
Semi-Monthly TIA ACEC Working Group Meeting

**Georgia Department of Transportation
One Georgia Center, Room 405**

**January 8, 2015
1:30 PM**

- 1. Revenues**
- 2. TIA Fact Sheet**

The new version of the TIA Fact Sheet was distributed and the layout of the information discussed. John Heath asked if any change in the revenue trend was expected. It was discussed that the revenues remain steady and well under the original forecasts. It is not expected to see those revenues recovered and that is the reason that the TIA program aggressively manages the project budgets and contingencies.

- 3. TIA Manual Update**

The quarterly update of the TIA Manual is planned for the end of January or first of February. Meetings are going on now reviewing the Manual. Updates will incorporate addendums that have been published up to this point. The main thrust of any other changes would be in giving Local Governments more latitude in managing their projects.

- 4. Contracting Update**

- a. Batch 2 Complete**

Batch 2 Procurement is completed as of today. All 5 contracts in the procurement have been fully executed and the last contract will be issued NTP today.

- b. Batch 3 Selections**

The selection process for the Batch 3 Procurement is complete and apparent awardees have been announced – posted on the Georgia Procurement Registry. Procurement is moving into the negotiation and contracting phase. Plans are to have contracts in place within a couple of months.

- c. Future Anticipated Advertisements**

Anticipating one final Batch advertisement. That will, for the most part, finish up all of the major projects requiring full design services. Most if not all of the projects will be Band 3 projects. The anticipated projects are listed in the 2015 Potential Consultant Acquisition Needs as posted on the GDOT website. These projects may be adjusted as we move closer to the time of advertisement. As of now, looking at a mid-Spring advertisement date – probably sometime in April. Will follow same format as previous procurements with a Public Notice Announcement and an Industry Forum Meeting.

Other smaller or partial project work will continue to be done with On-Call Task Orders. The current two active On-Call contracts are approximately 50% “utilized”. TIA is anticipating procurement of additional On-Call contracts in the late 2015 time frame. Still need to analyze needs to determine size and number of contracts needed.

A CEI procurement will also be needed in order to complete Construction Inspection needs through the end of the Program. No specific timeframe has been decided on for when we will proceed with this procurement.

- d. Project Contingency Utilization**

During the Batch 2 contracting phase, some changes were made to clarify the contract language concerning the requirement for contracted designers to design to budget. Changes will clarify the

intent of the design to budget approach of the TIA program. Many of the contracted consultants expressed concern that they could not perform within a budget if unforeseen circumstances in conditions arose. Explanations of how budgets could be adjusted during the contract seemed to satisfy most, but none of that explanation was actually in the contract.

Consequently, we developed some language that is now included in the Scope (see attached Exhibit B section.) This addition also required some language change to Article 4 (also attached.)

Discussion about this verbiage resulted in some consensus that the language in Article 4 could use some additional thought. As it reads now it generally only addresses the need to meet the construction budget, where the intent is that the contracted consultant is expected to manage all phases of the overall project budget to develop a buildable project within the constraints of the overall budget.

5. Future Meetings – Input from Industry

Consultant members present stated that there was a need on their part to better disseminate information coming out of our meetings. Since it is an ACEC-GDOT effort, it seems that ACEC should take a lead in getting the information out. The Consultant members said that they could give a summary briefing at the monthly ACEC Transportation Forum meeting. There should always be enough of the TIA-ACEC attendees at the Forum meetings to be able to provide the briefing.

6. Open Discussion

1. Q: Are some of the lessons learned or the methods for accelerating projects to letting that have been adopted in the TIA Program going to find their way into the mainstream GDOT program.

A: Some already are. Construction is already moving towards a risk-based inspection methodology that is being used for TIA. In other areas, the biggest factor preventing shortening some of the processes has been, and continues to be, adhering to federal requirements. Depending on the outcome of transportation funding legislation being discussed for this session, if more state funds are allocated and used in the design process, a lot of “TIA practices” could be adopted for the regular GDOT program.

2. Another topic arose about approvals required for TIA projects and where they had to come from, specifically BFI approvals were discussed. In the meeting the general answer was that most approvals, unless it was a blended project with federal funds, were done by the TIA PgM (AECOM). The major exception being any permits (access, signals, etc.) It was specifically stated in the meeting that BFI’s did not go to GDOT OMT. *After the meeting, further research revealed a needed clarification. As per the TIA Manual, any on-system project requires that the BFI is submitted to GDOT (OMT) for approval. That submittal will be done through the TIA PM, not directly to OMT.*
3. A point was made that there was no specific way for a consultant to capitalize on an innovative idea for saving project cost that may come up during the design of a projects. There is no mechanism to compensate the consultant for anything that may result in a significant construction savings. Consequently, there is no incentive for the consultant to implement such an item – particularly if it involves additional design work that would not be compensated. Example: An initial consultant contract agrees to produce a design for 500k that results in a “guaranteed” construction cost of 23 million. During the course of the design, an issue arises that requires the consultant to do some redesign in order to meet the stated construction budget. In the process, the consultant finds a solution that would reduce the construction cost by 8 million, but that change would require the consultant to do an additional 25k in design work.

Should part of the 8 million be used to additionally compensate for the 25k? Should the consultant be additionally rewarded for the extra savings?

The general consensus of the group was that there should certainly be a mechanism to cover the cost (and in the TIA methodology there is – the 8 million in CST savings can be reallocated to PE to cover the 25k.)

7. Next Meeting Scheduled for Thursday, March 12, 2015 at 1:30

