1. **Introductions - Hiral Patel**

- Provided background on GPTQ
- Partnership Goals
  - Work Together
  - Efficiency
  - Quality
  - Provide Best Practices
  - A forum for processes - discussion focused on projects, processes and products
  - Facilitate open discussion share ideas
  - Showcase achievements and quality made by partnership
  - A forum for long term improvements
    - Programmatic issues and processes

---

1. **CRC Task Force Reports (brief report out/update) 10:35 am – 11:00 am**

- **Practical Design Task Force - Allen Krivsky**
  i. Nearing the end of this Task Force effort. Delivered a draft to Hiral. Met and talked about edits to be made. Met last Friday to work through the comments that were made to try to get more specifics and guidance. Looking at a couple of weeks turn around to get through that, get it back to Hiral, and then hopefully get it to the Commissioner.
  ii. Goal to publish by April 2020. Does anyone here want to give their review of the draft? We can email it to you. The more thoughts we get together, the better. We just want to make sure that everybody is on the same page before we publish.
  iii. Feedback from the community? Steering Committee gave some feedback. Additionally, as part of the official rollout it will be presented at the forum. Need to get document blessed before going to the forum and publishing.
  iv. Has Design Policy reviewed yet? They have not reviewed the draft, but they are in the loop with monthly office head meetings. So, they’re in the loop with what’s going on and our approach for practical design. The Task Force met with them along the way to get their input and thoughts on the issues. It’ll be new and it’ll affect a lot of other offices. It’s written at somewhat of a high level to “plant the seed” for Practical Design and then see what changes to go from there.
  v. Question/Comment- This is a snag that always seems to come up on projects. We’re suggesting Practical Design items that seem right now and then it goes through design policy. You’ve got to write various design variances.
Sometimes they give you ominous wording like: “you may not be able to justify this.” So, we’re pretty far down the road when these things come up. We’re already in preliminary plans. Design variances and process will need to be evaluated.

vi. Do you anticipate this portion of the Task Force becoming a subcommittee after the rollout because there’s going to be a lot of issues? There likely will be a need for a subcommittee and this is part of next steps.

vii. There will need to be constant knowledge-sharing. If we do practical design on one project, how do we let everyone else know what’s happening on other projects? It will be important to keep the conversation going as we grow in this whole concept.

• **Design-Build Delivery Task Force**—Allen Krivsky gave update
  
i. They continue to meet.
  
ii. Discussed various management plans and their needs on similar design-build projects.
  
iii. Looking at scalability of different RFPs for different design-builds.
  
iv. Minutes from last November meeting will be posted.

• **3D Modeling Task Force development**—Frank Flanders
  
i. Identified goals at last meeting.
  
ii. Next meeting scheduled for February 6.

• **Planning & Environmental Linkage Task Force** – Phil Peevy/Charles Robinson
  
i. Continue to meet monthly, in addition to some small group meetings.
  
ii. Identified the data sets used in planning environmental linkage process
  
iii. Sent out some questionnaires to get more information to find out more about the environmental linkages processes done on projects that have already been completed.
  
iv. Identified more planning funds to be used for other parts of the process.
  
v. Moving forward, looking at identifying when PEL should be applied to projects/planning studies. Trying to better identify the cost and timesaving that’s associated with using this process. Plan to send out questionnaire and make some follow-up calls to get additional information. Goal is to create one document that shows how to incorporate the planning & environmental linkage process into our overall planning process.

• **Utilities Task Force**–Patrick Allen/Randy Sanborn
  
i. Not present

2. **CRC Subcommittee Reports (brief report out time permitting)**    11:00 am – 11:55 am

• Bridge & Structural – Bill DuVall, George Manning
  
i. Meet every other month. Last meeting in early December. Next meeting coming up in early February.
  
ii. Haven’t really made much progress since the last meeting.
iii. Continuing to develop ABC methodology toolkit. Gotten more people on board to help navigate that and try to develop something.

iv. Sub task force for ABC met last week. Kicked off and working on a mission statement to get everyone focused, and from there start developing.

- **CEI – William Dunwoody, David Graham**  
  i. Got in a little meeting over the holidays.
  ii. No other updates.

- **Engineering Services – Erik Rohde, Scott Jordan**  
  i. Last meeting December 13.
  ii. Should have LIBP lessons learned published in Q1 2020 as result of feedback on post-construction.
    a) Will be coordinated among offices.
  iii. Walt is putting together FPR training to roll out to consultants, districts, and other SMEs that are doing FPRs. This is scheduled for Q1 2020 as well.
    a) Thought was to have real-time, virtual review. SMEs can be at their desk utilizing the Bluebeam software, going through the plans, and having a marked-up set of plans all in Bluebeam. This came to our attention since many GECs were already doing this.
    b) Talking with Solutions Center. Walt is currently in talks with IT to see how it’s all going to work in the districts. Atkins presented a batch of projects, and one project has been identified by Walt to try out Bluebeam. Not 100% sure how that’s all going to work out. Thought process is to test it out on a small project and go from there.
  v. Josh Taylor is developing a cost-estimate guidance document, which should be published later this year. Several rounds of cost-estimate training.

- **Environmental – Eric Duff, Jordan Myers**  
  i. 2 meetings since we last met here.
  ii. Air & Noise met November 7 and elected new GPTQ co-chair.
  iii. Ecology met December 16 and elected new co-chair.
  iv. Meetings were overviews of what they had done over the entire 2019 year up to that point. Began to brainstorm what they need to work on over the next year.
  v. Signed 106 Programatic Agreement with USACE, Federal Highway Administration and SHPO.
    a) Previously, when doing work with the state, if the USACE was the lead agency, all documentation would have to go through USACE for review. Often, things would get sent back for changes/edits. Then, it would be sent back to USACE. USACE would then facilitate that SHPO received the document.
b) That process is very different from the process with the Federal Highway Administration. That was, once approved, GDOT sends the documents straight over to SHPO.

c) We were losing 60-90 days just going back and forth with USACE. With this new PA, we’ll be able to send anything (if USACE is lead agency) straight to SHPO. No longer have to wait for USACE to review everything. (They only have one reviewer, which is why they’re so slow.)

d) Plan on rolling out basic information on this and some basic training for all SMEs and workgroups. This should come relatively soon.

vi. Migratory Bird Treaty Act

a) Before, we’d have to net a bridge in March. If not netted in March, from April-August, you couldn’t do work on that bridge at all. This presented a lot of challenges. Especially if you’ve got things that are letting in February. Also, no real guidance on proper way to install this netting. They’re additionally really expensive (roughly $15,000) and are not reused on other projects.

b) Have partnered with Animal & Plant Health Inspection Services (APHIS). They’re under contact now. Starting this year, for all bridges, they will go out to knock down all old nests prior to nesting time. This partnership will be a lot of help for us, if the contractors work with us. If contractors see birds flying around/beginning to make nests, we have the ability, then, to call APHIS for them to knock the nests down.

c) Intention is not to harm, but to prevent. However, APHIS has special provisions, if needed. APHIS has a similar contract in South Carolina, and they’ve only had to knock down one nest that already had eggs.

d) Coordinated with Federal Highway Administration and Fish & Wildlife Services for the development of this. The key to this is getting out there early to 1) knock down old nests, and 2) prevent new nests from being completed.

e) All of this is to move away from using nets.

f) Working on this special provision right now. As soon as we get this out, we’ll also have training to give everyone an update on the program, and what we’re trying to achieve.

g) Contract with APHIS is around $200,000-$300,000 per year. At around $15,000 per net, this will be HUGE savings.

h) Need to work hard to ensure that contractors are communicative if they see a bird/nest problem. Should not have the mindset of not wanting a federal agency at their site. This will likely be a mind-change for them; however, APHIS is their friend.
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• Materials – Monica Flournoy, Robert Barnes
  i. Last meeting was on Thursday, January 16.
  ii. Two new items have been posted on roads.
    a) One was the assumption guidelines that go with the OMAT spreadsheet.
    b) Second was a new pavement evaluation summary template. This template applies to any new projects going forward. If you’re currently working on a project, it does not really apply, although it may ask for certain comments in its review.
  iii. Pavement group is currently working on revisions for the pavement evaluation guidelines. Also were involved in developing the new pavement design manual that replaced the draft. The target date for this is July 2020. Will be more of a ‘practitioner’s guide,’ with links to references. So, will be a much more concise, abbreviated version which will reference other, more specific materials.
  iv. Training
    a) Working on design package training for Q1.
    b) Also discussed need for new OMAT spreadsheet and assumptions guidelines. Will try to work with Robert and his group on that.
    c) Also discussed need for training on geotechnical template, which we came out with and revised last year. This will probably be more targeted to the geotechnical engineering group. Felt that there was need, with all the new templates and new guidelines, to get everyone up to speed with everything from last year.
  v. Research
    a) Work with UGA on developing new subgrade modulus, which involves pavement design.
    b) Work with rock RQD and rock strength to try to come up with bearing value guidelines for how to develop bearing resistance for drilled shafts.
    c) Looking at load transfer platforms and trying to get platform transfers more into a ground improvement-type system, to get away from LRFD requirements. Looking at different ways, start looking at agrapures that everyone uses in the commercial business. Look at load transfer platforms as a ground improvement method, instead of structure.

• Preconstruction Awards – Tim Matthews, Kristen Kasmire
  i. Will be kicking off 2020 in the next couple of weeks with the first meeting. Will create a timeline during this meeting.
  ii. If anybody has any feedback/complaints about the awards process from last year, email Kristen Kasmire.

• Procurement – Treasury Young, Richard Markwith
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i. We continue to be on a crazy pace for this fiscal year. For 6 months, already at roughly $350 million. Every year for the last 5 years has been a new record. In the weeks leading up to Christmas, we put out notifications for the shortlist of awards for 27 different projects.

ii. Creating of negotiations manual and updates to website have been completed. This has been a multi-year process that Curtis has been leading. Other states are interested in this as well.

iii. DBE utilization task force has drafted policy which has been vetted through the department. We’re ready to put it to industry. Not entirely sure how we’re going to do this
   a) How do we use the DBE consideration in the selection award process? The reason we entertained that was because our commissioner came to our meeting and gave us a charge to figure out how to make it defensible rather than just having standard department goal (16%). He wanted there to be some science behind it, so we’re going with a hybrid approach.
   b) On-call contracts will continue to use DBE goal, as these are harder to predict.
   c) Project-specific contracts will no longer use DBE goal. These will now use scored criteria, probably in Phase 2. (This has yet to be determined completely).
   d) This is one of two allowable non QBS criteria.
   e) What is your firm’s plan for engaging and using DBEs?
   f) Target end of Q1. On next batch.
   g) More scrutiny on tracking? Process for changes during contract?
      Something that Albert is aware of. Responsibility will primarily reside with the project manager, as they’re the ones who are engaged with the projects day-to-day. Albert is interested in the ability to always go back to the consultant’s proposal to see what they proposed, and then you can compare that to what they did. If there’s reason why they had a change of plans, then that should be documented and ultimately approved by the project manager as well.
   h) Challenge: lack of DBEs on certain area classes.

iv. Reference checks in utilizing past performance. Was implemented last year, with more steps this year. Hard to get people to respond to reference checks on projects. No real updates on this.

v. Procurement schedules in Phase 2 are given one week, which can be a tall order. Recommendation that in multi-project contracts, Phase 2 submittal be extended to 2-3 weeks.
   a) Not going to make allowances for firms that happen to be shortlisted on multiple ones. Not going to base our schedule based on the firms. If you don’t want to respond to one, you don’t have to.
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b) However, this will be talked about/wrestled with.
c) Extending affects schedule for award. Original RFQ schedule does not change, so you know what is required. Even if selected for one bundle with 5 bridges.

- Program Delivery – Krystal Stovall-Dixon, Nikki Parris unable to attend—Allen Krivsky gave updates
  i. Finished fishbone exercise.
  ii. Working on helpful checklists to provide consultant PMs about things to consider during the life of the project to help prevent schedule slippage.
  iii. Questions and comments about P6 Schedules:
    a) From conversations with PMs about P6 schedules. P6 schedule is based on anticipated NTP date. The P6 is created from a template based on type of project. It is sent to SMEs or PMs to approve the P6 schedule and then it gets locked in. When a consultant is awarded a contract, we could be 6-8 months into the P6 schedule. We then review the P6 schedule, look at the milestone dates and associate that with our design schedule, knowing what the project entails. Sometimes that P6 schedule does not have all the required tasks and information. Often times when we recognize the P6 is 8 months behind, we’re often told by PMs that you can’t change the schedule anymore. When you take many things into account, your P6 task dates have to change. There’s a lot of conflict with a task is not delivered on the date of the P6 schedule. Has anyone else experienced this conversation with PMs? Could the consultants be allowed to review the P6 schedule, evaluate based on the reality of the project, and then make recommendations to adjust it.
    b) It is very challenging to be working with an unrealistic schedule.
    c) There is an internal understanding with OPD that if the NTP comes late, they should restart the schedule.
    d) It is very challenging when PMs individual task driven vs. milestone driven when schedules are not restarted.
    e) Suggestion that template adjustments are needed. Also need ability to customize to each project. This needs to be considered by OPD & OPC.
    f) Schedule training is upcoming, which provides information on how the schedule is developed.
    g) We will continue this conversation in the future.

- Right of Way – Troy Byers, Jody Braswell
  i. Met a couple of weeks ago
  ii. Discussed feedback on the transportation summit panel discussion—ways to enhance for 2020.
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iii. Working with legal on requests to newspaper work commissioner
iv. Discussed set-asides and potential legal actions, and the need to have some
guidance for PMs and designers if they’re asked to be involved in a trial
v. Working on a PDP flowchart
vi. Met with Ron Battle, to talk about enhancements, to do the right of way
section on the external GDOT websites
   a) Clarifying the difference between right of way services
   b) Ton of things to post to right of way webpage

• Roadway Design Policy – Frank Flanders, Brad Robinson
  i. Big focus is rewriting the drainage manual. Making more of a policy-focused
document
     a) Review, made recommendations, take items out.
     b) Working on one draft and review to make sure we’re making the right
corrections
     c) Then, draft the remainder of it, and review as we go along

ii. OpenRoads:
   a) GDOT, for any in-house design, will be done in OpenRoads as of
      01/01
   b) In-house survey will be done in OpenRoads as of 04/01
   c) Required for consultants for any new projects starting 07/01
   d) Coming very soon.

iii. Feedback
   a) Most is plan/production
   b) Modeling aspect is very good
   c) Plan side is different
   d) Plan Presentation is mostly levels
   e) Other issues that it doesn’t work like InRoads, issue editing limits of
      the file
   f) Working on new EDG
iv. Bentley is not stopping use of SS2, even up to SS4, they are switching to node
    licensing at the end of this year (pay for individual computer installs)—
    waiting to hear more about this
v. Rollout for design? —as survey is performed in OpenRoads, so will design be
    performed in OpenRoads
vi. Any training?
   a) Using Bentley to train everybody
   b) Trying not to do any except for GDOT-specific stuff

• Survey/Mapping – Benny Walden, Tate Jones
  i. Last meeting mid-November
  ii. Discussed CSV file requirements—movement towards OpenRoads design
  iii. Couple of on-going processes
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a. Couple of people working with GDOT engineering software team & SUE group to get more SUE features included in our standard. Trying to replicate what we can do now in InRoads. SUE firms can send standards to assist with developments. Has been a very collaborative process.
b. Potential prequalification change that we’re discussing. To do with drone technology being split into three categories. Still in-process, although trying to get it out quickly. Prequalification coming up in April. Will be an option to use this technology. It will not be required.

- Traffic—Andrew Heath, Sunita Nadella—unable to attend—update from Allen Krivsky
  i. Subcommittee has been working with traffic analysis and report development guidelines workbook—made progress in 2019 & have draft of workbook completed.
  iii. Conference call to kick off 2020.
  iv. Next action item to start sharing guidance we’ve developed so far with OPD and design policy.
  v. Office of Planning and Traffic Ops have already reviewed the work done so far and given their input. Hoping to wrap up this task by mid-2020.

- Training – Kyle Mote, Robert Moses
  i. Last meeting in December
  ii. Will meet again in February
  iii. Pavement design training session coming in Q1. Because of location, did consider recording or broadcasting, but Microsoft Teams restricted to internal at GDOT. Will look to use in upcoming.
  iv. Design & Utilities training being offered in 2020. First session January 28. This will be repeated February 6.
  v. Earthwork training upcoming.
  vi. PDP dates on LMS website.
  vii. MS4 dates not set yet.
  viii. Scheduled training supposed to come out March/April
  ix. 4 NHI sessions identified. Trying to schedule for 2020. Four classes: Urban Drainage, HSM, RFD Superstructures, Construction of MSE Walls
  x. Need website for all training opportunities in one place—Ron Battle helpful for website

3. Open Discussion
   • No open discussion

4. Conclusion
   i. Next CRC meeting in March 17, 2020, 10:30am, Room 403/404