The following items were discussed:

1. The group reviewed the February 28, 2014 meeting minutes, and discussed a few follow-up items.
   a. FPR checklists
      o No updates were known to be forthcoming, however Lisa mentioned that there have been instances in the past where other GDOT offices have modified the checklist.
   b. P-C Evaluations (PCEs)
      o Lisa mentioned that Derrick Cameron, who recently joined Engineering Services, is starting to reach out to District Construction offices for them to consider scheduling these meetings as projects begin to close out.
      o As ACEC/G, we should continue to encourage folks to “follow” their projects through the construction phase, and also think about requesting GDOT consider facilitating the PCE as construction nears completion.
      o The PCE reports are posted on GeoTRAQS under each project’s PI number. Lisa mentioned that once ProjectWise is implemented (starting later in 2014), the consultants should be able to query for PCE reports.
      o The group asked Lisa to provide a list of project PI’s where PCEs had been facilitated.

2. The group discussed the FPR observations prepared and provided by one of the subcommittee members following the February 28, 2014 meeting.
   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 estimate could 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. The group briefly discussed all electronic submittals for FPR. No change anticipated at this time with current requirements.

4. The consultant rankings listed in the FPR reports were discussed. GDOT is evaluating how best to score plan presentation. Some were concerned that rankings were based on elements beyond consultant control. Examples discussed included utility markups being submitted through District Utilities to utility owners and utility owners not being responsive despite being given multiple opportunities.

5. ESPCP commonly seen comments were discussed.
   a. Following the 2/28 subcommittee meeting, Lisa provided a PPT of commonly seen comments.
   b. The group mentioned that the PPT was helpful to their staff.
   c. The group also discussed Catherine Samay leaving EPD.

6. Specifications updates were discussed.
   a. Lisa briefly discussed the process whereby specifications are updated.
   b. The group discussed the value of pushing specification updates to the consulting industry through ROADS update notifications.
   c. Lisa to follow up with Glenn Williams to discuss the possibility of issuing specification updates through ROADS.

7. Project cost estimates were discussed.
   a. Lisa mentioned that cost estimates submitted through CES at PS&E submittal by the designer don’t always match up to the estimates that Engineering Services develops.
   b. The group talked about the evolution of the cost estimate from concept to PS&E and the importance to GDOT’s overall management of the Construction Work Program (CWP). Lisa also talked about the challenges GDOT faces when project cost estimates require a STIP modification which in some cases have caused GDOT to defer award.
c. The group generally discussed opportunities for ACEC/G to educate designers on how important it is to develop and maintain a project cost estimate, as well as how best to encourage designers to pull bid tabulations on their projects to verify their estimates compared to actual bids.

8. Lisa described the Project of Division Interest (PoDI) process which will replace the Full Oversight (FOS) process. FHWA and GDOT will agree to a list of PoDI projects and a project specific oversight agreement will be put in place for that project. The specific oversight agreement will identify which documents FHWA intends to review. Consultants should be aware of the PoDI projects and aware of the specific oversight agreement.

Action Items:

1. Lisa to discuss with GDOT Construction Bidding if the ESPCP checklist that is included with the NOI can be modified such that it is more user friendly. [In Progress]

2. Lisa to provide a list of project PI’s where PCEs had been facilitated. [Completed]

3. Lisa to follow up with Glenn Williams to discuss the possibility of issuing specification updates through ROADS. [Completed]

   Lisa spoke to Christy Lovett who spoke to Glenn Williams who mentioned it may be easier to move the information to Publications with alerts posted there. Glenn mentioned some complications he has had with ROADS updates and maintaining a database of the subscribers. For the time being Lisa suggested it may be best to wait until the information is moved to Publications. Lisa asked Christy to let her know when new Specs and Shelf Specs are available and Lisa will give you an update at each of our meetings and we can include that in the minutes.

4. Rob to schedule the next GPTQ subcommittee meeting in August 2014. [Completed]

The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, August 22, 2014 at 11 am in GDOT’s 5th floor conference room.

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

Attachment: Current list of commonly seen FPR comments and ESPCP comments
Various PCE Reports

cc: Scott Gero (AECOM), Glenn Bowman (GDOT)