

352

**FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CONTRACTOR SURVEY**

FPID: 413776-1-52-01

T5127

A. QUALITY OF PLANS

(Comments may be added on the lines provided)	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Contract plan notes were clear, concise and consistent. <u>THE AREA THAT REQUIRED RE-GRASSING WAS NOT DEPICTED IN PLANS - MINOR ISSUE.</u>		✓		
2. Contract plans provided sufficient information to submit a competitive bid.		✓		
3. Contract plans were free from constructability issues, design errors. <u>THE DECK THICKNESS VARIED IN THE CENTER SPAN OF OLD DIXIE. THE EOR TRIED TO COVER W/ A PLAN NOTE.</u>				
4. Necessary pay items and quantities were provided.		✓		
5. Maintenance of Traffic phasing and sequencing was adequate.		✓		
6. Pre-Bid questions were answered in a timely manner.		✓		

B. ALTERNATIVE CONTRACTING/CONTRACT TIME

1. Alternative contracting method chosen for project was appropriate.				
2. The monetary value of alternative contracting method was commensurate with risk.				

C. PRECONSTRUCTION MEETING

1. Preconstruction conference agenda covered all the pertinent project issues.		✓		
2. Project Engineer was prepared for preconstruction conference	✓			
3. The date of preconstruction conference was adequately set prior to construction.	✓			

2 6 0 0

SCANNED

JUL 17 2006

District Construction

C. PRECONSTRUCTION MEETING - Continued

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
4. Other pre-activity meetings (paving, concrete, pile driving, MOT, signalization) were beneficial to the project.		✓		
5. The appropriate people attended the preconstruction meeting.		✓		
6. Preconstruction conference minutes were timely distributed.	✓			

D. FIELD INSPECTION AND RELATED SERVICES

1. Department personnel perform inspections and tests without delaying the project.		✓		
2. Project personnel had the required construction knowledge.	✓			
3. Project personnel had adequate knowledge of plans and contract documents.	✓			
4. Project personnel attempted to resolve unforeseen issues in a timely manner.	✓			

E. ADMINISTRATION OF CONTRACT DOCUMENTS

1. Project personnel maintained accurate and detailed documentation.	✓			
2. EEO, DBE, and OJT technical assistance was provided on a regular basis.		✓		
3. Requests for information were responded to in a timely manner.	✓			
4. Shop drawing reviews were performed in a timely manner.	✓			
5. Changes and modifications were properly coordinated and timely incorporated in the contract.		✓		

✓ ✓ ✓ ✓

E. ADMINISTRATION OF CONTRACT DOCUMENTS - Continued

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6. VECP's were processed in a timely manner.				
7. Reviews of the baseline schedule were performed within the time specified in the contract.		✓		
8. Constructive comments on the submitted baseline schedule were generated by the reviewer.				
9. The Contractor Past Performance Rating status was communicated to the contractor at least monthly.	✓			

F. UTILITIES

1. Department personnel were knowledgeable about the type and location of the utilities shown on the plans.		✓		
2. Department personnel were prepared to resolve issues concerning utilities.	✓			
3. The Department coordinated resolution of the utility issues in a timely manner.	✓			
4. Necessary utility contact numbers were provided		✓		
5. Utilities were properly identified on the plans.		✓		
6. Pre-utility meetings held prior to the preconstruction conference were beneficial.				
7. The Utility Work Schedules accurately reflect how the relocations took place.				

W Y D R

G. PAYMENTS

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Monthly progress payments were made in a timely manner, unless there was a contractual reason for withholding.	✓			
2. Bonus and incentive payments were made in a timely manner.				
3. Monthly progress payments adequately reflected work completed to date of cutoff.		✓		
4. Supplemental agreements were processed in a timely manner.		✓		
5. Work Orders were processed and reimbursement was provided on the subsequent progress payment.		✓		

H. ISSUE RESOLUTION

1. Reasonable efforts were made to prevent escalation of issues into major conflicts.		✓		
2. Notices of intent to claim were acknowledged, timely assessed, and impacts were mitigated.				
3. Issues submitted were promptly reviewed and responded to.	✓			
4. Issue negotiations were conducted objectively with fair and equitable settlement offers.		✓		
5. The claim appeal process provided the necessary recourse to appeal claim items.				
6. The Department supported the DRB process and issues were taken to the DRB when at an impasse.				

N S D D

I. DECISION MAKING PROCESS

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. In conflict situations the Department's chain of authority was clear.	✓			
2. The proper level of authority was readily available when a conflict did arise	✓			
3. Decisions as a result of conflicts were made in a timely manner.	✓			
4. Conflicts were resolved at the project level	✓			
5. Alternatives were given to continue working while conflicts were being resolved.	✓			
6. Effective lines of communication were clearly established early in the project.	✓			
7. A good line of communication was available with project personnel.	✓			

7

Name: CURTIS LONG
CONTRACTOR WHO COMPLETED THE SURVEY

Phone: 904-545-8763

Contractor:	Superior Construction Co., Inc.
Finance No.:	413776-1-52-01
Contract No.:	T5127
County and Road:	Volusia / Guardrail Improvement
Const Project Admin:	William J. Downey, PE
FDOT Project Mgr:	Suzanne Phillips, PE
FDOT Design Proj Mgr:	Christopher L. Dabson, PE
FA Date:	05/16/2006
Submit Date:	06/14/2006

Updated: 9/22/2004

RATING Points

Strongly
Agree

4

Agree

3

Disagree

2

Strongly
Disagree

1

Total Column X the Points

$$21 \times 4 = 84$$

$$20 \times 3 = \frac{60}{41}$$

$$144 \div 41 = 3.52$$

41

District 5 Roadway Sampling Test Data

Property	JMF	QC		RT		Auger		Hopper	
		AVG	STD	AVG	STD	AVG	STD	AVG	STD
% Air Voids @ Nd	4.00	3.017	0.322	3.237	0.403	3.458	0.355	4.050	0.389
Avg. Bulk (Gmb):	2.306	2.314	0.004	2.312	0.006	2.308	0.008	2.298	0.008
Rice MSG (Gmm):	2.402	2.386	0.006	2.389	0.008	2.391	0.005	2.395	0.004
Ext. AC %:	6.00	6.042	0.154	6.202	0.083	6.017	0.238	5.870	0.286
75um (#200)	5.00	5.078	0.213	5.942	0.129	5.590	0.167	5.783	0.343
2.36mm (#8)	52.00	54.293	1.098	57.142	1.552	56.267	1.872	56.673	2.298

Property	JMF	QC		RT		Auger		Hopper	
		AVG	STD	AVG	STD	AVG	STD	AVG	STD
% Air Voids @ Nd	4.00	4.032	0.416	3.881	0.625	4.414	0.436	4.534	0.534
Avg. Bulk (Gmb):	2.300	2.299	0.007	2.296	0.008	2.290	0.007	2.288	0.010
Rice MSG (Gmm):	2.395	2.396	0.009	2.389	0.011	2.396	0.008	2.397	0.007
Ext. AC %:	5.90	5.801	0.161	5.945	0.203	5.815	0.211	5.532	0.166
75um (#200)	5.00	5.339	0.273	5.756	0.325	5.711	0.333	5.647	0.575
2.36mm (#8)	55.00	56.272	1.379	57.716	1.077	57.474	2.345	54.737	3.492

Property	JMF	QC		RT		Auger		Hopper	
		AVG	STD	AVG	STD	AVG	STD	AVG	STD
% Air Voids @ Nd	4.00	3.633	0.847	3.922	1.000	3.958	0.704	4.241	1.021
Avg. Bulk (Gmb):	2.238	2.265	0.013	2.258	0.014	2.257	0.012	2.252	0.016
Rice MSG (Gmm):	2.331	2.350	0.009	2.350	0.015	2.350	0.016	2.352	0.012
Ext. AC %:	6.50	6.398	0.243	6.375	0.321	6.300	0.247	6.241	0.434
75um (#200)	5.70	5.197	0.387	5.286	0.380	5.384	0.457	5.165	0.425
2.36mm (#8)	52.00	52.772	1.760	54.104	2.192	54.123	2.153	51.881	5.049