

## District Construction Engineer's Monthly Meeting Notes

July 25, 2011 2:30 PM

### Attendees:

FHWA – Chad Thompson

TP – Matt Price, Bill Sears, Karen Akers

D1 – Jon Sands, Scott Presson, Ed McKinney, Lisa Brinson, Charles Reed, Jackie Brown

D2 – Al Moyle, Michael Sandow, Carrie Stanbridge, Katrina Sadler, Jordan Green

D3 – Steve Benak, Keith Hinson, Ranae Sanders, Dennis Chevillot

D4 – Pete Nissen, Leslie Wetherell, Ellen Daniels

D5 – Frank O'Dea, Lorie Matthews, Jennifer Taylor, Gigi Morgan, Vince Vacchiano

D6 – Mark Croft, Mario Cabrera, Barbara Espino

D7 – Conrad Campbell, Larry Taylor, Sara Clark

CO – David Sadler, Roosevelt Petithomme, Susan Robeson, Larry Ritchie, Alan Autry, Nancy Aliff, Jason Watts

### New Business:

1) Local Agency Program Oversight & Project Inspections – (Roosevelt Petithomme)

*Note: District LAP Administrators will join us for the discussion of this item.*

*Roosevelt provided the group an overview of a proposed procedure ([refer to attached document](#)) and provided a history of the LAP review process. Districts were asked to review the draft procedure and provide comments to Roosevelt. The objective is to incorporate this procedure into the LAP Manual (Chapter 23). Districts were asked to elaborate as to how LAP oversight and inspections are currently handled. Since the procedure references the S/W Critical Requirements and Guidelist and those documents refer to FDOT specifications which may or may not apply to LAP projects, the Critical Requirement and Guidelist documents may need to be revised to accommodate LAP project requirements. Roosevelt will continue to further develop this procedure and will follow-up with progress at the next DCE meeting.*

2) Local Agencies Requesting Electronic As-builts – (Pete Nissen)

*D4 has received requests from Local Agencies for FDOT to provide As-built plans in electronic formats (i.e. similar to the format for design files). The Local Agencies had also Districts were polled to determine if other Local Agencies were also requesting this information in other parts of the State. Only D2 had received a similar request but had not provided the As-built plans in a .dgn format. At this time, the department will not be providing As-built plans in .dgn format to Local Agencies, nor should plan notes be used to require this submission of FDOT contractors.*

3) DBE Annual Goal – (Pete Nissen)

Some concerns:

- Primes keeping more work in house
- Industry suffering, fewer DBEs around
- Closer monitoring of anticipated DBE

*D4 expressed concerns over trends they are experiencing related to DBE utilization wherein prime contractors appear to be performing work with internal forces which could be subcontracted to DBE firms. Other districts have not reported experiencing similar trends. It was noted as part of this discussion that the DBE goal may increase from 8.18% to 8.60% effective 10/1/2011.*

4) Wage rate tables 20% rule, can this apply to counties in addition to work type? – (Pete Nissen/Susan Robeson)

*Refer to [attached documents](#) related to this topic. The scenario was discussed as to how to properly apply wage rate decision tables when a single contract includes two separate projects (i.e. "Goes-with" Contracts) and the two projects are in different counties or portions of the project are located in different counties. Susan Robeson indicated that the appropriate wage rate decision for the county in which the "project" is located should be applied to that project within the Contract. Susan indicated that the "20% rule" is often misinterpreted and does not anticipate that it could be applied in these types of situations.*

5) Coordinating the Maintenance of Existing Landscaping on Construction Projects– (Larry Ritchie)

Prior to the meeting, districts were asked to review the following questions and prepare to discuss:

- How does your District handle the maintenance of existing landscaping on construction projects?
- Do you require the construction contractor to maintain existing landscaping?
- If so, how is it implemented?
- If coordination with DOT Maintenance or some other maintaining agency is done to ensure the existing landscaping is maintained, how is that process documented?

*Most districts reported that they do not require the contractor to maintain existing landscaping unless the contract plans identify that the contractor is to modify (remove & replace) the existing landscaping. In most districts the contractor is responsible to protect the existing landscaping from damage, coordinate with the maintaining agency who continues to perform maintenance functions and repair any damage caused to the existing landscaping and/or existing irrigation being used to sustain the existing landscaping. A few exceptions were noted but as a general rule this is being handled consistently across the State.*

6) Plan Quantity Items & Contingencies – (David Sadler & David O’Hagan)

This item is related to Roadway Design Bulletin 11-08

<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/rddesign/updates/files/RDB11-08.pdf>

*Districts were reminded of the above referenced bulletin and that contingency quantities should not be included on those items identified as Plan Quantity Concept Items.*

7) Plan Quantity Concept on Streamline Contracts – (Pat McCann)

*The group discussed how adjustments to items on Streamline Contracts should be handled (specifically MOT items where pay is based on an Each Day basis) when the contract time underruns. Districts also expressed concerns over the use of Plan Quantity concept on items such as sidewalk, concrete spall repair, etc. This topic will be discussed in a future meeting,*

8) Contractor Survey – (Pete Nissen)

*D4 proposed reviewing the existing questions included as part of the Contractors Survey to determine if they are relevant to our expected results. David suggested that the survey be made available via an on-line survey provider. The group agreed that it may be appropriate to review the current questions on the survey and the process by which surveys are completed/submitted. It was noted that current return rates are low and the information being returned doesn’t appear to be of much value to the districts.*

**NEXT DCE MEETING – September 14, 2011 Orlando**

Submit agenda items to Alan Autry by Wednesday September 7, 2011