1. Opening
   a. 10/20 Transportation Summit briefly discussed. A PPT of subcommittee accomplishments which
devolved as part of the 10/20 GPTQ subcommittee award were provided to the group.
   b. GPTQ webpage now includes a “what’s new” section – https://www.acecga.org/pages/GPTQ
      o Intent is to highlight the most recent posted subcommittee minutes.
      o Please continue to take minutes of the meetings.
      o This is the best way to communicate what is going on to the broader consultant community.
   c. Subcommittees should begin focusing on next year’s subcommittee initiatives. If a broader audience is
      needed, beyond the subcommittee committee members, then please consider. In the past, the
      environmental subcommittee performed a survey monkey of the industry as part of their effort to organize
      ideas around best practices.
   d. Schedules – open discussion
      o Rob mentioned that Albert Shelby noted in prior meetings that major schedule milestones are
        consistently being missed. Doesn’t seem to be a primary trend or one consistent reason and
        affecting all types of projects. Group discussed opportunities to address.
      o GDOT using new resources, e.g. Government Estimator, to build a more reliable baseline based on
        risks, types of projects, etc.…
      o GDOT is working to provide more information to consultants as projects are being advertised such
        as typical sections, possible risk matrix, schedule milestones… to communicate what GDOT is
        thinking.
      o While a more accurate baseline at the start of the project will certainly help, building/maintaining a
        culture of schedule management from all parties involved in the delivery process may also be
        needed. Cradle to grave, anticipating change, no-excuses mentality, knowing when to
        constructively escalate issues, etc.…
      o Albert encouraged PMs to build a relationship with GDOT’s District Program Manager (DPM).
      o Albert said that invariably things will come up during projects and that folks need to proactively
        communicate to the team, to the DPM and then to Albert/Kim if items needs to be escalated. A re-
        boot of schedules is sometimes needed.
      o Can consultants see GDOT P6 baselines, currently consultants get a spreadsheet of major
        milestones? Work with your GDOT PM. The major milestones are what the consultant should be
        managing to.
      o Group discussed time frames for Consultant and GDOT PM developing TO scopes, and GDOT
        PM obtaining independent mh est from SMEs prior to submitting to TSP.
        i. OPD is tracking these timeframes for the TOs leading to concept approval. Not tracking
           timeframes for subsequent TOs.
        ii. During monthly required meetings between GDOT PM and consultant, in progress/subsequent
            TOs should be discussed. If issues, then consultant should escalate.
        iii. Once scope is nailed down then GDOT PM should request ind mh est from SMEs. SMEs
            have 10 days to provide.
        iv. There are still some challenges with scope understanding between consultant and GDOT
            SMEs. The goal is to have all parties on the same page during the development of the TO
            scope. In some cases, the initial scope discussion does not always include GDOT SME that is
            preparing ind mh which could cause a difference in scope assumptions.
        v. One consultant mentioned that after a successful scoping meeting, the revised scope didn’t line
           up with what was discussed. Negotiations Manual may can clarify.
        vi. OPD is responsible for “shaking things loose” with internal mh estimates if that is needed to
            keep things on track. Same goes for consultants, they need to be responsive and help drive the
            process.
vii. Albert said the goal is to not get wrapped around the axle on minor issues regarding scope. If these minor issues arise and can’t seem to get resolved, then escalate. Eric Duff said too if there are these issues with env scope then let him know.

viii. Group discussed limitations in fee proposal spreadsheet which only allow enough room for a brief outline of scope assumptions.

ix. Group asked if consultants could attach scope assumptions to task order. Response was no.

x. Group discussed consultants requesting funds shift between phases and the GDOT PMs having the ability to approve such requests.

2. CRC Subcommittee Reports
      - Last met in August. Next meeting in January 16.
      - Recruiting – going better than expected.
      - Training – subcommittee focused on training as high priority. Training to include fundamentals, advanced training and joint training.
      - Technology – tablets for limited use with GDOT staff. Evaluating consultant use of tablets.

      - Rob Lewis on behalf of Greg and Bill provided a very brief report from their most recent mtg.
      - CONSPAN and RCPIER task force efforts continue.
      - Innovations continue to be evaluated.
      - Most recent minutes posted [here](http://www.acecga.org/pages/CRCBridgeStructuresSubcommittee).

      - Cost estimates require new routing form to be included.
      - Erik Rohde prepared spreadsheet showing HMA pay items and background on when to use. These are included in minutes and posted at GPTQ webpage.
      - CES pay item update.
      - Post Construction Evaluations (PCE) – Walt is preparing a new list.
      - In the context of schedules, deadlines continue to be missed per dates shown in the Letting Schedule for Processing Projects.
      - Erik Rohde may present at the January Transportation Forum.

        - Draft of Joint Coordination Procedures (JCP) is at agencies for review.
        - Discussed Local Coordination Process.
        - Working on programmatic agreement with National Marine Fisheries Services (NMFS). Also GDOT funding a position for NMFS.
        - Working group focused on survey methodology for species.
      - Arch – Short form being updated to also be used for more inclusive finds.
      - NEPA –
        - Public Involvement working group.
        - PCE agreement comments from FHWA anytime now.
        - Abbreviated FONSI to FHWA.
        - ICI, EJ templates being developed.

      - No report – refer to GPTQ webpage for minutes.
   - Recently met to debrief.
   - Planning award being considered.
   - Also, will provide more definition for rural and urban categories.

   - Consultant evaluations – has been rolled out as a pilot with some consultants.
     i. IT making a couple of modifications to CMIS.
     ii. If consultant “does not meet” then escalated to GDOT Office Head and AOH prior to consultant being notified.
     iii. Albert said for those “special” projects where a consultant is told to deliver and not to worry about having everything complete to meet a schedule; Hiral/Albert working on how best to “normalize” consultant evaluations in this instance. Eric reminded group that consultant can provide info in their response.
     iv. Albert said GDOT is looking for trends for consultant’s evaluations. When other scores are favorable, one negative score will not move the dial so to speak.

h. Program Delivery – [http://www.acecga.org/pages/CRCProgramDeliverySubcommittee1](http://www.acecga.org/pages/CRCProgramDeliverySubcommittee1)
   - Subcommittee will now meet bimonthly. Next meeting is Jan 10.
   - Due to Continuing Resolution (CR) through December, GDOT has a $1B shortfall. GDOT is having to prioritize Task Orders. This will impact some project schedules.
   - The subcommittee has been discussing effects of time extensions during construction as to why they are happening and resulting effect on traffic control, erosion, etc… pay items.
   - Program Delivery webpage is up and running. Please visit.
   - Subcommittee has solicited ideas for 2018 subcommittee initiatives, and is starting to focus on next year.
   - PM Roundtable – 2 held last year, 2 being planned for 2018.
   - TIA briefly discussed. May referendum for new regions.

   - Next subcommittee meeting is Dec 20.
   - “Best Practices” training which was cancelled in 2017 is being planned for Feb 2018.
   - Continue evaluating join training opportunities.
   - Utilities training has been scheduled.

   - Meet next in Jan.
   - DPM Chapter 12 for staging plans – detailed outline has been prepared. Next meeting is with GDOT District Construction to review outline prior to populating with content. Targeting Summer 2018 to roll out.
   - Concept Report – group discussed CR.
     i. Dan noted an improvement with quality of CRs.
     ii. Dan cautioned that 100 additional CR from the traffic ops projects is expected to come online. GDOT has the resources to review but cautioned other project CR should be submitted on schedule and not wait till last minute. GDOT is allowed 47 days to review/approve.
     iii. Dan reiterated that quality matters. Group discussed what poor quality looks like that included not easily followed when reading it or is missing information. Dan said it is fairly obvious to anyone what poor quality constitutes and is easily addressed by having a senior staff person QA.
     iv. Albert said bridge bundle CRs are being shared with awarded consultants. Main thing with these is getting the “right” alternative selected.
     v. Traffic Ops CRs – still trying to land on what these CR should include.
vi. Arterial CRs are different. These require time and thought to develop.

   ○ Meeting next week to set 2018 initiative/goals.
   ○ Still working on rolling out Traffic Signals Public Information guidance document.
   ○ Will plan to revisit DPM next year.
   ○ Group discussed the Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE). One comment was that ICE was a sleeping giant with respect to schedule and scoping, especially for larger project with numerous intersections.
     i. Albert mentioned that management is in a wait and see mode to see how the ICE effort “normalizes.”
     ii. Intent of process is to document intersection control recommendations by using ICE document. If another solution that is not shown, then requires a waiver.
     iii. With the level of effort currently described it takes quite a bit of time to evaluate each location.
     iv. More discussion likely needed.

l. Survey/Mapping
   ○ Joe Macrina provided report.
   ○ RR crossings, ownership of data, accuracy of surface, hydraulic surveys and septic tanks are a key focus of this subcommittee.

   ○ Met in August. Next meeting in Feb.
   ○ Utility designer training scheduled. Planning for more training.
   ○ DB training anticipated in Feb.
   ○ Utilities/ROW provided an overview at ASHE and Trans Summit.
   ○ Focus on all electronic submittals in 2018.

3. Action Items
   a. Rob send out 2018 CRC meeting invites. – complete

Group discussed timing of the next CRC meeting which is currently scheduled for January 16, 2018. The next meeting will be held Tuesday, February 13, 2018 @ 10:30 am in the 28th Floor Conf Room to allow subcommittees time to meet and prepare 2018 initiatives.

Attachments: None.
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