



Meeting Minutes

1255 Canton Street, Suite G
Roswell, Georgia 30075
(678) 461-3511 Fax (678) 461-3494

GPTQ History Subcommittee

Date: November 18, 2010

Location: One Georgia Center, 16th Floor, Lg. Conf. Rm.

Introductions

- 0 Glenn Bowman welcomed the committee members and guests to the subcommittee's first meeting. He stressed the importance of "Quality Documents On Time" and that this is a great opportunity.
- 0 Linda Edwards noted that the subcommittee was formed in order to identify best practices and to share those efforts with the larger community.
- 0 Sandy Lawrence welcomed everyone to the meeting, and everyone present introduced themselves to the rest of the group.

Subcommittee Objectives and Participation Guidelines

- 0 Heather Perrin briefly went over the participation guidelines:
 - o The purpose/objectives of the subcommittee were outlined in the invitation letter and are to strengthen relationships between GDOT and Consultants as a team of professionals, Discuss and evaluate current policies and processes for effectiveness and streamlining to reduce project delivery time, discuss current trends and upcoming policy changes and processes, serve as a forum to discuss issues concerning GDOT and Consultants.
 - o Prequalified consultants with the GDOT are members of the subcommittee. Other members of the community are welcome to attend, and they may bring up new agenda items, concerns, and issues at the end of the meeting during discussions of "new business".
 - o Also, the agenda will be set for each meeting with some time devoted at the end to "new business" when new items for discussion can be added to the agenda for the next meeting.
 - o If we get off topic during a discussion or a discussion becomes too long, it may be tabled until the next meeting or added to the agenda for the next meeting.
 - o Project-specific issues or problems cannot be resolved by the subcommittee, so they should be avoided. An exception to this is when all members of the committee could benefit from the resolution to an issue, or when there is a new process, policy, or procedure and the project serves as a good example of its implementation.
 - o Above all, the subcommittee is a forum for respectful discussion.

CMIS Evaluations

- 0 Sandy noted that the GDOT will begin using new CMIS consultant evaluations for the area class. These evaluations will replace the QAQC forms for all deliverables. The forms have not been completed to date, but they are expected to be completed soon.
- 0 The forms have their own categories and documents will be evaluated on a point scale.
- 0 The CMIS will be on file for each deliverable/Consultant. An appeal procedure has not been put in place to date.
- 0 Charlotte Weber asked whether Consultants will be asked to complete evaluations of GDOT. No, however, Consultants will be allowed to comment on their evaluations.
- 0 The CMIS form will not evaluate points for DBE goals; the evaluation is specific to the area of expertise.

Project Reevaluations

- 0 Sandy provided everyone a copy of the 2003 MOU between the GDOT, FHWA, and SHPO that sets forth guidelines for documenting design changes to a project after Section 106 has been completed. Sandy noted that a memo is not required to document changes for projects in which there are decreases in ROW or easements if that is the only change to the project.
- 0 A template for the reevaluation memo is forthcoming in the Environmental Procedures Manual.
- 0 Per the 2003 MOU, in situations where there is an increase in ROW and/or easement within the boundary of a resource with no adverse effect, a memo can be prepared rather than a revised AOE document; likewise, on a project with no eligible resources or changes occurring outside the boundary of eligible resources, a memo must be prepared. Under Section 4f de minimis requirements, FHWA asked GDOT to request SHPO's acknowledgement of our use of de minimis with every increase. In order to decrease the amount of paperwork this requirement would create, GDOT, SHPO, and FHWA agreed that GDOT could use the 2003 MOU as the basis for SHPO's once and final acknowledgement of the de minimis use, as long as the project changes fell within the agreed upon parameters of the 2003 MOU.
- 0 Erin Murphy asked if the old *de minimis* findings will be grandfathered, and yes, they will.
- 0 FHWA is interested in incremental increases of use within eligible boundaries, so we will be required to track this increase over time as applicable in our re-evaluation memos.

Processing Projects and Time Savings

- 0 Baseline schedules for ROW and Let are being implemented by OPD. So far, some of these schedules have been developed without input from OES or the Consultants in the field, they have been changed (to shorten timelines) without input, or they are scheduled with no room for unexpected (or even expected) delays.
- 0 Districts and OES have been asked to provide input into the schedules, but it appears that this may be inconsistent.

- 0 Right now, many projects are “Priority 1”, and there is not a clear prioritization of projects aside from ROW dates.
- 0 Heather asked whether we can develop some procedures so that we ensure that our input is not overlooked.
- 0 Linda suggested that she could bring it up with the GPTQ committees.
- 0 Scott noted that it is also a matter of educating the project managers; however, Eric Duff noted that the PDP clearly illustrates that the OES departments are integral pieces of a successful project.
- 0 After some discussion, it was determined that Eric Duff would request that Bobby Hilliard or Genetha Rice-Singleton from OPD come to give us a presentation at our next meeting regarding the baseline schedules and their development.
- 0 OES does have template schedules for standard processes for Section 106; however, they are not always used in the development of project schedules. These templates use “worst-case” scenarios.
- 0 Charlotte suggested implementing some time-saving processes, one of which could be to combine the survey report and assessment of effects reports into one as they do in many other states. Sandy noted that this could be a possibility for simple projects that don’t require ROW (even though many already have MOU in place or are covered by TE 106 Worksheets). Sandy suggested that Charlotte find a good candidate project to test the idea, and the candidate project will need to be identified before-hand, but she also noted that we already do this sort of combination on sidewalk projects. Mark Grindstaff noted that candidate projects are already short and simple and do not benefit from combined reporting.
- 0 Sandy also noted that it is important for GDOT to keep the survey report and assessment of effects separate so that the anticipated effects have no bearing on the eligibility determination or boundaries of the resource.
- 0 There may be other procedures and forms that could be used in other contexts (i.e. the TE Section 106 Worksheet) for simple projects. This is also why we have a streamlined AOE for some projects.
- 0 Other time-saving items that will be coming soon include the GDOT’s use of NAHRGIS, and the finalization of the bridge survey (expected May 2011).
- 0 Cutting down on multiple reviews is also important to streamlining the process. Aside from providing quality documents, how can the Consultants and GDOT work together to cut down on reviews?

Ranch House Guidelines

- 0 Sandy asked for feedback regarding the implementation of the Ranch house guidelines and whether they were working for the group as they are implemented. Everyone present was happy so far with the implementation of the guidelines.
- 0 The group was asked to provide input on a ranking of several suggestions for context studies on Ranch houses since the guidelines have been implemented and to see if the

rank had changed. Many were interested in the Building Industry in Georgia, Craftsman and Local Materials, Mid-century modern architects and builders in Georgia, and Geographic Studies. One person noted that African American suburbanization is also important and should be a high priority. Not mentioned as particularly important for a study included landscapes, transportation, or military topics.

Training

- Mulkey Engineers & Consultants is thinking of hosting the Mid-20th Century Structures class. They have a proposal for the weeks of January 18-20, 25-27, 2011 or February 1-3, 8-10, 15-17, 22-24 2011. 8:30 am registration, 9am – 5pm seminar. If you are interested in the class, please send an email to Heather Perrin at hperrin@mulkeyinc.com as soon as possible. The expected cost is \$1,000 per person with a minimum of 10 participants (the cost will lessen with additional participants). So far, 5 persons have expressed interest (Annette Loomis, Sharon Downs, Mark Grindstaff, Heather Perrin, and Nancy McReynolds).

New Business/Next Meeting

- Agenda items for the next meeting include:
- Bobby Hilliard or a representative from OPD will come to the next meeting to discuss project prioritization and baseline schedules.
- Ideas for streamlining the documentation and assessment processes.
- Surveying cut-off dates for historic resources. For FHWA, no resurvey is needed after ROW, but a list of resources in the project area up to 1970 may be implemented for each report.
- A committee has been formed to evaluate the need for arborists on projects and to determine what are the issues, the protocol for trees, the need for arborists on projects, and whether Consultants need to begin adding this into the scope of services. A field guide for historians to help identify historic, significant trees would be helpful. Right now, the SHPO is requesting expert opinions on conditions and ages of trees. So far, volunteers for the committee will consist of Chad Carlson, Annette Loomis, and David Adair.

This meeting summary was prepared by Heather Perrin. Notice of changes or corrections should be within ten days by email to hperrin@mulkeyinc.com.