

MEETING NOTES

Date: March 13, 2015
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
Robert Lewis	HNTB	rtlewis@hntb.com
David Henry	Transystems	dbhenry@transystems.com
Edgardo Aponte	DP&E	eaponte@dpengr.com
Angela Snyder	Wolverton	angela.snyder@wolverton-assoc.com
Adolfo Guzman	Clark Patterson Lee	aguzman@clarkpatterson.com
Michael Moseley	Atkins	michael.moseley@atkinglobal.com

The following items were discussed:

1. The meeting opened with follow up on action items from the last meeting:
 - a. Lisa is searching for clarification on the need for a special provision with the use of Type 11 Sheeting. After the meeting, she was able to discuss this with both Ken Werho in Traffic Operations and Rich Williams in Construction Bidding. It seems the confusion comes from an asterisk in the Pay Item Index. The asterisk beside the 636-1036 pay item is left over from the 2001 Spec Book. When Construction Bidding sees the asterisk, they then check the 2013 Spec Book to see if the item was included in the current book. Type 11 sheeting is listed in the 913 Material Spec, therefore, it does not require a special provision. Ken was recommending the special provision because he did not know the Type 11 sheeting had been added to the latest spec book. Construction Bidding is working to eliminate the erroneous asterisks from the Pay Item Index and Ken will no longer recommend the special provision.
 - b. CES is loading unit prices in the same format as previously posted. The 2013 Specifications prices are just now being posted so over time there will be more data available.
 - c. Lisa previously emailed the list of the currently revised Special Provisions. The updated GDOT website should have all of the updated special provisions loaded. Christy Lovett is the Specification Engineer and can be contacted for assistance.
 - d. Mike previously emailed out the cost estimating power point presentation (2013) to all of the subcommittee members.
2. As a follow up to last meetings discussion on Post Construction Evaluations, Mike noted that Marc Mastronardi spoke on the subject at the January 23rd ASHE luncheon held at GDOT. Marc offered that the P-C Evaluations were a valuable tool for lessons learned on projects and were underutilized. Highlights from the subcommittees discussion on P-C Evaluations:
 - a. Lisa reported that the P-C Evaluations are done by the Office of Engineering Services and they would be happy to do any that are requested.
 - b. Derrick Cameron presented the process of P-C Evaluations to the GDOT District Engineers in January.

- c. The subcommittee members inquired to the timing of the P-C Evaluations. Rob and Lisa both agree that it should happen while the contractor is still on site. The best time for the P-C Evaluation request would be once the final punch list has been created.
 - d. The group discussed the importance of the evaluations and ways to promote and increase the frequency of the meetings. One idea was to add it to the Construction Manual as a checkbox: “Would this project benefit from a P-C Evaluation?”.
 - e. Rob asked if the completed P-C Evaluations would be loaded onto ProjectWise. The thought was that the P-C Evaluations would be loaded onto ProjectWise with all other project data. Lisa offered that there is a possibility that they can be linked from the Engineering Services webpage as well. The subcommittee believes the evaluations and subsequent reports offer value to all designers for learning about problems encountered in the field.
3. The members briefly discussed Constructability Reviews:
 - a. Constructability Reviews will be run by the Office of Engineering Services at some point in the future. Engineering Services has limited resources and taking on these meetings will require more reviewers. The Office of Program Delivery is currently responsible for this task.
 4. The subcommittee next discussed ideas for the top hindrances to project delivery as they relate to Engineering Services:
 - a. To begin Angela asked for clarification of the responsibilities of the Office of Engineering Services. Lisa described the following responsibilities:
 - Estimating – the Estimating group is responsible for the cost estimate that is used for procuring the funding for projects prior to letting. They also process updated cost estimates at milestones, and the annual cost estimate updates.
 - Plan Reviews – Engineering Services is currently responsible for running Value Engineering Studies, PFPR, FFPR and P-C Evaluations. As noted previously, Constructability Reviews may be managed by Engineering Services in the future. This section of the office also handles the review of Specifications.
 - Environmental Compliance – this group ensures compliance with the environmental commitments on each project under construction, as well as ensuring compliance with NPDES requirements and procedures.
 - Authorizations – Engineering Services also authorizes funding for PE, R/W and Construction. This process includes tracking all needed certifications and approvals from other offices to ensure timely delivery.
 - b. The first idea was the importance of meeting submission deadlines. For example, when FFPR plans are submitted late that pushes the FFPR corrected sets later and therefore the Estimating group is later in starting the estimate. The project funding cannot be secured until the Engineering Services estimate is complete and submitted to the Office of Financial Management. These delays ultimately compress the construction authorization process, potentially missing the letting date.
 - c. A lack of focus on updating cost estimates can delay projects as well. If a cost estimate is out of date and has increased substantially a STIP amendment is required. A STIP amendment can also delay a project’s letting. It is important that the designer “own the estimate” and

MEETING NOTES

- update the cost estimate per Russell McMurry's Inter-Department Correspondence on Cost Estimates dated November 17, 2014.
- d. The next idea was the lack of available resources to staff Constructability Reviews. Constructability Reviews are an important tool to ensure all necessary R/W and easements needed for construction are evaluated early in the project including those impacts to the environment.
 - e. While not a hindrance it was discussed that leveraging P-C Evaluations can provide important lessons learned to avoid pitfalls during the design process.
 - f. The last few ideas centered around field plan reviews and NPDES plans:
 - Focus field plan reviews around R/W impacts and environmental compliance
 - Rectify the conflict between the FFPR schedule and the 31 week lockdown where certain permits are required
 - Field plan review comments between Environmental Services and Construction personnel are generally in conflict.
 - Georgia EPD reviews are too late in the process and are inconsistent. EPD comments generally require either an Amendment or Use on Construction revision to address.

Action Items: None

The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, May 15, 2015 at 11 am in GDOT's 5th floor conference room.

Please contact Mike Moseley at michael.moseley@atkinsglobal.com if changes or additions are necessary.

Attached: 3/13/2015 Meeting Agenda

cc: Al Bowman (Michael Baker)

3/13/2015

ACEC/G GPTQ Engineering Services Subcommittee

Mission: To promote communication, innovation and cooperation between GDOT and consultant design firms on plan presentation, review constructability and construction issues

Topics:

1. Introductions
2. 1/09 Meeting Minutes Recap
3. Follow up on previous Action Items
4. Brainstorm top 5 hindrances to project delivery
5. Open Discussion

Members:

- Lisa Myers, Angela Snyder, Adolfo Guzman, David Henry, Rob Lewis, Edgardo Aponte, Michael Moseley