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TAB 1: APPLICATION FORM
Schedule Outcome:

A) Original planned start date 7/1/2013
B) Original planned completion date: 1/15/2014
C) Planned number of work days: 563
D) Actual start date (Notice to Proceed): 7/1/2013
E) Actual completion date (if vertical, Certificate of Occupancy, if transportation, Substantial Completion): 11/21/2014
F) Actual number of work days: 508
   Days Ahead or Behind Schedule (F-C): 55 days ahead

Comments regarding schedule outcome anomalies or considerations:
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Project Budget Outcome:

A) Original Contract Amount: $14.6M
B) Final Contract Amount: $14.1M
C) Project Cost Under or Above Budget A-B): Under budget, $0.5M
D) Cost Increase Associated with Owner Initiated Change Orders: 0

Comments regarding budget amendments or considerations:
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Change Order Outcome:

Number of Change Orders Processed: 0
Number of Owner Initiated Change Orders: 0
Number of Field Initiated Change Orders: _____________________

Please describe any change order issues encountered and how the partnering process was used to address those issues in question 3 (Issue Resolution).

**Claims Outcome:**

Number of Claims Accepted: _________________

Number of Unresolved Claims (at close-out, ongoing?): _________________

Please describe any claim issues encountered and how the partnering process was used to address those issues in question 3 (Issue Resolution).

**Safety Outcome:**

OSHA Recordables: _________________

Lost-Time rate: _________________

Number of Fatalities: _________________

Comments regarding safety issues that occurred in the project:

The project logged nearly 100,000 hours with zero safety incidents.

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

**Personal Fulfillment Outcome (from participant surveys):**

Initial Participant Project Satisfaction Level: _________________

Final Participant Project Satisfaction Level: _________________

Please describe how project participants felt about participating in the project and how partnering influenced their feelings about their work in question 5 (Value/Outcome).

**Partnering Expense Analysis:**

Total Cost of Project Partnering (Facilitator, meeting expenses, and surveys): _________________

Final Project Cost: _________________
Partnering Expense as a % of Project Budget: __ 0.05% ________

Estimated Savings due to Partnering Program: __ $2.5M __________

Partnering Expense / Saving Expense Ratio (e.g. $1/$40): $1 / $322 saved

**PAYMENT & DEADLINE INFORMATION**

Deadline: Entries must be received by February 12, 2016 - before 5:00 p.m. PST. Late entries will not be accepted.

Send application with fee to:
International Partnering Institute
291 McLeod Street, Livermore, CA 94550

Entry Fee Enclosed: □ $500  or  □ $750  □ $1,000 □ other $_________

*Amounts above the entry fee of $500 will be considered additional donation*

Please make checks payable to: International Partnering Institute

**Note: Entry fee includes two admissions to IPI’s Awards Ceremony and three Project Trophies or Plaques (Owner, Prime Contractor, and Facilitator). Winners may purchase additional trophies. Please contact IPI for details.**

Project teams will be notified in the first two weeks of April 2016 as to the status of their project. While teams will be notified in writing as to whether or not their project team is a winner, the specific level of each award will be disclosed at the IPI Awards Ceremony.

All submitted materials become the property of the International Partnering Institute’s Partnered Project of the Year Award committee and may be used in education, marketing and promotion for the awards program. IPI is a 501(c)3 nonprofit corporation.
TAB 2: PROJECT SUMMARY
In 1935 the City of Phoenix purchased from American Airways a single runway airport of hardpack dirt nicknamed “The Farm” due to its isolation. 80 years later that remote, desert airstrip has grown into Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport (PHX), the 6th busiest in the nation, with over 42 Million passengers utilizing over 400,000 inbound and outbound flights in 2014. Bounded on four sides by major highways and arterials and linked to a new, city-wide multimodal transportation network (including light rail), PHX is a modern aviation facility faced with a decades-old problem that plagues the concrete taxiways, aprons, foundations and structures of airports nationwide: Alkali-Silica reaction (ASR). In the late 1990s, as part of the FAA mandated pavement management program at PHX, ASR affected panels in numerous locations in and around Terminal 4 were identified. By the late 2000s, the City of Phoenix Aviation Department, in consultation with engineering and technical experts, made the decision to replace all of the ASR affected concrete surrounding Terminal 4.

The $14.1M Terminal 4 South Apron ASR Reconstruction (“T4 South”) Design-Bid-Build project was the first to address the full replacement of a significant section of ASR affected concrete at PHX. From a technical perspective, the challenges included consideration that the 60+ acres of concrete being replaced contained an embedded fueling and fiber optic network, were on an active apron, and required the heavy civil equivalent of a “sterile” operating environment free of FOD within an “under-ten-foot” proximity to active aircraft. All this would be daunting enough, but then add key airline, tenant, airport landside and airside operations, security, environmental stakeholders as well as Federal Aviation Administration specifications and oversight, and the project challenges become exponentially more complex.

In successfully delivering this 14-phase project, the Banicki team balanced the needs and realities of field production with a zero-tolerance FOD mandate and a commitment to partnering and transparency with project stakeholders to develop an industry-leading model for airside ASR replacement. The result of these efforts could be seen across all project metrics. At the management level, performance evaluation ratings moved from 3.4 to an average of 4.8 out of 5, weekly team “strategy and partnering sessions” routinely completed early and formal RFI’s totaled only 17 for all phases. Best practices in the field resulted in a rise in craft worker productivity while rework was held to less than 0.097%. The project logged over 100,000 hours with zero safety incidents, zero citations for FOD and only a single issue relating to fuel pit construction required escalation above the field management level.

Overall, the T4 South was delivered $0.5M under the lowest-bid budget and $2.6M under the original engineer’s estimate, 55 calendar days early and with zero claims. The collaborative approach, means, methods and technologies developed for this challenging project have already been used to establish the delivery framework and lessons-learned performance benchmarks for new projects within the Phoenix Aviation Department system.
TAB 3: JUDGES' CRITERIA
1. How Did You Partner This Project?

The procurement of the project under the Design-Bid-Build model left the Banicki team with “little time or resources for a preconstruction effort” states Project Manager James Mathews: “so we began informal collaboration meetings with Key Subcontractors, Banicki Field Managers, Safety and Quality Managers prior to the Notice to Proceed in order to plan and implement an effective start. This effort prepared us to listen to, better understand and engage the City, Southwest Airlines and other key stakeholders during the formal partnering kickoff and really enabled the rapid establishment of the charter in reviewing critical issues that could affect or even derail the project.”

The development of the charter through a professionally facilitated partnering effort for the T4 South project involved a complex mix of Banicki Personnel, Key Subcontractors, senior representatives from Southwest Airlines, Aviation Department and Professional Consultant Staff and Sky Harbor Airport Operations personnel. All 28 signatories to the partnership charter were in attendance at the structured partnering kickoff led by Larry Miller, partnering facilitator of Productivity Through People, Inc. In this way, the charter supported the Partnership by acting as the key vehicle in which issues were vetted, a resolution framework was created, and - by signing - a visual commitment to “others before self” was created.

Specific goals of the charter were anonymously evaluated on a monthly basis utilizing a detailed assessment form completed by each team member. A measurement and metrics summary report, along with the related comments provide by team members were then made immediately available to each partnering team member. Over the lifecycle of the project, 16 performance evaluation rating “rounds” occurred, with an average participation rate of 82%. Illustrating the team’s commitment to leveraging formalized partnering for project success, average scoring moved from an average of 3.4/5 at the end of Phase 1, to an average of 4.8/5 through the remaining 8 phases. The partnering efforts, lessons learned and a review of the effectiveness of the approach were captured in a post-project closeout session with the goal of creating an industry best-practices model to be shared between all teaming members for future projects.
2. Charter and Goals of the Partnership

What were the team’s goals?

Beginning with a macro focus on establishing a project partnership culture, a Mission Statement was established through the leadership of Hal Emery, CH2M Hill Project Manager and Mike Abraham, Banicki President, which identified the broad goals of “safety, high quality materials and workmanship, a timely schedule, responsible budget, fair contractor profit and minimal impact to current airport operations.” From this benchmark, 28 members of the project team engaged in a robust discussion of specific goals covering:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Providing a durable, well build project that meets both City and FAA specifications</td>
<td>In meeting the challenges of providing consistent specification-grade quality without costly rework, Banicki created a “first run” quality field approach that stressed the incorporation of quality process steps during construction rather than reactive testing after completion - resulted in the minimization of rework to less than 0.097% of total scope while meeting all City and FAA specifications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Schedule                    | Completing the project at or ahead of schedule while avoiding unexpected impacts to all airport operations | Original number of working days: 370  
Final number of working days: 335  
Percentage of schedule savings: 10% The project was completed with Zero unplanned impacts or closures. |
| Airport and Operations Safety | Achieving a goal of zero incursions, incidents or FOD violations           | Zero incursions, Incidents or FOD Violations occurred over the 17-month project lifecycle through the use of a customized “Safe & Sound” HS&E program.                                                   |
| Construction Safety         | Proactively managing the worksite to achieve zero minor or lost time accidents | Total Man-Hours: 98,287  
OSHA Recordable Illness and Injury Rates: 0.00  
Lost Time Rate: 0.00  
(Innovation)Based on the Charter goal, Banicki developed “first 15” program in which key team leaders and superintendent staff engage in structured communication covering key daily activities as well as end-of-shift transitions. |
| Environmental Compliance    | Ensuring 100% compliance with environmental/ regulatory permits and requirements | Zero environmental citations issued over 335 days of dual shift work - 100% compliance with ADEQ requirements - (innovation) 39,967 lbs. of concrete dust eliminated from the air through a retrofitted dust collection system on the dowel bar gang drill |
How Were the Partnerships Goals Updated and Evaluated?

To create a sustainable and ongoing methodology to gauge the “health” of the project, informal but in-person discussions over the project’s “culture and mission” were held between Mike Abraham, Hal Emery and James Mathews, while specific goals of the charter were anonymously evaluated on a monthly basis utilizing a detailed assessment form completed by each team member. A measurement and metrics summary report, along with the related comments provided by team members were then made immediately available to each partnering team member. Over the lifecycle of the project, 16 performance evaluation rating “rounds” occurred, with an average participation rate of 82%. Illustrating the team’s commitment to leveraging formalized partnering for project success, average scoring moved from an average of 3.4/5 at the end of Phase 1, to an average of 4.8/5 through the remaining 8 phases. The partnering efforts, lessons learned and a review of the effectiveness of the approach were captured in a post-project closeout session with the goal of creating an industry best-practices model to be shared between all teaming members for future projects.
Immediately after Phase I, the Banicki team conducted a lessons-learned “marathon” roundtable in which every portion of the project plan, from staffing to methods to equipment, were reviewed. Although the goals of the project did not change, resulting from this effort were a set of technical, communications and operational “best practices” that the Team presented to the City and Stakeholders for review in preparation for Phases 2-8. Leveraging the commitment to partnership and trust built during Phase I, Banicki additionally proposed accelerating the schedule to complete the work two months earlier than planned, placing both reputation and profit on the line to boldly meet the needs of the City.

“I had severe reservations that this could be done” said Hal Emery, “but the Banicki team didn’t just tell us ‘they would’, they worked with me, the City, Southwest Airlines and key stakeholder to explain and illustrate ‘how’ and in the end, the entire project team was onboard. Sure, we achieve the project goals in Phase I, now the challenge was - ‘how can we achieve these goals most efficiently?’

3. Issue Resolution

Issue Resolution Procedure

The T4 South project team established an issues resolution ladder included as part of the professionally facilitated partnering effort. As a result of the team’s focus on proactive partnering, transparent communication and an emphasis on field-level resolution, the issues resolution ladder was only utilized to Level III in a single instance during the 17-month project lifecycle – specifically during Phase 1. This success is further verified by a second exceptional and industry-leading statistic: during the project, only 17 Requests for Information (RFIs) were generated by the Banicki team requiring formal clarification by the City of Phoenix Aviation Department.

Using Partnering to Overcome Challenges

In the initial kickoff meeting all T4 South partnering team members agreed that on a worksite located directly in the midst of the “controlled chaos” of the 6th busiest airport in the nation, ensuring the schedule outlined for each week, day and work cycle was consistently achieved was vital. Led by Mike Abraham, Banicki President and Hal Emery, CH2M Hill Project Manager, the T4 South Team created an issues resolution structure that stressed the localization of decision making based and a sequencing of “time to elevate (TTE)”, with the goal of keeping all but the most serious of issues within a 24 hour window for resolution.
Issues Resolved by Front Line Employees
In the only specific instance in which an issue was elevated to Level III, Banicki field teams misinterpreted the intended method of approach for the demolition of 20’ x 20’ ASR concrete panels which contained trench drain tie-in locations. These tie-ins were critical access points to connect the drains with the existing apron storm drain system. Design specifications called for the storm drain manholes and collars to remain in place, but this proved to be nearly impossible in practice as the surrounding ASR demolition consistently impacted these facilities. With the construction field and City inspection teams deadlocked on a consistent, best practices solution to move forward, the issue was quickly raised to the superintendent / City Inspection Manager (Level II) and then to Level III, where Hal Emery and James Mathews worked with key subcontractor RGG to establish a methodology in which the covers and collars would be removed after demolition and immediately replaced with specially fitted and temporary concrete block covers that met design specifications.

Lessons Learned Through the Issue Resolution Process
On an accelerated multi-shift project, the framework of the resolution ladder needed to account for “speed - an unresolved issue could potentially become moot if the process to arrive at a resolution spanned days. Thus a focus on the speed at which issues were resolved was agreed to be a crucial component that could potentially “make or break” the project.

4. Teamwork

How did you develop team member relationships?
“With over 35 years in the industry, I have participated on a large number of successful teams. This project developed a teaming culture that was an absolute cornerstone to the delivery of this project ahead of schedule and below budget” - Hal Emery, CH2M Hill Project Manager

• Over the course of this 17 month project, Banicki led a number of team building efforts which resulted in a win for our workers, the City, Stakeholders and the travelling public that we ultimately serve.

• Informal collaboration meetings with Key Subcontractors, Banicki Field Managers, Safety and Quality Managers prior to the Notice to Proceed in order to plan and implement an effective project start.
• Post phase lessons-learned “marathon” roundtable for partnering team members in which every portion of the project plan, from staffing to methods to equipment were reviewed. Resulting from this effort were a set of technical, communications, and operational “best practices” that the Team presented to the City and Stakeholders for review in preparation for Phases 2-8

• Community lunch times in which both day and night shift workers were able to informally join for conversation, community bonding and to share lessons learned. During this time, Banicki Field Managers would also work to establish rapport and relationships with subcontractor and supplier personnel.

• Stress relieving activities such as Bocce Ball which included any members of the project team available before or after shifts.

• Coffee and Doughnut meetings for craft workers coinciding with the end of the overnight shift and the beginning of day work.

• Overall establishment of an environment of mutual respect, compassion and humanity for the entire project team through effective communication practices and availability of senior and executive management personnel to supervisory and field craft personnel.

Relationships with Stakeholders
For the T4 South project, Banicki worked in concert with the City Aviation Department and key Airline, Tenants, Airside and Landside operations and facilities departments which make up the “community” that is Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport. By encouraging active stakeholder participation at weekly project update and status meetings, inclusion in formalized partnering activities and informal “social” activities including project barbeques and morning “coffee meetings” the Banicki team integrated a two-step methodology for growing and developing strong relationships with other project stakeholders.

As part of the formal partnering and informal outreach efforts, the Banicki team talked with each of the major stakeholders who would be directly or indirectly affected by the project. In these discussions, our team attempted to identify issues key to the individual stakeholder’s commitment to the T4
Project. It was discovered that for some stakeholders such as contractors working adjacent to the project site, the proposed work had little effect on their daily operations beyond the normal course of construction. For others such as Southwest Airlines, the proposed project work – if not sequenced and executed to avoid additional gate closures or unexpected access impacts - would have had a significant effect on their day-to-day operating schedule and passenger attendance. Key issues for individual stakeholders were categorized, quantified and included as part of the initial partnership report. This content was shared vertically in the Banicki chain of command to ensure all team members – from field to executive understood the importance of their work on a daily basis.

Project Manager James Mathews led the Banicki partnership effort with three unofficial rules. First, the Banicki team consistently treated stakeholders fairly, listened to individual and group concerns and documented issues for transparency. Second, the project team as a whole communicated important decisions about construction scheduling in a way that demonstrated that Southwests’ gate scheduling and passenger loading needs were understood and were taken into account to minimize impacts. Lastly and most importantly, the Banicki team maintained these relationships by “doing what we said we would do”. We listened, partnered, planned and then proved our commitment by acting in our stakeholder’s best interests.

“Overall, I was amazed at the level of personal concern and attention to our needs that was demonstrated by the T4 Project team” states Southwest Airlines Assistant Gate and Operations Manager Cesar Enriquez. “Meeting the tough deadlines even sooner than we expected was an incredible success and the direct result of the Team’s partnering efforts from project start to finish.”

How did the team develop relationships with stakeholders?

Teamwork and the Success of the Partnership

In one key example, Banicki and subcontractor RGG team – including key craft workers and field crews – developed a standardized approach for utilizing concrete dust collecting equipment on a commonly used Dowel Bar Gang Drill. This approach not only reduced the total amount of concrete dust emissions by over 40,000 pounds (based on 2.01# per Dowel hole x 19,884 dowels), but also assisted Banicki and the Airport Operations group in meeting stringent Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) standards. Overall, it was the strong
partnership between the key prime and subcontractor members of the subcontractor team that encouraged and supported innovative project delivery and contributed to the overall cost and schedule savings realized on the project.

**Celebrating Team Success**

“From the standpoint of Operations, I rarely have time for lunch” states Banicki Operations Manager Eric Rotner. “So creating opportunities for our T4 shifts to share a common meal and celebrate successes big and small didn’t really seem either impressive or useful to me. The result of the effort was actually a bit of both. We saw better communication among craft workers who were performing the same function but on different shifts and we noticed an uptick in the participation of all project team members and stakeholders at the project’s end-of-phase BBQ’s. In the end, I may still not have a lot of time for lunch, but I think this made the difference in bridging the gap between field workers, managers and stakeholders who would rarely come in contact with one another otherwise.”

**5. Value/Outcome**

**Meeting Project Goals**

From the very beginning of the Design-Bid-Build procurement, Banicki leveraged strong relationships with key subcontractors RGG United, Inc. and Drake Materials to successfully partner and vet unique and innovative approaches that contributed to the highly competitive $14.6M lowest-price win which beat the Engineer’s estimate by 87%.

These approaches included establishing an on-site batch plant to ensure materials consistency and availability while reducing haulage costs; modifying the performance specifications of key equipment to meet increased productivity and quality benchmarks while reducing impacts to airside operations; and developing an early consolidated phasing plan which leveraged the benefits of a “unified” dual shift work approach to meet potential schedule acceleration targets.

“It was the collaboration between Banicki, RGG and Drake that led our team to the initial win” says Mike Abraham, President of Banicki. “But more importantly, we transferred
the partnership culture developed in those early morning pre-bid meetings to our collaboration with the City, Southwest Airlines and airport facilities stakeholders during construction, enabling this project to be a significant “win” for all team members at closeout.”

Overall, the T4 South was delivered $0.5M under the lowest-bid budget and $2.6M under the original engineer’s estimate, 55 calendar days early and with zero claims. The collaborative approach, means, methods and technologies developed for this challenging project have already been used to establish the delivery framework and lessons-learned performance benchmarks for new projects within the Phoenix Aviation Department system.

**Partnering Adding Value for Stakeholders**

Through project acceleration, Banicki was able to eliminate “unseen” costs related to gate relocations and closures at Terminal 4.

“What you cannot see in the initial bid numbers was the amount of concern the City expressed over meeting time critical benchmarks while minimizing impacts to the Southwest Airlines operations” adds Project Manager James Mathews. “The costs to the City if the time line wasn’t met were substantial – potentially exceeding $1M per month in revenue impacts and the nearly incalculable “cost waterfall” effects that would occur across the nationwide aviation system if the project caused unforeseen impacts or delays to flight schedules. For every day we cut from the schedule, our airline stakeholder saved tens of thousands of operational dollars, but most importantly, we were able to mitigate gate impacts for thousands of travelers on a daily basis”.

**Lessons Learned**

"The addition of RGG as a key subcontractor prior to bid submittal really made the difference for our team” says RGG Project Lead John Kliethermes. “Often the relationship is all about price – with Banicki we were afforded the opportunity to really make a noticeable contribution and leverage the skills and expertise of the talented RGG in-house team to make a difference to winning the project. Then we were able to bring this institutional knowledge to bear in the innovative development of the Terex 6500 modifications which we have further used in the “PHX T4 North” ASR replacement recently awarded to J. Banicki Construction under a separate Construction Manager at Risk procurement, and similar PCC efforts led by other firms and ongoing at both Phoenix Goodyear (GYR) and Phoenix Deer Valley (DVT) airports.”
6. Innovation/Creativity

Procured under the Design-Bid-Build model, initial bidding on the T4 south project was highly competitive with Banicki leveraging a strong relationship with key subcontractor RGG United, Inc. to successfully partner and vet unique and innovative approaches which resulted in a lowest cost, best value and lowest environmental impact project delivery.

Working directly with the key concrete placement subcontractor, RGG and their team led by John Kliethermes, P.E., Banicki explored, developed and gained City Aviation Department approval for the use of a specifically modified Terex 6500 Bid-Well machine in lieu of the traditionally used Gameco 4500 unit and standardized slipform paving methodologies. Use of the 6500 Bid-Well dramatically increased daily productivity as single pass widths were doubled - from 20’ to 40’ widths. This key change was critical in helping Banicki achieve a 55 day reduction in the overall project schedule. Key changes to the 6500 machine included the upgrade of grade and alignment controls to ensure tighter quality with less rework; the development of tire and track pivots which allowed for complete 360 degree rotation of the machine; and substantial motor upgrades that increased the travel and transit speed of the machine from 1mph to nearly 20mph - allowing for the machine to be quickly remobilized to differing locations in the nearly 20 acre project site with nearly zero down time.

The use of innovative machinery to complete the job also led to an unexpected benefit as well. Over the 17 month project life cycle, over 112,687 pounds of CO2 emissions were saved using more efficient paving equipment better suited for panel replacement than the use of convention slip form (based on 5,076 Gal of diesel saved using EPA’s 22.2 LBS CO2/GAL Diesel).

The T4 South project stands as a testament to the commitment and resiliency of people, firms and stakeholders who leverage partnership to develop sustainable best practices and achieve true project success.

7. Bonus Points

Mike Abraham, President, J. Banicki Construction, Inc., IPI member (in progress): __ [Signature]
TAB 4:
ATTACHMENTS

Full Size Project Photos
Project Charter
Partnering Survey Form
Project Contact List
II.   PROJECT CHARTER

MISSION STATEMENT

Our mission is to work together as a cooperative alliance utilizing the concepts and principles of partnering to insure the safe and efficient operation of the South Apron of Terminal 4 by repairing and reconstructing the apron in a manner that emphasizes safety, high quality materials and workmanship, a timely schedule, responsible budget, fair contractor profit and minimal impact to current airport operations.

OBJECTIVES

QUALITY: Meet or exceed the quality intent of plans and specifications by featuring quality materials and workmanship, good QA/QC resulting in a functional, durable and low maintenance apron that fulfills the quality expectations of the owners.

SCHEDULE: Complete the project on or ahead of schedule by anticipating user patterns, having a contingency plan for changing conditions and airfield operations, good coordination of construction activities, being efficient in the submittal and processing of project documents and the regular monitoring, updating and communication the schedule to appropriate team members.

AIRPORT SAFETY: Finish the project with no airport-related accidents or incidents by closely adhering to airport operations and regulations as they relate to safety and closely managing and controlling the ingress and egress of construction traffic.

AIRPORT OPERATIONS: Utilize every precaution to eliminate the project’s impact to current Terminal 4 operations by proactively notifying airport operations of the construction schedule and carefully considering the potential of each major construction phase.

CONSTRUCTION SAFETY: Finish the project with no construction accidents by properly outfitting workers, the use of safe equipment, conducting regular safety meetings, being aware of weather extremes and acting quickly to correct any potentially unsafe conditions.

ENVIRONMENTAL/REGULATORY AWARENESS: Minimize impact to the environment by adhering to all environmental/regulatory permits and requirements, keep a clean jobsite and minimize environmental footprints when the project is completed.

FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY: Stay within contract budget and return a fair contractor profit by the timely preparation of pay quantities and payment for work completed and giving diligent consideration to project modifications that have the potential to save time or money without sacrificing desirable project outcomes.

COMMUNICATION: Get accurate information to the right people in a timely manner, utilize proper chain of command and protocol and involve key partners in weekly progress meetings.

CONFLICT RESOLUTION: Finish the project with no unresolved claims or litigation by quickly identifying and resolving issues in a timely, respectful manner and in compliance with designated procedures.