

Minutes
Joint Materials/Construction Meeting
9-13-06

8:00 am:

Introductions

Reordered agenda due to DME's meeting with directors until 10am.

Paul Wai, Matt Price, Keith Hinson, Stan Swiatek, Alan Autry, Terry Muse, Frank O'Dea, Pat McCann, Lorie Wilson, Don Budnovich, Mike McCammon, Amy Scales, Nancy Aliff, Patrick Stanford, Brian Pickard, Tracie Rose, Brian McKishnie, Peter Nissen, Greg Jones, Mario Cabrera, Mark Croft, Greg Schiess, Tim Ruelke, Ernest Garcia, Steve Crisler, Brian Blanchard, Jon Sands, Millicent Burns, Barbara Espino, John Tyler

Susan Blazo, Sam Joseph, Henry Haggerty, Steve Sedwick, Ghulam Mujtaba, Gale Page, Jim Musselman, John Shoucair, Roger Schmidt, Steve Benak, Ken Cox, Frank Kreis, Jeff Fetzko, David Horhota, Debra Schneider, Mayur Patel, Tom Malerk, Ken Weldon, Ken Morgan

Construction - Quality Control Issues:

1. QC Plans – how often pulled, by whom, consistency in approval process – limited numbers of plans pulled at residency level and these are addressed quickly by the contractor. Sometimes hear about plan accepted in one district, not in other.
2. Select backfill – for French drains, why blend stone and sand for area above stone/filter envelope? What is being done in your district?

443-2.3 Select Fill: Use select fill, unless otherwise called for, consisting of well-graded limerock or limerock and sand fill. Sand, or fill having a high proportion of sand, will not be accepted as select fill. Prior to placing select fill, obtain the Engineer's approval.

443-5.1 French Drains Under Pavement: Fill the area above the coarse aggregate with select fill material meeting the requirements of this Section. Place and compact the select fill according to the requirements for pipe as specified in Section 125. The Department will allow use of additional coarse aggregate over the top of the pipe instead of select fill material. In this case, the top of the coarse aggregate shall not be higher than the bottom of the base, unless shown in the plans. The Department will not pay additional costs associated with substituting coarse aggregate for select fill.

Historical perspective on this is for the select fill to be free of too many fines so that the fines won't flow into the coarse aggregate around the French Drain.

3. Drilled shafts for miscellaneous structures – SMO has some research ongoing to improve installation techniques. SCO is emphasizing this area more in its Geotechnical Process Reviews.

4. LIMS governing lab process vote, Role of the Construction PA – Susan Blazo email

Brian and Dave, the State Materials Office is evaluating the Governing Lab process in the Laboratory Information Management System. We originally created the process to allow labs to be set up as a governing lab over a subcontract lab on a project by project basis. It was originally developed for situations such as asphalt contractors who have several plants, but want all the data entry done by one user (say someone at the main office). Without the governing lab process, LIMS will not allow this since there is a one userid/one labid restriction.

Here is a brief summary of how it works:

1. The Contractor requests a governing lab setup in LIMS from the Project Administrator.
2. The Project Administrator goes into LIMS and sets up the governing lab/subcontract lab relationship on a project by project basis.
3. After subcontract lab is assigned to a governing lab, users in the governing lab can do data entry for samples logged into the subcontract lab.
4. The subcontract lab tests the sample and send the results to the governing lab.
5. A user in the governing lab enters the tests results on the result entry screen. The user also validates the tests on the validation screen. (User responsibility ends at validation).
6. The PA or designee approves the sample.

We are considering other options on who would be able to set up governing labs. With that background information, does the State Construction Office have concerns regarding Construction's role/responsibility in setting up the governing labs in LIMS? Would you prefer to keep that as a PA responsibility?

Susan Blazo discussed the process of assigning the LIMS governing lab. Presently, construction PA has to go in and assign relationships for the project. Presently, what value is PA adding to the process? Proposal is that the requirement for PA to assign relationship is to be removed. **DCE's are in agreement with this change.**

5. Update on QC-Lite (R²) and smoothness spec – Jim Musselman and Gale Page gave a quick update of the proposed changes to the 334 spec for traffic level A and B mixes (about 7% of our lanes – should be about 30% Dietrich working on this). Acceptance process is evolving or developing. Looking to have contractor to continue to perform QC testing and FDOT to reserve rights to sample. Planned rollout is July 2007 lettings. Spec is being proposed to be a performance based spec without limitation on the type of the mix used. Presently have 17 asphalt contractors in Florida that are not ACAF, FTBA members and do not bid FDOT work. This is part of what prompted some of the R2 and LAP spec changes.

Jim also briefed group on LAP specs and purpose for these. Explained the Category 1, 2, and 3 mixes and testing/acceptance requirements of each.

Gale discussed smoothness spec proposed changes. Process has been ongoing for what seems to be forever. Current spec requiring laser ride specs still require the use of manual straight edge for finding the elusive “bump.” We have developed higher pay schedule for incentive/disincentive payments on projects for good/poor performance. 330-12 is presently being rewritten and will include ride acceptance and straightedge requirements. We intend to eliminate the manual straightedge.

6. Materials pricing and availability discussions – aggregates, liquid, copper, etc.
Flowchart – Shoucair/Blanchard

Handout of proposed flowchart reviewed. Debated whether an arbitrary distance for haul should be considered. Debated what adjustment should be considered if any. Would need to define terms in the flowchart. Flowchart is intended for the DCE/PA’s to use as a tool for evaluating requests for additional time due to contractor assertions of materials shortages. The flowchart can also be publicized and provided to contractors in advance to clearly define the Department’s expectations. **Provide Brian comments from DCE/DME’s by Friday, September 22nd.**

7. Waivers on Straightedging in urban areas – how is your district handling this?

You heard Musselman’s comments at the Asphalt Conference about the affect the waiver can have on accelerating a project back into the work program. Ananth asked that this be discussed because he is hearing that some areas around the state are waiving the straightedging requirements prior to actual paving. DCE’s need to discuss this with their project folks. Mark Croft provided a copy of the tracking they are using in D6 for manhole/valve adjustments.

330-12.3.5 Adjustment of Pay Item Quantity: The Engineer may waive corrections specified above if an engineering determination indicates that the deficiencies are sufficiently separated so as not to significantly affect the ride quality of the pavement and corrective action would unnecessarily mar the appearance of the finished pavement.

Where the Engineer elects to waive correction and the finished pavement surface is a friction course, the Department will reduce the pay quantity for Asphalt Concrete Friction Course by the amount of friction course that the Contractor would have removed and replaced if the Contractor had made the correction.

Where the Engineer elects to waive a correction and the finished pavement surface is other than a friction course, the Department will reduce the appropriate pay quantity for Asphalt Concrete by the equivalent quantity of materials that the Contractor would have removed and replaced if the Contractor had made the correction.

8. Plastic Guardrail blocks – performance – check with Karen Byram on the performance of the blocks and cutting into the block by the guardrail.

9. Asphalt Sampling at the roadway – D5 update – John Tyler provided update on asphalt sampling of mix at the roadway. D5 is collected samples at the plant and roadway from the same truck. D5 pulling samples from the hopper and auger in the field and sample from the truck at the plant. D5 has completed sampling on 90 samples that

appear to show good comparison of data from plant and roadway. D5 working with SMO on analyzing data. Other states (Kansas, Georgia) have already moved this way and have developed correlations for the asphalt absorption with porous aggregate or long hauls and developed a correlation factor. With regard to other states using this method, something that has to be considered is the absorption rates of those state's aggregates. FDOT is looking at removing VT's from the plants.

Shuttle buggies – across the board recommendations from the District Bituminous Engineers and FHWA to add the shuttle buggies. Should be a performance spec if the FDOT drafts a spec. Jim will draft a spec for use of a shuttle buggy and I will go to specs office for this to be used as a developmental spec with me listed as the monitor.

10. What is the one thing that FDOT needs to work on? Cracking of pavements, smoothness. Ken Morgan asking group to think of the one thing FDOT needs to work on so this can be a focus at all meetings.

1:00pm DCE meeting – will continue unfinished items 9-14-06 beginning 7:30 am

9. Tim Lattner presentation on current MRP – discussed handout of the results on the construction projects. **Scanned report attached to minutes.** Recommend increased emphasis on signs installed; results have shown some decrease in signing grading. Tim Lattner agreed to send breakdown by district and cost center and email to DCE's.

10. Ken Weldon presentation on Sunshine One-call – **presentation included with minutes.** This training was required by HB 789. Discussed Statutory requirements and FDOT authority. Also, discussed utility property rights. Two major changes, 1) information provided by an excavator shall be considered valid for a period of 30 calendar days, and 2) locate requests shall occur not less than 2 full business days in advance of beginning excavation. Brian asked if the utility is required to provide as-builts to the maintenance office after the work is completed. Ken's response was no that it is not required by UAM. Brian asked the DCE's how this information is being captured on construction projects. Utilities are responsible for their facility and would be responsible for the locations if they are not placed in the correct location. Resident Construction Office is responsibility for monitoring the relocations done in advance of the construction work being performed. We send plans to utilities prior to new projects being designed to get the utilities to add their facilities on the drawings for design purposes.

10a. Greg Schiess – new Financial Review and Integrity Evaluation requirement. Asks FHWA to be more fiscally responsible. Adds more work to division offices to review: improper payment review; inactive federal-aid jobs where there hasn't been any billing. FDOT will have to justify to FHWA why there are no billings and Fed OIG will do audit. This is being headed up by Stephanie Gleason.

11. Steve Crisler presentation of D2 Warranty Coordination – gave presentation on D2 warranty tracking. Tim Ruelke started with history of this in D2 and task given to Steve to develop a system to provide 24 hour feedback on warranty features of any

section of roadway and whether the section had any EAR/DDM or failures during construction. Challenge was to have the entire system GPS based. **Presentation will be attached as part of these minutes.** CPAM instructions for Warranty Coordinators and statewide meeting of all warranty coordinators is being worked on. David Wang and Jim Johnson are working on these, respectively.

12. OSHA Safety Awareness Training – status of districts in taking the course – discussed availability of the CBT, ILT, or combination course. Reminded DCE’s why this course was developed by SCO. Also, informed group that Ananth and David will be meeting with State Safety Office later this month to discuss the course and attempt to get more buy-in from the district safety offices.

MOT Issues

13. MAS – Brian discussed the contractor’s request to use off-duty law enforcement officers for speed control – not going there at this time. DCE’s expressed concerns over traffic counters (tube type) and use of the hire back contracts, discussed observations on the use of the MAS. Encouraged districts to continue their vigilance in ensuring devices are moved out the clearzone after use, that the messages used are those allowed by the MAS index, that the devices are used in the correct locations and configurations.

14. Temporary Sign Structures – still seeing lots of temporary signs on barricades, need to use the devices required by the standard index.

15. Elimination of Steady Burn lights discussion – Are the 6 states that use the lights leading the country in safety in work zones? We need to study the issue from the safety standpoint.

16. Bolting requirements for Type K wall – required 1-1/4” anchor bolts, bending of smaller diameter bolts is a concern. Stay with the bolt required by the index.

Contract Administration Issues

17. Inform DCE to start sending contract modifications, limit extension requests, etc. to Derek Fusco. Discussed with DCE’s that these requests need to start being sent to Derek for his action.

18. SiteManager presentation on tracking holidays and weather – Jim Johnson – DCE’s expressed concern over the “suspension” in SiteManager and how this is not consistent with the specification that requires granting, not suspending, time. Frank explained the reasoning behind the specification time changes. This method would not be consistent with the spec. **Brian asked for DCE comments by Sept. 22nd.**

19. Final Estimates Strike procedure and offer of Final Payment discussion – Final Estimates meeting yesterday voted yesterday to eliminate the strikes on the PAR’s. There will be strikes on the random IA reviews. Chason suggested an increase from 30%

of the IA's to a higher amount. There has always been a process for holding teams accountable for their work. CEI grading form was revised last year and does include three areas for addressing the Final Estimate quality. When the random IA number comes up, need to take into account the completion percentage of the project. The group discussed a need for effecting grading the CEI Firm. If a CEI makes an error on the Final Estimates, is this considered an error/omission? Yes. If there is an overpayment to the contractor, the CEI is responsible for pursuing recovery of the overpayment. FDOT will not close out any project until there is a PAR review done.

PAR's are showing a lot of errors by the CEI. D2 was noted as doing a very good job with few errors.

DCE's think the strike process with Final Estimates is dysfunctional. On CEI grading, Final Estimates is seldom consulted about the CEI performance on the Final Estimate. This needs to be corrected as part of the grading.

DCE's feel that the accountability should be done as part of the grading and selection process. David Chason will work with his staff and the districts to revised the Review and Administration Manual accordingly. **Brian stated that we would continue to look into this and give feedback at the next meeting.**

Discussed the results of offers of Final Payment and the differences between the districts. Think that the procedure should be written as a performance based procedure telling what we want as performance and let the districts utilize its own efficiencies. Final Estimates asked that they be notified as early as possible when there are outstanding legal issues that may result in a judge's order of payment. This is problematic if the Final Offer of Payment has been made. **Improve communication.**

20. Documenting Contractor credits on Work Orders – all districts are using work orders. Send clarification to the DCE's. Clarify in the CPAM about whether a WO can be issued after final acceptance. Work with Derek and Legal on this. Discussed this further with DCE's while Tim Lattner was with the group. Will review this further – need to review CPAM and discuss further with Legal. **CPAM language with 7.3 and 7.4 will need to be reconciled to provide current guidance.**

21. SA or WO – requirements of CPAM – Handout of findings – **send the summary to the DCE's.**

22. SA coding change –

Currently Available Single Digit Description Codes for Contract Changes - Effective July 18, 2006

Here is a complete list of the currently available contract change description codes. The "Avoidable and Unavoidable" contract change examples above used codes drawn from these lists.

Avoidability Codes

Cost Recovery Codes

0 - Unavoidable: No Remedial Action Required
1 - Avoidable: Production Consultant*
2 - Avoidable: Production FDOT*
3 - Avoidable: Consultant CEI
4 - Avoidable: FDOT CEI
5 - Avoidable: 3rd party

R - Action Recommended
N - No Action Recommended

Claim/Extended Limits Codes

C - Claim settlement
N - Neither
E - Extend Project Limits

Discussed the changes to the Cost Recovery Code, eliminated the other codes since they were not being used. Also, Ken Leuderalbert's office is tracking the other codes with its system. D2 described its approach to coding of premium costs and coding – coordinating the premium costs with design project management. Entry into Leuderalbert's system starts with CEI. D7 process is that when an R is coded, the design side of the house is triggered to input data in their tracking system. DCE's not in favor of changing system to since data is reported to Transportation Commission. It is not known if Leuderalbert's report is given to Transportation Commission. Leuderalbert's office reports that they could not use Constructions database for tracking since the information was not a enterprise reporting system. For now, keep doing as is being done. Constructions data is pulled from CARS so there will have to be double entry of the premium costs (into CARS and into Leuderalbert's system) so that both systems are able to be reported. DCE's feel that if any changes need to be made, they should be made to Leuderalbert's system since the CARS has been in place for a long time and the information needed for Leuderalbert's system is a small part. **DCE's suggest that Leuderalbert's system should extract the information directly from CARS.**

23. Time extensions granted by the RE – Frank O'Dea – suggested that we revise CPAM 7.2 to allow the project Resident Engineer approve time up to 10% of the original time. **Frank will draft suggested language and send to me to work on with FHWA.**

24. Engineer's Estimate – matching Contractor's submitted price – expectation from SCO is that Engineer's Estimate will be done independent of price submitted to FDOT. DCE's explained that their folks were doing the Engineers Estimate independent of the submitted price from the contractor and only the final version was being included. Also, DCE's stated that for extra costs submittals, Engineers Estimates started from the contractor's submitted requests. **Instructed DCE's to continue as are doing and we will focus on this as part of the process reviews.**

25. Recognizing the difference between a mistake and intent – How does experience factor into this and what can we do to improve this? Discussed this in terms of focus group meetings and trust level. Discussed our needs to manage work with decreasing staff and augmenting with Consultant staffing.

Sidebar discussion of pricing from contractors that are 500% over normal pricing and what FDOT's recourse is with regard to contract. Section 7 has language about not

exploiting errors in the plan at bid time. Legal suggests that the district notify the contractor that the FDOT will not accept the price bid and will revise it to \$x price and will likely do it unilaterally. Question was asked about asking contractor to revise price prior to award? Concern is that this would open the door to allow the contractor to try to negotiate other items that they consider their bid to be too low. Some districts have paid 125% of the bid quantity and then paid revised price for quantity after than.

26. CPPR appeals update from districts – appreciate the appeals tracking that is being done by the districts. Circulated example spreadsheet to the DCE’s via email that could be used by the districts for tracking.

27. Kentucky modified DB process – Brian Blanchard – discussed what KY is doing. KY is requiring the firms that are submitting DB proposals to participate in a constructability review. Discussion centered on how this would be considered a DB contract if the agency had design plans already. The DB firm would take the Department’s preliminary plans and finalize the design similar to the normal DB process. Schiess is trying to get copy of the KY language – similar to European Early Contractor Involvement Process. If you want to try this, let Ananth/Brian/Schiess know and they can work with the district to develop process. Need to involve contractor early enough to be able to incorporate their innovations.

27a. FDOT in Responsible Charge of the work – Schiess - discussed FHWA’s concerns and willingness to work with FDOT with manpower. Concerns with integrity of the process since some Consultants have expressed reservations over managing other consultants. D1, D3, D5 have had to do this. Discussed a need for a different QA process for the oversight of the CEI. DCE’s feel it is best for the FDOT to have someone that is experienced, even though with a Consultant, to oversee the work rather than an inexperienced FDOT person.

Specification Issues:

28. Painting Contract – specs and debris handling

Handling issues

- a. spillage of paint debris and blasting media
- b. mixing of abrasive blast media – explosion potential in recycler
- c. storage mislabeling
- d. mixing of hazardous and non-hazardous materials
- e. CEI and Contractor poor record keeping
- f. Overfilling drums – exceeding 880# max
- g. Offsite storage of drums, debris, and equipment – potential problem for FDOT

Spec issues Section 560

560-16.10 Collection and Handling of Waste: Properly classify, package, store, transportation, and dispose of all paint removal debris, both solid and liquid in accordance with

SSPC Guide 7, Guide for the Disposal of Lead-Contaminated Surface Preparation Debris, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with amendments, and all other current government regulations and guidelines. Comply with the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act to include, at a minimum, CFR 40, parts 260-268. Keep solid and liquid waste separate and individual waste streams separate prior to identification, storage, transportation, and disposal. Submit the method of disposal Engineer for approval a minimum of three weeks prior to the date of off-site shipment of waste.

560-16.14 Waste Disposal: Dispose of all non-hazardous waste. The Department is responsible for the transportation, treatment and disposal of hazardous waste. Coordinate disposal of hazardous waste with the Engineer, a minimum of three weeks prior to the date of off-site shipment of waste.

Will keep DCE's posted on results of the DCIC meeting next week.

29. Milling machines for milling around manholes/valves – Keith Hinson – question was asked in D3 by utility companies to allow a small milling machine be used around existing manholes/valves without having to lower them. It did not seem feasible since would be limited to same depth of asphalt being removed and replaced and placed in one lift. D5 would like to try a variable height adjustable manhole riser as a LS JPA. D1 has a plan note that they use in addressing this issue. **Jon will send a copy of this to David.**

30. Damage to vehicles in Construction work zones – process for handling and spec clarification – Greg Jones and Brian Blanchard - often times contractors are refusing to pay for the vehicular damage. What happens when the contractor refuses to handle? Send the information to the Prequalification Specialist. Also, notify the contractor that the District has been notified about this and what are they doing about this. Melissa Counts in the Central Office General Counsel Office needs to be notified. Often hear from Contractors that issue has been turned over to its insurance company. Section 7-11.1 addresses that the contractor is responsible for preserving private property. 7-11.2 also affords the FDOT a mechanism for handling this.

31. Station Markers on Construction Projects – From 5-7.4

For all projects, set a station identification stake at each right-of-way line at 100-foot [30 m] intervals and at all locations where a change in right-of-way width occurs. Mark each of these stakes with painted numerals, of a size readable from the roadway, corresponding to the project station at which it is located. As an exception to the above, for projects where plans do not show right-of-way lines, set station identification stakes at locations and intervals appropriate to the type of work being done. For resurfacing and resurfacing/widening projects, set station identification stakes at 200-foot [60 m] intervals.

Issue has been a Final Estimate in terms of being able to provide necessary measurements because of lack of station markers. DCE's said that this is not a problem as they are requiring station markers.

32. Spec for Beneficial Occupancy – Brian Blanchard discussed a revised LD rate for projects if the work is substantially complete. To encourage the contractor to finish the

project in a timely manner, the daily CEI rate would be charged. Discussion amongst DCE showed that there was not support for this suggestion.

33. Punchlist difficulties – industry issue – discussed concerns from industry that there are multiple lists being given. What the DCE’s are seeing is that contractors are asking for punchlist prematurely while there is still remaining original work to be completed. Districts have provided lists (not punchlists) to the contractors to help them as partners in the work. Some contractors are construing this as punchlist. Construction punchlist, Maintenance punchlist, Signal/County punchlist, Structures Punchlist. Contractors need to follow 5-10.2.

34. 7-11.4

7-11.4 Traffic Signs, Signal Equipment, Highway Lighting and Guardrail: Protect all existing roadside signs, signal equipment, highway lighting and guardrail, for which permanent removal is not indicated, against damage or displacement. Whenever such signs, signal equipment, highway lighting or guardrail lie within the limits of construction, or wherever so directed by the Engineer due to urgency of construction operations, take up and properly store the existing roadside signs, signal equipment, highway lighting and guardrail and subsequently reset them at their original locations or, in the case of widened pavement or roadbed, at locations designated by the Engineer.

If the Department determines that damage to such existing or permanent installations of traffic signs, signal equipment, highway lighting or guardrail is caused by a third party(ies), and is not otherwise due to any fault or activities of the Contractor, the Department will, with the exception of any damage resulting from vandalism, compensate the Contractor for the costs associated with the repairs. Repair damage caused by vandalism at no expense to the Department.

Payment for repairs will be in accordance with 4-3.4.

Interpretation of this spec –

Reading this in its entirety leads me to believe that compensation for damages by third parties is only for the listed items (signs, signals, lighting, and guardrail) that existed prior to the work beginning and not to items installed by a contractor as part of his project.

The reason I believe this is that the contractor has a responsibility to protect the work until it is accepted by the Department. In this case, the work to be protected is the existing items or stored items if they were temporarily taken down, until the project is accepted. This also explains why vandalism is noncompensable. The items are until acceptance of the project the responsibility of the contractor. It is expected that the items are to be protected from vandalism as well as other risks during the contract period. If, however, third party damages occur as noted, FDOT will compensate for the replacement of the existing items. This should not be applied to the new items installed as part of the contract.

DCE's consider this an assignment of risk that FDOT will pay for one way or the other, either through insurance premium or by this spec. DCE's feel that the spec should be clarified to address what is wanted. Sadler will pursue a change in the spec.

DCE's suggest that SCO and State Maintenance Office meet about the requirements of maintenance responsibilities during a construction project.

35. Clearing and Grubbing – have districts allowed mixing of existing grass into the soils in lieu of stripping off grass and topsoil? Was clearing and grubbing paid? None of the districts reported that mixing was being allowed. Would not pass organics.

36. 1.5% markup – some contractors marking up WO's to include 1.5% markup. Informed DCE's that if they are receiving marked up WO's where the contractor has added a 1.5% markup and the job is under the new spec, then reject the document and issue a unilateral if the contractor refuses to execute the document without the markup. The specs have been changed to require payment of actual bond markup. Also, reminded DCE's that initial contingency amount has the bond already covered so don't accept any bond markup on Work Orders issued on the initial contingency items.

37. EDC update – Sadler – status is that there are two full EDC projects (D2, D4) that will be built later this year. Described some of the potential advantages of this system. Explained use of EDC on 4 projects per district between Jan and Jun 2007. These will be used on test piles to gain more data.

General Issues

38. FIN number in Email subject line – Greg Jones – discussed General Counsel Office responsibility with Construction litigation. Discussed email retention as a matter of public record. Discussed obligation to preserve all evidence related to claim issues. Concern is when does the preservation requirement go into effect. Obviously, for any 5-12 claim cases. How does the Department find emails that pertain to the issue? In the interim (prior to the new email system goes into effect), it is imperative that we preserve all emails related to projects. Searching of the emails to find the ones that pertain to project are district project responsibility. If you want to store emails longer than 1 to 3 years, contact OIS about preserving to CD all of emails. Response from DCE's is that everyone's email records would need to be preserved. Blanchard/Sadler recommend that this needs to be brought to the Executive Workshop for them to direct OIS to preserve all records, not have DCE's go to their respective OIS contacts about preserving their districts records.

What can be done now to help facility easier retrieval of emails. Mark emails for 3 years retention. For retrieval, tag emails with the FIN in the subject line. Greg requested that DCE's go back to their CEI's that they need to preserve their email records as a public record. Whatever is settled upon, it needs to be sortable for ease of retrieval by the FDOT.

Lorie Wilson will send be directions on method to save emails directly to Hummingbird.

Need to be more disciplined in the comments made in emails. Please discuss this with your folks.

39. CEI CADD requirements – None of the districts are doing any CADD (with the exception of D3 in-house) drawings for as-builts. Every field office in D3 has CADD capability but most as-builts being done with CADD. D3 has the process in place but majority of as-builts are still be hand and scanned into Image API. Discussed this as it relates to Electronic Density Log Book development.

40. Electronic Pile Books – Sastry summary – **will email update after the meeting.**

41. Update on Profile – Brian/Kenneth Standley – goal is to have system fully operational by Summer 2007. **Provided handout that is attached.**

42. Project Costing – Brian – after the fact invoicing by consultants for automating redistribution of hours/costs to the project. Robin Naitove will give a presentation to the Executive Workshop next Wednesday. DCE's selected option 2 of the proposed options.

DCE discussions – open topics

1. Brian discussed Contractor Prequalification meetings.

2. PPI – discussed intent of getting away from different item indexes and going with the PPI as one adjustment done to the contract monthly. Industry still wants the fuel and bit as well as PPI. Also, stated that some cities and counties use the FDOT fuel and bit. DCE's suggest that it be limited to large, long duration projects. Others feel PPI use might stimulate increased competition. A final decision on the PPI will be made by the Executive Board in its September meeting.

3. D4 – getting ready for Ernesto, some contractors were told to pull some turbidity barriers and didn't but told FDOT did. SFWMD is considering a fine against the FDOT. DCE's would consider the contractor responsible and CEI would be held accountable via performance evaluation.

4. D1 – hearing issues on CEI's. Hearing contractors say they don't like working with the CEI, that the CEI extending the time on the job to continue to be billable. Contractors feel being made to jump through hoops. Others districts echoed that they are hearing similar comments from time to time. Keep in mind there are two sides to every story. DCE's recommended that this issue be discussed with FICE.

5. Any opposition to including assistance dce's in the in on the email distribution lists. **DCE's will send Brian/Wynette a list of folks to add to the DCE email list by Friday, Sept 22nd.**

6. D5 comments on PPI, and how SA's are handled. Devil's in the details. There has been a draft spec. SA's after the fact shouldn't have the PPI applied.
7. D6 – QC/QA procedure – continue what you are doing now until the new CPAM procedure is updated. If changes have been made, continue with your changes. **NOTIFY RANDY THAT THIS IS THE WAY WE WILL PROCEED.**
8. D2 – dates on SA/WO – the date was intended to be the date in which the contractor can be authorized to proceed with the work. D2 is interpreting this to be the date the last person executed the agreement. **CPAM needs to be clarified on this. SA/WO form should be revised to eliminate this date.**