

**District Construction Engineers Meeting**  
**September 15 & 16, 2004 in Tampa, FL**

**Meeting Minutes**

**September 15, 2004**

8:00 am – 12:00 noon:           Joint DCE/DME meeting on Construction and Materials Business Plan

- Inter Sample comparison: Tom Malerk made a presentation on this concept. The group then discussed the requirement of 24-hour entry of data into LIMS. SMO asked to provide SCO report of timeframes currently happening before move to this automated feature. State Materials Office to share District data on time lag between QC taking up the tests and entering into LIMS. Ananth reiterated the use of the Contractor Grading process to facilitate timely entry of this data. The group then discussed the merits of system automatically performing verification of the QC data. It was agreed by all that this is the direction that we need to proceed. The development time is expected to take till April – June '05.

**ACTION ITEM: SMO to develop and Implement Inter sample comparison.**

- Automated entry of Asphalt Data into LIMS: Tom Malerk made a presentation on uploading data directly from Asphalt QC Excel Spreadsheet into LIMS. This step of automation was welcomed by all and Tom indicated an implementation date of December 04.

**ACTION ITEM: SMO to develop and implement Automated entry of Asphalt Data into LIMS.**

- Construction Quality Index (CQI): Ken Morgan gave a presentation on this concept. DCE and DME support this development and was jointly agreed to incorporate the CQI as part of Construction's and Material's Business Plans. Jennifer Olson was asked to represent DCE in the development of CQI. Estimated implementation date of July 2005 was established.
- Disposition of Defective Material: Mayur Patel made a presentation on this process. The current form has been revised and was effective last month. The Form and flowchart are available in the forms library. It was also agreed that a Contractor can submit a scope of EAR Analysis. The DME or delegate can approve as is or modify.
- Review of Construction's Performance Measures: Ananth Prasad passed out Construction Performance Measures for FY 03/04. Ananth indicated that the CEI Cost tracking report needs more work as it is not picking up the District-wide contracts. Ananth is currently working with the appropriate Offices to get this report corrected.
- Asphalt Engineering Analysis: The group then discusses Asphalt EAR in the context of low air voids. DMEs feel that air voids less than 2.0% should be removed and

**District Construction Engineers Meeting**  
**September 15 & 16, 2004 in Tampa, FL**

**Meeting Minutes**

replaced. EAR should only be done to delineate the areas of removal. The DCEs were cautioned on the fact that air voids @ plant vs. air voids @ roadways are “apples” and “oranges”. We need to rely on the expertise of the District Bituminous Engineer. If a contractor proposes a warranty to leave questionable material in place, then ask for warranty in the 5 to 8 year range. Do not accept a 3-year warranty as that is what we currently get for acceptable material.

- Independent Verification Testing: Independent Verification testing was discussed. There have been some instances where a project was shut down because of an IV failure only to later find out that the IV test result was incorrect. It may be worthwhile to sample enough material to run two IV test to confirm the results (the good one and the bad ones). It may be beneficial to also provide the contractor the opportunity to take split samples of IV.
- Ride Acceptance (All): Ananth Prasad passed out the latest statewide numbers for Ride. The numbers does show a fall but a significant portion of the fall could be attributed to the changes in the testing method. If appeared that all Districts are uniformly enforcing the requirement of having the contractor straightedge last layer prior to friction course. Ananth stressed that we need to make sure that the straightedge is calibrated.
- Training Issues
  - Self Study converted to Computer Based Training (CBT) Modules: There was a consensus among the group to convert Self Study course to a CBT. The group also discussed proctoring of the self study examination. Districts 4, 5, 6, and SMO were in favor, whereas, Districts 1, 2, 3, and 7 were opposed. State Construction Office to explore the ability to quiz an employee on the CBT but also scramble the questions so that the integrity of the examination is maintained.
  - Separating Level I and Level II Training: Due to the implementation of Materials Model in some Districts and optimizing the Contract Administration Costs, Ananth suggested that we need to separate Level I and Level II qualifications. Testers need to be Level I and Inspectors need to be Level II. There was a consensus among the group to move in this direction.
  - Technician Academy Update: Lorie Wilson gave an update to the group. This academy is for every DOT construction technician to attend initially and then have new technicians attend at the onset of their employment. The plans are to hold this academy twice a year.
  - Construction Academy (CA) Update: The group is currently updating the current CA academy to be in line with expectations of DCEs.
- Final Sign Inspection Report Form: SMO does not require such a form.
- Contract Administration Issues:
  - Letting period: Ananth shared an e-mail from Bob Greer to reduce the letting period back to 30 calendar days. All the Districts, with the exception of District 2, felt that we need to leave the period as is. District 2 was in support of reducing it to 30 days. Ananth also asked about reducing the time between

**District Construction Engineers Meeting**  
**September 15 & 16, 2004 in Tampa, FL**

**Meeting Minutes**

Notice-to-Proceed to first chargeable days. It was a consensus opinion to leave as is since the contract already provide for the Contractor to request an earlier start.

- Frank O'Dea informed the group on District 5's efforts on getting Contractor to review 60% and 90% set of plans.

**ACTION ITEM: Frank to send the link and information to all the DCEs.**

- Frank O'Dea informed the group on District 5's pilot project using ruggedized laptops. The goal here it to have SiteManager on these laptops and connect using wireless service. Presently, the laptops have electronic plans with links to Specifications and Standards.
- Laptop Purchases: Ananth informed the group on the recent purchase of Laptops. This will enable us to transition from PDA to Laptops.
- ProFile Implementation: Ananth informed the group that the implementation is on hold pending IRMC approval. Once the approval is obtained, we will begin implementation.

**September 16, 2004**

1:00 pm – 5:00 pm:                    DCE Meeting

• **Disputes Review Board Issues:**

- Members of Concern (All): The group had a general discussion on various members.
- Coding DRB monetary determination in excess of Engineer's estimate (OIG): Costs in excess of Engineer's estimate that the DRB recommended entitlement should be coded as settlement costs (CPAM code 861). Engineer can adjust the Engineer's estimates based on information provided at the DRB.
- Claim notice requirements v/s DRB escalation process: Dave Sadler handed out a flow chart to identify how the claim notice requirements work in concert with the DRB process.
- Mandatory claim records per article 5-12.7 and 100-1: Ananth informed the group of the requirement of the specification for weekly submittal of claim records from contractor after receiving Notice of Intent. OIG has concerns about information provided to DRB as supporting documentation for monetary issues. The list showing all equipment after Notice of Intent must be certified weekly.
- Three Party Agreement Changes: Ananth discussed changes to the TPA as they related to conflict of interest.

## District Construction Engineers Meeting September 15 & 16, 2004 in Tampa, FL

### Meeting Minutes

- Meeting frequency: Meeting frequency was discussed. Start off monthly and then if no disputes, go to a reduced frequency if both the Department and Contractor agree.

#### **Contract Administration Issues:**

- Contractor Grading: Ananth informed the group he intends to give presentation in all the Districts on this topic and stressed consistency. Dave then gave the Districts a summary of grade results that is being shared quarterly with the Henry Fuller Task Team.
  - Tracking System: A system to track appeal of Deficiency Letters, Deficiency Warning Letter and the Grade was discussed. Ananth passed out what D2 was doing but felt that it may be worthwhile to keep track of such appeals and outcome.
  - Conformance to Contract Documents: This category continues to be the most active of the categories. Look to the SCO website for a wealth of guidance.
  - Rescinding a Deficiency Letter: Dave informed the group that if a decision is made to rescind a DL, the Resident Engineer should get prior concurrence from the District Construction Engineer to ensure consistency and avoid succumbing to project pressures.
- **Weather days:** Ananth discussed handouts showing numbers of weather days granted by district. There were some significant differences by districts with the higher number of days being in the northern districts. This was accounted for primarily as colder temperatures in the fall and winter that limited night time paving.
- **Weather Impacts:** Ananth discussed the further guidance will be sent out on what is compensable due to the Hurricanes. General parameters were discussed. There was a consensus among the group that Maintenance of Traffic devices not on the project (as a result of Department directing such devices to be taken down) should not be compensated under the discretionary payment for Hurricanes. It was agreed by all that impact of emergency work should not be considered in adjusting the no-excuse bonus date. Don Davis of FHWA discussed issues pertaining to reimbursement and federal requirements. Ananth also shared an email from OIG's office on possible consequences of recent storm and things to watch for as it relates to requests from the contractors for impacts.
- **Aggregate/cement shortages and non-compensable TE:** Ananth reiterated that all time extensions relating to industry-wide material (aggregate and cement) shortages are non-compensable and expected consistency across the state.
- **"Buy America" Provision for Steel on Federal-Aid Contracts:** Dave Sadler informed the group that these provisions apply to both exempt and oversight projects. It is important that we do not waive this requirement and any waivers require FHWA approval. The Steel Industry has asked FHWA in Washington D.C. for a national waiver but has been rejected. Dave also informed the group to review the new specification on this subject as it further defines the requirement and is more in line with the Federal Regulations.

**District Construction Engineers Meeting**  
**September 15 & 16, 2004 in Tampa, FL**

**Meeting Minutes**

- **Specification changes:**
  - Approval by State Construction Office: Dave reminded the group to make sure to have SCO approval prior to committing. There have been instances where a specification change request came in after the fact and the SCO was very uncomfortable in approving the change due to the engineering issues.
  - New workbook: Dave discussed the changes to various specifications that are included in the new specification workbook. These changes are as follows:
    - 4-3.2 Extra Work – major rewrite.
    - 5-12.6 Compensation for Extra Work or Delay
    - 6-12.2 Source of Supply - Steel (Federal-Aid Contracts Only) - Buy America requirements
    - 7-1.9 Florida Minority Business Loan Mobilization Program
    - 8-1 Subletting requirements – Percentage changed to 40 % along with elimination of specialty work as part of the calculations
    - 8-3.3 Beginning Work - procurement of materials
    - 8-4.8 Fencing – Securing the right-of-way on limited access facilities.
    - 101-2.2 Mobilization – changes to the payout schedule
    - 102-9.3 Business Signs – Specific business names on each sign as standard.
    - 105-5.8 Supervisory Personnel – Requirements of Geometry Control Engineer/Manager
    - 105-5.11 Incidental Precast Concrete Manufacturing Facilities – Requirement of Quality Control Manager.
    - 105-5.12 Structural Steel and Miscellaneous Metals Fabrication Facility Quality Control Personnel
    - 120-9.4 Compaction of Subgrade - compaction requirements in under
    - 125-4.4 - pipe trenches with trench boxes and backfill requirements
    - 125-8.1.1 General - defining LOT's for CQC in trench boxes
    - 125-8.1.6 Placement and Compaction - compaction requirements under haunches of plastic pipe
    - Section 234 Superpave Asphalt - mix composition changes
    - Section 337 Asphalt Concrete Friction Courses - changes to basis of payment
    - Section 355 Value Added Portland Cement Concrete Pavement - applies to new pavements
    - 415-5.13.3 Plastic Chairs and Bolsters - changes in the requirements of plastic chairs and bolsters.

**District Construction Engineers Meeting**  
**September 15 & 16, 2004 in Tampa, FL**

**Meeting Minutes**

- 452-8.2 Erection Geometry Control - segmental box girder shim requirements
- 455-12.7 Temporary Steel Sheet Piling - sheet pile requirements and payment
- 455-12.9 Preformed Pile Holes - payment method for disturbed soils areas
- Section 523 Patterned/Textured Pavement
- Section 527 - Detectable Warnings on Sidewalk Surfaces
- 630-3.1.1 Conduit for fiber optic cables - conduit fill requirements
- 701-4.6 Retro-reflectivity - 30-meter geometry requirements for raised rib shoulder warning devices
- 702-4.3 Retro-reflectivity - 30-meter geometry requirements for inverted profile stripes
- 709-4.5 Retro-reflectivity - 30-meter geometry requirements for 2 reactive component systems
- 710-4.3 Retro-reflectivity - 30-meter geometry requirements for painted pavement markings
- 711-4.5 Retro-reflectivity - 30-meter geometry requirements for thermoplastic
- Section 713 Preformed Pavement Stripes and Markings
- 994-3.3 Color - fluorescent color requirements

**ACTION ITEM: Districts recommend Update Training to address these changes.**

- Specification changes as it relates to Extra Work and Claims: Ananth refreshed the group's memory on the changes made to the Extra Work and Claim Specifications. Ananth reminded the group of the certified list of items that needs to be submitted at the time of pre-construction conference. This submittal is condition precedent. Furthermore, the new specification requires contractor's to certify costs and time being submitted as a Request for Equitable Adjustment or other dispute resolution proposals.

**ACTION ITEM: Change the pre-construction conference checklist in CPAM to include certified information to be submitted.**

- **Sharing Consultant CEI savings with Contractor:** Ananth reiterated the need to "tie down" costs of all costs associated with CEI finishing early prior to agreeing to any proposal for sharing such costs with the Contractor. Approval from SCO is needed on such Supplemental Agreements. One of the considerations for approval would be the amount of time extension granted on the contract. It was agreed by all that these sort of proposals would only be entertained on contracts inspected by

**District Construction Engineers Meeting**  
**September 15 & 16, 2004 in Tampa, FL**

**Meeting Minutes**

Consultant firms. Ananth has asked the OIG to audit some of the supplemental agreements. FHWA still is not in favor of this concept and will not participate until the OIG issues a report on such cost savings.

- **Adding Incentive spec after the Contract is let:** Ananth stated the Management along with FHWA has concerns about this practice. However, the Department is willing to entertain such requests if there are compelling public interest needs for finishing the project early and if it meets one of the following criteria:
  - Significant change made/occurred on a project hence necessitating the Department to accelerate the project to avoid customer satisfaction issues (such as without the incentive, the project completion may fall within holidays, other public events, etc.)
  - Significant events subsequent to the letting
- **Changes to No-Excuse Specifications and paying for acceleration costs:** Ananth reminded the group of the changes to these specifications and the Department's policy of not paying for acceleration costs. State Highway Engineer's approval is needed to adjusting the no-excuse specifications.
- **No-Excuse Provision:** Ananth and Clay stressed to the group that we need to be sure that we have written request for payment of the no-excuse bonus with a claim waiver. There have been some contracts where we made payment of the no-excuse bonus without the contractor requesting it and providing the Department with the waiver of all claims.

**ACTION ITEM: Requirement of letter from contractor needs to be added to Final Estimates Checklist.**

- **Environmental Fines and Consent Orders:** Ananth stated the Department's position that the Contractor pay for his failure to comply with the permit. If Contractor refuses, SCO needs to be notified. The Department will then pay and deduct from contractor payments. If the fine is due to Department's inaction/error, then the Department needs to pay for fine. D-3 on of its contract paid 3<sup>rd</sup> party to perform work not done by contractor and back charged contractor.
- **Partnering:** Ananth suggested that we may need to do more partnering to account for various changes in the way we do things and the changes in personnel. Ananth stressed that Partnering is way to communicate and escalate issues, not a way to ignore contract terms and condition. Larry Bonine has been doing some partnering workshops around the State and suggested that Districts send some of their key staff to these workshops. Larry has already conducted such sessions in Tampa and Orlando. Districts definitely should consider partnering with new contractors to the area. In addition, look at jobs with Contractors where relationship are not very good and try to schedule partnering on job.
- **Supplemental Agreement Issues:** Joe Maleszewski of OIG informed the group about their recent audit and findings. OIG reviewed 20 to 25 contract modifications per District. Out of the \$76M total for contract changes, \$19M didn't have necessary

**District Construction Engineers Meeting**  
**September 15 & 16, 2004 in Tampa, FL**

**Meeting Minutes**

backup. Many of districts have processes in place now to improve. Review period was prior to amended documentation requirements. Common things found:

- Summary missing.
  - Unable to trace back Labor, Equipment, and Material breakout.
  - LS items need more information as backup to support price paid.
  - Signature & date of review/analysis.
  - Found a lot of documents where coding by CEI differed from what was in Jim Johnson's report. Whoever makes the change needs to initial such changes. Turnpike does this well.
  - MOT costs should show detail but should not be prorated. Same would apply for mobilization.
  - Paragraph 4 – The Department has serious concerns with contractors crossing out paragraph 4. If there are any specific exceptions, state them in the body of the agreement language. Advantage of this language is that it resolves majority of the issues as opposed to unilateral which gets no agreement. Ananth passed out suggested language. The Department should not be executing Supplemental Agreements with paragraph 4 stricken or modified.
- **Lump Sum Schedule of Values:** Dave stated that we should not use the schedule of values for pricing extra work (good place for comparison). Some folks are using schedule of values prices to negotiate change rather than comparing the prices to statewide averages. A standard schedule of values has been developed for Design-Build contracts and is posted on the web site. Dave posed the question as to whether we should consider asking contractor to complete standard schedule for future estimating purposes (concerns of group is that wouldn't get realistic and usable information). DCEs felt that we should not standardize this on LS contracts.
  - **ADA Compliance issues:** Dave discussed the findings of recent process review and suggested that we need to pay more attention and be proactive in field as it relates to curb cut ramps. On retrofit existing ramps, slope and truncated dome patterns are the main issues. Department has been subjected to litigation on ADA issues.
  - **Fast Response contract and DBE:** Ananth suggested to the group that fast response contract provides the Department a good opportunity to get DBE participation. Some Districts stated that they are required to generate full set of plan and specification packages for these type of contracts, however, there is no consistency among the Districts.

**ACTION ITEM: Issue guidance on what is required for Fast Response Contracts.**

- **Thermoplastic Striping:** Ananth informed the group that if a District can choose to include thermoplastic pavement markings back into construction contracts. However, Ananth suggested that we need to be using the No track products.

**District Construction Engineers Meeting**  
**September 15 & 16, 2004 in Tampa, FL**

**Meeting Minutes**

**ACTION ITEM: Dave to send the No Track Final Pavement Markings spec to Districts for use.**

- **District Warranty Coordinator and tracking warranty in Site Manager:** Dave informed the group that CPAM has guidance on site manager entry and tracking of warranty periods. Not all districts are entering their warranty commitments into SiteManager.

**ACTION ITEM: DCEs to send the names of DWC to Dave Sadler. Dave will send the report on warranty and “how to” track warranty in SiteManager.**

- **Construction Projects Emergency Plan for Hurricanes:** The group discussed the preparedness plan, best practices, FHWA & FEMA requirements, relationship of maintenance, and boilerplate types of contracts. Ananth also stated it is the Department’s position that emergency contracts in excess of \$ 250,000 require the contractor be pre-qualified. Ananth asked the DCEs to give names for folks to work on a team to develop written guidance. Tim Lattner from SCO would take the lead along with Don Davis of FHWA.

**ACTION ITEM: DCEs to give name of individuals who are going to participate on the Task Team. Don Davis of FHWA will forward the Q & A file on hurricanes to all the Districts.**

- **Guardrail Complete Item:** Dave gave the group a concept of guardrail complete item which would include all incidentals including miscellaneous asphalt. DCEs support change.

**ACTION ITEM: SCO to pursue this concept further.**

- **Pre-qualifications issues:** Ananth discussed prequalification and concerns that Department has with performance concerns with various contractors.
- **Role of CEI Firm and the Construction Project Manager:**
  - Revision to Pre-qualification categories: Ananth shared the changes to the Bridge pre-qualification categories for the CEI. These changes are made in context of recent problems on complex bridge contracts.
  - CEI not making decisions: Ananth stressed that the CEIs on our projects are hired to make decisions on the projects within the limits established in the contract. Don’t get coerced into making the decisions for the consultant.

**District Construction Engineers Meeting**  
**September 15 & 16, 2004 in Tampa, FL**

**Meeting Minutes**

- EAR Process – Dave discussed information detailed at Asphalt Conference and showed group new form (Disposition of Defective Material form and flowchart).
- CEI Firms of Concern: The group then discussed performance of various consultants.
- FICE working group for CEI Issues: Ananth informed the group of the establishment of this group and the goal of fostering a better framework to solve problems as it relates to CEI issues. Stefanie Maxwell will take the lead in setting up the meetings
- Project Manager Staffing Levels: Ananth shared a chart of proposed staffing levels. DCEs had some concerns and wanted to suggest a different way of establishing these levels. The expectation here is for the Districts to be in reasonable compliance prior to a Process Review to be performed by SCO and FHWA.

**ACTION ITEM: DCE to provide comments on bridge pre-qualification categories and project manager staffing levels to Ananth.**

- **CPAM Changes:** Dave provided DCEs a summary of various changes to the CPAM Chapters and briefly discussed them. Such changes are as follows:
  - **2.1, Project Scheduling**  
Pen and ink changes – Project Engineer changed to read Project Administrator, State Construction Engineer changed to read Director, Office of Construction and other minor changes.
  - **4.1, Administration of Consultant CEI Contracts (Changes made as a result of Revised Construction Bulletin No. 03-04)**  
4.1.6(A) has been deleted and replaced with new language.  
4.1.12(A), new language added to the beginning of paragraph.
  - **4.2, Consultant CEI Accountability (Changes made as a result of Revised Construction Bulletin No. 03-04)**  
4.2.5(A), first sentence of paragraph has been deleted and replaced with new language. This section was also renumbered and the above mentioned change appears in 4.2.6 (A).
  - **6.1, Unpaid Bills Processing**  
Pen and ink changes – PE to PA, State Construction Engineer changed to read Director, Office of Construction.
  - **7.2 Time Extensions (Changes include those made as a result of Revised Construction Bulletin No. 03-04)**

**District Construction Engineers Meeting**  
**September 15 & 16, 2004 in Tampa, FL**

**Meeting Minutes**

- 7.2.5, Revised approval authorities for granting contract time based on percentages of original contract time.
- 7.2.7, Clarified role of DOT's Project Manager in requesting Federal Aid participation on Consultant CEI staffed contracts.
  - 7.2.7.2, Clarified role of DCE in approving Federal Aid participation decision on non federal oversight projects.
  - 7.2.8(A), Clarify DCE role in review of contract changes.
- **7.3, Supplemental Agreement and Unilateral Payments (Changes include those made as a result of Revised Construction Bulletin No. 03-04)**
  - 7.3.4, Clarified definition of premium cost  
State Construction Engineer changed to Director, Office of Construction throughout.
  - 7.3.8, 7.3.15 and Guidance Document 7-3-A, Clarified documentation required for granting time on contract changes.
  - 7.3.9, Clarified record keeping responsibilities related to sending unsigned contract changes to contractor.
  - 7.3.11.2(A), first paragraph deleted and replaced with new language.
  - 7.3.11.3(A) has been deleted and replaced with new language.
  - 7.3.15, Guidance Document 7-3-A, Revised approval authorities for granting contract time based on percentage of original contract time.
  - 7.3.16, Clarified role of DCE in approving federal aid participation decision on non federal oversight projects.
  - 7.3.14, Revised the approval authorities and maximum approval dollar limits for supplemental agreements and unilateral payments.
  - 7.3.18(A), DCE roll in developing a process to review a sample of contract changes.
- **7.4, Contingency Supplemental Agreement and Work Order/Field Supplemental Agreement (Changes include those made as a result of Revised Construction Bulletin No. 03-04)**
  - 7.4.9, Clarify who has authority to execute Field SA.
  - 7.4.10(A), DCE role in developing a process to review a sample of contract changes.  
State Construction Engineer changed to read Director, Office of Construction and minor formatting changes throughout.
- **8.1, F.A.I.N Resolution**  
No changes made
- **8.2, Environmental Commitment Compliance**  
Being re-written to address environmental issues
- **8.3, Operation Within Railroad Right-of-Way**

**District Construction Engineers Meeting**  
**September 15 & 16, 2004 in Tampa, FL**

**Meeting Minutes**

Pen and ink changes – PE changed to PA

- **8.4, Shop & Erection Drawing Process**  
Pen and ink changes – minor changes to format
- **8.5, Contract Delinquency**  
Pen and ink, minor changes to format
- **8.6, Contract Default**  
No changes made
- **8.7, Contractor Non-Responsibility For Construction Contract**  
8.7.5, (B) in first sentence deleted, made by District Construction Engineer shall be summarized in a memorandum.” Changed to read “District Construction Engineer shall review the recommendation made by the Resident Engineer and in the event of concurrence, shall make, etc.”
- **8.8, State Arbitration Board**  
8.8.4, web site referenced.
- **8.9, Contract Termination**  
8.9.4 (B) added was last paragraphed. Other changes were pen and ink.
- **12.1, Project Acceptance (Changes include those made as a result of Revised Construction Bulletin No. 03-04)**  
Pen and ink changes throughout, Project Engineer changed to read Project Administrator.  
12.1.6(A), first paragraph deleted and replaced with new language.  
12.1.9(A), first paragraph deleted and replaced with new language.

**ACTION ITEM: DCEs are to review in detail these changes and respond back to Dave Sadler by November 22, 2004.**

- **Pilot Projects Update:** Ananth asked the Districts to give an update on the following pilot projects.
  - Performance Turf Update: Continue to monitor; mixed success; we need to keep trying so that we learn and refine the spec prior to implementation.
  - Informational Signs: District One piloting; D6 uses a different version everywhere. We need to keep trying these signs.
  - Value-added Signalization: Dave discussed that SCO has specification available for general projects subject to approval of SCO. It is to be used on all DB projects.

**District Construction Engineers Meeting**  
**September 15 & 16, 2004 in Tampa, FL**

**Meeting Minutes**

- Value-added Lighting: Dave discussed that SCO has specification available for general projects subject to approval of SCO. It is to be used on all DB projects.
- Customer Survey Incentive spec: D5 & 6 are trying this.

**ACTION ITEM: DCEs to identify projects to pilot Value Added Signalization and Signing Specifications. Look at using Performance Turf and Customer Survey Specifications**

- **Contract Delivery:** Ananth gave an update of the following:
  - Early Contractor Involvement – discussed concepts associated with process of involving contractors.
  - Contractor shortlisting prior to low bid – discussed the concept of a “shortlisting” of contractors eligible to bid certain types of projects based on past performance scores.
- **Maintenance of Traffic Issues:**
  - Pilot projects: Ananth asked the Districts to give an update on the following pilot projects.
    - Dynamic Lane Merge – DCE see no benefit in trying this. Ananth indicated there may be some potential for use.
    - “Speed Limit Reduced When Flashing” (D2 7 4) – D4 tried this with mixed success.
    - Rumble Strips (D1 & 2) – D2 tried this and will continue to experiment this concept. Ananth suggested that we need to aggressively pursue this concept and try to implement. D2 will be evaluating a concept using cables/hoses.
    - Type III (Potters) Bead (D3) – D3 had good success with this.
    - Sand Seal and Thin Overlay (D5) – D5 and D6 are both piloting this concept.
    - Electronic Speed Limit signs – Ananth expressed the desire for the Department to move in this direction.
  - Work Zone fatalities: Ananth passed out statistics and discussed thoughts on ways to improve numbers.

The meeting adjourned on September 16, 2004 at noon.