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INTRODUCTION

In September 2016, Mr. Mike. Formby, Interim CEO of the Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transit contacted the North American Transportation Services Association (NATSA) to request a peer review of the agency’s large capital rail project.

Through discussions between NATSA and Agency staff, it was determined the review would be conducted January 9-13, 2017.

A panel of industry peers was assembled that provided expertise in management of large capital programs, contract administration and change order/claims management. The peer review panel consisted of the following transit individuals.

Peer Review Panel Members

Jack Collins
Chief Capital Officer (retired)
Metrolinx/ GO Transit

Carolyn Gonot
Director, Engineering & Transportation Infrastructure Development
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

Mysore Nagaraja
Principal
Mysore Nagaraja Consulting, LLC
NYMTA President of Capital Construction (retired)

Randy Clarke
Peer Review Facilitator, VP of Member Services
American Public Transportation Association (APTA)

The panel convened in Honolulu, HI on January 9, 2017. Panel coordination and logistical support was provided by NATSA Staff Advisor Randy Clarke. All team members also coordinated and provided input in the drafting of this peer review report. Mr. Sam Carnaggio, Project Director, provided agency liaison support on behalf of HART.
Methodology

The NATSA Peer Review process is well established as a valuable resource to the public transport industry. Highly experienced and respected transit professionals, selected on the basis of their subject matter expertise, voluntarily provide their time and support to address the scope required.

The panel conducted this peer review through documentation review, field observations and a series of briefings, listening sessions and interviews with HART and consultant staff from all levels within the organization as well as contracted support. The panel concluded its review with a summary of observations and recommendations to Board Chair Damien Kim, Board Vice-Chair Terrence Lee, Interim CEO K.N. Murthy, Deputy CEO Brennon Morioka and Project Director Sam Carnaggio.

Scope of Report

The scope of this review focused on HART’s rail project, specifically the staff/consultant technical capacity to manage the project and the overall contract administration of the project. The observations and findings provided through this peer review are offered as an industry resource to be considered by HART in support of strengthening the organization’s management and delivery of the rail project.

Peer Review Focus Areas

- Technical Management Capacity and Capability
- Contract Administration
- Change Order Process and Claims Management
- Other Observations and Recommendations
OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

OPENING COMMENTS

- The project, once complete, will significantly improve mobility throughout Honolulu.
- HART staff and consultant staff are engaged and want the project to be successful but staff retention is a challenge.
- HART leadership is managing through historic issues both in contracting decisions as well as delay-based claims.
- The project sections that have completed construction or are under construction appear to be of good quality and have been well designed for future operations.
- Legal challenges and previous contracting decisions have had a significant impact on claims, budget and schedule.
- HART and local and state leaders are in the process of resolving long term funding in conjunction with the development of the FTA FFGA Recovery Plan.
- The Project Management Plan (PMP) exists but is not formally updated consistently and therefore does not appear to be a primary document used to manage the project.

1.0 Technical Management Capacity and Capability

The NATSA panel had a series of interviews over three days and at each meeting and interview the panel engaged the attendees on the topic of technical capacity and capability. In a review of the Project Management Plan, formally updated on July 17, 2012, the panel noted that the project organization is different than what is currently in place, which often happens once the project gets started and project management balances skills with delivery timeframes. In light of that, the panel made the following observations and recommendations.

1.1 Observations

- The majority of the staff are enthusiastic and doing the best they can considering the historic issues they are managing. Staff seems compromised in their ability to deliver the work going forward while also handling previous and outstanding issues resulting from past decisions.
- Current Executive Management has extensive experience delivering large rail infrastructure projects. The current CEO and the Project Director both have excellent experience for delivering a project like HART, but it should be noted that the CEO is interim, anticipated to have a one-year presence on the project.
- The HART Project team appears to be a positive blend of rail technical staff and local construction management knowledge. The experience of building a “mega” rail transit project is heavily brought by the consultant professional services supplemented and complimented by the staff with local knowledge of the stakeholder and processes.
• The frequency of staff turnover is high and impacts project delivery. This often leads to key management positions that are vacant and working knowledge of past activities diminished. The Project Controls team is competent but does not have much depth based on size and complexity of the project. In addition, the Project Controls team appear to be taxed with additional responsibilities related to the Recovery Plan.

• Key decisions will need to be made soon for future O&M operations, particularly in regards to the roles of HART and the City/County. These decisions will influence hiring of key transit O&M oversight staff.

• The requirements to have one-year personal services contracts for HART staff appears to impact recruitment and retention. The current process does not provide HART staff a guarantee of employment year to year even though the role is required on going during project delivery.

1.2 Recommendations

Success of projects of the complexity and magnitude of HART’s Rail System depend heavily on the strength and competence of the management organization. Our team strongly recommends that HART takes the following steps immediately:

• The Director of Design and Construction is vacant and is a key positions to urgently fill.
• Executive management should focus on strengthening the Project Controls team with additional experienced staff focused on scheduling, cost estimation, and trend reporting.
• Management should update the master staffing plan for overall project completion that includes the interim revenue service date, as well as the full line’s revenue service date, including bringing on the appropriate staffing for service testing and pre-revenue operations
• The Board, with the support of management, should analyze options related to the one year personal services contract vs. Civil Service employment to assist with recruitment and retention, especially for critical positions. This action would include taking necessary steps to retain key employees and managers for the duration of the project as continuity of personnel is a key to success.
• HART and City/County should determine long term O&M framework to influence decision on type of CEO to lead HART to successful delivery and revenue service. The focus of the CEO over the next five years will be the construction of the project. In addition, the CEO will be preparing for anticipated interim service beginning in 2020, which will be contracted but based on recent ballot decisions, would be managed or operated by the City/County. HART’s role in revenue service seems undetermined.
• The current project organization is not reflected in the Project Management Plan (PMP). HART should re-evaluate project organization in support of project delivery and update the PMP.
• HART may want to analyze creating a separate Claims Department to resolve past claims which will allow the project team to focus on project delivery. The project team has to
expend resources to resolve claims and anticipated claims at a level higher than anticipated during project delivery based on historical issues. These efforts can impede staff in their ability to deliver the project efficiently. A separate department to focus on the claims and coordinate with the delivery team may allow appropriate focus on for all project team members.

2.0 Contract Administration

The APTA Panel met with the Director of Procurement, Director of Contract Administration, senior staff from the Design and Construction group and key staff from both groups. The two Directors discussed the interdependence and working relationships between all three groups. Common to most transit agencies, the Procurement group takes the lead in contract development (terms and conditions, selection criteria, legal reviews, etc.) and ultimately the recommendation to award. Once contracts are awarded by the Contract Administration group support the day to day execution of the contract in the field by the Design and Construction group.

It was noted that the Manager of Design and Construction recently retired from HART, and the impact of this vacancy is having an impact on the communications between Procurement, Contracts Administration and Design and Construction Groups. The Panel questioned how the group communicates contract related issues? Staff noted that the retired Manager of Design and Construction held regular meetings with the three groups that enhanced communications and issue identification and resolution. These meetings were suspended during the holidays but have resumed.

Another concern was the absence of the Manager of Project Controls at the Contract Administration interview. A separate meeting was held with this group to explore the interaction between Contract Administration and Project Controls and these project controls observations are included in this Contract Administration and Change Order Process sections.
2.1 Observations

- Procedures\(^1\) and scheduling programs being used to manage the project\(^2\) are comparable to industry best business practices utilized for large transit infrastructure projects. However, the reporting of recognized increases in cost trends and claims exposure related to past construction delays appears out of date.

- Contractors are not supplying schedules and re-baseline schedule updates to HART per contract requirements. At contract award, detailed contract schedules utilizing Oracle P6 software are required to be submitted and approved by HART within 210 days of Notice to Proceed. These approved contract schedules are not in place for recently awarded station contracts and the airport segment. Where contractors are late in submitting monthly updates or the original baseline schedule, contractor progress payments are being withheld until submitted. However, this leaves HART somewhat exposed for having accurate schedule progress data. The Construction Management team is updating monthly schedule progress without contractor concurrence, which could lead to future contract disputes. Getting both parties to agree to the baseline contract schedules and monthly updates needs to be accomplished.

- The Master Project Schedule exists but is not fully accurate without project specific schedule updates. The Panel reviewed the current Master Project Schedule Summary dated November 25, 2016. We are concerned that the logic ties from the detailed contract schedules are not sufficiently rolling-up into the monthly Program Master Schedule. It is of critical importance that key contractor logic ties are tied to the Master Project Schedule in order to determine if delays to construction schedules impact the critical path to complete the overall project, or have ripple impacts on other contracts, such as the Core Systems contract that includes an Operations and Maintenance component.

- The Master Project Schedule is not being shared and reviewed with all project team members. While a Summary Master Program Summary is provided in Monthly Progress Reports, it is important that more detailed monthly schedule updates be reviewed by the entire project team in accordance with the Update Process included in approved procedures.

- An approved re-baseline program budget and schedule are needed now.

---

\(^1\) COST CONTROL PROCEDURE 4.PC-07, REV. 2.0 — APRIL 18, 2016

\(^2\) PROJECT SCHEDULING PROCEDURE 4.PC-04, REV. 3.0 — SEPTEMBER 20, 2016
Exhibit 1 – Master Project Schedule Update – Monthly Update Process

1. CEI PROJECT CONTROLS
2. CEI-RE CONSTRUCTION
3. CEI-RE DESIGN
4. DB and DBOM CONTRACTS
5. DBB CONTRACTS
6. DBB FINAL DESIGN CONTRACTS
7. HART LEAD PROJECT SCHEDULER
8. PROCUREMENT, ROW, ENVIRONMENTAL, PERMITS AND FTA ROAD MAP
9. VALIDATE AND PROVIDE UPDATE INFORMATION
10. PRELIMINARY MPS UPDATE
11. NOT OK
12. HART-GE4 REVIEW
13. OK
14. HART PROJECT DIRECTOR REVIEW
15. COMMENTS
16. MPS UPDATE
17. UPDATED MPS TO PMO/CPFA

---

3 PROJECT SCHEDULING PROCEDURE 4.PC-04, REV. 3.0 – SEPTEMBER 20, 2016
There is evidence that a Recovery and Financial Plan update are being developed. A number of implementation scenarios are being explored. A new plan must be finalized and approved by the HART Board as soon as possible to get the project back on track. The Panel reviewed the December 1, 2016 DRAFT Update of the Financial Plan for Full Funding Grant Agreement \(^4\) requested by the FTA and being prepared by HART. We also reviewed The HART Interim Plan\(^5\) (The Recovery Plan) dated September 30, 2016. Both of these plans will form a critical strategy for the successfully completion and phased opening of the project. The re-baselined budget and schedule that result from these plans, once approved, are desperately needed by the Project Team.

Various consultant contracts will expire before the 2025 project completion which may impact institutional knowledge transfer and project commissioning.

2.2 Recommendations

- Master Project Schedule needs to be proactively shared with all project team stakeholders to create a sense of a team schedule
  - HART should have one Master Project Schedule and Budget and Project Controls is responsible for maintaining it
  - Distribute Master Schedule updates to Project Team on monthly basis.
- HART should analyze impact on consultant contract expirations and options to ensure this issue is managed proactively
- Establish a monthly Project Trend Report Meeting that is focused on cost, schedule and quality
- HART should consider measures to force contractors to meet contract requirement to supply a schedule and timely updates
- Team to improve communication and collaboration and cooperation (3 Cs)
- Project Team to keep PMP updated and used as the overarching plan to manage the project
- Benchmark project staff size in relation to other major rail projects

\(^4\) HART DRAFT Update of the Financial Plan for Full Funding Grant Agreement, Updated December 1, 2016
\(^5\) HART Interim Plan, Prepared for: Federal Transit Administration (FTA), September 30, 2016
3.0 Change Order Process and Claims Management

The APTA Panel met with the Director of Procurement, Director of Contract Administration and Change and two Construction Managers from the Design and Construction group that are managing awarded contracts for East and West Areas. The Deputy of Procurement was also present to discuss legal support for active claims.

A follow-up meeting was held with the Director and Deputy Director of Projects Controls, Director of Special Projects (Risk Management) and the Lead Project Scheduler to better understand Project Control’s role in supporting the Change Order Process and how cost and schedule implications of changes and claims are recognized in cost and schedule updates. The Panel explored the Contract Change Procedure 6 with staff and the working relationships between Procurement, Legal, Contracts Administration, Design and Construction and Project Controls.

3.1 Observations

- The team is using industry standard processes and procedures to manage claims and change orders. The Panel reviewed the Contract Change Order Process Flowchart shown in Exhibit 2 to validate that procedures were being followed by staff. The Director of Contracts Administration and Change walked the Panel through the initial steps of change order review from a Contractor Request for Change, Finding of Merit, Technical Review to issue of RFC, preparation of an Independent Cost Estimate, Schedule and Time Impact Analysis.

- The interplay between project team members was evident to the Panel. Of concern is the important role that the Director of Design and Construction plays in validating technical merit and the initial Negotiation Strategy Memo and Independent Cost Estimate for HART in advance of contractor negotiations by the HART Project Manager.

---

6 Contract Change Procedure, 5.CA-11, Rev. 2.0, September 16, 2016
Exhibit 2 – Contractor Change Order Process Flowchart (1 of 2)\textsuperscript{7}

Exhibit 2 – Contractor Change Order Process Flowchart (2 of 2)

\textsuperscript{7} HART Contract Change Procedure, 5.CA-11, Rev. 2.0, September 16, 2016, p.16-17
A review of Project Costs by Contract dated 11/25/16 indicates that change orders (both already executed and pending) to original contract value ratios for contracts DB-120, DB-200 and DBOM-920 are far in excess of normal industry standards (36% for DB-120; 43% for
DB-200 and 16.1% for DBOM-920). This appears to be due to contracting decisions made previously. Other contracts on the list seem to be in initial stages of construction.

- The Project Management Plan (PMP) is a very effective tool to manage mega-projects and is therefore a requirement by FTA. The PMP should be used as a Roadmap for the project from initiation to the end. The PMP should be used as a living document and must be updated periodically (recommend quarterly) to reflect current state of the project’s progress. The peer review team observed that the PMP has not been updated since 2011 and strongly recommend that HART requires the project management team to update the same immediately and to take advantage of PMP updates in the future to actively manage the project. We recommend that the Board and the Executive management of HART makes this mandatory.

- Many of the claims appear to be the result of previous contracting or policy decisions and not related to current project management.

- The potential of additional claims related to delays or future contract sequencing exist. The Project Controls group provided the Panel with a copy of the HART Forecast Costs by Contract with Details for the month of November 2016. The internal report identifies original contract amounts, approved change orders, pending changes, probable changes, possible issues and a forecasted cost at completion. The report is a good tool for indicating change and potential change traffic as well as potential issues.

- Three external firms have been recently procured to concentrate on claims.

- Project Controls procedures on cost and schedule reporting reflect best practices.

- Risk Register and Risk Assessment process follow industry best practice and FTA guidance for large projects.

- The Change Control Board that is referenced in Contingency Management Plan was disbanded in 2012. The Contingency Management Plan set out procedures for establishing a Change Control Board. We believe that the CCB is critical to managing change and should be staffed by the Directors of Procurement, Contract Management and Change, Project Controls and Design and Construction.

- Supporting documentation for change orders include contractor initial proposal and final negotiated amount. Changes in excess of $1 million require Board approval. The Panel reviewed three Change Order approvals submitted to the HART Board of Directors for approval. While we respect the need for transparency in public documents, we are concerned that information is provided on the initial contractor claim, HART’s Independent Cost Estimate, and the final negotiated amount. While all this documentation is part of getting to a final resolution, we believe the best business practice it to only disclose the final negotiated amount to the Board and public. Our concern stems from contractors using this

---

8 HART Forecast Costs by Contract with Details, Report Cut-off Date: November 26, 2016
information to develop pricing and negotiation strategies that might work against the better interests of HART.

3.2 Recommendations

- HART may want to analyze impacts on proactively de-scoping current construction contracts or reaching a global settlement on change orders/claims to minimize future risk concerns.

- HART may want to consider using a Dispute Resolution Board (DRB) to facilitate solutions with their contractors. Ideally a DRB on large complex contracts results in dispute avoidance. We understand that DRB language has been added into the Airport Guideway & Stations Design Build contract. Although the Panel did not review the contract language, in discussions with Procurement and Contracts it appears to be more of a process for flagging potential disputes and elevating them up in the contractors and HART organizations for resolution. This large contract in excess of $800 million would benefit from a formal DRB process where each party selects a DRB member to represent them and then both agree on a third neutral member. The DRB is usually selected from retired industry leaders from the transit and construction industry. The Panel views this as a proactive claims avoidance tool that will be helpful in reducing future claims exposure.

- In order to ensure that cost and schedule Impacts for ongoing work and for future contracts are minimized, peer review team strongly recommends that HART dedicate a group of design engineers and contract administration team to do a thorough review of designs and contracts for remaining work on existing contracts and for future contracts. HART may also opt to have Claims consultants to be part of this review team.

- Analyze creating a separate Claims Department to resolve past claims which will allow the project team to focus on project delivery. Some Construction Management staff have taken on new contract assignments, yet are still burdened with resolving past claims resulting from the injunction delays and utility relocation and permit delays. The Panel recommends reorganizing HART resources to take on the work load associated with past claims to allow HART PMs and CMs to focus on delivery on new contracts and claims avoidance.

- Reestablish a Change Control Board and incorporate into Contract Change Procedure.

- Best industry practice does not include contractor’s initial proposal or the owner’s ICE in the board change order approval documents.

- The CEO change order authorization level is adequate for the West Side project but the East Side project scope and size may warrant adjustments.

4.0 Other Observations and Recommendations

- Establish a more holistic approach to a HART Corporate Risk Register that covers staffing, reputation and long term O&M.
• Evaluate impact on long term asset health based on contractor’s maintenance regime and use of technology. The length of a maintenance contract will impact the investment the contractor makes in ensuring asset life beyond the contract requirements.

• HART and HECO have improved the process for designing, estimating and executing utility relocations. This relationship and cooperation is key for the City Center component of the project and should be a closely managed element for the HART leadership team.

• Build and implement an outreach strategy that fosters credibility with the public.

• Ensure the Construction Mitigation Plan specifically for the City Center Project is proactively managed. This plan includes engagement with community groups, businesses, local elected officials and abutters. This should proactively manage dust, noise, traffic and other construction related impacts.
CONCLUDING REMARKS

The findings of this review are intended to assist HART in strengthening their ability to manage and execute the rail project. The panel sincerely appreciates the support and assistance extended throughout the entire peer review process by all HART and consultant personnel. The panel stands available to assist with any clarification or subsequent support that may be needed.
Appendix A

HONOLULU AUTHORITY for RAPID TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Richard A. White
Acting President & CEO
American Public Transportation Association
300 1 Street NW
Suite 1200 East
Washington, D.C. 20005

Subject: Request for an American Public Transportation Association (APTA) Peer Review

Thank you for our conversation on Friday, September 2, 2016, in which we at the Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation (HART) expressed our interest in having the APTA provide a peer review for our project, the Honolulu Rapid Transit Project (HRT). At the end of the day, our goal is to receive a report that addresses what we can do better to successfully finish this project.

Having received APTA's e-mail conveying the Peer Review Guidelines dated July 2016 and having reviewed these guidelines, HART hereby formally requests a peer review. In accordance with your guidelines, HART is requesting that the peer review focus on:

- Management capacity and capability. Review PMSC, GEC and CE&I roles, appropriateness of manning levels and functionality of HART’s organizational structure given DB contracts;
- Contract administration. Assess strength of organization and opportunities to improve management;
- Change order process/claims management. Assess organizational structure and opportunities for efficiency and improved functionality.

Additionally, HART would ask the Peer Review team to note any other areas of concern they believe should be brought to HART's attention.

As the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has requested that HART have APTA provide the peer review as a part of HART's Recovery Plan for the project, the preferred dates for the peer review are for it to be performed as soon as possible and to have it completed before the end of the year. As requested in APTA's guidelines, HART's staff liaison will be Charles (Sam) Carnaggio, Project Director for HART. His direct office number is (808) 768-6283, cell number (808) 464-5544, and e-mail address ccarnaggio@honolulu.gov. Enclosed is a signed "Letter of Indemnification" as stated in the guidelines.
Thank you for processing HART’s request. We look forward to your response. If any additional information is required, please do not hesitate to contact me at (808) 282-7961 or e-mail me at mformby@honolulu.gov.

Very truly yours,

Michael D. Formby
Acting Executive Director

Enclosure

cc: Mayor Kirk Caldwell
    Council Chair Ernest Y. Martin
    & Councilmembers
    Ms. Colleen Hanabusa, Chair
    HART Board of Directors
    Ms. Carolyn Flowers, Acting Administrator
    FTA
    Mr. Leslie T. Rogers, Regional Administrator
    FTA Region 9 Office
    Mr. Randy Clark, Acting Vice President, Member Services
    APTA
    Mr. Charles S. Carnaggio, Project Director
    HART
APTA PEER REVIEW PROGRAM

This is to acknowledge that the Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation (HART) (transportation organization) has requested the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) to provide for Transportation Organization Peer Review services through APTA’s wholly owned subsidiary, the North American Transit Services Association (NATSA) in accordance with the APTA Peer Review Program Guidelines.

APTA’s Peer Review Program is designed to assist transportation organizations in addressing public transportation-related needs and issues through subject matter experts within the public transportation industry. Through the coordination by APTA and NATSA and the support of their respective own organizations, the subject matter experts convene at the requesting public transportation organization and conduct an intensive review of the issues to be addressed. Peer Review participation is conducted by mutual consensus and through industry acknowledgement that this service is an extremely valuable resource to strengthening and enhancing public transportation functions and effectiveness. The APTA Peer Reviews follow the format as described in the APTA Peer Review Guidelines.

The observations and recommendations as provided through the APTA Peer Review process are provided in good faith and as based upon the experience and skills of the Review panelists. The APTA Peer Review does not, nor is it meant to, represent a full organizational review. The Peer Review is intended to be used as a resource that, in conjunction with other assessment tools, can assist the requesting organization to evaluate their particular needs and issues.

Indemnification: To the extent permitted by law, the Public Transportation Organization agrees to indemnify and hold harmless APTA and NATSA, its officers and employees, and any Peer Review panelists and their respective agencies in the conduct of their activities for claims of any kind (including attorney fees) arising out of the provision of this Peer Review, except to the extent such claims arise or are caused by the gross negligence or willful misconduct of APTA, NATSA, its officers and employees, or Peer Review panelists.

The undersigned, duly authorized representative of the Public Transportation Organization agrees to the terms of the provision of this Peer Review service.

Transportation Organization

By: [Signature]

[Signature - Name and Title of Authorized Representative]

Date: [Blank]
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APTA Peer Review for the
Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation
HRTP Project Review
January 9 to 13, 2017

Agenda

NOTE:
1. All times shown are an approximation
2. HART’s offices are at 1099 Alakea Street. Check in is required with receptionist and main offices are on the 17th floor.
3. The APTA Peer Review Team will be located on the 23rd floor with the Project Management team.
4. HART has a meeting room for the project review team with a screen, projector, easels, flip chart, and marker pens at all times in the meeting room
5. HART has a Wi-Fi connection at all times in the meeting room
6. HART has a photocopying facility at meeting location
7. For site visits, HART will provide PPE. (except boots)
8. HART daily primary contact is Sam Carnaggio at 808-464-5544 (cell). Call any time. Secretary is Donna Lloyd at 808-768-6152.

Sunday January 8, 2017
Various times Peer review team to arrive in Honolulu, HI.
Members to make their own ground transportation arrangements to the hotel.
6:30 pm Peer review team members that are present can meet in hotel lobby for a get acquainted dinner.

Monday January 9, 2017
6:30 am Peer review team briefing in the lobby of hotel
7:00 am Peer review team to meet HART Executive Management (Board Chair Damien Kim, CEO K.N. Murthy, Deputy CEO Brennon Morioka and Project Director Sam Carnaggio) at Liliha Bakery, 580 N. Nimitz Highway, Honolulu for Working Breakfast. Topics to include: Peer Review Overview 1) scope of work, 2) peer review process and 3) schedule.
8:45 am Check in at HART HQ. 1099 Alakea Street, Honolulu
A parking garage is available next to the building. After parking, take elevator to lobby. Take doors on left to building elevators. Go to 17th floor to check in.
9:00 am Peer review team to meet with CEO K.N. Murthy for his impressions after one month on site to include political issues.
9:30 am Peer review team to meet with Deputy CEO Brennon Morioka for local environment, local regulatory issues and history of Project.
10:30 am Peer review team to meet with senior project management to discuss current status of HRT to include overview, schedule and budget (23rd floor) HART Project Director – Sam Carnaggio
12:30 pm  Lunch
2:00 pm  Meet with technical project management team to review PMSC, GEC and CE&I roles and discuss organizational structure. To include staff levels, technical expertise, and future operational considerations. HART Project Director – Sam Carnaggio
5:00 pm  End of Day 1
7:00 pm  Optional Dinner with HART team
  • Peer review members
  • Strategize work plan for Tuesday

**Tuesday January 10, 2017**

7:30 am  Breakfast in the hotel
9:00 am  Check in at HART HQ. Go to 23rd floor.
9:15 am  Meetings with contract administration staff to review organizational roles and responsibilities related to administrative controls. This to include review of SOPs and policies related to all aspects of contract awards, contract oversight and controls. HART Procurement-Nicole Chapman, HART Design – In- Tae Lee, HART Construction – Kai Nani Kraut (West) and Kevin Cox (East)
12:00 noon  Lunch at meeting location
1:30 pm  Meeting with HART personnel and consultants to review change order process and controls. To include interactions between field staff, office staff and project management on how change orders are requested, approved and executed. HART Change Management – Brian Kelleher
3:00 pm  Meeting with FTA’s Project Management Oversight (PMO) Contractor – Jacobs Engineering – Tim Mantych and Bill Tsforias
5:00 pm  End of Day 2
7:00 pm  Dinner (Location TBD)
  • Peer review members
  • Strategize work plan for Wednesday

**Wednesday January 11, 2017**

7:30 am  Breakfast in the hotel
9:00 am  Check in at HART HQ. Go to 23rd floor.
9:00 am  Meeting with HART personnel and consultants to review claims management with concentration on current resolution process and areas for improvement. HART Procurement – Nicole Chapman/Lori Miyasaki
10:30 am  Transport to review a Project alignment and Maintenance Service Facility. HART Acting Chief Safety and Security Officer – Ralph McKinney
12:00 noon  Lunch at meeting location
1:30 pm  Continue with physical tour including on-site meetings or discussions with field personnel on technical capacity of project team and overall contract oversight from a field staff perspective. HART Construction – Kai Nani Kraut

If time permits, peer review team to caucus
5:00 pm  End of Day 3
7:00 pm  Dinner (Location TBD)
• Peer review members
• Strategize work plan for Wednesday

Thursday January 12, 2017
7:30 am  Breakfast in hotel
9:00 am  Check in HART HQ
9:15 am  Peer review team meets with HART personnel to discuss field visit and to obtain any additional information requested during the review period. HART Project Director – Sam Carnaggio
12:00 noon Lunch at meeting location
12:30 pm  Peer review team deliberation and presentation preparation
5:00 pm  End of Day 4
7:00 pm  Dinner (TBD)
• Peer review members
• Discuss findings of the day

Friday January 13, 2017
7:30 am  Breakfast in hotel
9:00 am  Check in at HART HQ. Go to 23rd floor.
9:15 am  Peer review team prepare for exit conference presentation
10:30 am  Exit conference briefing and Q&A with HART Executive Management Team. Board Chair Damien Kim, Board Vice-Chair Terrance Lee, CEO K.N. Murthy, Deputy CEO Brennon Morioka and Project Director Sam Carnaggio
12:00 pm  Peer Review concludes
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**DOCUMENT LIST**

1. HART Organization Charts; Full Organization; December 28, 2016
2. HART Program Controls Department Organization Chart; December 11, 2016
3. HART East Section Construction Engineering & Inspection Organization Chart; January 9, 2016
4. HART West Section Construction Engineering & Inspection Organization Chart; November 1, 2016
5. HART General Engineering Consultant Support Organization Chart; June 1, 2016
6. PMOC December 2016 Quarterly Report
10. Master Project Schedule Summary, (Draft Target Date), January 6, 2017
11. COST CONTROL PROCEDURE 4.PC-07, REV. 2.0 — APRIL 18, 2016
15. Operations and Maintenance Plan, HART -- September 27, 2016
17. Contingency Management Plan, HART – 4.PC, Rev. 1.0 – April 19, 2012
22. Contract Change Procedure, HART, 5.CA-11, Rev. 2.0 –September 16, 2016
23. Claims Avoidance Plan, HART – March 5, 2012
25. HART DRAFT Update of the Financial Plan for Full Funding Grant Agreement, Updated December 1, 2016
27. Three Board Approved Change Order Documents – November-December 2016
29. HART Forecast Costs by Contract with Details, Report Cut-off Date: November 25, 2016