



AGENDA

Georgia Partnership for Transportation Quality (GPTQ)

Program Delivery Subcommittee

Tuesday, February 27, 2013, 2:00 pm

GDOT – Room 409

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Mission of the Program Delivery Subcommittee

a. Purpose of subcommittee –discuss subcommittee areas of focus and topics to cover

1. Scope of Work
2. Scheduling
3. Invoicing
4. Compensation
5. Performance reviews/evaluations
6. Plan Development Process???
7. Informing consultants of procurement needs
8. Annual meeting of Project Managers- GDOT and consultant PMs
9. Project Manager evaluations by consultant
10. Project Management ‘Best Practices’
11. Filtering CRC meeting information to the consultant world
12. MAP-21
13. Other

b. Meeting Frequency – bi-monthly, 2nd Wednesday at 2pm at GDOT.

3. Next Meeting scheduled for April 3, 2013 @ 2:00 PM GDOT Room 409.



COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

Georgia Partnership for Transportation Quality (GPTQ)
Program Delivery Subcommittee
Wednesday, February 27, 2013, 2:00 pm
GDOT – Room 409

Allen Krivsky kicked off the committee meeting and committee members introduced themselves. Allen described the Mission of the Committee.

Mission: To promote communication, innovation, and cooperation between GDOT and consultant firms for the management of project scope, schedule, and budget for all external Georgia DOT projects.

The committee will take on topics for improving delivery. First and foremost, the committee is a sounding board for the project managers when challenges inhibit project delivery.

The meeting agenda lists topics for consideration. Many of the topics like Scope of Work, Scheduling, Invoicing, etc. are focused on when and if issues are brought to the committee's attention.

The other topics were identified by Genetha and she provided background on these.

The project manager evaluations to be performed by consultants, is an internal effort. A draft evaluation form has been created and the committee will be able to review.

An annual meeting of the Project Managers is an idea to facilitate sharing of information and challenges encountered from both consultant PM and GDOT PM Perspective. This could be a roundtable of select PMs to discuss Best Practices.

Informing consultants of procurement needs has begun. The procurement needs was posted to the website and Genetha intends to update quarterly in the future. The committee is welcome to provide input and comment.

The Plan Development Process is a topic for consideration. The Design Policy Committee has a responsibility to the PDP but they asked if our committee would take on some responsibility. The PDP is being updated primarily by GDOT staff with some support by consultants. Our committee responsibility should be more of clarifications, user friendliness, and developing methods for traversing through the PDP.

Other topic ideas included disseminating meeting information to the consultant community and MAP-21.

Committee members identified the following topics and discussion ensued:

- There are challenges with delivering Local Administered Projects. The locals need help with improving delivery. It was noted there is a CFR change proposed that will require GDOT to certify deliverers of local projects beyond that which is required by the LAP Manual. These projects used to be managed by GDOT local district offices and now local projects are managed by OPD. FHWA is currently auditing LAP certified agencies.
- The LAP Manual does not address design-build. The locals have not had any policies or procedures to procure by D-B, based on sporadic requests to utilize. The current trends

in D-B are likely to result in locals increasingly requesting to deliver projects with the D-B method, especially when schedule recovery is at stake. A section to the LAP manual should be developed to address the things they would need to address in order to be certified to use D-B.

- Senate Bill 70 passage will expand D-B flexibility to allow a single-phase procurement and a two phase Best Value approach. On the single-phase DB procurement, the scope of the project would have very little opportunity for innovation, Qualifications will be basic and certified by a simple check list (such as Area Class Prequalification certification and Contractor Prequalification) and then awarded based on Low Bid. Best Value procurement will be used on projects that have opportunity for innovation and will use a two-phase (RFQ, RFP) approach, with final award considering some combination of the scored final Technical Proposal that is evaluated in accordance with the RFP as well as Bid Price submitted. The opportunity for Alternative Technical Concepts (ATC) will be allowed on appropriate projects that Best Value is used. The State Transportation Board rules to guide the SB70 are yet to be worked out, but will be developed and hopefully approved for use as early as fall of 2013.
- MAP-21 has raised the project value that determines the requirement to conduct Value Engineering Studies from \$25 mil to \$50 mil. In addition, the VE requirement is waived for Design Build projects. This, of course, is for federal-aid projects only. Current state code requires all projects (state or federal) that are \$10 mil or greater have VE analysis prior to letting. HB 202 modifies the requirement to perform VE studies to match MAP 21 on both project value and D-B exemption. GDOT will consider raising their \$10 mil value requirement, but the legal requirement for this is lifted.
- The Plan Development Process-
 - o A question was made whether constructability review could be incorporated into the VE process?
 - o In general, clarity in the PDP would be useful
 - o The time between FFPR and environmental certification is still a challenge even after the last change to FFPR 24 weeks before letting. The challenge is due to plan changes after FFPR that require special study addendum and/or edits in the EA.
 - o There was a question about the continual matching of the 404 Permit and NEPA document. Why does the NEPA document have to be updated to the preciseness of the 404 Permit? Ans: To validate the NEPA document.
 - o Utility relocations and coordination is another challenge in the process.

It was noted that communication between the designer and environmentalist is critical. Study boundaries and the entire team being knowledgeable of the study boundaries can resolve many issues. The Electronic Data Guidelines (EDG) could include handling of study boundaries.

It was noted that the Plan Development Process is being reformatted entirely. GDOT staff and consultant representatives are tackling sections. Some of the PDP is outdated, does not adhere to current policies, and there are some inconsistencies.

- Right of way- There is a challenge with final construction plans not reflecting RW commitments. The recent D-B, Jimmy DeLoach Pkwy, was a good example of design and RW acquisition under one entity, the D-B team. Conventional design-bid-build requires more interaction between design and RW acquisition personnel. This challenge could be handled with RW acquisition personnel contracted under the consultant contract. With the IDIQ contracting method, RW acquisition under consultant contracts makes sense. This should be revisited with RW Office.

The committee will meet once a month for the next 3 or 4 months in order to determine topics and initiative to focus on. Smaller groups will be formed within the committee to be assigned topics.

Genetha and Allen will document meeting notes, organize the topics/initiatives, and develop a plan to focus on select topics/initiatives.

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled on March 27th at 2pm.

Then meeting adjourned.