COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES
Georgia Partnership for Transportation Quality (GPTQ)
Program Delivery Subcommittee
Wednesday, July 31, 2013, 1:30 pm
GDOT – Room 403

Allen Krivsky kicked-off the meeting with welcome, and introductions were made by all attendees.
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.

Reports were presented on six initiatives.

1. Project Manager Roundtable- Jeff Church presented. The first step is to select 20 project managers with 5-10 years of experience. The goal is to select project managers that will contribute to discussing ‘best practices’. We discussed whether there should be a new open solicitation to select PMs or go back to the last GPTQ solicitation for volunteers. The terms to serve on the roundtable should be staggered in order to plan on continued ‘roll-on’ and ‘roll-off’ of PMs. -> Jeff/Albert will draft a solicitation.
2. Plan Development Process- The next PDP committee meeting has been set. A date for completion of the updated PDP is unknown.
3. Local Administered Project Delivery- An internal meeting on the LAP has been held, Markups and changes to the Manual are required.
4. Local Administered Projects via Design-Build- No update.
5. NEPA and Design- Jody Braswell, Susan Thomas, Jeremy Busby, Saurabh- A group meeting is scheduled for the end of August. The group has focused mostly on the process flow chart of environmental process with design inputs- When information is needed. When coordination is needed. This will take time to develop and will require input from OES. The group is focused on scheduling. GDOT develops schedules early in the process for resource allocation. Understanding the next opportunity for schedule change has been a point of discussion. New information that affects the schedule must be used to change the schedule.
6. Other discussion related to project delivery-
   a. Communication between SME and SME in the environmental area
   b. Is there a benefit to a final plan review at 60% design plan development?
   c. Should the consultant PM be handling a PCRF?
   d. GeoTraqs- baseline schedules should be shown in TPRO report.
   e. Sharepoint- File exchange- there are different areas of access and this is not understood -> study access to different offices/Departments.

The next meeting is scheduled on September 26th at 2:00pm.