Project Delivery Task Force
Meeting Summary
December 11, 2015

ATTENDEES	
TAQC	N/A
TCC/LOCAL AGENCIES	Matt Bearden (City of Marietta); John Crocker (City of Roswell); Daniel Cummings (City of Marietta); Greg Holder (City of Atlanta); Randy Hulsey (Douglas County); Phil Mallon (Fayette County); Geoff Morton (Cherokee County); Jeff Mueller (City of Norcross); Hugh Saxon (City of Decatur); Michael Smith (City of Dunwoody); David Tucker (Gwinnett County); Miguel Valentin (Rockdale County); Michelle Wright (City of Douglasville)
ARC	Kofi Wakhisi; Byron Rushing; Allison Duncan; Amy Goodwin
GDOT	Julia Billings; Paul DeNard; Henry Green; Kaycee Mertz
USDOT	Tamara Christion (FHWA)
MARTA	N/A
OTHERS	Kim Conroy (Jacobs Engineering); Jonathan Cox (Jacobs Engineering); Jamie Fischer (GRTA); Shaun Green (ABI); Gil Grodzinsky (GAEPD); Todd Barker (Adrian Collaborative); Janille Smith-Colin (GA Tech);

SUMMARY

1. **Introductions**

   Jean Hee Barrett, ARC, kicked off the meeting by welcoming the group and leading the introductions. Barrett reviewed the agenda with the committee.

2. **Recap of 2015 Project Delivery Activities**

   Barrett gave a brief summary to recap project delivery activities of 2015. The Project Delivery Task Force was charged with re-visiting the 2014 Action Plan. Four sub-groups were convened during the first half of 2015. They were Project Programming and Feasibility, Dealing with Change, Limited Scope Projects (formerly Less Complex Projects), and Streamlining Environmental Analysis. Each group gathered to discuss, revise or add on to the action plan items for their respective sub-groups. The revised action plan items drafted by each sub-group will be incorporated into an updated Action Plan document and will be available in 2016.

3. **Project Feasibility and Deliverability Risk Assessment Guidelines for Local Governments**

During the latter portion of 2015, PDTF members participated in several general small group discussions on the Risk Assessment Tool. Jonathan Cox, Jacobs Engineering, gave the task force a summary of the comments received on the Risk Assessment Tool.

- Risk 5 - Historic Resources
    - Emphasis was added to identify historic structures early on in addition to focusing attention on features such as trees, landscaping, steps, etc. that may lie between the roadway and historic structure. Although the structure may not be impacted, the removal of a historic tree can still present project delivery delays.
- Risk 6 – Permitting
    - Language added that buffer impacts should be considered under Risk 7
    - Clarified that medium and high risk categories focus on permanent impacts
    - Additional tip added to this risk to cover floodplains and floodways.
- Risk 9 – Environmental Justice
    - Language for impact levels adjusted for this risk
- Risk 3 – Project Sponsor Experience
    - Language added stating the local sponsor should consider elements like off-site detours
- Risk 10 – Public Controversy
    - Language added to "Risk Management Tip" to include emergency services, school buses, etc.
- Risk 12 – ROW & Displacements
    - Adjusted language on the number of driveways and features that would need to be replaced as a result of ROW issues

Cox further elaborated on the scoring methodology and the options presented to ARC staff. One option would be for the score to be generated after completion of the tool to give the sponsor an idea of their project's risk level. The other option would put the score behind the scenes hidden with the sponsor/user only seeing the output of the tool. The overall focus should not be on the score itself but where the highest risks are for the project in question and review ways to mitigate issues. Cox emphasized that the tool should tell the sponsor the recommended next steps.

Kofi Wakhisi, ARC, reminded the PDTF members that there is still a lot of work that needs to be done on the tool. However, once the tool has been converted into an online platform, this may be something that may be beneficial to the entire state. Brian Allen, ARC, added that the tool should be used to assist locals in any project regardless of whether they are seeking federal funds or handled with 100% local funds.

Some of the additional comments, questions, or discussion by the PDTF members are as follows:

- Suggestion offered to give option to show score upon completion of tool. Possibility that a matrix can be provided or a summary showing where all the risks fall on the chart. This may be helpful as one can check off where risks have been mitigated.
- A GIS layer is available as an overlay up to the parcel level of the environmental database to assist with determining environmental risks. Cox added that it is critical to recognize what the information is telling you as the layer would show a general vicinity rather than the specific site of the impact.
- Risk Assessment Tool would be useful for state funded projects under the GEPA process. However, the group was reminded that although a project is state funded, NEPA requirements may still apply.

4.   **Project Delivery and Comprehensive Transportation Plans (CTPs)**

Patrick Bradshaw, ARC, gave an overview of linking the CTP Program to project delivery activities. ARC will be implementing new work scope elements consisting of 10 core elements and six optional elements starting with Rockdale and Douglas County CTPs. Jurisdictions will have the option to include the project screening element to develop a detailed scope, schedule, and budget for projects listed within the CTP. This will assist with moving forward the highest priority projects in addition to providing key pieces of information to be included in future solicitation applications. The Risk Assessment Tool can be utilized in the development of CTPs by assisting with reducing potential project delivery risks.

Some of the additional comments, questions, or discussion by the PDTF members are as follows:

- Flexibility with integrating project screening into the CTP process will be needed as this will be a new element to an existing program. But process may be beneficial to assist with requiring sponsor to thoroughly look at projects.

- Screening process should allow further flexibility where local jurisdictions will be able to handle on their own rather than have the CTP consultant fulfill the task. Concern was over the CTP project list being out of date. If information needs to be updated, the local jurisdiction should have the ability to go in and revise information, if needed.

5.   **Draft 2016 Project Delivery Work Program**

For 2016, the Project Delivery Task Force will meet on an as-needed basis. Dates will be announced in advance of the meeting date. Meetings will be geared towards obtaining feedback and will be designed to be more of a working session. ARC staff will be taking the lead on project delivery activities and tasks working towards the implementation of the revised Action Plan items drafted by the PDTF sub-group members. Items in the revised Action Plan will serve as the guideline for the 2016 project delivery work program.

The most important task of 2016 is the deployment of the Risk Assessment Tool. ARC staff will be investigating platforms to convert the tool from a traditional pen and paper tool to a web-based platform that is interactive and user-friendly. The tool will need several iterations of testing and refinement which may result in the actual deployment of the tool to go into 2017.