

District Construction Engineer's Meeting
February 27, 2012 2:00 PM
Video Bridge 1 (3101 OR 850-414-3101)

Attendees:

CO – David Sadler, Rudy Powell, Juanita Moore, Jeff Caster, Jason Watts, Larry Ritchie, Alan Autry
FHWA – N/A
D1 – Jon Sands, Terry Muse
D2 – Carrie Stanbridge
D3 – Steve Potter, Hal Gore, Ray Hodges, Jimmy Miller, Keith Hinson
D4 – Pat McCann
D5 – John Tyler, Lorie Matthews, Jennifer Taylor, Bert Woerner
D6 – Mark Croft
D7 – Conrad Campbell
TP – Matt Price, Bill Sears, Karen Akers, Kurt Stone

New/Follow-up Business:

1) Introductions

Introductions were made recognizing the attendees listed above.

2) Consistent/Predictable/Repeatable – (David Sadler)

Reminded districts to review the CPR information listed on the SCO website.

http://www.dot.state.fl.us/construction/CPR/CPR_Main.shtm

Previous requests from districts to be notified via email when the site is updated with new CPR issues and for site to be modified to include a date items are posted and/or updated has been addressed by SCO.

3) Bold Landscaping – (Jeff Caster)

Jeff Caster gave a presentation to the group related to the Departments direction of the Bold Landscaping approach. Refer to [attached documents](#) associated with this item for additional information. In the future, large, stand-alone landscaping project will be let as maintenance contracts. Some construction contracts will continue to include smaller landscape features. Discussed D2's pilot project under the Bold Landscaping approach. Subsequent to the meeting, D2 provided the attached specifications for this project. DCE's were asked to review all of the attachments related to this item and send comments/suggestions to Jeff Caster.

4) Office of Construction Tier 2 Business Plan – (David Sadler)

DCE's were asked to review the T2 Business Plan and be prepared to discuss/make changes during the March 2012 DCE meeting.

5) Bid Q&A – (David Sadler)

The following guidance previously disseminated to the DCEs was reviewed and discussed.

An example of a project with responses posted on the Bid Q&A website from that district shows that there were quantity errors that the district attempted to correct via Bid Q&A. While we are not questioning the validity of the statements of the district with regard to the errors in quantities, notifying bidders via Bid Q&A is not appropriate.

While corrected information is/can be provided to bidders via Bid Q&A, the bidding documents (EBS File) used by bidders to submit their bids electronically would remain unchanged and still reflects the erroneous quantities. Bidders would be faced with having to bid items with now known incorrect quantities and the Contracts Administration and Estimates Offices would have to adjust bids based on Bid Q&A stated quantities.

The only appropriate way to address this issue is to notify prospective bidders via the Bid Q&A website that there is an error in the quantity and issue an addendum to proposal holders with the corrected quantities reflected on the plans and in a new EBS file.

SCO, along with Contracts Administration Office, is currently evaluating the practices used as part of the administration of pre-bid questions for the purpose of developing guidance to ensure consistency. The examples included in the [attached document](#) related to this item were also reviewed and discussed. These examples will also be evaluated as the additional guidance is developed. Also discussed as part of this topic was the issue of releasing the Computation Book when requested by bidders as part of the Pre-bid Q&A process. Following the meeting, the below email and [attached guidance document](#) were issued to the DCE's. The instructions in this email and guidance document are to be followed when the Computation Book is requested by a bidder.

From: Moore, Juanita
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2012 10:48 AM
To: FDOT-DCA; FDOT-DCE
Cc: Brautigam, Duane; OHagan, David; Davis, Greg
Subject: Computation Book
Attachments: Comp Book.docx

In response to requests for the Comp Book, the current policy is to provide the Comp Book by loading it in Online Ordering. Please have the contractor add the question to the Bid Question and Answer System. Please use the language in the attachment as the response to the question.

This policy will facilitate all bidders having access to the information. Also, since the Comp Book may have exempt documentation, it would normally require that the receiver complete the Exempt Document Agreement Form. Those using Online Ordering have already completed this form.

If you have questions, please call me.

Juanita Moore, Manager
Contracts Administration Office
Florida Department of Transportation
605 Suwannee Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850) 414-4000
juanita.moore@dot.state.fl.us

A new section was recently added to CPAM addressing the administration of Pre-bid Questions and Answers (see link below).

CPAM Chapter 1.3 Pre-Bid Questions & Answers

<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/construction/Manuals/cpam/New%20Clean%20Chapters/Chapter1s3.pdf>

6) Litter Removal & Mowing – (Pat McCann)

The specification below was discussed as related to litter removal and mowing. The issue of separate payment for litter removal when mowing is not required was discussed. The specification allows for separate payment for litter removal when mowing is not necessary. When necessary, litter removal is intended to be performed on a frequent and regular basis even when it may not be necessary to mow on the project. A concern was raised over the basis of payment for litter removal and mowing being based on field measured quantities. It was noted that the method of measurement of these items is based on lengths, widths, station to station dimensions, as shown in the plans. These items were never intended to be based on field measured quantities. It was suggested to modify the specification to allow for basis of payment to be made on a per cycle basis as opposed to per acre. Design is implementing changes to delineate litter removal from mowing rather than both items being based on the same area. This will account for those projects where smaller areas are to be mowed but there are larger areas where litter removal is required (limited ROW, paved medians, etc.)

Specification 107

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.fl.us/LTS/CO/Specifications/WorkBook/Jul2011/SS1070000.pdf>

The responsibilities for maintenance activities on construction projects were discussed. Districts were polled to determine which require in-house maintenance or contracted maintenance services to maintain responsibility for maintenance of an area when the area is covered by an active construction project. All districts reported requiring the construction contractor assume maintenance responsibility, with very limited exceptions noted. Maintenance responsibilities on active construction projects should be administered consistently with the procedure referenced below.

Maintenance Responsibilities on Construction Projects (Procedure 850-000-005)

<http://procnet.co.dot.state.fl.us/procedures/current/850000005.pdf>

7) Incorporating “value-added ideas” from an unsuccessful D-B proposal into the successful D-B Firms design with a credit back to the Department – (John Tyler)

Project specific examples of implementing parts of an unsuccessful D-B firms technical proposal into the final design of the successful D-B firm were discussed. It was noted that this practice could only be implemented when compensation is made to the unsuccessful firm in the form of Stipend payments. Each time this approach is being explored the district shall determine whether or not a Stipend was paid to the unsuccessful firm, since the department isn't currently including Stipend payments as part of D-B contracts.

8) “Design refinements” on D-B projects – (Carrie Stanbridge)

Discussed specific examples where D-B firms propose project modifications which differ from the requirements of the technical proposal. Polled districts reported that when this occurs, entitlement to a credit is evaluated. Also discussed including the Cost Saving Initiative (CSI) proposal specification language as part of D-B contracts, which should consistently address this issue as it occurs. The CSI specification will be added to the July 2012 Division I D-B specifications. SCO is preparing a DCE memorandum which

will allow adding the CSI specification language to active D-B projects and those currently in the procurement process.

9) Curing Compound/Joint Material Certification Requirements – (Conrad Campbell)

Discussed certification requirements related to curing compound and joint material. This issue centers around certifications being attached to the drums containing the material (refer to [attached photo](#) as an example) and the drums containing the materials are not transported to the project site. It was noted that SMO is currently modifying the process by which these materials are certified. Districts were asked to explore this issue with Resident Engineer Offices and/or Operations Centers and report any issues and/or the process being followed to SCO following the meeting. [View Additional Attachments](#)

10) Should FDOT Permits be required when Warranty or Contractor Guaranteed Work is performed? – (Pat McCann)

Discussed requiring the contractor to obtain a permit when the contractor is performing Warranty or Contractor guaranteed work. Polled districts reported that a Permit is not required when this type of work is performed.

11) Cost Savings Initiative Proposals – (Lorie Matthews)

Link to the Revised (07-11) CSI Spec. 4-3.9:

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.fl.us/LTS/CO/Specifications/Workbook/Jul2011/SS0040301.pdf>

It refers to the Workshop:

4-3.9 Cost Savings Initiative Proposal:

4-3.9.1 Intent and Objective:

(1) This Subarticle applies to any cost reduction proposal (hereinafter referred to as a Proposal) that the Contractor initiates and develops for the purpose of refining the Contract to increase cost effectiveness or significantly improve the quality of the end result. **A mandatory Cost Savings Initiative Workshop will be held prior to Contract Time beginning for the Contractor and Department to discuss potential Proposals.** This Subarticle does not, however, apply to any such proposal unless the Contractor identifies it at the time of its submission to the Department as a proposal submitted pursuant to this Subarticle

Raised awareness of the specification requirement as related to the CSI meeting. A proposal to modify the specification to only require the CSI meeting in those instances when the contractor desires to submit a CSI proposal was discussed. SCO will explore this proposed change.

12) Intersections as “non-density” areas (CPR Issue) – (Conrad Campbell)

http://www.dot.state.fl.us/construction/CPR/CPR_Aspphalt.shtm

9. **Comment:** Some Districts (or Construction offices specifically) require you to break out intersections on road reports because of non-density and some don't care. Some Construction offices are inflexible with making adjustments with random number samples (e.g. If a core falls near a high traffic area open to cross traffic some are unwilling to move it, there is a safety risk; another example is in front of a fire station or a school entrance.)
- Response:** Intersections are defined as "Density Testing Exceptions" and paid for per the Specifications at a Density Pay Factor =1.0. Contractors must document intersections as non-density areas on the QC Roadway Reports. The intent of the random numbers is to get a random sample. However, safety concerns should prevail when project personnel are making any coring location decisions. Areas of safety concern may include such areas as:
- Core located too close to traffic
 - In front of Fire Station, Hospital, or other areas of safety concern

Reviewed and discussed the above CPR information posted on the SCO website. It was noted that a specification change is being developed so that the requirements of the specification will be consistent with the above guidance.

13) Florida Accountability Contract Tracking System (FACTS) – (David Sadler)

A brief update on upcoming changes related to FACTS was provided. Polled districts were aware of the changes and requirements related to FACTS. Refer to the attached user guide and email below for additional information. [FACTS - 35 Fields \(Contracts Admin. Office\)](#)

From: Moore, Juanita
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 4:36 PM
To: Sadler, David A
Subject: Florida Accountability Contract Tracking System (FACTS)

FYI

The Department is now required to input data in FACTS. We cannot get fund approval to award unless this information is in the system. There are 35 fields in FACTS that require data from us for each contract. The Comptroller's Office was leaning toward having my office provide this information on every contract prior to award. This information will have to be entered manually until a system can be developed to get it electronically. The implementation date is March 1, 2012. So, I scheduled a meeting with the Comptroller's Office to discuss the implementation plan. During the meeting I suggested we develop a matrix for this information.

One of the required fields in FACTS, is the contract manager. I am suggesting we use the DCE, since they would know the Project Engineer, if necessary. The contact information for the DCE will not be public. It will be used by the Comptroller's Office, if they have a question about the project.

The suggestion to use a matrix will save time and money in respect to getting the approval to meet our current award timeframe. The staff from the Comptroller's Office, as well as my office, was very happy with the solution. It was a productive meeting! ☺

Juanita Moore, Manager
Contracts Administration Office
(850) 414-4000

14) RPM/Paint Alignment – (David Sadler)

Reviewed and discussed the correspondence below related to this issue. Raised awareness of specification requirements as they relate to RPM & striping alignment. It was noted that a change to the specifications for RPM placement as they relate to pavement construction joints is being developed by SCO. The specification change will be sent out via the Industry Review process. Polled districts reported that RPM, striping and joint alignment has not been an issue on their projects.

From: Sadler, David A
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2012 3:11 PM
To: Brautigam, Duane; Powell, Jr., Rudy
Cc: Gentry, Paul; Autry, Alan; Maxwell, Stefanie
Subject: RE: paint

Yes to a discussion with the DCEs.

No to a spec change. Current 706 spec addresses offsetting of RPM from pavement joints. Current 710 spec addresses offset of stripe from joint on concrete pavement (710-5.1.1). Painting over the joints on asphalt has not been reported as an issue and the issue here seems only to be about measuring thickness, not about performance of the material.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

David A. Sadler, P.E.
Director, Office of Construction
(850)414-5203
Fax - (850)-414-4874
userid: cn982da
email: david.sadler@dot.state.fl.us

From: Brautigam, Duane
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2012 7:58 AM
To: Powell, Jr., Rudy; Sadler, David A
Cc: Gentry, Paul
Subject: FW: paint

Rudy/Dave - A potential item for discussion with the DCEs. Do you think we need a spec change, too, as Rodney suggests?

The RPM language in 706-4 reads:
Do not install RPMs over longitudinal or transverse joints of the bonding surface.

The alignment language for Paint in 710-5.2 reads:
710-5.2 Alignment: Apply painted stripes that will not deviate more than 1 inch from the stringline on tangents and curves one degree or less. Apply painted stripes that will not deviate more than 2 inches from the stringline on curves greater than one degree. Apply painted edge stripes uniformly, not less than 2 inches or more than 4 inches from the edge of pavement, without noticeable breaks or deviations in alignment or width.

Duane F. Brautigam, P.E.
Director, Office of Design
Florida Department of Transportation
605 Suwannee Street, MS 38
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450
(850) 414-4175
duane.brautigam@dot.state.fl.us

From: Gentry, Paul
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2012 5:24 AM
To: Milligan, Rodney; Lattner, Tim; Cook, Dale; Brautigam, Duane
Cc: Yates, Lizbeth; Hannigan, James
Subject: RE: paint

Rodney,

I brought this issue up at the Department's C-Team meeting for discussion and action to be taken to rectify this problem this past Tuesday morning. Chester and Stephanie were both in Tampa at the ATTSA meeting. I will keep you updated as this isn't the first place I have seen this. Thanks for taking the time to put it down in writing to be addressed. Paul

From: Milligan, Rodney
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 5:00 PM
To: Gentry, Paul; Maxwell, Stefanie; Henson, Chester
Cc: Yates, Lizbeth; Hannigan, James
Subject: paint

Paul, I was out looking at the I-75 project here in Lake City and noticed some problems. This problem contains two items that affect Maintenance. I noticed that the RPM's on this job are sitting in the longitudinal joint of the pavement, which is against the specifications. I called the project manager and he agreed, but the problem is the paint also straddles the joint. These RPM's will not last very long and when we do replace them they will not line up with the striping if we move them. This is becoming an obvious issue for those of us that are responsible for placing the final striping. You cannot get an accurate reading on the thickness if these skips are placed on this joint, it is impossible. The RPM's have language to offset this joint and I feel that the paint needs to have this specification also. Construction needs to really adhere to the striping specifications. I have encountered many problems trying to find suitable test areas for the three-dial gauge on open-friction pavement. Even edge lines that are not placed properly are impossible to measure with this gauge. Could anyone propose a solution for this? I appreciate your time and effort. Thanks and call me if you need any additional information.

Rodney Milligan
Contract Manager
District II Maintenance
(386) 961-7308
rodney.milligan@dot.state.fl.us

Walk-On Items

- 1) Landscape Warranty Bonds; Would like to require that this bond come from the prime. Spec.'s are silent. Should D-4 propose a spec. change? – (Pat McCann)

Reviewed and discussed current specification 580 requirements related to the Landscape Warranty Bond. It was noted that specifications are written to the contractor in active voice-imperative mood as commands to the contractor. As such, section 580 requires the Landscape Warranty Bond be provided from the Contractor. If districts receive Landscape Warranty Bonds from subcontractors, they are encouraged to contact OGC prior to accepting the bond. It was noted that as part of the Bold

Landscaping initiative, section 580 will be modified to remove the Landscape Warranty Bond in the future.

2) Use of LS Contracting – (Pat McCann)

Discussed current use of LS contracting. At a recent executive workshop David presented the data below which demonstrates how frequently LS contracting is being used. Districts were asked to review their upcoming Work Program to ensure that if the project scope meets the PPM criteria for LS contracting that LS contracting is used.

District/Contract	Original Contract Amt.	% by Orig \$	Total Amount Paid	Overrun Amount	Overrun %	# Jobs	% by job type
01	\$490,955,376		\$511,773,186	\$20,817,811	4.2%	206	
Conventional	\$328,141,283	66.8%	\$350,040,801	\$21,899,518	6.7%	69	33.5%
Lump Sum	\$162,814,093	33.2%	\$161,732,385	-\$1,081,708	-0.7%	137	66.5%
02	\$1,090,801,586		\$1,183,287,406	\$92,485,821	8.5%	181	
Conventional	\$999,447,711	91.6%	\$1,088,877,595	\$89,429,884	8.9%	111	61.3%
Lump Sum	\$91,353,874	8.4%	\$94,409,811	\$3,055,937	3.3%	70	38.7%
03	\$500,796,900		\$539,472,590	\$38,675,691	7.7%	148	
Conventional	\$383,304,091	76.5%	\$418,829,434	\$35,525,342	9.3%	99	66.9%
Lump Sum	\$117,492,809	23.5%	\$120,643,157	\$3,150,348	2.7%	49	33.1%
04	\$913,239,233		\$959,359,318	\$46,120,085	5.1%	137	
Conventional	\$797,412,549	87.3%	\$841,590,671	\$44,178,121	5.5%	123	89.8%
Lump Sum	\$115,826,684	12.7%	\$117,768,647	\$1,941,963	1.7%	14	10.2%
05	\$920,709,422		\$980,158,575	\$59,449,154	6.5%	172	
Conventional	\$855,928,904	93.0%	\$915,075,994	\$59,147,090	6.9%	96	55.8%
Lump Sum	\$64,780,517	7.0%	\$65,082,581	\$302,064	0.5%	76	44.2%
06	\$502,417,867		\$531,175,256	\$28,757,389	5.7%	121	
Conventional	\$498,897,893	99.3%	\$527,504,247	\$28,606,354	5.7%	118	97.5%
Lump Sum	\$3,519,973	0.7%	\$3,671,009	\$151,036	4.3%	3	2.5%
07	\$1,103,623,845		\$1,215,869,155	\$112,245,310	10.2%	119	
Conventional	\$1,074,982,997	97.4%	\$1,185,981,875	\$110,998,878	10.3%	103	86.6%
Lump Sum	\$28,640,847	2.6%	\$29,887,280	\$1,246,433	4.4%	16	13.4%
08	\$746,559,858		\$813,303,518	\$66,743,660	8.9%	50	
Conventional	\$734,112,098	98.3%	\$801,478,927	\$67,366,829	9.2%	36	72.0%
Lump Sum	\$12,447,761	1.7%	\$11,824,592	-\$623,169	-5.0%	14	28.0%
Statewide Avg						1134	
Conventional	\$5,672,227,528	90.5%	\$6,129,379,543	\$457,152,016	7.3%		
Lump Sum	\$596,876,558	9.5%	\$605,019,462	\$8,142,905	0.1%		
	\$6,269,104,085		\$6,734,399,005	\$465,294,920			

3) Consistency in information on the SCO internet site as it pertains to District Construction Offices – (Pat McCann)

Reviewed and discussed current district contact information posted on the SCO website. As changes are made to personnel, please notify Zach Wiginton so the SCO website can be updated accordingly. If the district has a website which displays accurate contact information, districts should provide those links to Zach so he can post the link on the SCO webpage.

4) Pro-rating of LS items on Construction projects – (David Sadler)

Discussed the practice of pro-rating or making adjustments LS items when contract time overruns and/or underruns. It was noted that unless plan errors are discovered, the intent is to pay the item as the LS unit without making pro-rated adjustments based on actual contract time used.

5) Regional and Statewide Dispute Review Board Hearing Rates – (David Sadler)

It was noted that the current Regional and Statewide DRB Three Party Agreements do not include the same payment rates for hearings as are defined in the DRB

specifications. If a hearing is required on a project wherein this conflict exists, the hearing rate per the current DRB specifications is to be paid so as to be consistent with the hearing rate described in the TPA's.

6) Cost Savings Initiative Proposals on Design-Build projects – (David Sadler)

It was noted that the department is moving toward including a modified version of the CSI specification in D-B projects effective July 2012. The final version of the specification has been developed and distributed for inclusion into select D-B projects when requested by the district. A DCE memorandum has been developed and is currently under review by FHWA. Once finalized the memorandum will be distributed to the DCE group. Under the conditions of the memorandum, the CSI specification which will be attached to the memorandum may be implemented into both active D-B projects (post-Award status) and those D-B projects in the active procurement (pre-Award) stage. Subsequent to the meeting, this DCE memorandum was issued. Refer to the link below: http://www.dot.state.fl.us/construction/memos/Current_Memo/CurrentMemos.shtm

7) Update on Construction Task Team from February Executive Board Meeting – (John Tyler)

David provided an update to the group on the status of the work performed by the Construction Task Team. Subsequent to the meeting, additional information was distributed to the DCE's via email.

8) Programming/staff changes in response to David Sadler's CEI Staffing Proposal; Are districts contemplating pursuit of inspection contracts as Contractual Services or Professional Services? – (John Tyler)

David provided an update to the group on the status of the proposed changes to CEI staffing. Subsequent to the meeting, additional information was distributed to the DCE's.

NEXT DCE MEETING – March 22, 2012 (Face-to-face in Orlando following Conference)

Submit agenda items to Alan Autry by March 12, 2012