

Project Delivery Task Force Meeting Summary April 17, 2015

ATTENDEES	
TAQC	Kerry Armstrong (ARC Board Chair)
TCC/LOCAL AGENCIES	Jennifer Harper (PCIDs); Michael Smith (Dunwoody); Michelle Wright (Douglasville); Tavoires Edwards (Coweta); Chris Haggard (Johns Creek); Randy Hulseley (Douglas); Phil Boyd (Gwinnett); Phil Mallon (Fayette); Geoff Morton (Cherokee); Miguel Valentin (Rockdale); Kyethea Clark (Marietta); Doug Joiner (Safe Routes to School); Tom Sills (CBMPO)
ARC	John Orr; David Haynes; Kofi Wakhisi; Jean Hee Barrett; Byron Rushing; Allison Duncan; Haley Berry
GDOT	Meg Pirkle; Bobby Hilliard; Matthew Fowler; Henry Green; Albert Shelby; Paul DeNard; Kaycee Mertz
USDOT	Neosha Price (FHWA); Tamara Christion (FHWA); Mindy Roberson (FHWA); Danielle Coles (FHWA)
MARTA	Mark Eatman; Cathy Gesick
OTHERS	Jonathan Cox (Jacobs Engineering); Janille Smith-Colin (GA Tech)

SUMMARY

1. Introductions

John Orr, Manager of the ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division, kicked off the meeting by welcoming the group and leading the introductions. Orr gave a special welcome to the new GDOT Chief Engineer, Meg Pirkle. Orr stated that progress made this year will be fulfilling to all transportation stakeholders and the region at large.

2. 2015 Project Delivery Assistance Contract Scope of Work Overview

Jean Hee Barrett, ARC, announced that the Jacobs Engineering consultant team was selected to assist ARC with accelerated project delivery implementation. The firm-members of the team are: Jacobs Engineering Group and Adrian Collaborative. Barrett explained that the Jacobs scope of work is divided into three tasks: (1) PDTF Action Work Program Implementation; (2) Analysis of Other State DOT and FHWA Categorical Exclusion (CE) Review Processes and MAP-21 Final Rules; (3) Development of a



Project Feasibility and Deliverability Risk Assessment Guidelines for Local Governments; and (4) On-Going Technical and Policy Support.

Mark Eatman, MARTA, suggested that the PDTF focus more on transit expansion delivery and define a process that will allow more efficient coordination and collaboration with highway/roadway project development and implementation. MARTA currently has three projects in the federal environmental review process and it would be helpful to have the following mechanisms in place either before or during this process: (1) joint scheduling [with highway] process; (2) more robust interaction with stakeholder local governments; (3) early risk assessments; (4) committed funding programmed; and (5) creating and refining joint databases/information systems. Phil Boyd, Gwinnett County DOT, concurred and noted that Eatman's suggestion is timely and appropriate, given the amount of time it's been since the last major transit expansion occurred.

Miguel Valentin, Rockdale County DOT, requested that the task force begin making actionable recommendations deriving from the MAP-21 provisions for streamlining the environmental review process.

3. Recap of 2014 Project Delivery Action Plan and Steps

Kofi Wakhisi, ARC, provided the task force with a brief re-cap of the discussion and the PDTF work that occurred in 2014. Wakhisi referenced the 2014 PDTF Action Plan as the cornerstone of the recommendations thus far, and asked the group to review the plan if they had not done so already. Wakhisi reminded the task force that the action plan steps are categorized into five groups (page 6 of the plan report): (1) "Cross-Cutting" Solutions; (2) Streamlined Environmental Analysis; (3) Project Feasibility and Programming; (4) Dealing with Change (after the project starts); and (5) Less Complex Projects.

Wakhisi explained that the Jacobs consultant team will be assisting ARC and the task force with prioritizing the action steps and identifying actionable steps and timelines. Wakhisi also explained that the bulk of the PDTF work and discussion this year will revolve around "fleshing out" the 2014 Action Plan Solutions, and he recommended that the task force members divide themselves into the five

categories and independently meet to keep the conversation moving. Randy Hulsey, Douglas County DOT, advised that the groups should work independently but should reconvene periodically so that other groups can learn from each other and identify common areas of concern or overlap.

4. Next Steps

Wakhisi recommended that each group meet at least once a month, beginning in May, and that all groups should reconvene once this summer, and again in late fall. ARC staff and members from the consultant team will cover and facilitate the group meetings, handle all of the logistics, and prepare documentation and material as needed. ARC staff will contact each group, based on the final selections made at or after the meeting, to notify them of the proposed meeting logistics.

MEETING HANDOUTS

- 1. April 17, 2015 PDTF Meeting Agenda**
- 2. 2014 Project Delivery Action Plan Report**
- 3. 2014 Project Delivery Task Force Group Assignments**

