Project Delivery Task Force
Meeting Summary
October 21, 2016

ATTENDEES	
TAQC	N/A
TCC/LOCAL AGENCIES	Bill Andrews (Clayton County); Mark Dana (City of Roswell); Tavores Edwards (Coweta County); Vince Edwards (Gwinnett County); Phil Mallon (Fayette County); Charles McGiboney (Barrow County); Jeff Mueller (City of Norcross); Hugh Saxon (City of Decatur); Tom Sills (CBMPO); Michael Smith (City of Dunwoody); David Tucker (Gwinnett County); Michelle Wright (City of Douglasville)
ARC	Brian Allen; Jean Hee Barrett; Patrick Bradshaw; Allison Duncan; Diana Fields; Amy Goodwin; David Haynes; Marquitrice Mangham; John Orr; Byron Rushing; Kofi Wakhisi;
GDOT	Paul DeNard; Matthew Fowler; Henry Green; Bobby Hilliard; Kaycee Mertz; Albert Shelby; Quinton Spann; Megan Weiss
USDOT	Tamara Christion (FHWA); Tiffani Davis (FHWA); Mindy Roberson (FHWA)
MARTA	Cathy Gesick; Tameka Wimberly
OTHERS	Jonathan Cox (Jacobs Engineering); Shaun Green (ABI); Gil Grodzinsky (GAEPD); Michael Kray (Jacobs Engineering); Elizabeth Yarnall (AECOM)

SUMMARY

1. **Introductions**

   Kofi Wakhisi, ARC, kicked off the meeting by welcoming the group and leading the introductions. Wakhisi reviewed the agenda with the committee.

2. **Status Update on the PDTF Action Plan**

   Amy Goodwin, ARC, gave a quick recap of activities in the last year since the Project Delivery Task Force (PDTF) met as a group. Goodwin provided an overview of the four groups – Dealing with Change, Limited Scope Projects, Project Feasibility and Programming, and Streamlining Environmental Analysis. Further revisions were made to the Project Delivery Action plan to reflect current and planned activities. It was outlined in a table and provided to attendees which was organized by short, mid, and long-term activities.

With the short-term activities, almost all are underway along with ARC investigating ways to assist with project delivery and be more involved in the process. The mid-term activities listed may take more time and staff resources while the long-term activities present more implementation challenges or are complicated to execute. The revised Action Plan will be available on the Program Delivery website (http://www.atlantaregional.com/programdelivery) and sent out to the task force members.

Wakhisi briefly discussed the Environmental Analysis tool that would be useful in helping with measuring potential environmental impacts. The tool examines impacts to wetlands, flood plains, historical cultural resources, and endangered species habitats. It is anticipated that the tool would be useful during the development of county Comprehensive Transportation Plans (CTPs) when determining desirable alignments or alternatives. Availability of the tool is anticipated for some time in 2017. Shapefiles may be emailed to ARC if a jurisdiction/sponsor would like an assessment. A report would then be sent back with the map showing the different layers provided within the tool.

a.   **TIP Policies and Delivery**

Brian Allen, ARC, provided a status update on the reprogramming policy. The TAQC subcommittee will be reviewing options to achieve the desired funding authorization and implementation goals. ARC is steering away from the use it or lose it policy and instead focusing on a revised reprogramming policy. The intention is to track projects in an efficient manner and get ahead of any potential issues that may arise. If a sponsor is unable to meet the first required milestone, ARC intends to work with the sponsor to determine issues and meet their target schedule. For projects continuously experiencing delays, its funding at its programmed year will be re-evaluated.

b.   **2016 Breaking Ground Report**

Patrick Bradshaw, ARC, presented the findings from the 2016 Breaking Ground Report. The report took each fiscal year in the TIP and pulled out all project phases in the analyzed fiscal year. Then looked at whether the phase was authorized for that fiscal year or delayed. This analysis reviewed all projects regardless of fund source. From the data, it appeared that delivery rates have stabilized over the last few years. This was due in part to establishing more realistic project schedules and the emphasis on project delivery. There will be some refinements to the Breaking Ground Report in the future. Among

them will be to look at delivery with respect to project status instead of funding authorization. And provide more frequent status updates on project delivery.

c.   **Risk Assessment Tool**

Bradshaw provided a demonstration of the Risk Assessment Tool in its digitized form. A webpage was created and a typable PDF version is available as a resource. The Risk Assessment Tool will not be built into the project prioritization evaluation. The tool is intended to serve as a guide for project sponsors to determine where their risks may exist at any point in the PDP process. The tool can be saved as you go along and returned to at a later time. However, when using the tool, one must use the same computer and the same web browser in order for the information to be saved. The digitized version of the Risk Assessment Tool will be available on the Program Delivery website. PDTF members, TCC members, and project sponsors will receive an email when it is available for use.

3.   Deliverability Criteria for Upcoming TIP Solicitation

Goodwin introduced the 2017 TIP Application Deliverability Assessment that will be used for the upcoming project solicitation. For new projects that are to be added to the TIP, a deliverability assessment will need to be filled out. The questions are almost exactly the same as the ones asked in the previous solicitation application. Additionally, the information requested mirrors the GDOT concept report. If the concept report was completed, the responses may be copied and pasted to respond to the deliverability assessment questions. Goodwin did note that some questions are unique and may not be in the concept report. ARC will compare responses with GDOT and examine the type of assumptions provided.

4.   Next Steps

Wakhisi notified PDTF members that ARC will conduct a pre-application workshop to provide assistance with the application and answer any questions. At the workshop, the intention is to talk about guidelines, expectations, and deliverables. The question needs to be asked, "What does a sponsor need to demonstrate to meet implementation?" The long-term goal is to conduct an ongoing solicitation process and have the sponsor fill out the application at any time. Applications would be reviewed during the next funding opportunity. The 2017

project solicitation is expected to open in early Spring and have recommendations for funding to be part of a TIP Update during the second half or 2017.