

District Construction Engineer's Meeting Notes
July 23, 2012 2:00 PM

Attendees:

CO – David Sadler, Rudy Powell, Larry Ritchie, Jeff Caster, Susan Robeson, Art Berger, Jason Watts, Alan Autry
FHWA – Not present
D1 – Jon Sands, Terry Muse
D2 – Carrie Stanbridge, Lorrie Williams, Ken Cheek
D3 – Steve Potter, Ray Hodges, Jimmy Miller, Wilson McBurney
D4 – Pat McCann, Angela Baigi
D5 – John Tyler, Susan Priel
D6 – Barbara Perez
D7 – Conrad Campbell, Brian Pickard, Will Moriaty
TP – Matt Price, Bill Sears, Karen Akers, Kurt Stone, Joan Randolph

New/Follow-up Business:

- 1) Introductions
Introductions were made recognizing the attendees listed above
- 2) Consistent/Predictable/Repeatable – (David Sadler)
 - A. Payment of Concrete Slab Replacement (Pre-Bid Q&A)

“On other recent and current contracts in at least two other Districts, under the same specification Section 353, the Department has paid for the actual thickness of the replacement slabs when that thickness varied from the "design" thickness. Why is District X not "Consistent" and "Predictable", as properly championed by Secretary Prasad, with other FDOT Districts in this issue?”

353-11 Method of Measurement.

The quantity to be paid for will be the volume, in cubic yards, of concrete placed and accepted. The quantity will be calculated on the basis of field-measured horizontal dimensions and **pavement design thickness**. No additional compensation will be allowed for additional concrete required to bring the proposed concrete slab up to finished grade.

Reviewed and discussed current specification requirements related to concrete slab replacement, basis of estimates, basis of payment and method of measurement in an effort to ensure consistent administration is occurring. Discussed several district specific examples and how the specifications were interpreted and applied. Polled districts to determine how administration is occurring and to identify any specific issues. Rudy is going to follow-up with the Production (Design) unit to ensure the BOE is being followed as these quantities are estimated. Discussed future specification improvements and ways to improve documentation on as-built plans.

- B. EEO Inconsistencies

Discussed feedback received from Secretary Prasad based on concerns raised by Industry during a recent meeting. Focus of discussion centered on EEO compliance, conducting Compliance Reviews, On-the-Job Training, and back-checking of resumes. A separate meeting of the DCE's and DCCM's has been scheduled for August 2012 to review and address these concerns specifically. DCE's were asked to send agenda topics to Susan Robeson for that meeting.

C. Regression on partnering philosophy (general attitude of the Department)

Discussed feedback received from Industry related to the departments current philosophy of partnering. Polled districts to determine if Industry has reported concerns at the District level and to determine what partnering efforts are currently being implemented. It was noted that the current bidding environment may be leading to the current position of Industry but the districts reported consistently handling of project related issues.

3) Status of Bold Landscaping – Jeff Caster

Since February, I have been reviewing landscape plans before they are let. Each month, I meet with the District Landscape Architects to discuss BOLD. There seems to be wide spread understanding of BOLD design concepts. Plans have many more large trees, and fewer shrubs. Secretary Prasad expects that every one of these landscape project will be implemented successfully (Projects meeting or exceeding contract requirements; plants #1 or better and growing vigorously, bed lines in place and mostly weed free, mulch fresh and full coverage, staking secure, irrigation functioning as designed.).

With regard to landscape construction, I'd like to respond to the DCE's question with a few questions.

- What can I do to help the District Construction Engineers implement every landscape project successfully?*
- Is every landscape project being implemented successfully all the way through the establishment period?*
- Is Section 580, Landscape Installation being enforced on every project, all the way through the establishment period?*
- Is there a complete record of monthly and quarterly reports, all the way through the establishment period?*
- Do monthly and quarterly reports contain accurate and complete information about the condition of plants, beds, mulch, litter, mowing, etc.?*
- Does the Specification need to be revised?*
- What landscape expert(s) does Construction rely on during landscape construction and establishment to verify and document that projects are being implemented successfully?*
- Do the DCEs have any suggestions for assuring that every landscape project is implemented successfully?*

Thank you.

Jeff

Jeff Caster

State Transportation Landscape Architect

Florida Department of Transportation

Environmental Management Office

605 Suwannee Street, MS 37

Tallahassee, Florida 32399 0450

850 414 5267

jeff.caster@dot.state.fl.us
<http://www.MyFloridaBeautiful.com>

Mr. Caster and the District Landscape Architects provided an update on the Departments Bold Landscaping Initiative focusing on efforts undertaken since the February 2012 DCE meeting. To date, the primary focus has been on establishing a definition of "Bold Landscaping" (many, large trees, few, if any, shrubs) and Landscape Architects review of design plans. District RLA's are meeting monthly and developing district landscape implementation plans. Suggested changes to specification 580 and the future development of a Value Added Landscaping specification were discussed.

- 4) Sika Corporation (refer to Rudy Powell email of 06/19/2012 and attached letter) – (Rudy Powell)

Raised awareness of the above referenced email, letter (See attachments) and QPL restrictions related to the use of Sika products (post-tensioning grout). Information on restrictions for use can be found at the links below:

<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/SpecificationsOffice/ProductEvaluation/QPL/QPLIndex.shtm>

938	Post-Tensioning Grouts
	Horizontal
	Vertical
	Repair

- 5) FHWA 1273 & DCE Memo 10-12 ([DCE MEMO 10-12](#)) – (Susan Robeson)

Reviewed and discussed the current version of FHWA 1273 and the above referenced memo for the purpose of raising awareness and highlighting the memo requirements. Susan Robeson indicated that training is expected in October 2012. Questions related to FHWA 1273, the memo or the training should be directed to Susan.

- 6) FHWA Approval of Contract Changes – (Chad Thompson)

This topic was tabled and will be discussed at a future meeting.

- 7) MOT – Lane Closures on Interstate – (David Sadler)

Raised awareness of Lane Closure Restrictions identified in the Construction Contract Plans and encouraged project personnel to monitor situations where extended traffic back-ups occur and implement corrective actions when necessary.

Walk-On Items

- 1) Statewide perspective for using FHP Hire-backs on Design-Build projects – (John Tyler)

Discussed consistent use of FHP Hire-back contract on D-B projects. Polled districts indicated they use this contract (where appropriate) regardless of contract delivery method (i.e. D-B vs. Design-Bid-Build).

2) ITS Damage Recovery – (Rudy Powell)

Discussed the background which led to the development of and raised awareness of the use of SP0711 which is expected to be implemented in July 2013. The table included in this SP will be completed via coordination with the District Construction Engineer and will be based on lane closure/lane rental (road user costs) data which may result in higher values. Procedural implementation will be addressed in CPAM and usage notes for the SP. SP0711 may be accessed at the link below:

<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/specificationsoffice/Implemented/WorkBooks/History/Jan13/Files/0071107.impl.pdf> :

3) Sizing of the “End Road Work” sign – (David Sadler)

Raised awareness of MUTCD size requirements for the End Road Work signs when placed in various applications. Specific information is below:

Below is the table from the 2009 MUTCD. The 2003 MUTCD only required the 36 x 18 size, but we have seen signs on projects with a 12 inch height dimension.

Table 6F-1. Temporary Traffic Control Zone Sign and Plaque Sizes (Sheet 3 of 3)

Sign or Plaque	Sign Designation	Section	Conventional Road	Freeway or Expressway	Minimum
Detour (with distance)	W20-2	6F.19	36 x 36	48 x 48	30 x 30
Road (Street) Closed (with distance)	W20-3	6F.20	36 x 36	48 x 48	30 x 30
One Lane Road (with distance)	W20-4	6F.21	36 x 36	48 x 48	30 x 30
Lane(s) Closed (with distance)	W20-5,5a	6F.22	36 x 36	48 x 48	30 x 30
Flagger (symbol)	W20-7	6F.31	36 x 36	48 x 48	30 x 30
Flagger	W20-7a	6F.31	36 x 36	48 x 48	30 x 30
Slow (on Stop/Slow Paddle)	W20-8	6E.03	18 x 18	—	—
Workers	W21-1,1a	6F.33	36 x 36	48 x 48	30 x 30
Fresh Oil (Tar)	W21-2	6F.34	36 x 36	48 x 48	30 x 30
Road Machinery Ahead	W21-3	6F.35	36 x 36	48 x 48	30 x 30
Slow Moving Vehicle	W21-4	6G.06	36 x 18	—	—
Shoulder Work	W21-5	6F.37	36 x 36	48 x 48	30 x 30
Shoulder Closed	W21-5a	6F.37	36 x 36	48 x 48	30 x 30
Shoulder Closed (with distance)	W21-5b	6F.37	36 x 36	48 x 48	30 x 30
Survey Crew	W21-6	6F.38	36 x 36	48 x 48	30 x 30
Utility Work Ahead	W21-7	6F.39	36 x 36	48 x 48	30 x 30
Mowing Ahead	W21-8	6G.06	36 x 36	48 x 48	30 x 30
Blasting Zone Ahead	W22-1	6F.41	36 x 36	48 x 48	30 x 30
Turn Off 2-Way Radio and Cell Phone	W22-2	6F.42	42 x 36	42 x 36	—
End Blasting Zone	W22-3	6F.43	42 x 36	42 x 36	36 x 30
Slow Traffic Ahead	W23-1	6F.27	48 x 24	48 x 24	—
New Traffic Pattern Ahead	W23-2	6F.30	36 x 36	48 x 48	30 x 30
Double Reverse Curve (1 lane)	W24-1	6F.49	36 x 36	48 x 48	30 x 30
Double Reverse Curve (2 lanes)	W24-1a	6F.49	36 x 36	48 x 48	30 x 30
Double Reverse Curve (3 lanes)	W24-1b	6F.49	36 x 36	48 x 48	30 x 30
All Lanes	W24-1cP	6F.49	24 x 24	30 x 30	—
Road Work Next XX Miles	G20-1	6F.56	36 x 18	48 x 24	—
End Road Work	G20-2	6F.57	36 x 18	48 x 24	—
Pilot Car Follow Me	G20-4	6F.58	36 x 18	—	—

4) CTQP/State Construction Office Training Needs – (Rudy Powell)

Due to a vacancy in the State Construction Office, Districts were asked to send all CTQP and State Construction Office Training related issues to David Sadler and Rudy Powell until further notice.

5) Status of CCEI/RCS Scope of Services – (Rudy Powell)

Districts inquired as to the status of the Scope of Services for Consultant CEI and RCS contracts. All inquires for these documents should be sent to Jerry Rudd.

NEXT DCE MEETING – September 12, 2012 (Orlando following Asphalt Conference)

Submit agenda items to Alan Autry by September 4, 2012