

Six Sigma DMAIC Improvement Story

Green Belt Project Objective:

To Reduce the Length of Time to Launch **Capital Project**

Last Updated: 04.15.13

Team: PWWM Capital d/b/a Slate Consulting

Gaspar Miranda (Co-Team Leader) Anita Gibboney (Co-Team Leader) Maria E. Johnson Michael Bauman Asok Ganguli Sandra Melean Andrea Brown

Kathleen Woods-Richardson (Sponsor)



Identify Project Charter

The team developed a team Project Charter.

| | | Project Charter | 2 🔽 | | | | | | |
|------------------|---|---|-----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Project Name: | Reduce Cycle time to launch PWWM Capital Projects | | | | | | | |
| Business Case | Problem/Impact: | WWM Capital Projects are important to be completed timely for continuat nd improvement of services provided to county customers. | | | | | | | |
| | Expected Benefits: | Improvement will result in reduced time to launch PWWM Capital Projects | | | | | | | |
| | Outcome Indicator(s) | Q4- # of DaysCapital project Completed Late | | | | | | | |
| | Proposed Target(s) | Target=TBD | | | | | | | |
| Objectives | Time Frame: | Nov 2012 through March 2013 | | | | | | | |
| | Strategic Alignment: | Supports the County's Business Plan | | | | | | | |
| | In Scope: | PWWM Capital Projects | | | | | | | |
| Scope | Out-of-Scope: | Non-PWWM Capital projects | | | | | | | |
| | Authorized by: | Kathleen Woods-Richardson | | | | | | | |
| | Sponsor: | Kathleen Woods-Richardson | | | | | | | |
| | Team Leader: | Team Leader: Gaspar Miranda and Anita Gibboney | | | | | | | |
| Team | Team Members: | Maria E. Johnson, Mike Bauman, Asok Ganguli, Sandra Melean, Andrea Brown | | | | | | | |
| | Process Owner(s): | Assistant Director | | | | | | | |
| | Mgmt Review Team: Antonio Cotarelo; Chris Rose; Kathleen Woods-Richardson | | | | | | | | |
| | Completion Date: | 31-Mar-13 | | | | | | | |
| Schedule | Review Dates: | Monthly and Final Review in March 2013 | | | | | | | |
| Conodalo | Key Milestone Dates: | See Action Plan | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |







Review Process Flow Chart



Hidden Costs of Late Capital Projects

The team identified info on costs of late Capital Projects

Annual Cost

1. Construction delay cost (on an average \$5 million contract with a year delay)

2. Managing Project Backlog

3. Design rework

Hidden Costs = \$277,750

**This information is based on the table of Construction Cost Inflation Factors published by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Office of Policy Planning.







Identify Data Collection Needs

The team developed a data collection spreadsheet.

Miami-Dade Capital Project Status Summary

| BC | B DEMOGRAPHICS | | | | | | | | | | MILE | STONE D | ATES | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------|--------------|-------------------------|---|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| | | | | | WHAT | | | | | WHERE | | | WHO | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | E | В | с | D | Е | G | | н | J | к | L | Μ | N | 0 | Ρ | Q | R | S | U | V | W | x | Y | Z | AA | AB |
| Line # | Proj | iject F # De | Project esc'ptn | Project Type | G Kight-of-Way ✓ Acquistion? | Tota Cost Avg \$5,576, | al Fur (\$) Sc 1 (426 | nding purce % | Pist Cap Prict Phys Loc'n | District Served | Muni- cipality | A/E PM | Design PM | Con- struction PM | 1- A/E Selection Start Date | Day % Mo 20.0 | 2- A/E Selection End Date | Day % Mo 15.0 | 3- Design Start Date | Day % Mo 40.0 | 4 Design End Date | Day % M 25.0 | 5- Cntrcto Selectio Start Date | or on Day % Mo 5.0 | 6- Cntrctor Selection End Date | Day % Mo 15.0 |
| | 1 6E | =+06 W | IDEN N I | Roadwa | Ν | \$8,314 | ,000 | | | | | Leandro I | Leandro | Frank Aira | 1/28/03 | Tu | 12/14/03 | Su | 8/4/03 | Мо | 7/1/04 | Th | 12/6/0 | 6 We | 6/4/07 | Мо |
| | 2 6E | +06 IN | | Roadwa | N | \$8,201 | .,000 | | | | | Leandro L | Leandr | Frank Air | 9/29/03 | Мо | 6/7/04 | Th | 1/3/05 | Mo | 12/11/0 | 6 Mo | 9/12/0 |)6 Tu 7 Th | 7/31/07 | Tu |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1 | DURAT | TION | | | | TADOLL | | 10 | | | | | | | | | OUTCO | OMES | | | | | |
| AC R- |)= P | AD= U-R | AE= W-U | AF= Y-W | A | AG= \A-Y | AH= AA-P | AI | AJ | AK | AL | AN | Л | AN= Today-AM Due | AO= Today-AL Due | AP= R- (P+Al) | AQ= W- (U+AJ) | AR= AA- (Y+AK) | AS= AP+ AQ+AR | AT AA (P+A | | U= (' if <=AI _ / | AV= 'Y' if AE <=AJ | AY= 'Y' if \G <=AK | BA= 'Y' if AU=AV= AY='Y' | BB |
| A/E Sta | Sel / | A/E Sel End | Design Start | Desig End | n Cnt | trtr Sel Start | A/E Sel Start | A/E Se Start | Design Start | Cntrtr Se Start | A/E Sel Start | | | | # of Days Until | Phase 1 # of Days | Phase 2 # of Days | Phase 3 # of Days | # ol Days | # c Day | of ys A | /E | Design (| Cntrctr | All Project | |
| T | C | TO | TO | TO | | TO | TO Castada O al | TO | TO | TO Centerte C c | TO Castata Ca | I New Mil | | # of Days | Contractor | A/E | Design | Cntrctr | All | Cap | Prj Se | lctd | Ended | Selctd | Phases | |
| A/E Er | Sei | Start | End | Start | | End | End | A/E Se End | End | End | End | | estone e | stone Due | Selection | Late | Late | Late | Late | Cmp Lat | te ir | n- ne? | Time? | On- Time? | Un- Time? | Comment |
| | | | Avg | # of Day | s | | | | Avg # | of Days | | | | # Past Due | # Past Due | | A | verage # | of Days | | K | | %Y | es | | |
| 24 | 5.8 | 51.1 | 795.1 | 67.3 | 3 | 19.3 | 1478.5 | 289.2 | 464.2 | 271.6 | 1025.0 | | | 0 | 0 | -51.4 | 335.9 | 45.9 | 330.4 | 448 | 8.7 | 5.0 | 30.0 | 25.0 | 5.0 | |
| Р | 1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | | P5 | P6 | | | | | | | P7 | P8 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q3 | Q | 4 0 | 25 | Q6 | Q7 | Q8 | |
| 32 | 20 | -132 | 332 | 888 | | 180 | 1588 | 449 | 365 | 307 | 1121 | **Cntr Se | elected* | NA | NA | -129 | -33 | -127 | -289 | 46 | 7 | Y | Y | Y | Y | |
| 40 | 2 | 60 | 707 | -90 | | 322 | 1401 | 449 | 365 | 307 | 1121 | **Cntr Se | elected* | NA | NA NA | -47 63 | 342 682 | 15 | 310 | 28 | 0 | Y N | N | N | N | |
| |) | <u>.</u> | 1171 | -30 | I | | Def | ine | - 300 | Mea | sure | An | naly | ze | Impr | ονε | | ntro | | | <u> </u> | | 5 | | | ADE |

Review Selected Indicator

The team collected Q4 indicator data and reviewed performance trends:



Q4- # of Days Capital Project Launched Late

Capital Project (date Launched)

The team next looked closer at the Gap.



Define Measure Analyze Improve Control



6

Stratify the Problem

The team stratified 20 Launched Capital Projects using a histogram and found...



Stratify the Problem

The team compared the LATE Projects to the TIMELY Projects and found...

Launch Capital Projects



The team looked more closely at the 16 LATE Projects for the Design Step.





Stratify the Problem



The team stratified the 16 Late Launched Projects for the Design Step and found...



Stratify the Problem (Continued)

The team stratified the 133 Invoices Paid Late many ways and found...



Problem Statement: *"11 Late Launched Roadway Projects (launched 6/2007 thru 10/2010) were all late in Design step and took on average 524 days longer in the Design Step over Timely Launched Projects"*





Identify Potential Root Causes



The team reviewed Project records and interviewed involved staff before completing Single Case Bore Analysis.





Identify Potential Root Causes



The team completed Cause and Effect Analysis and found...



Verify Root Causes

The team collected data to verify the root causes and found.... 11.,12.

| | Root Cause | Verification Matrix | |
|----|--|--|--------------------------|
| Ро | tential Root Cause | How Verified? | Root Cause or Symptom |
| A | Public Hearing/ Input Process is not well designed to gain concensus for deadlines from all parties | Team reviewed the Procedures for Public hearings | Root Cause |
| В | No formal Service agreements to establish Priority and responsibilities | Team reviewed the Procedures for Public hearings | Root Cause |

...both potential root causes were validated as a root causes.







Identify and Select Countermeasures

The team brainstormed many countermeasures and narrowed them down to these for evaluation:

| Countermeasures Matrix | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---------------|-----------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | Legend: | 5=Extremely 4=Very | 3=Moderat 2=Somew 1=Little c | ely hat r None | | | | | |
| Problem Statement | Verified Root Causes | Countermeasures | Effectiveness | Feasibility | ::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::: | Overall Take Action? Yes/No | | | | | |
| | | A1- Advertise Project on County Website | 2.5 | 5 | 12.5 | Y | | | | | |
| | | A2- hold Public hearing sooner | 5 | 5 | 25 | Y | | | | | |
| "11 Late Launched | A - Public Hearing/Input | A3- Set Standards for what "Can" and "Can't be Changed" | 5 | 4 | 20 | Y | | | | | |
| Roadway Projects | Process is not well designed | A4- Provide Alternate Design Options to Public | 4 | 3 | 12 |) Y (| | | | | |
| thru 10/2010) were all late in Design | to gain concensus for deadlines from all parties | A5- Provide Earlier notification and Concensus on Process and Deadlines from Elected Officials/Public | | | | | | | | | |
| average 524 days | | 5 | 5 | 25 | Y | | | | | | |
| Design Step over | | A7- Select Appropriate & knowledgeable presente | | | | | | | | | |
| Projects" | B - No formal Service | B1- Develop Inter / IntraService Agreement and protocol for securing agreement | 4 | 5 | 20 | Y | | | | | |
| | agreements to establish Priority and responsibilities | B2- Develop Team (with responsibilities and is part of performance evaluation) with Points of Contact for key depts involved in Capital Project | 4 | 4.5 | 18 | Ŭ | | | | | |

The team selected 9 countermeasures for implementation.





Identify Barriers and Aids



The team performed Barriers and Aids analysis on the selected Countermeasures.

Countermeasure(s): Implement 9 Countermeasues to Improve Timeliness of Capital Projects

| | Barriers | Aids | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Impact (H, M, L) | Forces against Implementation | Forces For Implementation | | | | | | |
| Н | 1) Laws may restrict or prevent countermeasures (Supported by Aid: C,E) | A) County has an existing Website | | | | | | |
| H | 2) Politicians/Agencies may push back on changes (Supported by Aid: A,B,C,D, E) | B) Everyone wants Project Benefits | | | | | | |
| Μ | 3) Public may push back on Changes | C) Mayor and many elected Officials are very supportive of Projects | | | | | | |
| | (Supported by Ald: A,B,C,D) | D) Beneficial Impact on Cost and Time Savings | | | | | | |
| Н | 4) Changes could cost more (Supported by Aid:A, B,C,D, E) | E) Management very supportive of team's efforts in saving costs | | | | | | |

The team next sought to incorporate this analysis into the team's Action Plan.





Develop and Implement Action Plan

Legend: = Actual = Proposed

| The team implemented an Action Plan for the team's Countermeasures. | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------|--------|------------|----------------------|-------|------|---------|-------|
| W | HAT: Implement 9 Countermeasues to Improve | I Imeliness of Capital Projects | | | | | | | |
| | LIOW | | 2013 | | | | | | |
| 1. | Develop Countermeasures: | | Jan | Feb | Mar | April | May | Jun | Jul |
| | A1- Advertise Project on County Website | Andrea/Anita | [| | 02/2 | 8/13 | 4 | | |
| | A2- hold Public hearing sooner | Gaspar/Maria/ Mike | | | 2/28/13 | | | | |
| | A3- Set Standards for what "Can" and "Can't be Changed" | Gaspar/Maria/ Mike | [I | | 2/28/13 | 3 | | | |
| | A4- Provide Alternate Design Options to Public | Gaspar/Maria/ Mike | | | 2/ | 28/13 | | | |
| | A5- Provide Earlier notification and Concensus on Process and Deadlines from Elected Officials/Public | Gaspar/Maria/ Mike | | | 2/28/1: | 3 | | | |
| | A6- Establish upfront "Core Group" from Community to review Design(s) /Options | Gaspar/Maria/ Mike | | | 2/28/13 | 3 | | | |
| | A7- Select Appropriate & knowledgeable presenter | Gaspar/Maria/ Mike | ſ | | 2/28/1: | 3 | | | |
| | B1- Develop Inter / IntraService Agreement and protocol for securing agreement | Gaspar/ Anita | | | 2/28/1: | 3 | | | |
| | B2- Develop Team (with responsibilities and is part of performance evaluation) with Points of Contact for key depts involved in Capital Project | Gaspar/ Anita | C | — 2 |] 2/18/13 | | | | |
| 2. | Secure Management Approval of Countermeasures (share benefits and Time savings) | Team | | | | 3/15/ | 13 | | |
| 3. | Communicate/Train Staff in Countermeasures and related policies/procedures (share Improved Service & Time savings) | Team | | | | | | 4/30/13 | |
| 4. | Implement Countermeasures | Team | | | | | | 6/3 | 30/13 |
| 5. | Establish On-going responsibilities and standardize countermeasures into operations | Team | | | | | On-g | | |





Review Results



The team collected indicator data and reviewed results of it's countermeasures



Standardize Countermeasures



The team revised indicators and incorporated the improvements into the Process flowchart.



The team looked to standardize the Indicator monitoring

Standardize Countermeasures



The team Developed a Process Control System (PCS) to monitor the process on-going.

| Process Control System | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Process Name: Launch Public Works and Waste Process Owner: Assistant Director | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mana | gement (PVVVM) Capital Pro | Jects | | Critical Customa | r Beguire | mente: Lou | noh Drojaat | | | | |
| FIOCE | ess customer. County tax p | Jayer | | Timely and accortable to community | | | | | | | |
| Proce | ess Purpose: Secure A/F | Design | and | Current Sigma L | evel: TBC |) | | | | | |
| Secure Contractor timely Outcome Indicators: 01 02 03 04 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Process and Quality Indicators | | | Checking / Indicat | or Monitorii | ng | Contingonov Plana (| | | | |
| | Process Indicators | Control | | | Timeframe | | Misc. | | | | |
| | And | Limits | D | ata to Collect | (Frequency) | Responsibility | Actions Required | | | | |
| | | Specs/ | What | is Checking Item | VVhen to | Who will | • Procedure | | | | |
| | Quality Indicators | Targets | or Ind | icator Calculation | Data? | Check? | References | | | | |
| P1 | # of Days to Advertise for | TBD | # of Day | s to Advertise for | By | A/E PM | Capital Project | | | | |
| | Consultant (from Approved Capital Project) | | Consulta Capital E | nt (from Approved Project) | project | | Status Summary | | | | |
| P2 | # of Days to Approve | TBD | # of Day | s to Approve | Ву | A/E PM | Capital Project | | | | |
| | Consultant (from | | Consulta | int (from | project | | Status Summary | | | | |
| | Advertisement) | | Advertise | ement) | - | D · D | | | | | |
| P3 | # of Days to Approve Final Design (from Approved | IBD | # of Days | s to Approve Final | By | Design PM | Capital Project | | | | |
| | Consultant) | | Consulta | int) | project | | Status Summary | | | | |
| P4 | # of Days to Advertise for | TBD | # of Day | s to Advertise for | Ву | Const PM | Capital Project | | | | |
| | Contractor (from Design | | Contract | or (from Design | project | | Status Summary | | | | |
| D5 | Approved) # of Days to Approve for | трп | Approve | a) s to Approve for | By | Const PM | Capital Project | | | | |
| FJ | Contractor (from | | Contract | or (from | project | | Status Summarv | | | | |
| | Advertisement) | | Advertise | ement) | | | • | | | | |
| P6 | # of Days to Approve for | TBD | # of Day | s to Approve for | Ву | Const PM | Capital Project | | | | |
| | Contractor (from Approved Capital Project) | | Contract | or (from Approved Project) | project | | Status Summary | | | | |
| Q1 | # of Days A/E Secured Late | 0 | (Date A/ | E Secured)- (Date | Ву | A/E PM | Capital Project | | | | |
| | | | A/E Due |) | project | | Status Summary | | | | |
| Q2 | # of Days Design Completed | 0 | (Date De | sign Completed)- | By | Design PM | Capital Project | | | | |
| | | | (Date De | | project | | Status Summary | | | | |
| Q3 | # of Days Contractor | 0 | (Date Co | Intractor Secured)- | By | Const PM | Status Summary | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q4 | # of Days All Phase | U | | Phases Secured)- | By | Const PM | Status Summary | | | | |
| | Completed Late | | | Thuses Duej | project | | Glatus Guilliary | | | | |
| Q5 | # of Days Capital Project | 0 | (Date Ca | pital Project | Ву | Const PM | Capital Project | | | | |
| | launched Late | | Complete | ed)- (Date Capital | project | | Status Summary | | | | |
| | | | project D | ue) | | | | | | | |

The team looked ahead to the future.



Approved:

Define Measure Analyze Improve Control

Date:

Rev #: _____



Rev Date:

Identify Lessons Learned



Lessons Learned

- 1) Root Cause Analysis tools (Single Case Bore & Fishbone) helped the team identify Potential Root Causes: "Standards that Failed or People Failing Standards"
- 2) DMAIC Process was systematic and effective for problem Solving. The team learned to trust the process and "Let the Data take you to the Root Causes"
- 3) Be open minded to new ways to do work.... Creative Thinking Techniques helped the team think "Outside the Box"
- 4) Centralized Data collection worked best for managing and analyzing our Capital Projects process

Next Steps

- 1) Implement countermeasures
- 2) Monitor performance

Results will take time





