AGENDA

1. Introductions/Meeting Purpose 10:00 AM – 10:10

2. Project Purpose 10:10 – 11:40
   - History of Project – City (15 min)
   - Caltrans Perspective (15 min)
   - Project Definition/Scope – CH2M HILL (30 min)
     - Schedule
     - Preliminary geometrics
     - Data needs
   - Expectations for a “Successful” Project (30 min)

BREAK 11:40 – 11:45

3. Roles and Responsibilities 11:45 – 1:30
   - City/Caltrans staff (15 min)
   - CH2M HILL staff (15 min)

LUNCH (30 min)
   - Decision processes (how to keep project moving and obtain input from appropriate staff/disciplines)
     - Diagram decision/communication flow & protocol
     - Conflict resolution

4. Selection of communication methods 1:30 – 1:50

BREAK 1:50 – 2:00

5. Quality Assurance 2:00 – 2:10


7. Summarize Meeting/Develop Action Items 2:35 – 3:00 PM
1. Introductions and Meeting Purpose

Leslie Regos/CH2M HILL welcomed meeting attendees and asked for self-introductions. The purpose of the meeting was then described as chartering the team prior to the project moving forward. The goals for this chartering meeting were described as:

- Clarifying Roles & Responsibilities
- Defining Project Goals
- Clarifying Expectations
- Establishing Operating Guidelines for the Team
- Make the Best Use of Collective Resources and Knowledge

Leslie explained that the technical detail of the project would not be discussed in this meeting, but that as items came up for further discussion they would be added to the “Parking Lot”. Detailed technical issues will be addressed at future meetings.

2. Project Purpose

Cynthia Daniels/City of Oxnard provided an overview of the Rice Avenue/Highway 101 Interchange project. Rice Avenue has special status as a Port Intermodal Corridor. The main driver of the project is the need to provide improved access from Highway 101 to the Port facilities in Oxnard, and to enhance economic development. In 1990, a Memorandum of Understanding was signed with Caltrans stating that Highway 1 will be routed to Rice Avenue, once several projects are completed: (1) Rice Avenue is improved; (2) Pleasant Valley/Route 1 interchange is upgraded; and (3) Rice Avenue is extended to Hueneme Road. Cynthia reviewed the history of the development of the Project Study Report for the project, and the consultant activity to date. The City views this phase as a new beginning to the project and an opportunity to review previous studies to ensure the project is clearly and accurately defined. A major concern of the City is new right of way required for the project.

Cynthia explained that the project budget consists of $16.8 million of TEA 21 funds, with additional funds for PS&E, with the remaining amount to be made up from a new financing district that will be formed.
Caltrans was given the opportunity to discuss their perspective on the project. Tony Velasquez/Caltrans stated that the focus of Caltrans' involvement on this project is to ensure that the project is completed to design standards. Caltrans considers the traffic studies and the right-of-way aspects of the project to be areas for specific consideration.

Rob Roshanian, City of Oxnard, stated that the goal is to do the best project possible on a fast track schedule. He said that Rose/101 interchange went well and that project will set the standard for this project.

Project Definition/Scope

Marge Lazarus/CH2M HILL reviewed the Consultant Scope of Work for the project. Following are the major tasks for this scope of work:


**Task 2 – Final Project Report** – prepare the Final Project Report including coordination with the production of the environmental document prepared by Myra Frank & Associates

**Task 3 – Permits** – coordinate permit requirements to construct improvements

**Task 4 – Project Management** – manage development and delivery of work products, coordinate with City, Caltrans, and environmental consultant during project implementation.

Marge then asked Lee Lisecki/Myra Frank & Associates to provide a brief description of their scope of work for the environmental document for the project. Lee indicated a ten-month schedule to prepare the study and identify mitigation actions. NTP is expected to be 1 to 2 months away.

Schedule

Marge reviewed the overall project schedule. Two schedules were provided, the "Target" schedule and the "Revised" schedule. The "Revised" schedule is the preferred schedule and Marge requested that Caltrans and Myra Frank review the schedule and provide any comments to her for consideration. One general comment from Caltrans was to allow plenty of time for the geometric review.

The Project Report development and review periods should reflect the following:

1. Prepare draft
2. Allow 1 month for first draft review
3. Prepare 2nd Draft
4. Allow 1 month for 2nd draft review
5. Prepare Final Draft Project Report
6. Allow 2 weeks for final review/approval
Preliminary Geometrics

Joe Sawtelle/CH2M HILL reviewed the plan and profile for the interchange design. Key highlights are:

The design speed for Rice Ave – future State Route 1 was assumed to be 80 km/hr. The primary goal of the design was to meet all mandatory design standards. Some advisory standards have not been met with the preliminary design, which will be addressed at the first PDT meeting.

There was discussion about whether the future widening of Highway 101 in this area was planned to occur to the inside or outside of the existing facility. Caltrans agreed to research whether this is already identified. CH2M HILL will review the typical section for the design and provide a recommendation on the widening potential.

Fekade stated that as the project engineer, it is his responsibility to ensure that all non-standard elements are identified prior to PS&E. Mandatory and Advisory Fact Sheets should be approved prior to design. As a new interchange, it will be difficult to obtain Mandatory exceptions.

Data Needs

Karen Chapman/CH2M HILL reviewed the list of data needs to move forward in preparing the Draft Project Report. Attached is a list of the information requested. Many of the documents listed had been delivered. Caltrans agreed to research what documents were available or existed in their system.

Expectations for a Successful Project

Leslie asked everyone to take five minutes and write down his/her individual expectations for a successful project. Participants were asked to write one expectation per yellow post-it note. The group was then divided into four smaller groups. Each group was asked to review each person’s expectations and create a summary for the group to present.

Each group reported their ideas and expectations for how this project can be successful. These ideas and expectations were then categorized into several groups; Scope, Design Standards/Safety, Teamwork, Building Project Support, Schedule/Budget, Personal, Product Quality, Learned and Applied. Following is a summary of the Project Team’s expectations for the Rice Avenue/Highway 101 Interchange Project:

**Scope**

- Design to allow accurate R/W acquisition (minimize cost)
- Clearly define project scope and objectives
- City to meet Caltrans requirements on transfer of R/W to State
- Accurate utilities assessment for a good design
• Minimize utility relocation
• Preserve trees along Highway 101
• Minimize residential and businesses relocation
• Develop a design that include environmental concerns, i.e. relocation natural resources
• Fulfill project objectives

Design Standards/Safety
• Safe Travel
  – Safe distance
  – Super (no adverse super)
  – No backup of drainage on traveled way
• Clear recovery zones/adequate trees, etc. (30’ preferred) minimum
• Good product DPR, DED, PR, FED
• Maintaining landscaping within Caltrans R/W
• Provision of adequate access for Caltrans maintenance personnel
• Safety devices – MBGR, as required on ramps, etc.
• Traffic numbers revisited City/Caltrans/Consultant
• Cooperation with 2020 traffic projections
• Minimize design change
• Innovative solutions and design methods
• City to ensure Federal/State procedures are met on acquisition/relocation of property
• Fully meets or complies with City, Caltrans and FHWA regulations and requirements
• Best use of land - minimum right-of-way take identified

Teamwork
• Good communication throughout the project
• Resolving issues professionally
• Develop a good working relationship
• Know that we had a good team
• City to seek the consultant service of a qualified agency to oversee the R/W acquisition work to be contracted out
• Continue to develop new relationships with District
• Reinforce relationships within CH2M HILL Team
• Maintain commitments
• Good working communications among agency staff and consultants
• Build a positive, long-term relationship with Caltrans
• Minimal friction through Caltrans and City
• Fluid, positive, conflict resolution, also short
• Identify issues that City will need to be aware of for future phases of work
• Open communication (meetings, if helpful)
• Distribute names/telephone number of concerned parties to participants
• City to understand Caltrans process

**Building Project Support**
• Community agreement and council acceptance
• Good public comment and review
• Minimize impacts to environment, especially residents
• Aesthetically pleasing project
• Maximizes community support
• Feel that the taxpayers got their money’s worth paying for various aspect of the PR
• Caltrans viewed as asset to locals

**Schedule/Budget**
• Completed on time
• Completed within budget
• Ahead of schedule
• Under budget
• Good scheduling/planning
• Enough time to review project report, etc.
• Standing at the ribbon cutting ceremony
• PR signed by 5/2000
- Cost effective bridge structure over Highway 101
- Cost effective design

**Personal**
- I’m proud of what is accomplished
- A project to be proud of
- The City Council is very pleased
- City is satisfied with project results
- CH2M HILL gets PS&E follow up work
- Project looks good on CH2M HILL resumé
- Personal satisfaction
- Enjoyed it

**Product Quality**
- We did it right the first time
- Goal: to have enough issues resolved so that during design phase, design only needs to be done once.

**Learned and Applied**
- Have learned better ways to prepare and get approval on PR, education
- Learn about geographic area
- Learn /address City of Oxnard’s key issues
- Have improved our performance and delivery since last interchange project

Leslie suggested that the Team review this list of expectations at one of the PDT Meetings part way through the project.

3. **Roles and Responsibilities**

The Project Team discussed the roles and responsibilities of each agency/company, and the protocol for communication between the Team members. Following is a narrative of this discussion.

**CH2M HILL**

Leslie Regos provided an overview of the organization and roles for the CH2M HILL Team.
Marge Lazarus – Project Manager. Primary point of contact for all communication with the City and with Caltrans. Responsible for team deliverables, resources made available to the project, and overall project execution.

Karen Chapman – Project Engineer. Responsible for producing the Project Report and coordinating input of all other disciplines to the study.

Chris Angleman – Traffic Analysis. Responsible for the traffic data analysis, geometric design of the improvements and the construction staging plans.

Joe Sawtelle – Cost Estimating and Geometrics. Responsible for preparing geometric design for the project alternative, developing cost estimates, and collecting and analyzing data required for the Project Report.

Kent Cordtz – Structures. Responsible for bridge design.

Kathleen Higgins – Drainage. Responsible for drainage design and analysis.

Derek Davis – Utilities. Responsible for utility coordination and relocation design.

Fred Carpenter – Survey/Mapping. Responsible for any survey and/or mapping required to support design.

Debbie Danitz – Permitting. Responsible for coordinating permits to construct.

Leonard Sequeira – QA/QC. Responsible for development and implementation of the quality assurance and quality control plan for the project.

Steve Thoman and Steve Pettee – Constructability Value Analysis. Responsible for providing review and analysis on the constructability of the improvements design.

City Of Oxnard

Cynthia Daniels – Project Manager. Responsible for managing consultant contracts and deliverables for CH2M HILL and Myra Frank & Associates. She will interface with the City Manager, the City Council and the City Engineer. Cynthia will be the primary point of contact for the City. Cynthia will coordinate with Caltrans on scope, schedule and budget issues. Rita Johnson will serve as Cynthia’s backup.

Hung Le – City Engineer. Responsible for technical review and coordination with Consultant and Caltrans. He will copy Cynthia on communications with the Consultant and Caltrans. Lou Balderrama will serve as Hung’s backup.

Joe Genovese – Traffic Engineer. Responsible for review of traffic studies and geometric alternatives.

Caltrans

Tony Velasquez reviewed the organization and roles of the Caltrans staff for this project.

Tony Velasquez – Project Manager. Responsible for decisions having impact on scope, schedule, and/or budget.
Fekade Mesfin – Design Manager. Responsible for coordination of technical aspects and Caltrans staff assigned to project. Also included in discussion of scope, schedule and budget.

Gary Maxwell – Project Engineer. Responsible for reviewing design and providing technical information to Consultant. Coordinates directly with Caltrans discipline staff to get review comments and distribute Consultant information.

Patty McCauley – Structures. Responsible for review of structure design. Also included in cost estimate and constructability review. Communicates directly with Consultant staff as needed. Provides Gary/Fekade with copies of communication to Consultant.

Jean Quan – Right-of-Way. Responsible for review of right-of-way needs and coordinating right-of-way acquisition process.

Gary Kevorkian – Traffic. Responsible for providing input to traffic data review and geometric design.

Jerrell Kam – Hydraulics. Responsible for providing input to hydraulic design.


Following is a summary of the key communication links:

1. Cynthia will be the primary point of contact for any issue related to the project, for Caltrans and the Consultants.
2. Marge will be the primary point of contact for CH2M HILL.
3. Marge will interface between Caltrans and the City for project-related issues.
4. Fekade will be the main point of contact for Caltrans on any technical issue.
5. Fekade will distribute project information to project engineer and disciplines as needed.
6. Tony will be the main point of contact for Caltrans on any scope, schedule, or budget issue.
7. Caltrans and the City will communicate directly to determine the right-of-way process and acquisition.

Decision Process

The Project Team discussed protocol for resolving issues/conflict/problems for this project. Attached is a copy of the Decision Flow Process using a likely scenario for the project. This will not reflect every project scenario; however, it provides a sequence of steps to use as a guide to decision making throughout the project. This diagram may require further
discussion and/or follow-up at the first PDT meeting. Please review and provide any
comments on this process to Marge Lazarus.

Additional items discussed during this portion of the meeting include having an adequate
contingency in the PR cost estimates; including landscaping, utilities, drainage, and right of
way; having no mandatory exceptions; and including hazardous waste remediation costs
(gas station?).

4. Selection of Communication Tools

In general, the Project Team was comfortable with using phone calls, memos and email to
communicate throughout the project. As needed, conference calls may be needed
intermittently between PDT meetings to resolve any project issues.

The PDT Meetings will be planned, facilitated, and summarized by CH2M HILL. Myra
Frank & Associates will be invited to these meetings. Several highlights on PDT Meetings:

1. The purpose of these meetings is to provide a status report on each technical aspect
   of the project for each discipline.

2. An Action Items List will be a product of each PDT Meeting and provided as part of
   the meeting minutes within one week of the meeting.

3. A Decision Log will be developed and maintained throughout the life of the project.
   Fekade has an example of this for Marge to use as a template.

4. The PDT Meetings will be held in District 7. Each meeting will be scheduled at the
   previous meeting on a monthly or as needed basis.

5. Each meeting will have an agenda with time allocated to discuss new issues in order
   to keep the meetings on time. New issues that require further discussion may be
   included on the following agenda, or a separate meeting may be scheduled.

5. Quality Assurance

Marge informed the Project Team that a Quality Assurance and Quality Control Plan would
be developed for this project. She asked the Team if there were any suggestions of
approaches that have worked well in the past that would be valuable to include in the Plan.

One suggestion was to include a constructability and a safety review in the Plan given that
the project has changed some from the original PSR. Another suggestion was to use a color
code system to respond to comments (red- Caltrans comments; blue- accepted; green- not
accepted but resolved). All comments should be resolved prior to submittal. Additionally,
Fekade suggested use of the standard checklist at the back of the Project Development
Procedures Manual. He also suggested a review of the draft submittal two weeks prior to
the formal submittal.

Fekade requested that the PR requirements be followed as closely as possible. Patty
McCaulley expressed concern that the PR will go through the environmental process
before she has the opportunity to review the Advance Planning Study.
In addition, Fekade noted that the first PDT meeting should cover previous alternatives and why they were discarded. There is not necessarily uniform agreement on the VA alternative as the preferred alternative. The decision made will be documented at this meeting. Additionally, the PSR has been discarded for this project due to its age and change in alternatives.

The QA/QC Plan will be developed and provided to the City and Caltrans.

6. **Summarize Meeting**

Leslie then reviewed the material covered over the course of the meeting and asked if there were any further questions regarding the discussions. She reviewed the action item (Parking Lot) list and assigned a responsible party and timeframe for completion of these items. Following is a summary of the action items:

1. Determine who is responsible for right-of-way acquisition, Caltrans or the City of Oxnard.
   - *Fekade Mesfin/Caltrans* to research the cooperative agreement between Caltrans and the City for this locally funded project. *Provide response to Cynthia Daniels/City of Oxnard.*

2. Provide clarification on the condemnation process. There is a new ruling on local condemnation on behalf of State.
   - *Jean Quan/Caltrans* to research and provide response to Cynthia.

   - *Lee Lisecki/Myra Frank* and Caltrans to provide comments to Marge Lazarus/CH2M HILL by 5/28/99.

   - *Fekade to research and respond to Marge by June 1.*

4. City to review traffic volumes presented in PSR.
   - *Caltrans will review if a change is recommended.*

5. Develop “Fact Sheet” noting standards before design proceeds.
   - *CH2M HILL* to prepare exceptions during PR phase.

6. Review “Lessons Learned” on previous City projects (i.e., change orders)
   - *City to review and summarize for Caltrans and CH2M Hill– late June.*

7. Project Team to review all project alternatives in the PSR.
- Conduct review prior to first PDT Meeting. Resolve alternative selection at first meeting. Fekade to set up meeting for June 10 (morning) or June 15 (12:30 PM or later).