



Arkansas Highway Commission Review and Advisory Subcommittee Meeting

Recommendations Report Presentation:
Summary of Recommendations and Findings

October 5, 2020

Organizational Structure - Current State Findings

Recommendation 1:
Finalize KPIs

Recommendation 2:
Strengthen
Knowledge
Management

Key Finding(s)

OS2.1: Current Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are limited to system condition. Operational effectiveness is not yet being measured

OS3.1: SOPs are extensive, but not regularly updated

OS3.2: Minimizing knowledge loss is a strategic priority for ArDOT, but efforts are not mature

Supporting Evidence

- Of ArDOT's **41 Performance indicators**, **17 emphasize on system condition**; **~18** are focused on operational effectiveness with **~12 under development**
- **Strategic goals** and objectives **lack performance targets**
- **District and Division KPIs do not exist**
- There is **no operational plan to implement the Strategic Plan**

- ArDOT has **50+ SOP documents**
- There are **no standard protocols for developing and maintaining SOPs**. Instead, each division and district has their own internal protocol
- ArDOT has identified **knowledge transfer a High Priority Risk in it's TAMP**
- HR has developed a matrix to **identify key positions at risk for knowledge loss**, but the **next steps have not been finalized**



GLOSSARY

KPI: Key Performance Indicators SOP: Standard Operating Procedures

TAMP: Transportation Asset Management Plan

The recommendations and findings included in the presentation are a point in time representation and are subject to change. Also, Anticipated Impacts are estimates, directional in nature. Please see the assumptions slide in the appendix for further details.

Portfolio Planning - Current State Findings

Recommendation 3:
Publish
Construction and
Maintenance Status

Recommendation 4:
Manage all
Customer Inquiries
to resolution

Key Finding(s)

PP1.2: ArDOT's public communication related to project status, schedule, and budget is disjointed and inconsistent

PP2.3: There is no formal structure to coordinate maintenance workplans to the general public or interested stakeholders

PP3: Although ArDOT is responsive to public inquiries, it only offers a limited number of tools to capture and track them

Supporting Evidence

- **The Department implemented changes to construction project prioritization, budget, and timing** through ~56 amendments (from 12/2016) and ~11,150 change orders (from 2014)
- **ArDOT's public communications meet regulatory requirements**, however, it is **not clear** that the Department has assessed **whether they meet the needs of its stakeholders, constituents, and the general public**

- iDRIVE Arkansas, and the Connecting Arkansas Program (CAP), **provide mechanisms to capture customer inquiries**
- There is **no comprehensive Department wide protocol or tool to capture customer inquiries and problems**, manage these inquiries, track a resolution, or measure impact to in-progress or planned work

Procurement - Current State Findings

Key Finding(s)

Supporting Evidence

Recommendation 5:
Implement efficiencies in procurement and purchasing

PR1.2: Low bid procurement is viewed by staff as a cultural and financial necessity
PR4.1: ArDOT takes advantage of legislation that allows consideration of qualifications in some procurement
PR4.2: Alternative contract methods have allowed ArDOT to influence contractor behavior
PR5.1: ArDOT is not using data to understand procurement trends and identify efficient practices
PR5.2: E&P has minimal authority to facilitate implementation of efficient procurement practices

- From 2014 – 2019, ArDOT levied **~\$20M in Disincentives/Item Deductions; ~\$44M in Incentives**
- ArDOT does not have formal protocols to **standardize decision-making** around use of specific strategies
- ArDOT spends on average ~\$24.4M and ~\$12.7M in Small Order and Competitive Bid purchases per year
- ArDOT does not have **formalized policies to identify purchasing trends** and establish term/supply contracts **to yield savings**

Recommendation 6:
Implement construction contractor performance measurement

PR2.1: Pre-qualification and bonding approximate likelihood of project completion, but do not screen for quality
PR2.2: ArDOT's Standard Specifications (2014) mandate certain performance criteria, but do not screen for quality
PR3: Opportunities exist to improve existing quality issues

- Performance bonds provide **"no guarantee against a contractor's marginal quality of work**, so long as the contractor's failures are not large enough to trigger a default," according to FHWA.
- Current policies **do not limit** the ability of **poor-quality contractors to compete for bids**
- ArDOT's 2019 TAMP identifies **poor quality construction work as a "very high impact" risk factor** for asset management
- **ArDOT does not formally monitor contractor quality**



Expenditures - Current State Findings

Recommendation 7:
Implement project
and portfolio
planning
frameworks

Recommendation 8:
Implement leading
practices in
construction project
design

Key Finding(s)

EX1: Project development, construction, and maintenance functions present unique resource management challenges
EX4: The construction project development process may be enhanced through formalized project management tools
EX5.1: Existing project management tools may have broader applications for construction staff
EX5.2: Change orders are not formally reviewed
EX 6: Scheduling and evaluation of maintenance activities may be improved through the use of project management tools

EX2.1: Formal protocols around the use of practical design are lacking
EX2.2: ArDOT has not taken advantage of the full benefits of Value Engineering
EX3.1: Engineer’s estimates are not formally evaluated to identify future design cost efficiencies

Supporting Evidence

- **The Department budgets ~\$40M** for Planning, Design, and Construction monitoring Activities, yet, **Mechanisms to match STIP projects with these budgets and resources are “homegrown” or non-existent**
- **Target costs** associated with executing pre-construction, construction monitoring or maintenance activities **do no exist**

- **Absent formal documentation** around its iteration of practical design, ArDOT is **unable to implement leading practices, show cost savings**, and sustain critical knowledge management
- ArDOT completes **2.2. VE studies per year and realized a total savings of \$377k since FY2015**, which puts **ArDOT below the national average**
- The cost of Change Orders directly tied to “Plan Omissions/Errors” has averaged \$3.1M from CY2014 to CY2019



IT - Current State Findings

Key Finding(s)

Supporting Evidence

**Recommendation 9:
Build an IT Governance Structure to guide ArDOT's IT investments**

IT2.1: ArDOT has not developed a Governance Structure to ensure IT investments support objectives, manage enterprise risk, and meet external stakeholder needs

IT2.2: There is no overarching enterprise architecture or blueprint to standardize, organize, and align IT infrastructure and solutions with business goals

- ArDOT continues to **increase its IT investment** as the IT Budget has **increased** dramatically **from ~\$9.2M in FY16 to ~\$23.5M in FY20** with Operating Expenses and Equipment costs being the biggest Drivers.
- A review by a 3rd party consultant, *Info-Tech*, revealed that there is an **“Unclear decision making process”** and “no IT Governance” for these expenditures
- Enterprise Architecture **is siloed organizationally** with this **responsibility residing with each of the divisions and districts** that primarily “own” their respective IT platforms and solutions

**Recommendation 10:
Implement mid-term IT initiatives that can optimize business operations**

IT1.1: ArDOT appears to be approaching data center modernization phases, but without a formal integration plan

IT1.2: ArDOT has preliminarily identified software needs, but efforts to align IT purchases across the Department has not been universally implemented

- ArDOT has prioritized the **Mainframe upgrade, Oracle implementation, several storage and server infrastructure upgrades**
- ArDOT deploys **~263 applications**, has **300+ databases (DBs)**, and an unknown amount of data stored locally on staff computers
- Internal strategic planning documents reveal a **lack of alignment between IT solutions purchases**, as well as **poor data quality** and difficult data access
- **10 instances in FY19 of significant IT spend without prior IT involvement**



IT - Current State Findings (Cont'd)

Recommendation
11:
Develop necessary
pillars to establish IT
as an effective
business partner

Key Finding(s)

IT2.3: ArDOT lacks a service catalog and defined service level expectations, yielding confusion on what IT will deliver, when, and how support is distributed

IT2.4: ArDOT's efforts to establish a project management infrastructure to ensure effective delivery of IT projects is still in its infancy

Supporting Evidence

- Internal strategic planning documents reveal a **lack of clarity around core IT service offerings**
- It does not appear that the IT division has established service level agreements (SLA), **nor tracks performance against these SLAs**
- ArDOT has recently restructured its IT Department to **include a Project Management Office (PMO)**
- ArDOT **has not adopted** any formal Project Management **(PM) standards or protocols** to help drive IT Project delivery

People Capabilities - Current State Findings

Key Finding(s)

Supporting Evidence

Recommendation 12: Ensure Career Development

- PC1.1:** Recruitment and retention are challenges
- PC2.1:** Dissatisfaction with compensation
- PC2.2:** Strong Competition for talent
- PC3.2:** Flexible work strategies exploration
- PC4.1:** Career paths not defined nor communicated
- PC4.2:** Performance evaluations not understood or trusted

- **Turnover rate has increased** from ~6% (2016) to ~9% (2019), with average tenure of Central Office staff **dropping from 6 to 2.5 years** (FY15 – FY19)
- **54% of staff definitively agree** that “**Employee retention is important at the Department**”
- Although *career paths are known informally*, staff *lack clarity* on precisely how their *career can develop*
- **53% of staff definitively believe that they can advance** their careers at ArDOT

Recommendation 13: Improve Staff Capabilities

- PC3.1:** Staff have positive relationships with managers
- PC5.1:** Training is offered, but lack formal learning pathways
- PC5.2:** On-the-job training is preferred, but difficult to institutionalize

- **74% of staff definitively trust their manager**
- A ~10% **gap** exists in **measures of favorability** between **division/district and executive leadership**
- **58% of staff** definitively agree that they have **received an adequate amount of training** and only slightly more found the training useful
- There are **no formal learning pathways** that align training with job competencies, performance evaluations, or career ladders.