

MEETING NOTES

Date: February 28, 2014
Project: GPTQ Engineering Services Subcommittee
Purpose: General discussion meeting
Location: GDOT 5th floor conference room
Time: 11:00 AM

Attending:

Lisa Myers	GDOT	lmyers@dot.ga.gov
Dan Cogan	CDMSmith	cogandp@cdmsmith.com
Erick Fry	URS	erick.fry@urs.com
Robert Lewis	HNTB	rtlewis@hntb.com

The following items were discussed:

1. At the previous December 20, 2013 meeting, GDOT was scheduled to meet with EPD in February. Lisa confirmed that GDOT did meet with EPD to discuss NPDES. She understood the meeting went well. Once more information is known about the EPD meeting specific to ESPCP then Engineering Services will review the commonly seen Field Plan Review comments and update as necessary.
2. The group generally discussed the list of documents currently shown on ROADS and listed below. No additional follow up required.
 - a. Revisions to Program Costs – Template (3/14/2012)
 - b. PFPR Checklist (9/18/2013)
 - c. FFPR Checklist (9/18/2013)
 - d. CES Cost Estimate Process (4/25/2012)
 - e. CES User Account Request (8/24/2010)
 - f. Consultant Agreement/CES Request Process (8/24/2010)
3. Post-Construction (P-C) evaluations were discussed. At this point they are not being requested with any regular frequency. Lisa mentioned following up internal regarding ways to solicit more P-C evaluations being requested. At the same time consultants can request their GDOT PM's to request these as well.
4. The group talked about overall observations of the Field Plan Review comments from project to project and from District to District.
 - a. Lisa mentioned that there seemed to be a more regular frequency of comments related to constructability. The group briefly discussed the constructability review process as it relates to the PDP. Consultants who prepare plans must check the plans for constructability, regardless if a formal constructability review is performed.
 - b. Rob asked Erick if he could solicit his group's constructive observations of Field Plan Reviews and resulting comments. These will be discussed at the subsequent GPTQ subcommittee meeting.

Action Items:

1. **Once more information is known about the EPD meeting specific to ESPCP then Engineering Services will review the commonly seen Field Plan Review comments and update as necessary.**

- 2. A list of constructive consultant observations of the Field Plan Reviews and resulting comments will be compiled, and discussed at the subsequent GPTQ subcommittee meeting. [The following is the list drafted comments]**
- a. Duplicated comments could be eliminated and generalized comments could be more specific.*
 - b. The reviewer should have an understanding of the scope and complexity of the project going into the FPR meeting. Reviewers should not be compiling comments together from SME's at the start of the meeting.*
 - c. Some reviewers have a problem taking charge of the meetings and let extraneous comments be discussed for longer than they need to be.*
 - d. Scoring of the reviews should account for problems that are not the fault of the designers and/or out of the designer's control. (i.e. utility information not provided by utility companies). A consistent procedure for scoring should be available?*
 - e. It would be better if all the experts attended the FPR including the bridge office. Sometimes the bridge comments affect the rest of the plans, but we generally have no idea as to what/when the comments will be received and how they will impact the plan development.*
 - f. Another suggestion is to have a value engineering section in the report/field plan review. No one really focuses on the money being spent at the FPR.*
 - g. It may be a good idea to visit the project first and look at issues the reviewer specifically has before the FPR. Alternately, the reviewer should visit the project before producing the draft report. The review should also review the project concept report.*
 - h. Right of way seems to be glossed over. Cost to cure type stuff that can either go on the plans as part of a project or paid out separately is never discussed in terms of what will be better for the department in terms of money/schedule.*
- 3. Rob scheduled next GPTQ meeting for April/May timeframe.**

Please contact Robert Lewis at rtlewis@hntb.com if changes or additions are necessary.

cc: Greg Mayo (Stantec), Michael Moseley (Atkins), David Henry (Transystems), Scott Gero (AECOM), Joe Carpenter (GDOT)