Session Eighteen

Getting it Built

About the Panel Members

Robert Brown, received a BSE from the University of Minnesota. Bob has 23 years of experience at Mn/DOT. During the last 12 years, 6 years were spent as a Planning Engineer for metro, while the most recent 6 years have been spent as a Metro Division State Aid Engineer.

Merry Daher, began working at Mn/DOT in 1985. Merry's current position is Project Liaison Engineer in Mn/DOT's Office of Technical Support. Merry received her Bachelor of Civil Engineering from University Of Minnesota. Merry co-Chaired Mn/DOT's Public Involvement Task Force in development of Mn/DOT's Public Involvement Guide, Hear Every Voice.

Ron Erickson, has worked for Mn/DOT for 33 years. Ron has held positions in bridge construction, traffic engineering, maintenance, project development and currently is serving as the state geometrics engineer since Aug. of 1997. Ron graduated from the University of Minnesota.

Rod Garver, is the Highway 61 North Shore Corridor Manager for the Minnesota Department of Transportation. In this position, Rod provides a connection between the citizens, local governments, and other state agencies along the North Shore to Mn/DOT's project development and design process. Rod has his master's degree in Civil Engineering from the University of Akron and has been employed with Mn/DOT since 1984.

Mark J. Krebsbach, is a 1985 graduate of the University of Minnesota with a degree in Civil Engineering. He spent three years with a local consulting firm as a project manager before joining the Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT) in 1988. Since joining Mn/DOT, Mark has held several positions including Metro Final Design Project Manager, State Aid Project Development Engineer, and Metro Preliminary Design Engineer. Since 1998, Mark has been Director of Mn/DOT's Pre-Letting Services Section in the Office of Technical Support. This Section coordinates Mn/DOT's project letting schedule, prepares the PS and E packages for all Mn/DOT highway construction project lettings, and prepares cooperative construction and utility relocation agreements.

Mike Spielman, graduated from the University of Minnesota with a Civil Engineering Degree in 1969 and has spent his entire career with Mn/DOT. Mike spent 7 years as the District Hydraulics Engineer of District 5 in Golden Valley and 5 years as a Construction Project Engineer working on I-94 through North Minneapolis. He worked in Aeronautics for 5 years, and then became the first Metro Division Consultant Design Engineer. During this ten year tenure, Mike was Corridor/Project Manager for TH 55 Hiawatha Avenue Project, and served as project manager on several other projects, including TH100, TH 212, and TH 610. Currently, Mike is the in the Tort Claims/Traffic Standards Engineer in the Office of Traffic Engineering and has been in this position for 2 years.

Session Eighteen

Getting It Built

Discussion Questions

1. Is there design immunity in Minnesota? Are there limits to liability? What determines negligence?

2. Is the Road Design Manual a guideline or a standard? What is the difference? What about the AASHTO Green Book? What about state-aid standards?

3. What requires a Design Exception? What is the difference between a design deviation and a design exception? What is the difference between a variance and a design exception?

4. How do you obtain/justify a Design Exception? A variance?

5. When should the design review/design exception people be involved in the project development process?

6. Can the transportation agency walk away from a safety problem if it cannot get community approval for the project? What are the liability concerns?

7. What is a "natural preservation route"? Can these guidelines be used for other roadways?

8. Should design guidelines or standards change to be more context sensitive? How?

9. How can a project manager ensure that community commitments are kept when the project is built?

10. What should a project manager do when handing off a project to a new project manager or a different unit in the department?

11. How can a project manager manage cost and schedule with the context sensitive design approach? Doesn't it f worms" when you get all of those people involved? How does the project manager deal with cost overruns or add-ons?

12. How much more will context sensitive design cost? What percent of project cost is appropriate for aesthetics and landscaping?

13. What are cost participation policies for aesthetics and landscaping? How should they change? What's the difference between mitigation and enhancement?

14. Do right-of-way acquisition laws and policies make it difficult to implement context sensitive design guidelines? What changes would help? When do you squeeze the design rather than buy the right-of-way or vice versa?

15. What should a project manager do when additional funds above those allocated for the project are needed for mitigation? How do you convince department and political leaders that the investment is worthwhile?

Session Eighteen

Getting It Built

16. What are the internal and external roadblocks to context sensitive design? What changes are needed to make context sensitive design the routine way of doing business?

17. If I am an inexperienced project manager, how can I make these design judgments and know I'm not doing something that will be a problem later? How do I direct and review consultant work? Who can I go to for advice?

18. What if a project manager gets stuck between "a rock and a hard place"? Where are resources in Mn/DOT? Who will help navigate internal processes?

19. If one has to choose between impacting two elements of the context represented by different agencies or factions of the community, how do you choose?

20. How does a project manager handle a difficult community meeting on a controversial issue? What Mn/DOT resources are available to help facilitate this type of situation?

21. How does a project manager decide when to say no to a request from a stakeholder. What is the best way to say no?

22. How does the department decide when a project is too expensive? When is it appropriate to stop a project? What does the project manager do then?

Session Eighteen

Getting It Built

Reference Materials

Included Articles

Minnesota Department of Transportation. (1996). Road Design Manual, Vol. 1.
(Includes: 1. Trunk Highway Road Design Standards and 2. State Aid Road Design Standards)

Pline, James L. "Liability Doctrine and Expert Witness Information Notebook. Institute of Transportation Engineers.

Gowman, Breland C. (1998). "Standards Vs. Guidelines: Engineering Tools or Legal Weapons?" 77th Annual Meeting. Transportation Research Board. Washington, D.C.

Brown, Pamela J. (May 1998). "Flexible Design Risks, Exposures and Defenses." Thinking Beyond the Pavement. Federal Highway Administration.

National Cooperative Highway Research Program. Risk Management for Transportation Programs Employing Written Guidelines as Design and Performance Standards.

Minnesota Department of Transportation. (July 2000). Technical Memorandum No. 96-37-B-04. Website: www.dot.state.mn.us/tecsup/tmemo/tm96/9637b04.html

Minnesota Department of Transportation. (July 1998). "Chapter 12: Tort Claims." Traffic Engineering Manual.

Disque, Earl A. The Great River Road – A Model for American's Scenic Routes. National Park Service, Southeast Region.

Passonneau, Joseph. (May 2000). Context-Sensitive Design of Streets and Roads.

Day Three Evaluation

Getting it Built/ Leaving a Legacy

Name (optional):

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	**Session 16 - Putting It All Together – Charleen Zimmer**				
	The presenter was well organized and prepared for the program.	4	3	2	1
	The case studies added to my understanding of the topic.	4	3	2	1
	The presentation materials were clear and helped me understand the information presented.	4	3	2	1
	The material presented was appropriate to my level of expertise and experience.	4	3	2	1
	Overall session rating.	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Poor

Comments:

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
2.	**Getting It Built – MnDOT Panel Discussion**				
	The presenters were well organized and prepared for the program.	4	3	2	1
	The discussion helped me better understand how CSD can be implemented through the MnDOT project development process.	4	3	2	1
	The panel format of the discussion was well suited to the topic.	4	3	2	1
	Overall session rating.	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Poor

Comments:

3.	**Overall evaluation of Day Three**	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Poor

Comments:

(over)

Overall CSD Workshop Evaluation

Please provide your rating and comments of the overall workshop.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	I now have a good understanding of Context Sensitive Design.	4	3	2	1
2.	The Working Case Study design sessions helped me better understand Context Sensitive Design.	4	3	2	1
3.	I will apply Context Sensitive Design to my current assignments.	4	3	2	1
4.	I feel confident in the resources and support available to me in applying the principles of Context Sensitive Design.	4	3	2	1
5.	The workshop met my expectations for the training.	4	3	2	1
6.	The Participant Reference Manual was well-organized and provided helpful information.	4	3	2	1
7.	The facility was well-suited for the workshop.	4	3	2	1

8. What questions or concerns do you still have about applying Context Sensitive Design to your daily work?

9. What other materials or information would still be helpful to you?

10. What were your objectives or expectations for this training? Were these objectives met? Did they change during the course of the workshop?

11. What suggestions would you have for future offerings of this workshop?