1. Objectives of Committee
   a. Identify areas of potential improvement between GDOT and Consultants or Public.
   b. Identify areas where process improvements might be needed.

2. Old Business
   a. Minutes of Last meeting.
      i. The following sections of the Traffic Signals Public Information Document were assigned for revision and re-writing.
         1. Section #2 Nithin Gomez
         2. Section #3 Paul Slone and Jagan Kaja
         3. Section #4 Bill Ruhsam and Kelly Cory
         4. Section #5 Jim Tolson and Todd DeVos
         5. Section #6 and #7: Scott Zehngraff and Aaron Steede
ii. Xuewen Le has volunteered to help the document design process after the draft content is completed.

iii. The concept of an Operational Analysis Defaults document was discussed.

1. Roundabouts Defaults in Georgia is one possibility for analysis defaults. GDOT Road Design is working on this. They may not release this to the public. The desire is for a designer to have something basic to start with, like 160’ inscribed diameter for single lane roundabouts.

2. Traffic Default Values in GA guidebook might compile all of the above including Synchro defaults, Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) defaults, etc.

3. Discussion

a. Traffic Signal Public Information Document

i. Sunita is be a good person for reviewing the FAQ document from a secondary perspective. She will review the updates that Scott and Aaron have made. [Sunita Task]

ii. Jim suggested a second review by a third party might be useful. Bill said that we should get the first revision pass complete between the Subcommittee and ITE Technical Committee members before releasing for another review. This item to be discussed at the next joint committee meeting.

b. Discussion began for the next main focus of the Subcommittee after the Traffic Signals Public Info Document is concluded:

i. Detail and standards reviews: are there issues on the GDOT standards and details or missing elements? Could any of the existing documents be revised for better utility?

1. Bill suggested that each committee member poll their individual company’s PMs to review the standard and details. The designers/PMs who are day-to-day with them will have better knowledge and insight as to where
there are gaps or lacks, or items needing updates. [Committee Task]

2. There was wide-ranging discussion surrounding the existing details and standards. Jim Tolson will develop a strategy for the committee to pursue. [Jim Task]

ii. Design Policy Manual (DPM)

1. Roundabout section update due to Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) policy was discussed. Scott said that this is being taken care of by other parties.

2. The Design Policy Subcommittee asked the Traffic Subcommittee to discuss the Roundabout design peer review and if any changes to the policy or process are needed. It was decided that incremental reviews have been useful. Preliminary Field Plan Reviews (PFPR) peer reviews have had some conflicts and Final Field Plan Review peer reviews have caused some major headaches because of the need to revise right of way (r/w) at that late date.

   a. Best practice: Peer review needs to happen early (prior to PFPR) to avoid schedule impacts and r/w impacts.

   b. GDOT PMs and Consultant Designers need to actively seek the review early, rather than waiting on milestones. “Fatal Flaw” issues can be identified quickly before a major review milestone such as PFPR.

3. Chapter 13 updates. Chapter 13 of the DPM has been in need of an update since the Forecasting Manual was published. We will look into a review of this chapter by the committee. [Paul task]

   iii. Roundabout/Capacity Analysis standards and guidelines
1. Modeling and microsimulation doesn’t have much a clear review hierarchy. Who/which office is responsible for what reviews on what projects? This could use some clarity for people working on GA projects.
   a. ITE has a task force working on Microsimulation. This committee will coordinate with them to ensure we’re not duplicating efforts. [Sean task]

   a. GA could use some basic defaults and guidelines to both guide studies, and to have common reviews across projects.
   b. Sunita to lead up and assign tasks. [Sunita task]
   c. Jim Tolson discussed bringing in a contractor forum for traffic engineers.
      i. This would be to bring together contractors who build the projects with designers who do not see the field construction. The intention would be to find out what is best practice that we should be designing to, what should be avoided that is causing problems for contractors.
      ii. Need to follow up with GDOT Signals group to discuss this item [Bill task]
      iii. Scott mentioned a roundabout contractor forum to inform designers from the contractor’s perspective what’s working in the field and what could be improved. This will be examined at a later date for possible action.

4. Action Items
   a. Finalize draft of Public Information Document (early December)
   b. Review need for standards and details updates or revisions
   c. Review Chapter 13 of the Design Policy Manual for potential updates
d. Coordinate with ITE Microsimulation Task Force to discuss review procedures and their work to date

e. Develop a draft modeling and analysis Defaults and GA Standards document

5. Next Meeting
   a. December 19th

The above represents our understanding of the items discussed. Please notify us of any discrepancies or questions as soon as possible.