

**NCHRP Domestic Scan 07-02
Accelerated Construction Techniques
Webinar on Six-Month Survey Results**

CTC & Associates LLC
January 31, 2011

Facilitators

- ❑ Patrick Casey, Investigator
CEO of CTC & Associates

- ❑ Dylan Casey, Co-Investigator
CTC Associate
Faculty, St. John's College, Annapolis

Scan Participants

- ❑ Brian Blanchard, Florida DOT, co-chair
- ❑ Christopher J. Schneider, FHWA, co-chair
- ❑ Thomas Bohuslav, Texas DOT, co-chair (now retired)
- ❑ Richard H. Sheffield, Mississippi DOT
- ❑ Steven. D. DeWitt, North Carolina Turnpike Authority
- ❑ George Raymond, Oklahoma DOT
- ❑ Stuart Anderson, Texas A&M University, SME
- ❑ Cliff J. Schexnayder, Arizona State University, SME

NCHRP Domestic Scan Project Panel

- Mr. Harold R. “Skip” Paul, P.E., Director LTRC, chair
- Dr. Shane Brown, Washington State University, panel member
- Ms. Nancy L. Chinlund, CALTRANS, panel member
- Ms. Marsha Fiol, Virginia DOT, panel member
- Mr. Rick Kreider, Kansas DOT, panel member
- Mr. Glenn E. Roberts, P.E. New Hampshire DOT, panel member
- Ms. Amy Schutzbach, P.E. Illinois DOT, panel member
- Mr. Mark A. Van Port Fleet, P.E. Michigan DOT, panel member
- Mr. David M. “Mike” Burk, FHWA liaison
- Keith M. Platte, AASHTO liaison
- Mr. Mark R. Norman, TRB liaison
- Dr. Andrew Lemer, TRB, NCHRP Staff
- Ms. Sheila Moore, TRB, NCHRP Staff

Accelerating Innovation–Tracing Domestic Scan Impacts NCHRP 20-68B(02)

- ❑ Review of the effectiveness of the Domestic Scan Program in fostering the implementation of innovative technologies and practices
- ❑ Special interest in evidence of technology transfer beyond original core participants
- ❑ Continuation of a more in-depth review completed for two pilot scans

Survey Goals

Identify:

- Progress toward implementation of technologies and practices identified in each scan's implementation plan
- Benefits of the Domestic Scan Program to you, your agency, and industry as a whole
- Completed or planned dissemination activities
- Names of individuals (beyond participants) who have heard about scan findings

Webinar Goals

- ❑ Review and discuss survey results
- ❑ Share successes and challenges in implementing scan technologies and practices
- ❑ Reconnect with fellow scan team members
- ❑ Discuss role of scan participation once the final report is complete

Survey: Conduct of Scan

Conduct of Scan. Please rank each of the following scan program features in terms of its contribution to the overall value of this particular scan tour, where 1 is “not important” and 5 is “extremely important.” If it did not apply to your scan, please pick N/A (Not Applicable).

Answer Options	Not Important				Extremely Important		N/A	Response Count
Preparatory materials and meetings in advance of the scan tour	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
On-site visits to view the subject technology or practice	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Face-to-face technical exchange with host state personnel and other scan participants	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Final report of scan findings	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Post-scan consultation with host state personnel and other scan participants	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2

Survey Results: Scan Outcomes

Scan Outcomes. Please rank each of the following scan program outcomes in terms of its contribution to the overall value of this particular scan tour, where 1 is “not important” and 5 is “extremely important.”

Answer Options	Not Important		Extremely Important		Response Count	
Introduction to a new technology or practice	0	0	1	1	0	2
Clearer understanding of a new technology or practice	0	0	2	0	0	2
Identification of one or more individuals at a host state to call on as a future resource	0	0	0	2	0	2
Identification of one or more scan participants to call on as a future resource	0	0	0	2	0	2
Information with which to begin implementation of a technology or practice at your agency	0	0	2	0	0	2
Information with which to <u>continue</u> implementation of a technology or practice at your agency	0	0	0	2	0	2

Scan Results: Value of Scan

I believe the host state's take pride in getting to showcase their success stories and receive this type of national recognition; just a fringe benefit to the scan program I think.

Survey Results: Implementation

Did your participation in the scan facilitate the implementation of any new practices or technologies?

Yes – 0 No – 2

Are any implementations planned within the next year?

Yes – 1 No – 1

Planned Implementations:

"Construction Manager / General Contractor" (CM/GC) alternative project delivery method. Adopted and prominently used by Utah DOT, look for more widely spread use among US state DOTs. An FHWA EDC initiative.

Prefabricated Bridge Elements and Systems (PBES). Anticipate more widely spread application of standardized bridge elements by US state DOTs to shorten highway project delivery. A FHWA EDC initiative.

Survey Results: Implementation

- ❑ Number of respondents who attempted an implementation without success: *none*
- ❑ Number of contacts provided regarding current or planned implementation activities: *none*
- ❑ Number of contacts outside the agency provided: *none*

Non team-member contacts regarding implementation (and even dissemination) are essential to tracing the extent of technology transfer attributable to the scan.

Survey Results: Dissemination

One respondent listed a recent presentation:

- Annual WASHTO Meeting

Discussion

- ❑ Survey results
- ❑ What have been the successes and challenges in implementing scan technologies and practices?
- ❑ How does the scan fit in with the way you obtain and transmit knowledge about practices and technologies in your work?

Next Steps

- ❑ Final participant survey in six months
- ❑ Survey of accumulated contacts in six months – tracing impact of scan beyond initial participants

www.domesticscan.org