0.070	*	0.020	0.210	*
Claims Cost (%)	0.000	0.330	*	0.013	0.610	*
Award Price (\$)	4,050,425	4,925,201	2,966,150	4,502,484	10,669,634	3,383,195

Note: TxDOT 95 = Grajek, 1995; TxDOT 96 = This study; ODOT 94 = Chapin, 1994

TxDOT has reduced the mean cost growth of partnered projects by 2% since the Grajek study. This study has also shown a much greater difference between partnered project cost growth and non-partnered project cost growth. Grajek reported about a 0.5% difference in cost growth between partnered and non-partnered projects finding the partnered projects to be slightly more efficient than the non-partnered projects. This study finds a 1.8% difference in cost growth between partnered and non-partnered projects which is a much more significant finding. Other factors may have contributed to the difference such as better designs, scheduling techniques, and dispute resolution; however, partnering is the only major factor that is not the same between samples. The Chapin study of Ohio DOT projects reported a 3.0% difference in cost growth.

Also, the mean change order cost percentage was found to be much lower in this study than either of the other two studies. TxDOT did show an increase in the mean number of change orders. From the amount found by Grajek this shows that TxDOT field personnel may be more willing to write change orders, and this could be the result of them being more willing to consider contractor-initiated change orders.

In looking at time growth, Grajek reported a decrease in construction time for both types of projects with the partnered projects outperforming the non-partnered projects by 4%. According to the Grajek study this was not a big enough difference to say that partnering had a definite impact. This study found an increase in mean construction time for the nonpartnered projects, and the partnered projects outperformed the non-partnered projects by 14.74%.

In looking at the overall performance of partnered projects versus non-partnered projects, partnered projects out performed non-partnered projects in the following categories:

- Cost growth
- Time growth
- Mean change order cost
- Total number of claims
- Total amount of claims
- Total number of disputes
- Total amount of disputes

The only category that was contrary to this was in the total number of change orders. Although partnered projects had 38% more change orders, the total cost of those change orders was 67% less than non-partnered projects. The statistical breakdown of project parameters by “award price” range and “total population” is shown in Table 12.

Table 12. Statistical Breakdown of Project Parameters by Award Range and Total Population

Award Price Range	\$0-\$5M		\$5M-\$40M		\$0-\$40M	
	PT	NP	PT	NP	PT	NP
Project Parameter						
Number of Projects	146	146	58	58	204	204
Award Price	\$2,170,135	\$1,055,024	\$11,860,368	\$14,789,745	\$4,925,201	\$4,959,994
Cost Growth as % of Total Cost	5.22	2.39	1.87	3.94	2.93	3.70
Number of Change Orders	11	6	28	29	16	10
Avg Cost Growth per Change Order	\$10,485	\$9,309	\$7,946	\$21,032	\$9,198	\$18,713
Avg % Cost Growth per Change Order	0.48	0.88	0.07	0.14	0.19	0.38

As a result of these studies, we can conclude that Partnering has a distinctly positive performance for projects over \$5 million. The average partnered project finished 4.7% earlier than originally planned and the average non-partnered finished 10.04% later than originally planned. For the projects between the \$1 million to \$5 million range, there are no costs associated with disputes and claims on partnered projects and their claim costs are lower in other ranges as well.

Table 13. Statistical Breakdown of Project Parameters by Award Price Range

Parameter	Award Price Range		Award Price Range	
	\$0-\$1 M		\$1M-\$5M	
	PT	NP	PT	NP
Number of Projects	35	100	110	46
Award Price	667,572	429,912	2,643,916	2,413,961
Cost Growth as % of Total Cost	12.47	-0.81	4.64	3.63
Number of Change Orders	8	2	12	7
Avg Cost Growth per Change Order	10,366	-2,324	10,511	12,850
Avg % Cost Growth per Change Order	1.55	-0.54	0.40	0.53
% of Projects with Deducts	4.41	24.02	12.75	7.84
Time Growth as % of Total Contract Days	2.84	-24.92	-3.16	15.76
% Additional Days Granted	20.25	4.71	7.90	17.86
% of Projects with LD's	1.47	6.86	10.29	4.41
LD % of Total Contract Days	1.58	1.99	1.51	3.15
LD Cost as % of Total Cost	0.21	0.09	0.11	0.25
Claims Cost (%) of Total Cost	12.93	5.46	0.11	0.15
Disputes Cost % of Total Cost	0.00	11.81	0.13	2.03
Parameter	Award Price Range		Award Price Range	
	\$5M-\$15M		\$15M-\$40M	
	PT	NP	PT	NP
Number of Projects	45	35	14	23
Award Price	8,557,678	8,552,594	22,240,253	24,281,065
Cost Growth as % of Total Cost	2.99	6.04	0.52	2.81
Number of Change Orders	23	21	45	38
Avg Cost Growth per Change Order	11,337	24,446	2,571	18,122
Avg % Cost Growth per Change Order	0.13	0.29	0.01	0.07
% of Projects with Deducts	4.90	2.45	0.49	1.47
Time Growth as % of Total Contract Days	-6.33	12.91	-8.64	23.71
% Additional Days Granted	6.63	11.72	8.99	13.80
% of Projects with LD's	1.96	6.37	0.00	5.88
LD % of Total Contract Days	0.91	4.64	0.00	10.21
LD Cost as % of Total Cost	0.07	0.29	0.00	0.64
Claims Cost (%) of Total Cost	0.00	1.07	0.00	0.08
Disputes Cost % of Total Cost	0.00	0.71	0.00	0.00

Table 14. Statistical Breakdown of Project Parameters by Award Price Range and Total Population

Award Price Range Project Parameter	\$0-\$5M		\$5M-\$40M		\$0-\$40M	
	PT	NP	PT	NP	PT	NP
Number of Projects	146	146	58	58	204	204
Award Price	\$2,170,135	\$1,055,024	\$11,860,368	\$14,789,745	\$4,925,201	\$4,959,994
Cost Growth as % of Total Cost	5.22	2.39	1.87	3.94	2.93	3.70
Number of Change Orders	11	6	28	29	16	10
Avg Cost Growth per Change Order	\$10,485	\$9,309	\$7,946	\$21,032	\$9,198	\$18,713
Avg % Cost Growth per Change Order	0.48	0.88	0.07	0.14	0.19	0.38
% of Projects with Deducts	17.16	31.86	5.39	3.92	23.53	36.27
Time Growth as % of Total Contract Days	-0.32	-9.16	-14.97	36.62	-4.70	10.04
% Additional Days Granted	28.15	22.57	15.62	25.52	8.32	12.49
% of Projects with LD's	11.76	11.27	1.96	12.25	21.08	23.53
LD % of Total Contract Days	3.09	5.14	0.91	14.85	5.04	14.56
LD Cost as % of Total Cost	0.32	0.34	0.07	0.93	0.07	0.21
Claims Cost % of Total Cost	13.04	5.61	0.00	1.15	0.33	0.61
Disputes Cost % of Total Cost	0.13	13.84	0.00	0.71	0.04	0.93

Partnering's Impact on Cost Growth

This parameter is the classic metric for project performance. Non-partnered projects outperformed partnered projects in the two lower award price ranges. The opposite was true in the two higher price ranges. This is an interesting result. It appears that the change in adversary relationships makes the owner's field personnel more willing to accept contractor-initiated change order requests. These would show a higher percentage of contract value in less costly projects than in the larger projects. When the entire population is considered, partnered projects have a slightly less cost growth. This leads to the conclusion that implementing partnering generally improves cost growth performance with the greatest impact being felt in projects which are greater than \$5 million.

Partnering's Impact on Change Orders

Change orders are the major source of cost growth. There were three parameters developed to evaluate partnering's effect on project change orders. The first concern that needs to be looked at is the feeling by field personnel that partnering makes the owner's representative more likely to accept contractor-initiated change requests. Analysis shows that partnered projects have more change orders than non-partnered projects. This would seem to confirm that suspicion. It should be noted that the researchers have no way of differentiating between contractor-initiated and other types of change orders. Next, we need to test the idea that the contractors "return the favor" by keeping change order costs down. Table 12 indicates that across the entire population mean partnered project change cost was roughly one half the average cost of the average non-partnered change order. This parameter was less for partnered projects in three out of the four project size groupings.

When viewed as a percentage of contract amount, the amount of each partnered change order is less than non-partnered change orders but the orders of magnitude are roughly the same for the top three groupings. The smallest projects stand out as an anomaly. Non-partnered change order values ended up as a net deduct while partnered change order cost was roughly the same per change order as in the larger projects. Perhaps, this is confirmation that implementing partnering creates an environment where TxDOT field personnel are more inclined to favorably consider contractor-initiated change requests.

If we measure contractor willingness to minimize overall project costs by looking at the percentage of projects with negative cost growth, ignoring the small projects, we find that for partnered projects in the \$1 million to \$5 million range the percentage of deducts is roughly twice that in non-partnered projects. This trend reverses itself in the largest projects. However, when you consider that the population of partnered projects in the middle range is 155 compared to only 14 in the highest range, you can dismiss that reversal as statistically insignificant. Therefore, we can conclude that partnering seems to create a desirable effect with regard to deducts.

Impact on Time Growth

The other objective measure of project performance is time growth. We have two parameters which are designed to provide trend information with regard to partnering. The first is mean percentage time growth. For the three largest size project groups, time growth was negative in partnered projects and positive in non-partnered projects. For the entire population, the average partnered project finished 4.7% earlier than originally planned and the average non-partnered finished 10.04% later than originally planned. The trend is reversed for the smallest projects, but again, the size of the partnered population makes it difficult to infer significance to that statistic. That is not the case for non-partnered projects with a population of 100 and a time growth of – 25%. This result might be explained by the administrative process used to set contract completion criteria being too conservative. In other words, actual contractor performance consistently exceeds the expectations of those who establish contract completion criteria.

The second metric is the number of additional days granted expressed as a percentage of total days allowed. The parameter was meant to test the owner's willingness to grant time extensions as a result of a partnering relationship. The analysis shows that in the smallest three groupings this parameter shows a distinct willingness on the part of Department personnel to grant additional days on partnered projects.

Partnering's Impact of Liquidated Damages

This analysis may be the acid test for partnering. It is easy to grant accolades for innovative approaches that were tried on projects that went well. The real test of a partnering relationship comes from those projects that do not proceed according to plan. The data showed that there were liquidated damages assessed on partnered projects. That means that some partnered projects finished late in spite of the investment in team building and relationships. The percentage of partnered projects with LD's is less than non-partnered projects with LD's in all categories except the \$1 million to \$5 million range. This is notable in that that range contained over half the partnered projects and in that range there were over twice as many late partnered projects as non-partnered projects. However, if we redistribute the award price ranges as shown in Table 14, one can see that for partnered projects greater than \$5 million only 2% have LD's compared to over 12% on non-partnered projects in the same category. Whereas, for those under \$5 million the two types of projects are roughly equal. The \$5 million break point seems to have some significance. Table 14 shows that partnered projects above \$5 million outperform non-partnered projects in virtually every parameter.

Our analysis examined the impact of LD's with respect to the total project cost. In this case, while the \$1 million to \$5 million range had the largest percentage of partnered projects with LD's, the cost impact of those LD's was not as great as on the non-partnered projects which had a cost impact which was twice as great as the other. For the lowest cost group of projects, LD cost impact was greater than non-partnered and this can probably be explained by the fact that several days of LD's will constitute a proportionately larger percentage of a small contract than a large contract. Finally, when we look only at LD's in terms of time, we can see that partnered projects had a fewer number of LD days than non-partnered projects in all categories. Thus we can draw the conclusion that partnering does indeed work on projects with time problems by reducing the number of days that a project finishes late.

Partnering's Impact of Disputes and Claims

Remembering that disputes are issues that are settled at District-level or below and that Claims are issues that are settled above the District, studying the potential impact of partnering on these two parameters is extremely important. Our analysis shows that partnering seems to virtually eliminate the cost allocated to disputes and has the same effect on claims for projects greater than \$1 million. The only significant costs that remain in these two parameters are for claims on projects, which are less than \$1 million. When we look at Table 14, once again we see that for the \$5 million to \$40 million range, there are virtually no costs associated with disputes and claims on partnered projects. The total percentage of dispute and claims costs on non-partnered projects is relatively low. Whereas if we look to the lower half of the projects, we find that there are significant dispute and claims costs associated with both types of projects. This disparity is hard to explain. Perhaps, the magnitude of the issues encountered on the large projects was small enough in relation to the size of the project that both sides found it easier to settle these issues on the job site. On the other hand, an issue that might get lost in the financial noise of a large project may be large enough in relation to the size of the contract on a smaller project that it must be escalated to receive final settlement.

ANALYSIS OF PROJECT VARIANCE

To quantify project performance statistically, one must not only complete the comparative analysis detailed in the previous section, but one must also study the relative variance around the means established in the data analysis. In this setting, variance is a quantitative measure of TxDOT's control of final project outcomes. The outcomes of greatest importance are cost and time growth. Comparing relative variance between partnered and nonpartnered projects allows statistical inferences with regard to whether partnering enhances overall control of project performance outcomes. Smaller variance equals greater control. In this analysis we have selected the Coefficient of Variance (COV) as the best statistical measure for variability of project performance.

The projects analyzed were significantly different from each other in cost, volume and types of construction procedures. To suppress the negative influences of these factors, relative variables were introduced for statistical analysis. These variables were OC/FC (original contract cost/final cost) and OD/TD (original contract days/total days).

Use of the relative variables and comparison of their respective COV's revealed the fact that the variability of all partnered projects was smaller than the non-partnered projects. This variability is summarized in Table 15.

Table 15. Variability Comparison: Partnered and Non-partnered

Projects	Number of Projects	COV for Variable	
		OC/FC	OD/TD
Partnered	204	0.123	0.701
Non-partnered	204	1.254	0.99

An analysis of partnering effects based on forming cost-based subgroups did not demonstrate systematic statistical trends in all cases. However, for all the selected groups in partnered and non-partnered databases (below \$1 million, \$1 – 2 million, \$4 – 10 million, > \$10 million) , the COV for both relative predictors (OC/OF and OC/TD) was consistently smaller than that for all partnered and non-partnered projects (*Table 16*)

Table 16. COV Dollar Grouping: Partnered and Non-partnered

Relative Variable	OC/FC		OD/TD	
	COV for Projects Partnered	COV for Projects Non - Partnered	COV for Projects Partnered	COV for Projects Non - Partnered
Below \$1	0.146	1.55	0.59	0.708
\$1 - 5	0.070	0.080	0.585	0.537
\$5 - 10	0.050	0.090	0.454	0.403
> \$10	0.254	0.059	0.438	0.395
All Projects	0.123	1.254	0.701	0.990

To further understand the variance of these projects, smaller groups of like projects were analyzed. Because the population in the data was quite diverse with respect to the kinds of construction that were actually conducted in each contract, the partnered and non-partnered projects were divided into two general groups. The contracts that only had one type of technical construction process are classified TYPE I. For example, a contract that involved only pavement

rehabilitation would be classified as a TYPE I project. All other projects that involved more than one technical construction process in one project are classified as TYPE II. For instance, if a pavement rehabilitation project also included a seal coat, this would be a TYPE II project.

Partnered TYPE I projects were further divided into two subgroups: Asphalt Concrete Paving (ACP) and Rehabilitation. These were the two types of technical construction process in data population that had the largest number of similar projects. Thus, a reasonably statistical analysis could be conducted. Similarly, Partnered TYPE II projects were also divided into two groups for the same reason: Grading and Planing. Non-partnered TYPE I projects were also divided into two dominant subgroups: Asphalt Concrete Paving and Seal Coat. Finally, Non-partnered TYPE II projects were separated into Grading and Widening. The coefficient of variance was calculated for each of these subgroups and is shown in Table 17.

Table 17. Coefficient of Variance (COV) Analysis

OD/TD

Non-partnered	COV	Partnered	COV
ALL-Non-partnered	0.99	ALL-Partnered	0.70
TYPE I All	0.80	TYPE I All	0.61
TYPE I -Seal Coat	0.66	TYPE I -ACP	0.44
TYPE I -ACP	0.52	TYPE I -Rehabilitation	0.31
TYPE II-all	0.87	TYPE II-all	0.72
TYPE II-grading	0.70	TYPE II-grading	0.71
TYPE II-widening	1.08	TYPE II-planing	0.23

OC/FC

Non-partnered	COV	Partnered	COV
ALL-Non-partnered	1.25	ALL-Partnered	0.12
TYPE I All	0.19	TYPE I All	0.11
TYPE I -Seal Coat	0.09	TYPE I -ACP	0.05
TYPE I -ACP	0.03	TYPE I -Rehabilitation	0.10
TYPE II-all	0.08	TYPE II-all	0.14
TYPE II-grading	0.07	TYPE II-grading	0.16
TYPE II-widening	0.07	TYPE II-planing	0.11

It should be noted that due to the great diversity of project types it is impossible to directly compare every partnered subgroup with its corresponding nonpartnered subgroup. However, direct comparison can be made for TYPE I ACP and TYPE II Grading. Table 17 shows that cost growth COV for partnered projects is significantly less than for nonpartnered projects. All of the COV calculations result in partnered COV's that are less than nonpartnered COV's.

The statistical analysis shows that the change in original cost of partnered projects is significantly less than the change in non-partnered projects. All of the calculations and the two main approaches result in the performance of partnered projects exceeding that of non-partnered projects. Therefore it can be inferred that instituting partnering reduces project performance variance. This means that TxDOT has greater control over both cost and time growth on partnered projects. In fact, across the entire population (Table 16: All Projects), it appears that partnered project cost growth is ten times less variable.

Regression Models

Stepwise and complete regression procedures were used for multiple regression analysis with the types and subgroups. The results of this analysis are presented in Appendix A. While interesting from an academic standpoint, they were judged to be of no practical predictive value. Therefore, details and discussion have been related to the appendix.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Analyzes of all data supports the following conclusions.

1. Partnering has become an institution in TxDOT. Awareness of the Partnering Program and its goals is wide spread and pervasive. The Office of Continuous Improvement is recognized as the subject matter expert for the organization.
2. Partnering is used in most public engineering/construction agencies throughout the nation. It is an accepted business practice for both government and industry. It is generally recognized as a means to improve communications, reduce adversarial business practices, and create a good environment in which to conduct business. It is believed to reduce contract disputes, claims, and litigation. However, the literature contains little documentation of this perception.
3. Partnering has potential to improve contractual relationships beyond the so-called traditional engineering design and construction contracts. It has been used as a mechanism to improve internal communications and relationships within various types of organizations.
4. The time and expense of the widespread use of formal partnering has led to the development of informal partnering practices to capture the best elements of the partnering movement without incurring the costs of a full blown partnering session. Informal partnering seems to be the rule rather than the exception.

With respect to the quantitative analysis, significant trends have been identified and the following conclusions made.

1. Partnered projects outperformed non-partnered projects in virtually every category if they were awarded at a price above \$5 million.
2. Partnered projects have a slightly less cost growth when the entire population is considered.
3. Partnered projects have more change orders than non-partnered projects and this probably demonstrates an increased willingness by TxDOT field personnel to favorably consider contractor-initiated change requests.

-
4. Across the entire population the mean partnered project change order cost was roughly one half the average cost of the average non-partnered change order. Therefore, contractors are attempting to keep the cost of change orders down.
 5. The idea that contractors are working to keep costs low is further reinforced by the trend which shows that partnering seems to create a desirable effect with regard to the number of projects with negative cost growth.
 6. For the entire population, the average partnered project finished 4.7% earlier than originally planned and the average non-partnered finished 10.04% later than originally planned.
 7. Partnered projects have a fewer number of liquidated damages (LD) days than non-partnered projects in all categories. So partnering seems to have a positive effect on projects with time problems by reducing the number of days that a project finishes late.
 8. For the \$5 million to \$40 million range, there are no costs associated with disputes and claims on partnered projects.

With respect to the survey of perceptions by TxDOT and contractor personnel, the following following conclusions can be made.

1. The focus was to measure partnering experience and maturation levels in the formal partnering process. The general contractor question is also asked for partnering experience in non-TxDOT projects. While only 24% of the TxDOT respondents had participated in more than four partnered projects, the general contractor level was much higher: 43% for TxDOT and 53% for non-TxDOT partnered projects. However, the maturation level for both groups for two or more TxDOT partnered projects is nearly the same level (TxDOT=73% and General Contractor=81%). When compared to the Grajek baseline data of 1995 which showed about 50% experience level for two (2) or more partnered contracts for both groups, the maturation level for partnering experience has gained almost 30% for both groups.
2. 60% of TxDOT personnel and 82% of contractor personnel believe that partnering improves the quality of the final project. As the contractors are in a better position to see just how much quality is built in to the project, this is a significant finding.

Finally, integrating the quantitative and subjective analyses, yields two important findings.

1. Partnering appears to have a distinctly positive performance impact on projects which are greater than \$5 million. This statement is backed up by the survey of ODOT personnel and contractors who selected this level as the right level on which to invest the time and money to formally partner a project.
2. The presence of a partnering agreement seems to take the psychological pressure off the contractor as the TxDOT field people become more willing to grant contractor-initiated

change orders and additional days. The contractors seem to react favorably to this by keeping the cost of change orders down and by completing earlier than anticipated. They also believe that they produce a better quality project as a result of the presence of a partnering agreement.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Approach

The results of this study have conclusively shown that Partnering has been institutionalized in the Texas Department of Transportation. Therefore, what remains to be done is to formalize the decision-making process in a manner that maximizes the benefits accrued by partnering without wasting precious resources by partnering all projects regardless of type. The implementation of the TxDOT Partnering Plus program in 1996 required that all projects be partnered. To do this, the Department separated partnering into two types: Formal Partnering and Informal Partnering. The difference was defined as follows.

“Partnering can be formal, which requires a facilitated meeting, or informal, which requires a non-facilitated meeting between TxDOT and Contractor representatives who will work the project.” (TxDOT Partnering Handbook, 1996).

This study found that informal partnering was the more popular of the two types. Commentary data reveals that this is because the focus seems to be project-oriented. This certainly makes sense because all the participants are directly involved in the project. In a formally partnered project, the facilitator generally is not involved in the project, and as a result of both that and the fact that the facilitator personally leads the workshop, the workshop will be more focused on the relationships. These facts lead to the first implementation recommendation. The Department should drop the terms “formal and informal partnering” and return to the pre-1996 policy of partnering those projects where the investment in relationship-building will accrue benefits. Informal Partnering should be replaced by inserting three facets of the typical partnering workshop to the preconstruction conference for those projects that will not be partnered. Those facets are listed below.

1. Potential project issues (sometimes called “Rocks in the Road”)
2. Action plans to resolve these issues.
3. Development of an issue resolution/escalation ladder.

Doing so will further institutionalize the benefits of the partnering process ensuring that the three most beneficial facets of the partnering workshop will be retained for all projects without the need to specifically focus on relationship-building. Thus, the definition of a “partnered project” becomes one where the project’s nature is such that investing the time to specifically focus on TxDOT-Contractor relationships is deemed to be worthwhile and will likely accrue benefits. Therefore, the remainder of this section is devoted to the development of a partnering decision-making process to assist Department management personnel in determining which projects have the greatest potential to benefit from the investment of time, money, and energy required to hold a partnering workshop. It should be noted at this point that for the remainder of this section the

term “partner” will be used to describe some type of facilitated meeting whose focus is on building a strong, positive relationship between TxDOT and its Contractor for the life of the project.

Partnering Model

The basis of this model is to leverage the information gained during the both the quantitative and qualitative analyses completed in this study. These analyses proved that implementing partnering on certain projects does indeed accrue benefits to the Department in terms of cost and time savings as well as the virtual elimination of claims and disputes costs. Additional, the statistical analysis showed that partnering reduced variability and gave the Department more control over partnered projects. Therefore, it is logical to use these facts to maximize the benefits of partnering by applying it to those projects whose inherent qualities make them most susceptible to partnering benefits.

Figure 1 is a flow chart designed to document the process of deciding whether to partner a specific project. It leads to a decision to either partner or cover the three partnering facets mentioned above in the preconstruction conference. Partnering is about relationships. Therefore, the first step is to determine if Department and Contractor personnel are working together for the first time. A contractor who may have done work for TxDOT in another area still needs to become familiar with the standards to be enforced on this specific project. In fact, it may be more important in this instance than for a contractor who is embarking of its first TxDOT project. Research Project 0-1787 “Seal Coat Constructability Review” found that there are large differences between Area Offices with regard to how a project as simple as seal coat are applied (Gransberg, et al, 1998) and that contractors often assume that project quality control requirements are uniform across the Department. This impacts the way they prepare their bid and could lead to a source of friction during project execution. Therefore, a new relationship creates a situation where investing in a partnering workshop is warranted in almost every case. Obviously, the level of effort expended on each project should be a function of its size and complexity.

* New Relationship means that TxDOT and Contractor Personnel have no previous working relationships.
 ** Partnering requires specific meeting to work on relationships and requires either an external or internal facilitator.
 *** Pre-construction meeting to include addressing
 • potential problems ("rocks in the road")
 • issue escalation ladder
 • action plans
 ***** Complex means more than one phase.




Figure 1. TxDOT Partnering Flowchart

The quantitative study showed conclusively that projects greater than \$5 million directly benefit from partnering (Gransberg, et al, 1997). They accrue roughly 2% less cost growth, significantly less time growth, and no costs associated with claims and disputes. Even when they finish late, they have lower assessed liquidated damages and finish less late than nonpartnered projects. In this award price range, partnered projects outperformed nonpartnered projects in all categories. Therefore, it is prudent to partner all projects whose award price is greater than \$5 million.

For those projects whose award price is less than \$5 million but greater than \$1 million, cost growth savings were not evident, but time growth savings were. In public transportation construction projects, user costs of construction can be very high. Total user construction cost is a function of the total length of a given project. These costs are minimized by completing projects as quickly as possible. The quantitative study showed an 18% time savings on partnered projects in this price range, and partnered projects finished approximately 3% early while nonpartnered project finished around 15% late. Therefore, remembering that user costs of construction were not considered in the cost savings analysis, it is logical to consider partnering projects in this price range as a means of accruing maximum time savings. Obviously, projects with a short duration will not accrue as much benefit as longer projects. Therefore, a benchmark must be established to separate the two types. Table 17 shows that the average duration for partnered projects in the subject price range is about 180 contract working days with a standard deviation of about 90. As a result, the logical break point would be for those projects that last longer than the average plus one standard deviation. In this case that would be 270 contract working days. So to attempt to make the decision uniform on a statewide basis, the contract duration break point will be defined as greater than one construction season. This permits flexibility to adjust to differing climatic conditions while retaining the salient reason for partnering projects in this price range. Obviously, the potential for problems due to construction delay will be greater for those projects that extend across more than one construction season.

Table 18. Contract Time for Projects Between \$1 and \$5 Million.

Nonpartnered Projects	Contract Working Days	Partnered Projects	Contract Working Days
Mean	193	Mean	177
Standard Deviation	117	Standard Deviation	91
Coefficient of Variance	0.606	Coefficient of Variance	0.516

Projects that are in the \$1 to \$5 million award price range but whose duration is less than one season are the next discussion topic. At this point, only the survey data gathered from TxDOT and Contractor personnel to help guide the decision-making process is used. Both groups cited project complexity as a reason to partner. This is application complexity will be defined by the number of construction phases required. A project is “complex” if it has more than one construction phase. Thus, this type of project will require closer coordination to successfully complete. This coordination is doubly important in an urban project where exposure to the traveling public is the highest and the potential for construction related congestion is almost certain. Therefore, the model leads to a decision to partner this type of project if it is both complex and located in an urban area.

To summarize the model, the following projects will be partnered.

1. Projects where a new business relationship exists.
2. Projects with an award price greater than \$5 million.
3. Projects with an award price between \$1 million and \$5 million where:
 - a. Project duration is greater than one construction season
 - b. Project duration is less than one construction season but the project has more than one phase of construction and is located in an urban area.

All projects that do not fit in the above categories would not be partnered. However, project issues, action plans, and issue resolution/escalation would be covered as a mandatory agenda item in the preconstruction conference for all projects.

Specific Implementation Actions

It is recommended that the following actions be taken to implement the findings of this project.

1. Revise the Partnering Handbook to reflect the partnering decision-making model detailed in this section.
2. Change the appropriate policy documents regarding the preconstruction conference to reflect mandatory inclusion of project issues, action plans, and issue resolution/escalation as an agenda item in all preconstruction conferences.
3. Take the results of this study and include it in the Partnering Handbook as a mechanism to retain institutional knowledge on this subject. The results of this study furnish the hard factual evidence that Partnering does indeed accrue benefits on certain types of projects. Knowing these facts should facilitate acceptance of the new model by those skeptics that remain in both the Department and in Contractor organizations.
4. Update “Special Provision – Partnering Plus” to reflect that partnering is a facilitated meeting focused on relationship-building. Eliminate all references to informal partnering.

APPENDIX A: QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF PROJECT PERFORMANCE

Data Collection and Reduction

In order to complete the tasks listed above, the researchers were required to interact with several departments within TxDOT. These include the Continuous Improvement Office (CIO), Construction and Maintenance Division (CMD), Division of Construction and Contract Administration (CCA), and the Information Systems Division (ISD). An informal partnering session was held in October of 1996, between TxDOT and TTU, and included members from each department within TxDOT and two of the three members of the research team. The level of cooperation the research team received indicated that the informal partnering session was a success.

The data collection effort started with the identification of 204 completed partnered projects, then proceeded to an equal number of non-partnered projects from a time period that did not overlap the date ranges of the partnered projects. The research team thought that if the control group of non-partnered projects was selected from the same time period as the partnered projects, a great number of them may have been rejected as bad candidates for partnering and would bias the results. The control group of 204 non-partnered projects was selected from a list of 255 projects that actually started before partnering was an option. The Partnering Section of the CIO provided the list of partnered projects while the non-partnered list came from the CCA.

The data fields requested by the research team were matched with the corresponding data routinely collected by CIS. Although some of the partnered project data were readily available in the current CIS database, most of the data had to be restored from tape archives. The representatives from CIS sent the files containing all of the data to the research team via e-mail as attachments. These database files from TxDOT's mainframe computer then had to be reformatted from a fixed-width column format to a crosstab spreadsheet format for tabulation and analysis. This was accomplished using Microsoft Visual Basic 4.0 programming language and Microsoft Excel 7.0.

The research team found that not all of the requested data fields were available from the CIS reports. These data fields such as claims and dispute costs, the names of partnering session participants and travel costs for partnering sessions were located in the files of CIO, CMD, and each individual District office. This fact presented the most difficult task yet to the research team because it was also found that they all had different record keeping systems and most of the data resides in paper files. Although these records were compiled to the satisfaction of each individual department, they were not in the same format as the data supplied by CIS. For instance, the claims and disputes data were kept using Lotus Approach, a database program, and indexed by Claim Number or Dispute Number. The only links to the main database, the Project Number or CSJ Control Number, were input in the description field of each claim or dispute. In other words, the data from each different department could not be imported reliably with Microsoft Access, a database program, but had to be hand sorted and then input to ensure integrity of the data.

Some of the records gathered from the Partnering Section, such as the participant data, had to be photocopied from the paper files, scanned into a MSWord document, and then formatted into a spreadsheet in MSEXcel. Only then could the information be sorted because the field used as an index has to be an exact match between spreadsheets. Although most of the records contain index fields such as the Project Number or CSJ control number, inconsistencies between the Partnering Section's input and CIS input increased the time to gather and reduce the data considerably.

All change order data are kept in two different databases. The CCA tracks change orders as well as CIS. It was found that these two databases did not match exactly. So the CIS data was chosen as the sole source. It should be noted that certain types of change orders do not have a direct effect on the partnering effort. For example, the change orders paying for on the job training (OJT) of contractor employees were all removed from the analysis. Also, the lack of detail in the description field restricted the use of change orders as a performance indicator. The individual files in each District are needed to develop a true performance index for the two types of projects.

In order to assess the total TxDOT investment in the partnering effort, several assumptions and estimates had to be made. The exact amounts cannot be determined because of the nature of TxDOT's cost tracking system. According to CCA, the partnering effort was never set up as an action item requiring cost codes, and therefore, no accounting was made of costs attributed only to partnering.

All of the above data are now combined into one single database indexed to any of three data fields, the research team's ID number, TxDOT's project number and CSJ control number. This database contains data from 408 completed projects worth \$2.1 billion, which is three times as many projects as any of the other studies found in the literature search. In this form, the research team has computerized access to any or all of the pertinent data fields for comparison with findings of the two other studies, and then for a later detailed analysis using state-of-the-art statistical methods.

Data Analysis

Analysis of the data collected permitted the calculation of thirteen separate project performance parameters. Each of these parameters mathematically describes some performance measure, which can be compared between partnered and non-partnered projects. The intent of this effort is to identify trends, which will help develop a method for partnering decision-making.

Cost Growth

Cost growth is a standard measure of project performance. In essence cost growth is defined as the change in contract amount with respect to the original contract amount. This can be described by the following equation:

$$\text{Cost Growth} = \frac{\text{Final Contract Amount} - \text{Original Contract Amount}}{\text{Original Contract Amount}} \dots\dots\dots[A-1]$$

Cost growth can then be converted to a percentage of growth over original contract amount. The comparison of this parameter between partnered and non-partnered projects should permit the determination of whether partnering has any impact on subsequent cost growth within a project. A partnering proponent would hypothesize that the enhanced relationship between the owner and the contractor would encourage the settlement of change orders, which might arise and minimize their final cost to the owner. The other side would argue that because owner personnel are expected to avoid claims that they would tend to agree to higher change order costs rather than risk an unsettled change order turning into a dispute, and therefore, this parameter would be higher for partnered projects.

Average Cost per Change Order

Average cost per change order (AC/CO) is merely the arithmetic average of the actual changes on each project. This parameter allows the researcher to develop an idea of the order of magnitude of changes that occur on typical projects. This parameter is described by the following equation.

$$AC/CO = \frac{\text{Final Contract Amount} - \text{Original Contract Amount}}{\text{Number of Change Orders}} \dots\dots\dots[A-2]$$

This parameter is important because it allows an order of magnitude to be assigned to the question of change orders. Again, proponents of partnering would expect this number to be lower on partnered projects than on non-partnered projects arguing that the improved relationship between contractor and owner would encourage settlements of change orders to be lower than if the relationship was adversarial. Again, the opposite could also be argued using the same theory as that espoused on cost growth.

Average Percent Increase per Change Order

Average percent increase per change order (A%/CO) is a measure of incremental cost growth. A large average percent increase per change order would indicate that cost growth occurs as a step function and provides a means of assessing the quality of the contract documents. A contract with no change orders would be the perfect situation and have no cost growth. The larger the average percent increase per change order, the higher the probability that some errors of design were contained in the project. This would indicate that regardless of the quality of the relationship due to partnering, a flawed design will require change orders and encourage cost growth. This parameter is described by the following equation.

$$A\%/CO = \frac{\text{Cost Growth (\%)}}{\text{Number of Change Orders}} \dots\dots\dots[A-3]$$

Average Total Change Orders per Project

Average total change orders per project are merely the arithmetic total of the number of change orders per project. This ratio further defines the impact of original contract quality on project performance. This parameter quantifies the number of times the owner and the contractor had to reach an agreement. Additionally, it also provides an indicator of original contract quality. A flawed contract will have a large number of change orders as compared to a perfect one, which has none. It is common knowledge that many change orders are the result of contractor requests to make the job better or to allow a variance, which benefits both contractor and owner. Thus this parameter can also be used to judge the impact of partnering on project performance. A higher number of change orders per partnered project than per non-partnered project indicates a greater willingness on the part of the owner's field personnel to entertain contractor-initiated changes. Taking this with respect to average percent increase per change order would show whether the contractors are "returning the favor" by keeping the cost of change orders to a minimum.

Time Growth

Time growth (TG) is the change in time with respect to the original contract completion date. Time growth is generally a result of changes in scope of the project. Time growth can be either positive (when the project is completed later than the original completion date) or negative (when the project is completed earlier than the original completion). In TxDOT contracts, time growth is a function of allowable working days. These contracts typically have a given number of days associated with the project. Things such as poor weather require field personnel to determine whether or not to charge a working day to the contract period. This system promotes the accurate interpretation of project time performance by making it unnecessary to cull out time growth due to circumstances beyond the contractor's control. Time growth is calculated using the following formula.

$$TG = \frac{\text{Days Charged} - (\text{Total Days Allowed} + \text{Additional Days Granted})}{\text{Total Days Allowed} + \text{Additional Days Granted}} \dots \dots \dots [A-4]$$

Average Percentage of Additional Days Granted

The average percentage of additional days (AD%) granted is an indicator of the owner's representative's willingness to reduce time pressure on the contractor. Often in construction contracts, a contractor will ask for additional time without additional compensation. This factor was included to test the hypothesis that TxDOT field personnel have become more lenient with regard to granting time since the advent of partnering. This and an allegation that field personnel are averse to imposing liquidated damages were picked up during interviews with Department employees and can easily be tested statistically. It should be noted that both allegations are not necessarily bad if they are true. Pressure due to imminent liquidated damages and other time related impacts are generally associated with poor quality workmanship.

Therefore, if partnering has changed the Department's approach to managing construction time to a kinder, gentler general policy, it would be expected that overall quality of final projects would increase as well. This parameter can be computed using the following equation.

$$AD\% = \frac{\text{Additional Days Granted}}{\text{Total Days Allowed}} \dots\dots\dots[A-5]$$

Average Liquidated Damages as a Percent of Total Cost

The average liquidated damages (LD's) as a percent of total cost (ALD) is included as a means to measure the impact of partnering on those projects which have some problems as indicated by the imposition of liquidated damages. When new performance enhancing programs are introduced, focus tends to be on those projects that go well. If a program is to become totally institutionalized, it must also produce positive results in those projects that have problems. Measuring LD's on those projects that finish late is an objective metric with which to compare partnered projects to non-partnered projects. Ideally, proponents of partnering would expect to see a lower percentage of LD's on partnered projects arguing that partnering would encourage TxDOT personnel to work with the contractor on time related problems thus decreasing the total amount of LD's assessed. This parameter can be calculated using the following formula.

$$ALD = \frac{\text{Liquidated Damages Cost}}{\text{Total Contract Cost}} \dots\dots\dots[A-6]$$

Average Liquidated Damages Days as a Percentage of Total Time

Average liquidated damages days as a percentage of total time (LDD) is a metric designed to measure the effect of LD days on the overall contract period. Again, comparing this parameter between the two types of projects should give us the ability to quantify the impact of partnering on project performance. This parameter is computed as follows.

$$LDD = \frac{\text{Number of Days of LD's}}{\text{Total Days Allowed} + \text{Additional Days Granted}} \dots\dots\dots[A-7]$$

Percent of Projects with Liquidated Damages

The percentage of projects with LD's (%LD) is a direct measure of the concerns expressed by TxDOT field personnel with regard to the willingness to assess LD's. Additionally, it provides an indicator of contractor ability to prosecute the projects as they were originally planned and bid. A difference in this indicator between partnered and non-partnered projects will provide a means to explain the value of partnering on projects that do not finish as expected. This metric is calculated by the following formula.

$$\%LD = \frac{\text{Number of Projects with LD's}}{\text{Total Number of Projects}} \dots\dots\dots[A-8]$$

Percentage of Projects with Deducts

A deduct is defined as a change order which reduces the contract amount. This parameter was developed to provide a measure of contractor willingness to keep total project costs as low as possible. Generally, contractors are reluctant to agree to deductive change orders because they throw off the balance achieved by spreading overhead and profit margin across bid items and possibly put a contractor in the position of not being able to recover his mark-ups. Thus, the percentage of projects with deducts is a good indicator of the success of the partnering charter. This parameter is calculated by dividing the number of projects that had negative cost growth by the total number of projects.

Claims Cost as a Percentage of Total Cost

Claims are requests by contractors for compensation for work performed, which the contractor believes is outside the scope of the contract. Generally, claims begin as contractor requests for a change order, and they become claims when the owner rejects the change order request. Negotiations ensue and, if a settlement is reached, the contract is increased by the amount of the settlement. For purposes of this study, claims are defined as contract disputes that are settled above District Level. The purpose of instituting partnering is to avoid claims cost. (CC) Theoretically, a partnered contract should have no claims. Partnered projects typically develop an issue escalation ladder to deal with disagreements and attempt to keep them from becoming claims. Therefore, analysis of project performance in relation to this indicator is a key point. This parameter is determined as shown below.

$$CC = \frac{\text{Total Cost of Claims}}{\text{Original Contract Cost}} \dots\dots\dots[A-9]$$

Dispute Cost as a Percentage of Total Cost

Disputes, for purposes of this study, are claims that are settled at or below District level. Again, the establishment and use of an issue escalation system in a partnered project would lead one to believe that partnered projects should have a significantly lower level of disputes than non-partnered projects. This is also an important parameter because it speaks directly to the most highly touted benefit of partnering, which is dispute resolution. It is calculated as follows.

$$DC = \frac{\text{Total Cost of Disputes}}{\text{Original Contract Cost}} \dots\dots\dots[A-10]$$

Award Price

Award price is merely the original contract amount for each project, and the award price provides a method to separate and discriminate between projects based on their relative financial size. This parameter is important because the size of a project may influence the amount of benefit it can actually accrue from partnering. For example, a small project that has a \$20,000 change order will experience a larger percentage of cost growth than a large project with the same size change order. Thus it is important to look at similar sized projects as measured by award price to accurately assess the impact of partnering on the TxDOT construction program.

Analysis of Statistics

Table A-1 shows a breakdown of all the parameters discussed above for the 204 partnered projects and 204 non-partnered projects. The projects are broken into four groups based on award price, and the award price groups are as follows.

- \$1 million or less
- \$1 million to \$5 million
- \$5 million to \$15 million
- Greater than \$15 million

These groupings were selected after discussions with the Project Director and represent a typical ordering of project size in use at TxDOT. The total sample population of projects was equal. But it can be seen that when the projects are grouped according to size, the significant grouping for partnered projects was in the \$1 million to \$5 million range; the significant grouping for non-partnered projects was in the \$1 million or less range. Interestingly, taking the two groups together yields virtually equal populations of partnered and non-partnered projects. Thus, as shown in Table A-2, there are equal groups of projects less than \$5 million and projects greater than \$5 million which enhances the value of the inferences that can be made from the statistics. The individual dynamic found in large and small projects is germane when the shift in this study's focus to develop a method to assist the Department in determining which projects to formally partner is considered. The intuitive solution is to spend the time and resources required to formally partner those projects that are large and complex. Analyzing this data should provide the answer to that question.

Table A-1. Statistical Breakdown of Project Parameters by Award Price Range

Parameter	Award Price Range		Award Price Range	
	\$0-\$1 M		\$1M-\$5M	
	PT	NP	PT	NP
Number of Projects	35	100	110	46
Award Price	667,572	429,912	2,643,916	2,413,961
Cost Growth as % of Total Cost	12.47	-0.81	4.64	3.63
Number of Change Orders	8	2	12	7
Avg Cost Growth per Change Order	10,366	-2,324	10,511	12,850
Avg % Cost Growth per Change Order	1.55	-0.54	0.40	0.53
% of Projects with Deducts	4.41	24.02	12.75	7.84
Time Growth as % of Total Contract Days	2.84	-24.92	-3.16	15.76
% Additional Days Granted	20.25	4.71	7.90	17.86
% of Projects with LD's	1.47	6.86	10.29	4.41
LD % of Total Contract Days	1.58	1.99	1.51	3.15
LD Cost as % of Total Cost	0.21	0.09	0.11	0.25
Claims Cost (%) of Total Cost	12.93	5.46	0.11	0.15
Disputes Cost % of Total Cost	0.00	11.81	0.13	2.03
Parameter	Award Price Range		Award Price Range	
	\$5M-\$15M		\$15M-\$40M	
	PT	NP	PT	NP
Number of Projects	45	35	14	23
Award Price	8,557,678	8,552,594	22,240,253	24,281,065
Cost Growth as % of Total Cost	2.99	6.04	0.52	2.81
Number of Change Orders	23	21	45	38
Avg Cost Growth per Change Order	11,337	24,446	2,571	18,122
Avg % Cost Growth per Change Order	0.13	0.29	0.01	0.07
% of Projects with Deducts	4.90	2.45	0.49	1.47
Time Growth as % of Total Contract Days	-6.33	12.91	-8.64	23.71
% Additional Days Granted	6.63	11.72	8.99	13.80
% of Projects with LD's	1.96	6.37	0.00	5.88
LD % of Total Contract Days	0.91	4.64	0.00	10.21
LD Cost as % of Total Cost	0.07	0.29	0.00	0.64
Claims Cost (%) of Total Cost	0.00	1.07	0.00	0.08
Disputes Cost % of Total Cost	0.00	0.71	0.00	0.00

Table A-2. Statistical Breakdown of Project Parameters by Award Price Range and Total Population

Award Price Range Project Parameter	\$0-\$5M		\$5M-\$40M		\$0-\$40M	
	PT	NP	PT	NP	PT	NP
Number of Projects	146	146	58	58	204	204
Award Price	\$2,170,135	\$1,055,024	\$11,860,368	\$14,789,745	\$4,925,201	\$4,959,994
Cost Growth as % of Total Cost	5.22	2.39	1.87	3.94	2.93	3.70
Number of Change Orders	11	6	28	29	16	10
Avg Cost Growth per Change Order	\$10,485	\$9,309	\$7,946	\$21,032	\$9,198	\$18,713
Avg % Cost Growth per Change Order	0.48	0.88	0.07	0.14	0.19	0.38
% of Projects with Deducts	17.16	31.86	5.39	3.92	23.53	36.27
Time Growth as % of Total Contract Days	-0.32	-9.16	-14.97	36.62	-4.70	10.04
% Additional Days Granted	28.15	22.57	15.62	25.52	8.32	12.49
% of Projects with LD's	11.76	11.27	1.96	12.25	21.08	23.53
LD % of Total Contract Days	3.09	5.14	0.91	14.85	5.04	14.56
LD Cost as % of Total Cost	0.32	0.34	0.07	0.93	0.07	0.21
Claims Cost % of Total Cost	13.04	5.61	0.00	1.15	0.33	0.61
Disputes Cost % of Total Cost	0.13	13.84	0.00	0.71	0.04	0.93

Partnering's Impact on Cost Growth

This parameter is the classic metric for project performance. Looking at Figure A-1, non-partnered projects outperformed partnered projects in the two lower award price ranges. The opposite was true in the two higher price ranges. This is an interesting result. It appears that the change in adversary relationships makes the owner's field personnel more willing to accept contractor-initiated change order requests. When the entire population is considered, partnered projects have a slightly less cost growth. This leads to the conclusion that implementing partnering generally improves cost growth performance with the greatest impact being felt in projects which are greater than \$5 million.




Figure A-1. Cost Growth

Partnering's Impact on Change Orders

Change orders are the major source of cost growth. There were three parameters developed to evaluate partnering's effect on project change orders. The first concern that needs to be looked at is the feeling by field personnel that partnering makes the owner's representative more likely to accept contractor-initiated change requests. Figure A-2 shows that partnered projects have more change orders than non-partnered projects. This would seem to confirm that suspicion. It should be noted that the researchers have no way of differentiating between contractor-initiated and other types of change orders. Next, we need to test the idea that the contractors "return the favor" by keeping change order costs down. Table 2 indicates that across the entire population mean partnered project change cost was roughly one half the average cost of the average non-partnered change order. Figure A-3 shows that this parameter was less for partnered projects in three out of the four project size groupings.




Figure A-2. Number of Change Orders




Figure A-3. Average Change Order Cost

When viewed in figure A-4 as a percentage of contact amount, the amount of each partnered change order is less than non-partnered change orders but the orders of magnitude are roughly the same for the top three groupings. The smallest projects stand out as an anomaly. Non-partnered change order values ended up as a net deduct while partnered change order cost was roughly the same per change order as in the larger projects. Perhaps, this is confirmation that implementing partnering creates an environment where TxDOT field personnel are more inclined to go along with contractor-initiated change requests.




Figure A-4. Average Change Order Cost as a Percentage of Contract Amount

If we measure contractor willingness to minimize overall project costs by looking at the percentage of projects with negative cost growth, ignoring the small projects, we find from Figure A-5 that for partnered projects in the \$1 million to \$15 million range the percentage of deducts is roughly twice that in non-partnered projects. This trend reverses itself in the largest projects. However, when you consider that the population of partnered projects in the middle range is 155 compared to only 14 in the highest range, you can dismiss that reversal as statistically insignificant. Therefore, we can conclude that partnering seems to create a desirable effect with regard to deducts.




Figure A-5. Percent of Projects with Negative Cost Growth

Time Growth

The other objective measure of project performance is time growth. We have two parameters which are designed to provide trend information with regard to partnering. The first is mean percentage time growth. Figure A-6 shows the most vivid difference in the entire study. For the three largest size project groups, time growth was negative in partnered projects and positive in non-partnered projects. For the entire population, the average partnered project finished 4.7% earlier than originally planned and the average non-partnered finished 10.04% later than originally planned. The trend is reversed for the smallest projects, but again, the size of the partnered population makes it difficult to infer significance to that statistic. That is not the case for non-partnered projects with a population of 100 and a time growth of -25%. This result might be explained by the administrative process used to set contract completion criteria being too conservative. In other words, actual contractor performance consistently exceeds the expectations of those who establish contract completion criteria.




Figure A-6.Time Growth




Figure A-7. Additional Days Granted

The second metric is the number of additional days granted expressed as a percentage of total days allowed. The parameter was meant to test the owner's willingness to grant time extensions as a result of a partnering relationship. Figure A-7 shows that in the smallest three groupings this parameter shows a distinct willingness on the part of Department personnel to grant additional days on partnered projects.

Partnering's Impact of Liquidated Damages

This analysis may be the acid test for partnering. It is easy to grant accolades for innovative approaches that were tried on projects that went well. The real test of a partnering relationship comes from those projects which do not proceed according to plan. The data showed that there were liquidated damages assessed on partnered projects. That means that some partnered projects finished late in spite of the investment in team building and relationships. Figure A-8 shows that the percentage of partnered projects with LD's is less than non-partnered projects with LD's in all categories except the \$1 million to \$5 million range. This is notable in that that range contained over half the partnered projects and in that range there were over twice as many late partnered projects as non-partnered projects. However, if we redistribute the award price ranges as shown in Table A-2, one can see that for partnered projects greater than \$5 million only 2% have LD's compared to over 12% on non-partnered projects in the same category. Whereas, for those under \$5 million the two types of projects are roughly equal. The \$5 million break point seems to have some significance. A quick look down Table A-2 shows that partnered projects above \$5 million outperform non-partnered projects in virtually every parameter.

Figure A-9 shows the impact of LD's with respect to the total project cost. In this case, while the \$1 million to \$5 million range had the largest percentage of partnered projects with LD's, the cost impact of those LD's was not as great as on the non-partnered projects which had a cost impact which was twice as great as the other. For the lowest cost group of projects, LD cost impact was greater than non-partnered and this can probably be explained by the fact that several days of LD's will constitute a proportionately larger percentage of a small contract than a large contract. Finally, when we look only at LD's in terms of time in Figure A-10, we can see that partnered projects had a fewer number of LD days than non-partnered projects in all categories. Thus we can draw the conclusion that partnering does indeed work on projects with time problems by reducing the number of days that a project finishes late.




Figure A-8. Percent of Projects with Liquidated Damages




Figure A-9. Liquidated Damages as a Percent of Total Cost




Figure A-10. Liquidated Damages as a Percent of Total Time.

Partnering's Impact of Disputes and Claims

Remembering that disputes are issues that are settled at District-level or below and that Claims are issues that are settled above the District, studying the potential impact of partnering on these two parameters is extremely important. Figures A-11 and A-12 show that partnering seems to virtually eliminate the cost allocated to disputes and has the same effect on claims for projects greater than \$1 million. The only significant costs that remain in these two parameters are for claims on projects that are less than \$1 million. When we look at Table A-2, once again we see that for the \$5 million to \$40 million range, there are virtually no costs associated with disputes and claims on partnered projects. The total percentage of dispute and claims costs on non-partnered projects is relatively low. Whereas if we look to the lower half of the projects, we find that there are significant dispute and claims costs associated with both types of projects. This disparity is hard to explain. Perhaps, the magnitude of the issues encountered on the large projects was small enough in relation to the size of the project that both sides found it easier to settle these issues on the job site. On the other hand, an issue that might get lost in the financial noise of a large project may be large enough in relation to the size of the contract on a smaller project that it must be escalated to receive final settlement.




Figure A-11. Disputes Cost




Figure A-12. Claims Cost

CONCLUSIONS

The above discussion springs from the preliminary statistical analysis of the data collected for this project. Basically, we have only calculated means, standard deviations, and variances for the selected parameters. This was done to identify trends and lead us to those places where additional analysis with more complex methods will likely provide definitive information. This analysis will take place during the second year of the project and will be reported in the final report. As can be seen from the above discussion, significant trends have been identified and some emerging conclusions can be made. These are as follows.

- Partnered projects outperformed non-partnered projects in virtually every category if they were awarded at a price above \$5 million.
- Partnered projects have slightly less cost growth when the entire population is considered.
- Partnered projects have more change orders than non-partnered projects and this probably demonstrates an increased willingness by TxDOT field personnel to favorably consider contractor-initiated change requests.
- Across the entire population mean partnered project change order cost was roughly one half the average cost of the average non-partnered change order. Therefore, contractors are attempting to keep the cost of change orders down.
- This is further reinforced by the trend which shows that partnering seems to create a desirable effect with regard to deducts.
- For the entire population, the average partnered project finished 4.7% earlier than originally planned and the average non-partnered finished 10.04% later than originally planned.
- There appears to be a distinct willingness on the part of Department personnel to grant additional days on partnered projects.
- Partnered projects have a fewer number of LD days than non-partnered projects in all categories. Thus, partnering seems to have a positive effect on projects with time problems by reducing the number of days that a project finishes late.
- For the \$1 million to \$5 million range, there are no costs associated with disputes and claims on partnered projects.

APPENDIX B: REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF PROJECT DATABASE

Step-wise regression procedure was used for multiple regression analysis. The parameter “Final Cost” was selected as the dependent variable. Specific parameters and variables used in the analysis included the following.

- Final Cost (FC)
- Contractor Work Days (X)
- Additional Days (Y)
- Net Length
- Asphalt-Concrete Paving (ACP)
- Seal Coat (SC)
- Total Days (Z)
- Additional Days (AD)
- Contractor Workdays (CW)
- Coefficient of Multiple Regression (r)
- Net Length In Miles (NLM_)

Regression analysis is a tool used to evaluate a stated mathematical association between variables. It results in a linear or curvilinear relationship to be used for prediction purposes. For example, suppose that the number of line items processed in an organization’s supply warehouse affects the number of labor-hours required in the warehouse. The required hours can then be expressed as a mathematical function of the number of line items processed.

The correlation coefficient is a useful measure of linear association applied to the regression model. It is a dimensionless ratio ranging from -1.0 (perfect inverse linear association) through zero (linearly unrelated) to $+1.0$ (perfect direct linear agreement). The ratio can be used as an index without any assertion being made about the distribution form.

For the analysis involving the sample projects, both partnered and non-partnered categories were established with the subgroups ACP and SC delineated within these categories. The regression models developed for the selected categories/subgroups are shown in Table B-1.

Table B-1. Regression Models

Projects	Regression Equation	COR
All Non-partnered	$FC = 34253X - 60359Y - 2149Z$	0.760
	$Z = 40.26 + 0.688X$	0.960
Seal Coat	$FC = 31569X$	0.906
ACP	$FC = 15109X + 8424Z + 168237Y$	0.970
All Partnered	$FC = 18292X + 8424Y + 13013T$	0.689
ACP	$FC = 14048X$	0.986
Legend: • FC = Final Cost • X = Contractor Work Days • Y = Additional Days • Net Length		

Examination of the above models indicates very high correlation for equations 2, 3, and 5. For partnered ACP projects, a good estimator for the Final Cost of the project would be simply a function of projected contract work days multiplied by the constant factor “14048. The non-partnered Seal Coat model shows a similar linear equation structure. The non-partnered ACP model while showing near perfect correlation poses a drawback as to its use as a estimator of Final Costs. That drawback is the variable in the equation pertaining to “additional workdays.”

APPENDIX C: SURVEY SUMMARIES

B-1: TxDOT/General Contractor Attitudinal Survey on Formal Partnering

Summary of TxDOT Field Questionnaire on Formal Partnering

1. How many times have you participated in TxDOT partnered projects?

	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O more than 4
Responses:	23%	19%	23%	10%	24%

2. Please indicate your TxDOT role in a partnered project. (Check the most appropriate/frequent role)

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Inspector | <input type="radio"/> Chief Inspector | <input type="radio"/> Project Engineer |
| <input type="radio"/> Assist. Area Engineer | <input type="radio"/> Area Engineer | <input type="radio"/> Dir. Of Construction |
| <input type="radio"/> Assist. Dist. Engineer | <input type="radio"/> District Engineer | <input type="radio"/> Designer |
| <input type="radio"/> Other (please specify) _____ | | |

Project Engineer 11	Labor 1
Chief Inspector 38	Laboratory Supervisor 3
Construction Record Keeper 10	District Construction Auditor 2
Area Engineer 41	Director of Operations 1
Inspector 18	Construction Manager 2
Project Manager 7	Assistant District Engineer 4
Assistant Area Engineer 16	Engineering Specialist II 1
Director of Construction 8	Director of Transportation & Auditor 1
District Laboratory Engineer 1	Assistant Director 1
District Construction Engineer 1	Public Information Officer 2
Designer 5	Traffic Control 1
District Materials Engineer 2	R.O.W. Utility Agent 1

3. Which parts of the *initial facilitated partnering workshop* do you find to be most beneficial. If you are not familiar with a particular item as a part of the workshop(s) you have attended, leave the item blank.

	Not Beneficial 1	2	3	4	Extremely Beneficial 5
a. Introductions:	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5
Responses:	19%	7%	29%	28%	17%
b. Joint Value Exercises:	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5
Responses:	5%	25%	33%	31%	6%
c. Mutual Goals:	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5
Responses:	4%	9%	31%	38%	17%
d. Perception of the Other Organization:	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5
Responses:	8%	13%	33%	32%	14%
e. Role Reversals (putting yourself in the contractor's shoes):	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5
Responses:	13%	15%	31%	28%	14%

f. Mission Statement (or Charter) with measurable goals and objectives:					
	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
Responses:	12%	20%	28%	26%	13%

g. Video Tape(s) on partnering:					
	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
Responses:	21%	33%	24%	19%	3%

h. Personality Profile:					
	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
Responses:	22%	24%	24%	20%	10%

i. Issue Resolution:					
	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
Responses:	4%	3%	18%	45%	30%

j. Setting up Evaluation System:					
	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
Responses:	10%	15%	32%	32%	10%

k. Getting to Know Project Team in a Relaxed Environment:					
	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
Responses:	2%	7%	18%	37%	37%

4. Which of the following partnering tools have you used in partnered projects?

1. Never 2. Occasionally 3. Some of the time 4. All of the time

a. Mission statement with measurable goals and objectives				
	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4
Responses:	22%	25%	27%	26%

b. Personality profiles				
	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4
Responses:	39%	29%	25%	7%

c. Conflict resolution/issue escalation (agreeing to disagree and escalate)				
	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4
Responses:	6%	17%	31%	46%

d. Problem solving				
	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4
Responses:	9%	21%	36%	34%

e. Evaluating or monitoring system (periodic report cards)				
	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4
Responses:	39%	28%	26%	7%

5. If you have not used the partnering tools, please indicate the reason(s)

- Not enough time
Responses: 18%
- Disinterest among team members
Responses: 56%
- Too complicated
Responses: 2%
- Too much paper work involved
Responses: 8%
- Forgot to use them

Responses: 16%

Other: please specify _____

Responses: 0%

6. How do you think partnering has affected your job relationships? (please only answer those questions that apply)

1. Much Worse 2.. Somewhat Worse 3. No Change 4. Somewhat Better 5. Much Better

a. Relationship with Contractor

1 2 3 4 5

Responses: 1% 2% 27% 53% 18%

b. Relationship with Subcontractors

1 2 3 4 5

Responses: 1% 1% 62% 30% 7%

c. Relationship with Suppliers

1 2 3 4 5

Responses: 2% 1% 83% 11% 4%

d. Relationship with Fellow TxDOT Project Team Members

1 2 3 4 5

Responses: 1% 1% 50% 34% 14%

e. Relationship with TxDOT Divisions/Special Offices (Austin)

1 2 3 4 5

Responses: 3% 3% 71% 18% 6%

7. Did you participate in a follow-up partnering workshop(s)?

Yes No

Responses: 37% 63%

8. Did you find the follow-up workshop(s) beneficial?

Not Beneficial

1 2 3

Extremely Beneficial

4 5

Responses: 24% 8% 21% 38% 10%

9. Did you participate in a close-out partnering workshop(s)?

Yes No

Responses: 20% 80%

10. Did you find the close-out partnering workshop(s) beneficial?

Not Beneficial

1 2 3

Extremely Beneficial

4 5

Responses: 36% 5% 18% 30% 11%

11. What level of service do you feel you are receiving from The TxDOT Continuous Improvement Office?

Poor

1 2 3

Excellent

4 5

Responses: 10% 19% 42% 23% 5%

12. The level of services provided to you by the Continuous Improvement Office have been

Poor

1 2 3

Excellent

4 5

Responses: 12% 15% 42% 27% 4%

13. The Continuous Improvement Office needs to improve support in the following area(s). Please list in the space provided.

- O _____
- O _____
- O _____
- O _____

Responses:

- Help with follow ups. Do report cards.
- More participation from higher levels of management.
- Longer time with these work shops.
- The CI office works hard to provide the tools they have to offer, however I'm not sure these tools are effective in the real world.
- Partnering was of little use, due to lack of interest on everyone's part.
- TxDOT inter team support.
- We need to play the game by the rules, don't back off at the expense to TxDOT.
- They've never been involved that I know of.
- Training.
- To follow up on all partnering workshops.
- Perhaps more knowledge in TxDOT Projects.
- Work under the condition and with the contractor.
- Contact A.E. with advance and follow up checks.
- Partnering is a waste of time and money and has not been used on my project. The only way this could work is for the inspector to have some way to make the contractor abide by all partnering rules, goals, and objectives.
- Need to "back-off" of partnering.
- Response to questions.
- Problem solving Resolution.
- Evaluate mission goals statements mid-way through project.
- Insist on close-out partnering workshops.
- Assess TxDOT and Contractors attitudes during project.
- Understand construction and design.
- Focus on job and not personalities.
- Don't dictate to the Districts.
- Don't implement CI issues simply for sake of trying to justify existence.
- Don't take position that status quo is always bad.
- Communication between district and area offices.
- Communication between district design and area design.
- Directors and top level personnel need to listen to employees.
- Send out a list of suggestions made so we can monitor changes.
- Returning phone calls.
- Some body in office for assistance.
- Just emphasize open-communication.
- Letting offices know who and what they are, and what kind of service they provide.
- Communication.
- Get TxDOT personnel to understand that partnering doesn't mean to throw the plans and specs out the window when a contractor makes a request.
- Contractors to understand partnering is a two way street, not get, get, get, all the time. They need to give some also.
- Cost of living, and promotions.
- Rule out out-of-town partnering sessions.
- Inspectors training.
- Training (In house between TxDOT Sections) how to partner.
- Management communication.
- Heighten employee morale.

- No communication.
- Allow district to have input in setting up meetings.
- The CI office speaks with large bureaucratic catch-phrases while the real work is done by local teams.
- Organize and coordinate all partnering activities.
- Make all arrangements.
- Don't know of anything yet but as we get into partnering, plus I feel the partnering office may be able to supply materials (tapes, lit., ect.).
- Provide more training at the dist. level.
- Screening of facilitators, for qualification.
- Spearhead the implementation of their designed programs. Inform all levels of their design.
- Resolution of differences.
- They lack experience and knowledge in what real pressures exist between the Department and the contractor. These pressures intensify as the project progress. The effects of these pressures cannot be masked by partnering.
- Follow up visits to individual employees, not group meetings.
- When you make rules , enforce them.
- Let employees give honest opinions without repercussions.
- Need more than initial meeting only.
- Where are they? I had no contact with them.
- I really don't know what they do. It appears they hand down edicts without knowing what really goes on In the field.
- Provide information about partnering location, and lodging by mail in timely manner rather than a rushed fax.
- Less paper pushing and more "out in the field" "real world" solutions.
- Quit making blanket rules for the state wide. Each part of the state has regional differences and needs. Let us use some common sense. We already know the contractors.
- Need to provide module information for informal partnering workshops.
- What are they here for?
- Developing environment that enforces policies that are published as a rule. Not to find reasons not to follow policies or demand compliance with standards and specifications.

14. Who should attend partnering workshops: (Check as many as apply for the initial partnering workshops)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> FHWA | <input type="checkbox"/> Area Engineer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Inspector | <input type="checkbox"/> Superintendent |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Foreman | <input type="checkbox"/> Estimators |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Material Suppliers | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Public officials | <input type="checkbox"/> Continuous Improvement Office Personnel |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Project Manager (TxDOT, Contractor) | <input type="checkbox"/> District Engineer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CEO/Upper Management of Contractor | <input type="checkbox"/> Subcontractors |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TxDOT Division Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Executive Director |
| i.e. Mat. & Tests, C&M, Design | <input type="checkbox"/> Designer of Plans |
| <input type="checkbox"/> District Construction Engineer | <input type="checkbox"/> City Entities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Construction Records Keeper | <input type="checkbox"/> DPS |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify: _____) | |

Response Rank-Ordered:	
Rank	Job Title
173	Area Engineer
169	Project Manager(TXDOT, Contractor) 169
167	Superintendent
154	Foreman
143	Subcontractors
140	District Construction Engineer
133	Construction Record Keeper
120	CEO/Upper Management of Contractor
117	Inspector

99	Designer of Plans
80	Utilities
64	Materials Suppliers
59	District Engineer
55	FHWA
55	City Entities
49	Local Public Office
48	Estimators
39	TxDOT Division Support
39	Construction Improvement Office Personnel
38	DPS
4	Executive Director

15. An *informal* partnering project is defined as one in which a non-facilitated meeting between TxDOT and contractor representatives occurs. What criteria do you recommend for warranting the use of an informal partnered project instead of a formal partnered project? (For blank spaces provide your estimate)

Contract values less than _____ dollars

Response Average: \$1,000,000

Previous partnering experience of TxDOT personnel

Response: 47%

Previous Experience of contractor

Response: 46%

Previous experience of both TxDOT and contractor personnel

Response: 68%

Project period less than _____ weeks

Response Average: 30 Weeks

Urban project

Response: 11%

Rural project

Response: 22%

Other

Response:
Any project where one party is trying to improve relations.
TxDOT area office and contractor have been through a partnered project together previously.
When TxDOT personnel and Contractors have already worked well together.
of parties involved potential area of conflict problems with utilities possible.
Past relationship of parties involved.
Complexity considering individual elements.
Complexity considering the relationship of elements.
Dependant upon complexity of project.
No utilities.
Not a complicated project.
No major utility adjustments.
Simple construction project (urban/rural).
Maintenance contracts.
Project complexity, standard vs special designs, unique construction sequences.
New contractor in area.
Complexity of project (lack of).

Projects in low profile areas.
Combine partnering with pre construction conference on small project.
Type of contractor, I.e. ACP ovlys, shoulder project, seal coat, rehab FM's.
Vary based on complexity.
TxDOT and contractor have partnered before.
Specific scope of work, e.g. thin overlays, seal coat projects, traffic signal jobs, ect.
Complexity.
Seal coat or hot mix projects.
Now technical projects that don't have major anticipated problems.
Projects involving one item of work (mowing, signing, tree-trimming, level-up, seal coating, pavement markers, etc.)
How many times have contractors and TxDOT worked together.
Previous partnering between TxDOT and same contractor.
Project simplicity (number of items).
A job that has already been done on different roads.
Overlay, illumination, signals.
Simple straight forward project.
No time for formal.
Exist. relationships between TxDOT/contractor.
Depends upon complexity of project.
Mutual agreement between area eng. and contractor.
Non-complex projects.
Minor utility adjustments, simple TCP, few stake holders.
Mutual agreement between TxDOT and contractor.
Roadway overlay projects.
Simple, repeat work with same contractor.
This method is much preferred (informal partnering) by myself. Let's just have a 1-day pre-construction meeting.
Contractor with other project under you.
A workshop should be held for every partnering project regardless how many one has made! Every project is different, people employment changes,
managers, etc. This is very important.
Complex projects.
Already get along with contractor.
If a project must be partnered, this is the way to do it.
Small amount of subcontractors.
One contractor only.
Signal projects.
Off system county bridges.
Preventive maintenance projects.
Mutual agreement between TxDOT and contractor.

16. In your experience with partnered projects, which of the objective criteria below represents the best measurable yardsticks in which to access the benefits of partnering? You may mark as many as you feel are germane. If you mark more than one, please rank order your responses 1,2,3,... with "1" being the best choice and so on.

	RANK ORDER
<input type="checkbox"/> Value engineering dollars generated	5
<input type="checkbox"/> Cost growth due to change orders	4
<input type="checkbox"/> Number of change orders	6
<input type="checkbox"/> Time extensions due to change orders	9
<input type="checkbox"/> Liquidated Damage Costs	7
<input type="checkbox"/> Number of claims	2
<input type="checkbox"/> Claims cost	3
<input type="checkbox"/> Users' cost of construction	8
<input type="checkbox"/> Administrative costs	9
<input type="checkbox"/> Time to resolve escalated issues	1
<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	

17. Please rank order the subjective partnering measurements using 1,2,3 and so on with 1 being the most important benefit of partnering.

	RANK ORDER
<input type="checkbox"/> Better communication	1
<input type="checkbox"/> Increased trust	3
<input type="checkbox"/> TxDOT satisfaction	5
<input type="checkbox"/> Contractor satisfaction	7
<input type="checkbox"/> Better teamwork	2
<input type="checkbox"/> Stronger Relationships	6
<input type="checkbox"/> Public satisfaction	4

18. In my experience with partnered projects, the project team developed a process for resolving disagreements.

	O Always	O Most times	O Some times	O Never
Response:	34%	37%	24%	5%

19. In my experience with partnered projects, the project team felt that it was empowered to make the decisions it needed to make to complete the project.

	O Always	O Most times	O Some times	O Never
Response:	14%	47%	32%	7%

20. Overall, I believe that the TxDOT partner program as it affects TxDOT, the contractors, and the general public has been

	Not Beneficial				Extremely Beneficial
	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
Response:	9%	14%	31%	33%	13%

21. Overall, I believe that partnered projects improve quality.

	O Agree	O Disagree
Response:	60%	40%

22. Overall, I believe that partnered projects result in better safety and health for project personnel.

	O Agree	O Disagree
Response:	64%	36%

General Contractor Attitudinal Survey to Formal Partnering

B-2: General Contractor Partnering Questionnaire

Please darkened with pencil or pen the circle next to your selected response.

1. How many times have you participated in partnered projects?

	<input type="radio"/> TxDOTO 1	<input type="radio"/> O 2	<input type="radio"/> O 3	<input type="radio"/> O 4	<input type="radio"/> O more than 4
Responses:	19%	18%	6%	14%	43%

	Other <input type="radio"/> O 1	<input type="radio"/> O 2	<input type="radio"/> O 3	<input type="radio"/> O 4	<input type="radio"/> O more than 4
Responses:	17%	13%	17%	0%	53%

2. Please indicate your TxDOT role in a partnered project. (Check the most appropriate/frequent role)

- Project Manager
- Superintendent
- Forman
- Safety Officer
- C.E.O.
- Field Engineer
- Other (please specify) _____

Project Manager 31%	Superintendent 17%
Forman 0%	Safety Officer 0%
C.E.O. 30%	Field Engineer 0%
Upper Management Rep. 1%	Estimator 3%
Vice President 3%	Subcontractor 2%
Contract Administration 3%	Qwner 2%
General Contractor 2%	Area Manager

3. Which parts of the *initial facilitated partnering workshop* do you find to be most beneficial. If you are not familiar with a particular item as a part of the workshop(s) you have attended, leave the item blank.

	Not Beneficial					Extremely Beneficial
	1	2	3	4	5	6
a. Introductions:	<input type="radio"/> O 1	<input type="radio"/> O 2	<input type="radio"/> O 3	<input type="radio"/> O 4	<input type="radio"/> O 5	<input type="radio"/> O 6
Responses:	0%	11%	14%	25%	29%	21%
b. Joint Value Exercises:	<input type="radio"/> O 1	<input type="radio"/> O 2	<input type="radio"/> O 3	<input type="radio"/> O 4	<input type="radio"/> O 5	<input type="radio"/> O 6
Responses:	2%	5%	26%	39%	26%	2%
c. Mutual Goals:	<input type="radio"/> O 1	<input type="radio"/> O 2	<input type="radio"/> O 3	<input type="radio"/> O 4	<input type="radio"/> O 5	<input type="radio"/> O 6
Responses:	0%	4%	12%	23%	45%	16%
d. Perception of the Other Organization:	<input type="radio"/> O 1	<input type="radio"/> O 2	<input type="radio"/> O 3	<input type="radio"/> O 4	<input type="radio"/> O 5	<input type="radio"/> O 6
Responses:	0%	7%	18%	26%	40%	9%
e. Role Reversals (putting yourself in the contractor's shoes):	<input type="radio"/> O 1	<input type="radio"/> O 2	<input type="radio"/> O 3	<input type="radio"/> O 4	<input type="radio"/> O 5	<input type="radio"/> O 6
Responses:	1%	3%	21%	29%	40%	6%
f. Mission Statement (or Charter) with measurable goals and objectives:	<input type="radio"/> O 1	<input type="radio"/> O 2	<input type="radio"/> O 3	<input type="radio"/> O 4	<input type="radio"/> O 5	<input type="radio"/> O 6
Responses:	2%	10%	19%	32%	31%	6%
g. Video Tape(s) on partnering:	<input type="radio"/> O 1	<input type="radio"/> O 2	<input type="radio"/> O 3	<input type="radio"/> O 4	<input type="radio"/> O 5	<input type="radio"/> O 6
Responses:	21%	19%	34%	15%	9%	2%

h. Personality Profile:

	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5	O 6
Responses:	8%	17%	29%	25%	19%	2%

i. Issue Resolution:

	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5	O 6
Responses:	2%	6%	8%	29%	32%	23%

j. Setting up Evaluation System:

	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5	O 6
Responses:	4%	5%	20%	25%	33%	13%

k. Getting to Know Project Team in a Relaxed Environment:

	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5	O 6
Responses:	3%	0%	6%	33%	26%	24%

4. Which of the following partnering tools have you used in partnered projects?

1. Never 2. Occasionally 3. Some of the time 4. All of the time

a. Mission statement with measurable goals and objectives

	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4
Responses:	12%	22%	25%	41%

b. Personality profiles

	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4
Responses:	25%	22%	38%	15%

c. Conflict resolution/issue escalation (agreeing to disagree and escalate)

	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4
Responses:	10%	7%	28%	55%

d. Problem solving

	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4
Responses:	3%	10%	39%	48%

e. Evaluating or monitoring system (periodic report cards)

	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4
Responses:	26%	27%	27%	20%

5. If you have not used the partnering tools, please indicate the reason(s)

- Not enough time
Responses: 32%
- Disinterest among team members
Responses: 52%
- Too complicated
Responses: 3%
- Too much paper work involved
Responses: 10%
- Forgot to use them
Responses: 3%
- Other: please specify _____
Responses: 0%

6. How do you think partnering has affected your job relationships? (please only answer those questions that apply)

1. Much Worse 2. Somewhat Worse 3. No Change 4. Somewhat Better 5. Much Better

a. Relationship with

(1) TxDOT

O 1 O 2 O 3 O 4 O 5

Responses:	0%	7%	26%	40%	27%
------------	----	----	-----	-----	-----

(2) Other

O 1 O 2 O 3 O 4 O 5

Responses:	0%	3%	33%	28%	36%
------------	----	----	-----	-----	-----

b. Relationship with Subcontractors

(1) TxDOT

O 1 O 2 O 3 O 4 O 5

Responses:	0%	12%	46%	27%	15%
------------	----	-----	-----	-----	-----

(2) Other

O 1 O 2 O 3 O 4 O 5

Responses:	3%	8%	44%	19%	26%
------------	----	----	-----	-----	-----

c. Relationship with Architects

(1) TxDOT

O 1 O 2 O 3 O 4 O 5

Responses:	0%	21%	45%	27%	7%
------------	----	-----	-----	-----	----

(2) Other

O 1 O 2 O 3 O 4 O 5

Responses:	10%	10%	10%	50%	20%
------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

d. Relationship with Fellow Project Team Members

(1) TxDOT

O 1 O 2 O 3 O 4 O 5

Responses:	0%	8%	26%	41%	25%
------------	----	----	-----	-----	-----

(2) Other

O 1 O 2 O 3 O 4 O 5

Responses:	0%	27%	42%	36%	15%
------------	----	-----	-----	-----	-----

e. Relationship with owners

(1) TxDOT

O 1 O 2 O 3 O 4 O 5

Responses:	0%	8%	44%	40%	8%
------------	----	----	-----	-----	----

(2) Other

O 1 O 2 O 3 O 4 O 5

Responses:	0%	11%	51%	26%	12%
------------	----	-----	-----	-----	-----

7. Did you participate in a follow-up partnering workshop(s)?
 Yes No

(1) TxDOT

Responses:	40%	60%
------------	-----	-----

(2) Other

Responses:	37%	63%
------------	-----	-----

8. Did you find the follow-up workshop(s) beneficial?

Not Beneficial 1 2 3 4 Extremly Beneficial 5 6

TxDOT
 1 2 3 4 5 6

Responses:	16%	4%	24%	24%	28%	4%
------------	-----	----	-----	-----	-----	----

Other

Responses:	27%	18%	27%	10%	18%	0%
------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

9. Did you participate in a close-out partnering workshop(s)?

Yes No

(1) TxDOT

Responses:	22%	78%
------------	-----	-----

(2) Other

Responses:	17%	83%
------------	-----	-----

10. Did you find the close-out partnering workshop(s) beneficial?

Not Beneficial 1 2 3 4 Extremly Beneficial 5 6

TxDOT
 1 2 3 4 5 6

Responses:	17%	22%	17%	17%	27%	0%
------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Other

Responses:	22%	22%	52%	0%	0%	0%
------------	-----	-----	-----	----	----	----

11. Who should attend partnering workshops: (Check as many as apply for the initial partnering workshops)

Responses reflect percentages and do not sum to 100%.

- FHWA: 22%
- Inspector: 93%
- Foreman: 85%
- Material Suppliers: 30%
- Local Public officials: 28%
- Project Manager (TxDOT, Contractor): 100%
- CEO/Upper Management of Contractor: 64%
- TxDOT Division Support: 44%
i.e. Mat. & Tests, C&M, Design
- District Construction Engineer: 57%
- Construction Records Keeper : 43%
- Other (please specify): _____
- Area Engineer: 92%
- Superintendent: 95%
- Estimators: 33%
- Utilities: 43%
- Continuous Improvement Office Personnel: 8%
- District Engineer: 31%
- Subcontractors: 80%
- Executive Director: 3%
- Designer of Plans: 38%
- City Entities: 33%
- DPS: 20%

12. An *informal* partnering project is defined as one in which a non-facilitated meeting between Owner and contractor representatives occurs. What criteria do you recommend for warranting the use of an informal partnered project instead of a formal partnered project? (For blank spaces provide your estimate)

Responses depicted as a percentage of total respondents that answered this to this question.

- Contract values less than \$500,000 (modal value: 27%) dollars
- Previous partnering experience of owner personnel: 100%
- Previous experience of contractor: 73%
- Previous experience of both owner and contractor personnel: 100%
- Project period less than 26 Weeks (modal value: 21%) weeks
- Urban project: 27%
- Rural project: 53%

13. In your experience with partnered projects, which of the objective criteria below represents the best measurable yardsticks in which to access the benefits of partnering? You may mark as many as you feel are germane. If you mark more than one, please rank order your responses 1,2,3,... with "1" being the best choice and so on.

	RANK ORDER
<input type="radio"/> Value engineering dollars generated	6
<input type="radio"/> Cost growth due to change orders	6
<input type="radio"/> Number of change orders	6
<input type="radio"/> Time extensions due to change orders	5
<input type="radio"/> Liquidated Damage Costs	3
<input type="radio"/> Number of claims	2
<input type="radio"/> Claims cost	4
<input type="radio"/> Users' cost of construction	5
<input type="radio"/> Administrative costs	4
<input type="radio"/> Time to resolve escalated issues	1

14. Please rank order the subjective partnering measurements using 1,2,3 and so on with 1 being the most important benefit of partnering.

	RANK ORDER
<input type="radio"/> Better communication	1
<input type="radio"/> Increased trust	4
<input type="radio"/> TxDOT satisfaction	5
<input type="radio"/> Contractor satisfaction	6
<input type="radio"/> Better teamwork	2
<input type="radio"/> Stronger Relationships	3
<input type="radio"/> Public satisfaction	5

15. In my experience with partnered projects, the project team developed a process for resolving disagreements.

	O Never	O Some times	O Most times	O Always
Response:	2%	8%	55%	35%

16. In my experience with partnered projects, the project team felt that is was empowered to make the decisions it needed to make to complete the project.

	O Never	O Some times	O Most times	O Always
Response:	3%	18%	64%	15%

17. Overall, I believe that the TxDOT partner program as it affects TxDOT, the contractors, and the general public has been

	Not Beneficial				Extremely Beneficial	
	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5	O 6
Responses:	7%	5%	22%	27%	25%	14%

18. Overall, I believe that partnered projects improve quality.

	Agree	Disagree
Response:	82%	18%

19. Overall, I believe that partnered projects result in better safety and health for project personnel.

	<input type="radio"/> Agree	<input type="radio"/> Disagree
Response:	81%	19%

20. When did your company partner its first project? _____ Month _____ Year

Response: 20% (modal value) started partnering in 1994

21. What is your company's total partnered projects for 1996?

a. TxDOT	Response: Average - 2.0
b. Other	Response: Average - 1.7

22. What is your company's estimated yearly average claims expense for

a. Partnered projects Response: (only 13% of respondents reported): Average \$130,5000

b. Non-partnered projects Response: (only 11% of respondents reported): Average \$23,285

23. Based on your experience, does partnering a contract reduce the potential for claims?

	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Not Sure
Response:	56%	18%	26%

24. Any other comments

Responses

Extremely beneficial for 1st project with an engineer or complicated projects. Repetitive when it is the same contractor and engineers

Good idea. Need to shorten the program. Only do the really important things. Make it more relaxed and a chance to meet each other.

We have effectively completed projects and enjoyed great relationships with owner, architects, and engineers over the past 20 years. IMHO, Partnering is a way to create jobs for people who can't get them, create jobs for academia to run studies in order to justify more studies and create additional funding justification for TxDOT. It is a complete waste of money.

I feel that "mandatory partnering" is a contradiction in terms. It is silly that the state has forced all jobs to be partnered due to pressure from the "partnering lobby". My recent experience with the informal partnering has proven to be more time /cost effective than the formal partnering.

Some area engineers do not support partnering. Some Tx Dot employees at the project level think that partnering is a give away by TxDOT. Our company has had so called partnered projects where project inspector stated in meeting he did not believe in partnering in the presence of A.E. and Dist Eng. The further you get from Austin the less TxDOT employees believe in partnership.

The major problem now is that everyone is partnered "out". It takes something different to get everyone's minds of their work enough for the partnering to sink in.

Much of the basis for partnering is good. This new informal spec is better. Get rid of the touchy-filly stuff and get down to business more. Most contractors can't afford to spend the time for the people

that need to be at these sessions. So, instead of foreman, supt's and inspectors, you end up with CEO's, Estimators, Area Engineers, Etc. Cut the time down and get the field people into the sessions.

Purpose of partnering not claims related, the purpose for partnering is to get two assholes - one on each side to take a lousy set of plans and build a job. Partnering should take place during design if we must have substandard plans.

The long time reputable firms should be treated as such by the highway department and we wouldn't need partnering

A key to partnering is to support the partnering process with enhanced efforts to keep the process alive

Partnering is a great concept that seems to lose its effectiveness after the first or second disagreement or problem. The follow up partnering at 40% would be extremely beneficial. Our experience with partnering have helped us to get to know the players but hasn't dramatically changed our working experience with the field.

Mandate it. DBE's under General Contractor special session for them-keep all honest

Partnered projects only work if the "leadership" of parties involved already have a culture that is conservative and supportive, otherwise it is only up service and a wasted exercise

In my opinion on the smaller projects my company has done the same goals & needs are accomplished with the pre-construction meetings that are held before beginning a project. However my experience with large contracts as a sub-contractor the partnering that was discussed was a big joke. Nothing went as it should have and no partnering efforts were made by contractors.

By the time large projects are completed most personnel have changed jobs and very few of the people that attend the original session were around. Everyone that attended never used any of the information we took back to the project to resolve any issue but the concept of partnering was used and the issues were resolved.

With TxDOT in our district partnering has very little meaning except in word only- the concept is there-TxDOT wants to do it- but when the time comes TxDOT sacrifices everything to the GOD OF TOTAL CONTROL. They simply will not allow the contractor to build the job without doing everything their way. Good ideas- just won't work in the current atmosphere.

B-3: TxDOT Formal/Informal Partnering Survey Summary

Questionnaire Prologue. In December 1996, the Texas Department of Transportation introduced the *Partnering Plus (P²)* program. The most important improvement expected from this program is the intent that *all* construction and maintenance contracts will be partnered.

With this all-inclusive intent, the only remaining decision to be made relative to a project is whether the project will be *formally* or *informally* partnered. To ensure all respondents to the questionnaire have the same understanding of these two types of partnering, the following definitions are quoted from the TxDOT "Partnering Handbook."

- Formal Partnering - A facilitated meeting which covers one or more modules of the *partnering* process.

- Informal Partnering - A non-facilitated meeting which at the minimum covers communication, issue resolution and issue escalation processes..

The important distinction to note between the two methods of partnering is the absence of the requirement for a *facilitator*. Recognizing that partnering must occur, the project officials face the decision as to which type of partnering is best suited for project.

Survey Purpose. The survey questions that follow are to collect information from those individuals involved directly in the TxDOT partnering process. The information sought will be used to develop a management tool whose purpose is to provide guidance to the key project managers responsible for determining the type of partnering to use- -informal or formal. To that end, your input will be vital to the analysis and synthesis phases of the development effort.

Questionnaire

Instructions. Complete this questionnaire only if you have participated in one or more TxDOT partnered projects (either formal, informal, or both).

1. Indicate your affiliation and job title by place an "x" in the appropriate box.

- | | |
|--|--|
| ● TxDOT | ● Contractor |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Inspector | <input type="checkbox"/> Superintendent |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Chief Inspector | <input type="checkbox"/> Project Manager |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Project Engineer | <input type="checkbox"/> Project Manager |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Area Engineer | <input type="checkbox"/> Area Manager |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Construction Engineer | <input type="checkbox"/> Vice President |
| <input type="checkbox"/> District Engineer | <input type="checkbox"/> President |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Design Engineer | <input type="checkbox"/> Admin. Staff |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Field Engineer | <input type="checkbox"/> Sub-Contractor |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lab Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Mtrl./Equip. Suply. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Give Job Title)
_____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |

2. As your organization's representative in a partnered project, did you have the decision making authority for negotiating the type of partnering (informal or formal) to implement?

46% Yes 54% No

3. Indicate by type the number of partnered projects you have participated in as your organization's representative.

- Formal (enter the number) Average: 3.4
- Informal (enter the number) Average: 5.5

The next series of questions are based on the premise that all partnered projects can be compared to a baseline composed of the following.

- estimated project cost
- project complexity
- project coordination
- experience level of project personnel

From your perspective gained from participation in partnered projects, provide your opinion on the following factors as affecting the selection of either formal or informal partnering.

Answer each question as if it were the only question on which to base the selection of *formal* partnering.

Should I Partner Formally?

Project Cost

4. Indicate which dollar value (in millions) might be considered as a threshold range for initiating formal partnering.

3%	29%	46%	19%	4%
<input type="checkbox"/>				
0-1M	1-5 M	5-15 M	15-40 M	>40M

Project Complexity

5. The project involves the integration of multiple contracts. I should use formal partnering.

4%	8%	22%	44%	23%
<input type="checkbox"/>				
strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree

6. The project involves unique characteristics and concerns. I should use formal partnering.

2%	15%	20%	47%	16%
<input type="checkbox"/>				
strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree

7. The public may be impacted during construction. I should use formal partnering.

3%	36%	26%	28%	7%
<input type="checkbox"/>				
strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree

8. An inability to meet the schedule will have negative consequences. I should use formal partnering.

2%	23%	26%	37%	12%
<input type="checkbox"/>				
strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree

Coordination

9. There are several parties involved in the project. I should use formal partnering.

2%	25%	23%	37%	13%
<input type="checkbox"/>				
strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree

10. TxDOT must closely coordinate with other parties. I should use formal partnering.

2%	26%	25%	37%	11%
<input type="checkbox"/>				
strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree

11. The project will require close coordination among other divisions within TxDOT. I should use formal partnering.

5%	31%	31%	28%	5%
<input type="checkbox"/>				
strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree

12. The finished product will be passed onto another governmental entity for operations and maintenance. I should use formal partnering.

3%	31%	36%	23%	7%
<input type="checkbox"/>				
strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree

Experience

13. The product user has little or no experience with TxDOT. I should use formal partnering.

4%	20%	22%	38%	16%
<input type="checkbox"/>				
strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree

14. The contractor's project personnel have little or no experience with formal partnering. I should use formal partnering.

6% 34% 22% 28% 11%

strongly disagree disagree neutral agree strongly agree

15. The TxDOT project personnel have little or no experience with formal partnering. I should use formal partnering.

6% 34% 22% 28% 11%

strongly disagree disagree neutral agree strongly agree

16. Rank-order the factors below as to their importance in the consideration of using *formal* partnering. Use number "1" as most important, 2 next, etc.

- #3 Project Cost
- #1 Project Complexity
- #2 Project Coordination
- #4 Project Personnel Experience

Informal Partnering Considerations

17. All parties in a project should have been involved in at least one formal partnered project before using the informal partnering process.

57% 28% 11% 3% 0%

strongly disagree disagree neutral agree strongly agree

18. Personality types between TxDOT and contractor personnel should be considered before using informal partnering.

11% 43% 32% 11% 0%

strongly disagree disagree neutral agree strongly agree

19. If all parties in a project have participated in (enter a number) ___ or more formal partnered projects, then informal partnering should be used regardless of the project's cost, complexity, coordination needs, and/or experience levels of all parties as the levels affect working with each other.

12% 30% 23% 23% 12%

strongly disagree disagree neutral agree strongly agree

20. Rank-order the factors below as to their importance in the consideration of using *informal* partnering. Use number "1" as most important, 2 next, etc.

- #3 Formal partnering experience by all parties
- #1 TxDOT and Contractor experience in the type of work to be performed
- #2 Project Cost
- #4 Project Personnel personality types

This completes the questionnaire. Thank you for taking time from your very busy schedule to assist us in this important study. Please mail the completed questionnaire to:

Department of Engineering Technology
Attention: Lee Reynolds
Box 43107
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, TX 79409-3107

B-4: General Contractor Formal/Informal Partnering Survey Summary

Questionnaire Prologue. In December 1996, the Texas Department of Transportation introduced the *Partnering Plus (P²)* program. The most important improvement expected from this program is the intent that *all* construction and maintenance contracts will be partnered.

With this all-inclusive intent, the only remaining decision to be made relative to a project is whether the project will be *formally* or *informally* partnered. To ensure all respondents to the questionnaire have the same understanding of these two types of partnering, the following definitions are quoted from the TxDOT "Partnering Handbook."

- Formal Partnering - A facilitated meeting which covers one or more modules of the *partnering* process.
- Informal Partnering - A non-facilitated meeting which at the minimum covers communication, issue resolution and issue escalation processes..

The important distinction to note between the two methods of partnering is the absence of the requirement for a *facilitator*. Recognizing that partnering must occur, the project officials face the decision as to which type of partnering is best suited for project.

Survey Purpose. The survey questions that follow are to collect information from those individuals involved directly in the TxDOT partnering process. The information sought will be used to develop a management tool whose purpose is to provide guidance to the key project managers responsible for determining the type of partnering to use- -informal or formal. To that end, your input will be vital to the analysis and synthesis phases of the development effort.

Questionnaire

Instructions. Complete this questionnaire only if you have participated in one or more TxDOT partnered projects (either formal, informal, or both).

1. Indicate your affiliation and job title by place an "x" in the appropriate box.

- | | |
|--|--|
| ● TxDOT | ● Contractor |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Inspector | <input type="checkbox"/> Superintendent |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Chief Inspector | <input type="checkbox"/> Project Manager |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Project Engineer | <input type="checkbox"/> Project Manager |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Area Engineer | <input type="checkbox"/> Area Manager |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Construction Engineer | <input type="checkbox"/> Vice President |
| <input type="checkbox"/> District Engineer | <input type="checkbox"/> President |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Design Engineer | <input type="checkbox"/> Admin. Staff |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Field Engineer | <input type="checkbox"/> Sub-Contractor |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lab Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Mtrl./Equip. Suply. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Give Job Title)
_____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |

2. As your organization's representative in a partnered project, did you have the decision making authority for negotiating the type of partnering (informal or formal) to implement?

83.7% Yes 16.3% No

3. Indicate by type the number of partnered projects you have participated in as your organization's representative.

- Formal (enter the number) Average: 3
- Informal (enter the number) Average: 4

The next series of questions are based on the premise that all partnered projects can be compared to a baseline composed of the following.

- estimated project cost
- project complexity

- project coordination
- experience level of project personnel

From your perspective gained from participation in partnered projects, provide your opinion on the following factors as affecting the selection of either formal or informal partnering.

Answer each question as if it were the only question on which to base the selection of *formal* partnering.

Should I Partner Formally?

Project Cost

4. Indicate which dollar value (in millions) might be considered as a threshold range for initiating formal partnering.

<input type="checkbox"/>				
0-1M	1-5 M	5-15 M	15-40 M	>40M
7%	28%	49%	6%	2%

Project Complexity

5. The project involves the integration of multiple contracts. I should use formal partnering.

7%	14%	26%	37%	16%
<input type="checkbox"/>				
strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree

6. The project involves unique characteristics and concerns. I should use formal partnering.

9%	12%	19%	40%	21%
<input type="checkbox"/>				
strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree

7. The public may be impacted during construction. I should use formal partnering.

9%	28%	40%	16%	7%
<input type="checkbox"/>				
strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree

8. An inability to meet the schedule will have negative consequences. I should use formal partnering.

9%	26%	26%	26%	14%
<input type="checkbox"/>				
strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree

Coordination

9. There are several parties involved in the project. I should use formal partnering.

7%	23%	33%	26%	12%
<input type="checkbox"/>				
strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree

10. TxDOT must closely coordinate with other parties. I should use formal partnering.

9%	28%	28%	23%	12%
<input type="checkbox"/>				
strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree

11. The project will require close coordination among other divisions within TxDOT. I should use formal partnering.

7%	33%	30%	23%	7%
<input type="checkbox"/>				
strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree

12. The finished product will be passed onto another governmental entity for operations and maintenance. I should use formal partnering.

7%	40%	30%	21%	2%
<input type="checkbox"/>				
strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree

Experience

13. The product user has little or no experience with TxDOT. I should use formal partnering.
 7% 19% 30% 35% 9%

 strongly disagree disagree neutral agree strongly agree

14. The contractor's project personnel have little or no experience with formal partnering. I should use formal partnering.
 12% 33% 14% 33% 9%

 strongly disagree disagree neutral agree strongly agree

15. The TxDOT project personnel have little or no experience with formal partnering. I should use formal partnering.
 14% 28% 16% 30% 12%

 strongly disagree disagree neutral agree strongly agree

16. Rank-order the factors below as to their importance in the consideration of using *formal* partnering. Use number "1" as most important, 2 next, etc.

- #4 Project Cost
- #1 Project Complexity
- #2 Project Coordination
- #3 Project Personnel Experience

Informal Partnering Considerations

17. All parties in a project should have been involved in at least one formal partnered project before using the informal partnering process.
 9% 37% 14% 30% 9%

 strongly disagree disagree neutral agree strongly agree

18. Personality types between TxDOT and contractor personnel should be considered before using informal partnering.
 9% 37% 12% 33% 9%

 strongly disagree disagree neutral agree strongly agree

19. If all parties in a project have participated in (enter a number) ___ or more formal partnered projects, then informal partnering should be used regardless of the project's cost, complexity, coordination needs, and/or experience levels of all parties as the levels affect working with each other.
 12% 30% 23% 23% 12%

 strongly disagree disagree neutral agree strongly agree

20. Rank-order the factors below as to their importance in the consideration of using *informal* partnering. Use number "1" as most important, 2 next, etc.

- #3 Formal partnering experience by all parties
- #1 TxDOT and Contractor experience in the type of work to be performed
- #4 Project Cost
- #2 Project Personnel personality types

This completes the questionnaire. Thank you for taking time from your very busy schedule to assist us in this important study. Please mail the completed questionnaire to:

Department of Engineering Technology
 Attention: Lee Reynolds
 Box 43107
 Texas Tech University
 Lubbock, TX 79409-3107

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, N. C. (1993). "Partnering--What Is It?" Internal Report, Texas Department of Transportation, Austin, Texas.
- Appel, Mark E. "Partnering: New Dimensions in Dispute Prevention and Resolution." *The Arbitration Journal*, 48(2): 47-51. 1993 Jun.
- Aylesworth, R. (1992). As quoted in "Light, Shallow Truss Under Cover." *Engineering News Record*. McGraw-Hill, October 12, 1992, 26-28.
- Back, W. Edward and Sanders, Steve R. "Partnering in a Unit Price Environment." *Project Management Journal* 27(1): 18-25. 1996 March. [Charts, References]
- Baker, Scott T. "Partnering: Contracting for the Future." *Cost Engineering*, 32(4): 7-12. 1990 Apr. [Charts, Graphs].
- Barfield, Tom. "Alternative Dispute Resolution." *Business Credit*, 96(1): 10. 1994 Jan.
- Beaty, Don L. "Institutional Retrofit Begins with A Partnered Mission." *Consulting-Specifying Engineer*, 15(3): 68-70. 1994 Mar.
- Bergstrom, Robin Yale. "Partnering A Niche Global." *Production*, 106(7): 26,28+. 1994 Jul.
- Bottorff, D. (1992). "Bullish on Partnering: The U. S. Navy." *Constructor*, May, 54-55.
- Bradford, Hazel. "Laborers Ink Mexican Pact." *Enr.*, 234(4): 18. 1995 Jan 30.
- Bradford, Hazel and Krizan, William. "Building Trade Unions Cleaning Up in Environmental Business Push." *Enr.*, 233(21): 58-60. 1994 Nov 21.
- Buffington, J. E. (1992). Partnering Policy Memorandum. Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Washington, D. C.
- Builders Take Time to Resolve Conflicts. *News for You*, 41(22): 3. 1993 Jun 9.
- Building A Partnership For Success (1995). Texas Department of Transportation, Partnering Division, Austin, Texas.
- Building on Budget. *Chain Store Age Executive*, 72(5): 164-166. 1996 May.
- Burnett, W. G. (1994). Administrative Announcement, Texas Department of Transportation, Austin, Texas.

-
- Butler, G. (1992). Letter to Author, August 20, 1992, Huntington District.
- Carlton, Jim. "Working It Out." *Successful Meetings*, 42(12(Part 1)): 102-109. 1993 Nov.
- Carr, F., Edelman, L., and Lancaster, C. (1991). *Partnering*. U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington D. C.
- Challenge: How to Help Business Partners Be More Successful. *Food Management*, 30(8): 58. 1995 Aug.
- Chilton, Kenneth W. *A New Social Contract for the American Workplace: From Paternalism to Partnering*. St. Louis: Center for the Study of American Business, Washington University, 1994.
- Cole, Ed. "Partnering: A Quality Model for Contract Relations." *Public Manager*, 22(2): 39-42. 1993 Summer.
- Competition Requirements (1985). *Federal Acquisition Regulation 6*, Federal Acquisition Council, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C.
- Copare, Philip B. "Partnering - A New Philosophy in Business." *Transactions of the American Association of Cost Engineers*, (1994 Transactions): HF3.1-HF3.4. 1994.
- Cowan, C. (1991). "A Strategy for Partnering in the Public Sector." *Proceedings of the ASCE Construction Congress '91*, Cambridge, MA, April 13-16, 1991, 721-726.
- The Construction Industry Institute (1991). *In Search of Partnering Excellence*, A report by the Partnering Task Force of the Construction Industry Institute, Austin, TX, Special Publication 17-1, July.
- Cruver, Donald R. "Adding A Neutral Third Party to ADR Process Can Reduce Exposure to Construction Litigation." *Cost Engineering*, 36(5): 32. 1994 May.
- Dadian-Williams, A. (1995). Conversation with Author, February 14, 1995, TxDOT.
- DeMarco, Anthony. "Teamwork Pays Off for Ross and Sterling Winthrop." *Facilities Design & Management*, 12(12): 38-41. 1993 Dec. [Diagrams].
- Design/Build Method Saves Millions on Parking in San Francisco. *American City & County*, 109(10): 52. 1994 Sep.
- DiConato, S. Leonard. "Alternate Methods to Resolve Contract Disputes: Approaches to Effective Prevention, Management, and Settlement of Construction Contract Claims." *Transactions of the American Association of Cost Engineers*, G.2.1-G.2.11. 1993.

-
- Dorris, Virginia Kent. "Project Partnering." *Architecture - The AIA Journal*, 82(10): 111-113. 1993 Oct. [Photograph]
- Dubbs, Dana. "Partnering Means Making Friends, Not Foes." *Facilities Design & Management*, 12(6): 48-51. 1993 Jun.
- Edelman, Lester. *Partnering*. [microform]. [Washington, D. C.]: U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Water Resources Support Center, Institute for Water Resources, [1991].
- Effective Partnering: A Report to Congress on Federal Technology Partnerships. Washington, D. C. (14th St. & Constitution Ave., NW, Washington 20230): Dept. of Commerce, Office of Technology Policy, 1996.
- Eisenhart, James. "A Group Effort." *American School & University*, 66(4): 40g-40h. 1993 Dec.
- Ellicott, M. A. and Gransberg D. D. (1996). "Best Value Contracting Criteria." *Proceedings, American Association of Cost Engineers International, Vancouver, British Columbia*.
- Farmer, M. (1992). Letter to Author, June 2, 1992, Savannah District.
- The Federal Acquisition Council (1985). *Federal Acquisition Regulation 6. "Competition Requirements."* General Services Administration, Washington D. C.
- Frey, Sherwood C., Jr. and Schlosser, Michel M. "ABB and Ford: Creating Value through Cooperation." *Sloan Management Review*, 35(1): 65-72. 1993 Fall. [References].
- Galey, Mary, Pogrzeba, Roy and Reinerman, Paul. "Coleman Federal Correctional Complex: The Power of Partnering at Work." *Corrections Today*, 58(2): 124-127. 1996 Apr. [Photograph, Illustration].
- Galliford Puts Partnering into Practice. *Purchasing & Supply Management*. 24. 1995 Oct.
- Godfrey, Kneeland A. *Partnering in Design and Construction*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1996.
- Grajek, K. M. (1995). "Partnered Project Performance in the Texas Department of Transportation." Austin, Texas.
- Green, P. (1993). "Importing Materials by Sea is Way to Go on Navy Job." *Engineering News Record*, 231, 23, 16.

-
- Grogan, Tim. "The Top 400 Contractors: Design-Constructors Boost Awards 5.6%." Enr., 226(21): 68,71. 1991 May 27. [Charts, Graphs].
- A Guide to Partnering for Construction Projects (1990). U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile, Alabama.
- Harris, L. (1994). "Team Building and Project Partnering." CII Implementation Status Report No. 1, Construction Industry Institute, Austin, Texas, November.
- Hatch, H. (1992). "Policy Memorandum #16 to the Corps of Engineers, February 18, 1992." U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington D. C.
- Haumersen, D. (1992). Letter to Author, March 2, 1992, St. Paul District.
- Hendrick, Thomas E. Strategic Supplier Partnering: An International Study. [Tempe, AZ]: Center for Advanced Purchasing Studies, 1993.
- Hernandez, J. L. (1994). "Why Partnering." Infrastructure, November-December 1994, 9-10.
- Hill, R. (1992). Letter to Author, March 13, 1992, New Orleans District.
- Himes, Paul E. "Partnering in the Construction Process: The Method for the 1990s and Beyond." Facilities, 13(6): 13-15. 1995 May. [References].
- Holmes, W. B. (1992). "Partnering and Fast Tracking Keep the Naval Intelligence Center Project on Schedule." Navy Civil Engineer (Fall/Winger) 14-17.
- HUD Adds Union Partner. Enr., 234(18): 14. 1995 May 8.
- Hunter, Keith W. and Hoenig, James K. "Construction Dispute Prevention Comes of Age." Dispute Resolution Journal, 50(1): 53-54. 1995 Jan.
- Hunter, Keith W. and Hoenig, Jim. "Dispute Resolution and Avoidance Techniques in the Construction Industry." The Arbitration Journal, 47(3): 16-18. 1992 Sep.
- Ichniowski, T. (1992). "History Overpowers Archives Job." Engineering News Record, McGraw-Hill, August 3, 1992, 26-28.
- Ichniowski, T. "Worldly-Wise Bank Gets on Top of Trials." Enr. 235(23): 28-30. 1995 Dec 4. [Diagrams].
- In Search of Partnering Excellence (1991). Special Publication 17-1, Partnering Task Force, Construction Industry Institute, Austin, Texas, July.

-
- Janecka, A. (1992). Conversation with Author, March 13, 1992, Galveston District.
- Jensen, Melinda. "Casinos Ready to Commit." *Successful Meetings*, 45(6): 17. 1996 May.
- Johnson, G. (1992). As quoted in "Light, Shallow Truss Under Cover." *Engineering News Record*, McGraw-Hill, October 12, 1992, 26-28. News
- Jones, H. (1991). "Partnering On The Bonneville Navigation Lock." *Proceedings of the Construction Congress '91*, Cambridge, MA, April 13-16, 1991, 727-732. ASCE
- Kadala, P. (1992). Letter to Author, April 21, 1992, Wilmington District.
- Kane, C. (1992). "Mitigating Construction Contract Disputes." *Public Utilities Fortnightly*, 130(1): 11-12. 1992 Jul 1.
- Keen, Edward S. "Future Directions in the Engineering and Construction Industry." *Cost Engineering*, 33(5): 17-20. 1991 May.
- Kemezis, Paul. "Rocket Engine Test Plant Rises." *Enr.*, 228(21): 47-48. 1992 May 25.
- Kliment, Stephen A. "Partnering Makes Sense." *Architectural Record*, 181(3): 9. 1993 Mar.
- Krull, J. (1992). Letter to Author, February 19, 1992, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Washington D. C.
- Kubal, Michael T. *Engineered Quality in Construction: Partnering and TQM*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1994.
- Kumor, J. (1992). Letter to Author, March 9, 1992, Buffalo District.
- L.A. Learns from Mistakes. *Enr.* 232(11): 16. 1994 Mar 14.
- Landeros, Robert, Reck, Robert F. and Griggs, Frank T. "Evaluating Suppliers' Overhead Allocations." *International Journal of Purchasing & Materials Management*, 30(2): 40-50. 1994 Spring.
- Larson, Erik W. and Gray, Clifford. "Project Partnering in the Construction Industry: The Wave of the Future?" *National Productivity Review*, 14(1): 15-24. 1994/1995 Winter. [Charts, Graphs].
- Lehmann M. (1995). Conversation with Author, March 30, 1995, TxDot.
- Looi, E. C. "Managing for Quality - The Sacramento Convention Center Expansion Project." *Transactions of the American Association of Cost Engineers*, (1994 Transactions): CSC5.1-CSC5.9. 1994. [Charts, References].

-
- Maestas, A. (1992). Letter to Author, February 26, 1992, Albuquerque District.
- Mann, Tina G. and Wells, C. Michael. "Partnering for a Better Cost System." Transactions of the American Association of Cost Engineers, (1994 Transactions): CSC8.1-CSC8.6. 1994. [Charts, Graphs].
- Massachusetts Pioneers Design Partnering. Civil Engineering, 65(4): 32. 1995 Apr.
- McCloskey, C. (1992). Letter to Author, February 24, 1992, Little Rock District.
- McDowell, Theodore N., Jr. "Partnering with Hospitals for Subacute Care." Nursing Homes, 43(8): 10-13. 1994 Oct.
- McManamy, B. (1994). "Industry Pounds Away at Disputes." Engineering News Record, July 11, 1994, 24-27.
- McManamy, Rob. "CII Benchmarks Savings." Enr., 233(7): 15. 1994 Aug 15.
- McManamy, Rob. "Dispute Resolution Gaining." Enr., 233(17): 16. 1994 Oct 24.
- McManamy, Rob. "Quiet Revolution Brews for Settling Disputes." Enr., 227(8): 21-23. 1991 Aug 26.
- McMorrow, Eileen. "USAA Southeast Regional HQ Is TQM-Insured." Facilities Design & Management, 14(1): 42-47. 1995 Jan. [Charts].
- Miller, I. and Freund, J. E. (1977). Probability and Statistics for Engineers. 2nd Ed., Prentice Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N. J.
- Mills, J. (1992). Letter to Author, February 13, 1992, Fort Worth District.
- The Mobile District (1990). A Guide to Partnering for Construction Projects, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile, Al.
- Moore, Carl, Mosley, Donald and Slagle, Michelle. "Partnering: Guidelines for Win-Win Project Management." Project Management Journal, 23(1): 18-21. 1992 Mar. [Chart,References].
- Mosley, Donald, Moore, Carl, Slagle, Michelle and Burns, Daniel. "Partnering in the Construction Industry: Win-Win Strategic Management in Action." National Productivity Review, 10(3): 319-325. 1991 Summer. [Charts].
- Neil, James M. "Incentives - Powerful Tools for Owners." Cost Engineering, 33(1): 19-23. 1991 Jan. [Charts].

-
- Office of Chief Counsel (1991). "Executive Partnering Seminar Report." U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington D. C.
- Paek, J. H., Lee, Y. W. and Napier, T. R. (1992). "Selection of Design/Build Proposal Using Fuzzy-Logic System." ASCE Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, Vol. 118, No. 2, pp. 303-317.
- Parker, Kevin. "Putting Back Together What Adam Smith Took Apart." Manufacturing Systems, 10(8): 16-20. 1992 Aug.
- Parkinson, Gerald and Fouhy, Ken. "Riding the E&C Wave." Chemical Engineering, 98(9): 30-39. 1991 Sep. [Charts].
- Partnering, A New Concept for Attaining Construction Goals [microform]. Government Documents, U. S. Dept. of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, 1992.
- Partnering, A New Concept for Attaining Construction Goals [microform]. Government Documents, U. S. Dept. of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, 1991.
- Partnering and Mediation Gaining Widespread Acceptance, Says Survey. Civil Engineering, 65(5): 28-30. 1995 May.
- Partnering Implementation Guide: Building Communication. Eastern Federal Lands Highway Division, 1996.
- Partnering May Pare Quality with Claims. Enr., 233(3): 13. 1994 Jul 18.
- Partnering Saves Time, Pays Dividends at Plant Expansion Project in Washington State. Watering-Engineering & Management. 143(1): 10. 1996 Jan.
- Persad, K. (1995). Conversation with Author, April 17, 1995, TxDOT.
- Pettijohn, C. (1992). Letter to Author, August 26, 1992, Jacksonville District.
- Picard, Hans E. and Macklin, Harley R. "Power Plant Outage Project Productivity Improvement." Transactions of the American Association of Cost Engineers, I.4.1-I.4.8. 1993. [Charts, Graphs, References].
- Pina, B. D. (1993). Partnering at the Naval Facilities Engineering Command: An Effectiveness Study. MS Thesis, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.
- Pons, Ted. "DART Is Aimed at Construction Bulls-Eye." Dispute Resolution Journal, 50(1): 51-53. 1995 Jan.

-
- Post, Nadine M. (1992). "Light, Shallow Truss Under Cover." *Engineering News Record*, McGraw-Hill, October 12, 1992, 26-28.
- Power and Partnering. New York: Haworth Press, 1995.
- The Power of a Global R&D Network. *Telesis*, (99): 48-55+. 1994 Dec.
- Powers, Mary Buckner. "Second Quarterly Cost Report: Concrete Challenges Steel." *Enr.* 234(25): 52. 1995 June 26
- Professional Profile: Dresser-Rand Turbo Products Division. *Purchasing*, 113(6): 43. 1992 Oct 22.
- Putting the Pieces Together. *Chain Store Age Executive*, 71(5): T1-T16. 1995 May.
- Rackham, Neil. *Getting Partnering Right: How Market Leaders Are Creating Long-Term Competitive Advantage*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1996.
- Rice, Kenny A. "Interstate-90 - Managing A Mega Construction Project." *Transactions of the American Association of Cost Engineers*, 1: G.2.1- G.2.8. 1992. [Maps, Diagrams].
- Robison, Rita. "The Great Texas Prison Caper." *Civil Engineering*, 65(2): 67-69. 1995 Feb.
- Rock, T. (1992). "An Overview and Comparative Analysis of U. S. Army Corps of Engineers Partnering in Construction." Thesis presented to Texas A&M University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Engineering.
- Roderiguez, V. (1995). "Partnered Projects Receive Four Texas Project Awards." *The Communicator*, Texas Department of Transportation, Austin, Texas, January.
- Roland, T. (1992). Letter to Author, February, 18, 1992, Memphis District.
- Rosenberg, Jim. "Vendors' Agreements." *Editor & Publisher*, 129(30): 24. 1996 Jul 27.
- Rowbotham, Jill. "Getting Together to Advance the Job." *Brw (International Edition)*, 3(8): 26-29. 1993 Sep.
- Savidge, T. (1992). Letter to Author, March 12, 1992, Portland District.
- Schmader, K. J. (1994). *Partnered Project Performance in the U. S. Naval Facilities Engineering Command*. MS Thesis, The University of Texas, Austin, Texas.
- Schmader, Kelly J. and Gibson, G. Edward, Jr. "Partnered Project Performance in the U. S. Naval Facilities Engineering Command." *Project Management Journal*, 26(3): 39-48. 1995 Sep.

-
- Schmitz, William J. and von Rosenvinge, Theodore, IV. "The Key Is Constructability." *Civil Engineering*, 64(8): 54-56. 1994 Aug. [Diagrams].
- Schriener, Judy. "Arizona's Long, Winding Glory Road." *Enr.* 236(3): 26-29. 1996 Jan 22.
- Schriener, Judy. "Partnering and More on the Web." *Enr.* 235(25): 12. 1995 Dec 18.
- Schriener, Judy. "Partnering Paying Off on Projects." *Enr.*, 227(15): 25-27. 1991 Oct 14.
- Schultzel, Henry J. (1940). *Successful Partnering: Fundamentals for Project Owners and Contractors*. New York: Wiley, 1996.
- Schumacher, Lee. "An Integrated and Proactive Approach for Avoiding Delay Claims on Major Capital Projects." *Cost Engineering*, 38(6): 37-39. 1996 June.
- Segers, Jean-Pierre. "Strategic Partnering between New Technology Based Firms and Large Established Firms in the Biotechnology and Micro-Electronics Industries in Belgium." *Small Business Economics*, 5(4): 271-281. 1993 Dec.
- Setzer, Steven W. "Forecast 94: Scent of Recovery Is in the Air." *Enr.*, 232(5): 66-69. 1994 Jan 31.
- Sipkoski, Michael and Kozakiewicz, Dan. "Early Input from All Sources Drives Cost Down for Project." *Health Care Strategic Management*, 9(12): 12-15. 1991 Dec.
- Smith, John A. "How to Use Dispute Review Boards for Claims Settlement during Contracts." *Cost Engineering*, 35(8): 39-47. 1993 Aug.
- Soast, Allen. "Massachusetts Pioneers Design Partnering." *Enr.*, 234(15): 36-38. 1995 Apr 17.
- STAFDA Looks Forward to Orlando. *Industrial Distribution*, 82(10): 40-41. 1993 Oct.
- Stephenson, Ralph, J. (1922). *Project Partnering for the Design and Construction Industry*. New York: Wiley, 1996.
- Stipanowich, Thomas J. "Beyond Arbitration: Innovation and Evolution in the United States Construction Industry." *Wake Forest Law Review*, 31(1): 65-182. 1996 Spring.
- Stundza, Tom. "Haggard Recovery, But Recovery Nevertheless." *Purchasing*, 112(2): 60-63. 1992 Feb 6. [Charts, Graphs].
- Tarricone, Paul. "Howdy, Partner." *Civil Engineering*, 62(3): 72-74. 1992 Mar.

-
- Tarricone, Paul. "What Do You Mean By That?" *Civil Engineering*, 63(4): 60-62.
1993 Apr.
- Team Building: Improving Project Performance (1993). Publication 37-1, Project Team Building Task Force, Construction Industry Institute, Austin, Texas, July.
- Templeton, B. F. (1994). "Partnering Now Under Continuous Improvement." *The Communicator*, Texas Department of Transportation, Austin, Texas, September.
- Thompson, Kevin D. "Forging A Perfect Partnership." *Black Enterprise*, 24(2): 66-70.
1993 Sep.
- United States. Army Research Laboratory. Partnering Opportunities with the Army Research Laboratory. The Laboratory, 1995.
- United States. General Accounting Office. Partnerships Customer\Supplier Relationships Can Be Improved through Partnering: Report to the Chairman, Legislation and National Security Subcommittee, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives.
- Washington, D. C.: The Office; Gaithersburg, MD (P. O. Box 6015, Gaithersburg 20884-6015): The Office [Distributor, 1994]. Warne, Thomas R. Partnering for Success. New York, N. Y.: ASCE Press, 1994.
- Use Partnering for Project Success. *Water-Engineering & Management*, 141(10): 19-21.
1994 Oct.
- Vincent, John R. and Hillman, Peter. "A Working Partnership." *Tqm Magazine*, 5(5): 21-26. 1993 Oct. [Charts, References].
- Wearne, Stephen H. "Contract Administration and Project Risks." *International Journal of Project Management*, 10(1): 39-41. 1992 Feb. [Charts, References].
- Weller, J. (1992). Letter to Author, February 11, 1992, Rocky Mountain Area Office, Omaha District.
- Weston, D. (1992). An Analysis of Project Performance for Partnering Projects in the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers. MS Thesis, The University of Texas, Austin, Texas.
- Weston, D. and Gibson, G. E. (1993). "Partnering--Project Performance in the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers." *ASCE Journal of Management in Engineering*, Vol. 9, No. 4, 410-425.
- Willard, G. (1992). Letter to Author, June 11, 1992, Walla Walla District.

Zack, James G., Jr. "Claimsanship - A Current Discussion." Transactions of the American Association of Cost Engineers, 1:D.6.1-D.6.9. 1992. [References].

Zack, James G., Jr. "Practical Dispute Management." Cost Engineering, 37(12): 55-60. 1995 Dec.

Zack, James G., Jr. "Practical Dispute Management." Transactions of the American Association of Cost Engineers, (1994 Transactions): GVT3.1-GVT3.6. 1994.