Mission: To promote communication, innovation, and cooperation between GDOT and consultant firms on issues affecting design decisions, criteria, processes, and implementation as well as plan and document presentation.

Subcommittee members in attendance (comprehensive attendance sheet attached):
- Alex Stone, Co-chair - CALYX Engineers
- Bill Rountree – Parsons
- Brent Story, Co-chair – GDOT Design Policy
- Daniel Pass, Co-chair – GDOT Design Policy
- Brad Gowen – Holt Consulting
- Tyler McIntosh - ICE
- Chris Marsengill - Moffatt & Nichol
- Kevin Ergle – Kimley Horn
- Brad Robinson – Wolverton & Associates
- Bradley Cox – Clark Patterson Lee
- Drew Martin – GDOT Design Policy

1) Introduction of Drew Martin. Drew works with Brad McManus in water resources group.

2) Recap of previous meeting and ongoing business:
   a) Chapter 12 DPM – Staging Plans – outline and purpose
      i) Workshop January 8 in Macon - discussion of agenda
      ii) Once feedback is received, will make adjustments to initial outline.
      iii) Mid-2018 deadline – there will be work to be done in between meetings.
   b) Roundabouts – peer reviews. Discussed with Traffic subcommittee, it is in their hands moving forward.

3) Design Policy updates:
   a) New Chapter 10 of DPM – Pavement Design: The new chapter has been added to provide practical guidance for the preparation of pavement designs. Alex said the group would review the new chapter and provide comments.
   b) Cast-in-place Concrete Barriers (MASH): The new guidance is to adhere to the agreement GDOT has with FHWA that all new installations are MASH compliant. GDOT will be releasing new standards and details; in the meantime reach out to Frank Flanders for the special details.
   c) USACE 408 process: working on being finalized.
   d) ProjectWise Deliverables: training has been completed
   e) OpenRoads: GDOT is working with Bentley on customization for future implementation.
   f) Concept reports: continued improvement of approval rates.
   g) MS4 guidance: 6 new counties and city of Richmond Hill are included as MS4 areas.
h) Other policies:

i) Chapter 8 – ICE policy will be updated in this chapter. The group discussed that ICE is not always relevant to all types of projects. Waivers should be included for rural passing lane projects and other similar project types. GDOT is looking at different approaches for specific project types. Consultants should look to simplify their ICE approach to answer the question which intersection type is best.

4) New business – 2018 goals, ideas for new topics:

a) Open Roads / 3D modeling – committee will be involved in 2018. Plan to bring Frank Flanders into the meetings this year. GDOT’s goal to roll out in 2018.

b) Design criteria for ramps - group asked if GDOT could include general ramp design criteria in the DPM. There is a log of criteria in AASHTO but would be good to have it consolidated and clear for GDOT projects. The group discussed that a lot of ramp design is based on engineering judgment due to the speed transitions that occur.

c) Lateral offset to obstruction in urban areas - DPM is very specific regarding the required offsets. It was mentioned that this comes up more on local projects. Dan recommended evaluating crash history for impacts to roadside objects, and consideration of risk related to size and offset and then applying engineering judgment when making a recommendation to GDOT (i.e.).

d) Cost estimating - Dan said that lump sum costs can be used for concept report cost estimates, which will result in less review comments for small items that add no meaningful value to the estimate (e.g., a striping pay item). Engineering Services is over Cost Estimating and can answer questions.

e) ICE – is there a way to follow the policy yet make the process more efficient? GDOT will be coming out with more guidance in 2018.

f) Drew was asked about the new MS4 permit. The biggest change is that it requires infiltration. Bill asked if level spreaders were a good BMP and Drew said that the sheet flow must remain within ROW. GDOT would like for maintenance cost to be considered also. Though MS4 design can cost a lot in design fees, it is minimal compared to the maintenance cost that GDOT incurs with the BMPs.