The meeting was held April 17th at the City of Tulsa office. Those present were Paul Zachary, Henry Som de Cerff, Terry Ball, Shannon Hanks, Sarah Reece, Jared Podolny, Damon Domer, Rusty Ackerman, and Doug Glenn.

A brief discussion was had regarding the importance of maintaining trust and focusing on the common mission of serving the public through infrastructure delivery.

Mr. Zachary then presented the synopsis of the City's perspective on top three areas of improvement (attached herewith). Additional notes are as follows:

1. The City acknowledges that they must enforce the minimum standards for land surveying on all projects and that they should not be quick to cut surveying scope in attempts to save costs.
    1. It is best to survey all the way to the house front for any street project. We are experiencing multiple issues with tying in driveways and other things where more surveys would be helpful. Mobilizing once and surveying a little more is less costly than mobilizing again or having a problem during construction.
    2. We should expect to perform SUE on every project.
2. Consultants should know that it's okay to pass on projects if the timing is not good for them. This will not disqualify them from future opportunities. The City would rather the Consultants pass than run into issues around project delivery schedules.
3. Consultants need to come to the kickoff meetings already prepared with a good understanding of the project.
4. Consultants should ensure that quality control checks are completed by more senior level, experienced staff. They are relying on us to get it right.
5. The City acknowledges that utility coordination has been an issue and they have made some recent adjustments to improve. It was noted that there are multiple new fiber optic companies in town, exacerbating the problem.
6. Consultants should resist calls to 'dumb down' our plans when asked. Unless we are doing a simple mill and overlay, details need to be there – especially concerning ADA ramps and other grade sensitive areas.
7. Specifications should be prepared earlier in the design process and kept current with plan production. There are too many problems with rushing them out at the end of the process.
8. The City has moved to a more formal RFI process which should be making us all better over time.
9. City staff explained how they are able to move funding between projects to pay for additional surveys or designs when projects have stalled or need scope revisions.
10. It was suggested that we get back to doing plan-in-hand meetings in the field, probably after the 60% submittal. This would be time well spent to create better drawings and coordinate on any critical design decisions. Both sides seemed eager to make this change.

11. When coordinating with other parts of the City system or with citizens, business owners, or council members – ALWAYS include the City project manager.
12. Consultants should try to take City PM's with us to 'yard meetings' or at least document our discussions and keep them informed. We need to train our people to never make promises to the public.
13. Consultants need to be at all public meetings and engage.
14. Mandatory 'all-design' meetings are coming back.
15. Consultants should feel free to check in early and often on projects and lingering questions. Do not hesitate to 'nag.'
16. Both the City and Consultants reiterated that we should feel open to coming to each other with staff issues.
17. The City of Tulsa emphasized that they consider the Consultants to function as an extension of staff.

Discussion then turned to the Consultant's perspective. Most items attached and above are high on our list as well. We also discussed:

1. The key thing we are looking for is alignment on scope, schedule, and budget as early in the process as possible. The tighter we can nail the scope down at project initiation, the better we can meet the schedule and provide a tighter fee.
    1. The City instructed that we use the work breakdown structure to achieve clarity between parties on what is and is not expected in the scope.
2. The City stated that the 8% of construction costs cap on fees should be the 'second chair' of fee derivation, not the first. Meaning, it should be a check and is not a hard line that can never be crossed.
3. The 3.0 multiplier maximum was discussed. The City is open to reviewing new methods of looking at this. Consultants should bring a proposal to the table.
4. The City is not interested in lump sum contracts at this time.
5. Consultants commended the City on their willingness to process contract amendments, but all agreed that a goal to need less of them was better for everyone.

All parties agreed to meet as often as necessary, but at least quarterly. The Consultants will connect and provide some suggestions for addressing some of these key items and then schedule the next joint meeting.