Joint District Construction and Materials Engineer's Meeting Notes
September 12, 2012 8:00 AM
Orlando Construction

Attendees:

David Sadler, Tim Ruelke, Tom Byron, Steve Potter, Charles Holzschuher, John Tyler, Carrie Stanbridge, Carolyn Gish, Rich Hewitt, Rudy Powell, Mark Croft, Jon Sands, Art Berger, Greg Jones, Sam Joseph, Mayur Patel, Ken Morgan, Jennifer Taylor, Bert Woerner, Brian McKishnie, Frank Kreis, Jim Musselman, Matt Price, Paul Vinik, Ken Cox, Lani Nash, Jeremy Walcott, Mark Peronto, Terry Puckett, Susan Blazo, Steve Sedwick, David Davis, Rafiq Darji, Conrad Campbell

New Business – DCE/DMRE Meeting:

1) Introductions

   Introductions were made recognizing the attendees listed above.

2) LIMS replacement with MAC (Materials Acceptance & Certification System) – schedule and implementation plan, answer questions from Construction – Tim Ruelke, David Davis

   David Davis provided the group an overview of MAC (scope, capabilities, customization, etc.) as well as a schedule for implementation as this new system replaces LIMS. The group discussed specific details of the new system i.e. customization, applicability and function on Lump Sum and Design-Build projects, development of Job Guide Schedule, cross functionality with GIS, Quality Control Plan, etc. Refer to the attached power-point presentation for additional details.

3) DDM / EAR Database – GPS units have been distributed. Question for DCEs : What feedback are you getting from the users? – Tim Ruelke

   Tim provided the group an update on the GIS tracking of DDM/EAR information as gathered by the handheld GPS units previously distributed to Construction personnel via the DCE's. SMO is currently tracking the GPS data and presented the tracking information to the group. It was noted that SMO is receiving data (GPS coordinates) in other formats than those requested when GPS units were distributed. Also, use of other GPS units (or cell phones) to gather the coordinates may provide less accurate or inconsistent data.

Walk-On Items

1) Cathodic Protection Training – (Paul Vinik)

   Paul Vinik provided the group an overview of the Cathodic Protection process, the need for training for Department personnel and an overview of the training. Refer to the

attached power point presentation for additional details. The group discussed the benefits of the training, as well as, expressed concerns related to the cost of the training.

2) Use of Warm Mix Asphalt – (John Tyler)

John inquired about an update on the Departments use of Warm Mix Asphalt on a statewide basis. Jim Musselman indicated that to date the Department had placed approximately 88K tons of Warm Mix Asphalt statewide. Jim noted that the average temperature of conventional asphalt mixes is approximately 320° as opposed to the average temperature of Warm Mix asphalt which is 270°. The discussion of this topic was related to a presentation made at the Asphalt Conference in the days preceding this meeting. This will be a topic of discussion at the next Henry Fuller Task Team

New Business – DCE Meeting:

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

   A. Solutions (aka Agreements) for addressing thermoplastic deficiencies – (Stefanie Maxwell)

   Rudy discussed the process for notifying and involving SCO with regard to addressing deficiencies related to the placement of thermoplastic markings. Specification requirements and expectations related to material and placement requirements.

2) Use of 415 Barrier Wall (no longer allowed after July 1, 2012) – (Stefanie Maxwell)

Rudy & David raised awareness that effective with the July 1, 2012 project Lettings 415 Barrier Wall (aka Pin & Loop Barrier Wall) is no longer allowed. Active projects Let prior to July 1, 2012 may allow the use of this type of Barrier Wall.

3) MOT – Lane Closures on Interstate – (David Sadler)

David 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. It noted that there are sometimes inconsistencies exist between lane closure restrictions on Construction vs. Maintenance contracts which occur on the same roadway, in the same location and when the scope of work is similar or the same.

4) Consultant CEI Percentages on Future Contracts – (David Sadler)

   Need to discuss Consultant CEI percentages on future contracts. Assume that current Consultant CEI percentage is 12%, want to get jobs at 11% or less. Interested in effecting change in CEI delivery and how to gain savings. If percentages for CEI contract exceed 11%, would need to get SCO approval.

David provided an overview of proposed changes to Consultant CEI percentages as they relate to the construction cost of the project (i.e. Phase 62 vs. Phase 52). The

objective is to reduce current percentages with project specific exceptions above 11% requiring SCO approval. It was noted that every project is unique and currently districts are focusing their efforts on meeting overall goals while reducing project specific percentages as well. It was suggested to solicit feedback from Industry along with the District CCEI Managers related to implementation of current District negotiation practices & procedures focusing on feedback from Consultant CEI's who work across District lines. It was also noted that the accuracy of the Consultant CEI percentage information provided to CO Management and District Secretaries (which derived from reports of the Adopted Work Program) has come into question. Districts are currently reviewing this information and correcting any deficiencies as necessary. Also a consistent format for reporting the current percentages was discussed. Future implementation of this and other proposed changes to the CEI (In-house & Consultant) program were discussed. Also discussed was how the changes to implementation of Streamline, Streamline LS, Witness & Hold, etc. projects impact this proposal.

5) CTQP Extension Requests – (David Sadler)

> *High number of extension requests for lapsed qualifications – CTQM addresses that personnel are to seek requalification 6 months before expiration of qual.*

David updated the group on the number of extension requests which are being submitted to SCO for review and approval. The group was reminded of the requirements related to the timeframe for scheduling courses in advance of qualification lapse. Districts were asked to raise awareness of these requirements with CTQP qualification holders.

6) D5 Contract Change Numbering – (John Tyler/Jennifer Taylor)

John provided the group with status update on the D5 pilot program of numbering Work Orders. Jennifer Taylor shared information related to a proposed change to the contract change numbering system based on the D5 pilot. The objective of the proposed change is to have a single place in SiteManager and ultimately CIM that list all contract changes (SA's, WO's, UP's TE's, line item adjustments, etc.). Various D5 contract examples of data in CIM were reviewed and discussed. D4 indicated that one of their Operations Centers is currently evaluating current processes for the purpose of developing an improved process to create consolidated contract change numbering and tracking.

7) Pre-bid Q&A site for Design-Build Projects – (John Tyler/Bert Woerner)

John and Bert presented to the group a proposal which would incorporate changes to the Bid Q&A site to address the various deadlines for submittal of questions and posting of responses on a D-B project (i.e. deadline for questions/responses prior to submission of the Technical Proposal, deadline for questions/responses prior to submission of the Price Proposal, etc.). SCO is aware of these proposed changes, is currently evaluating the concerns and working with BSSO to develop future changes to the Bid Q&A system to address the issue.

8) Plan Quantity for Sod (CPR issue for D5) – (John Tyler)

John discussed project specific situations where contract plans call for the installation of sod of specific dimensions when contractors install sod in different dimensions due to

means & methods or convenience. This issue was previously discussed in other DCE meetings. Raised awareness that payment for sod (performance turf) should be in accordance with the governing specifications.

9) Directional Bore Specification Clarification: What is the intent for survey reference for 1" irrigation pipe? – (John Tyler)

John reviewed with the group current specification requirements related to survey references for directional bore, jack & bore, etc. and discussed proposed changes to the specification which would allow survey reference points be those described in the specifications as well as those "as directed by the Engineer". D5 will coordinate with proposed changes to the specifications. SCO will review and coordinate with the Design & Specification offices.

Walk-On Items

1) Pile VT Acceptance Testing – (Pat McCann)

Rudy discussed project specific examples of VT acceptance testing on D-B project as well as RFP and specification requirements related to frequency of VT acceptance testing. FHWA has identified inconsistencies via project specific process reviewes. Raised awareness that VT acceptance testing frequency should be conducted in accordance with the RFP and governing specifications.

2) CEI Hybrid Model Monetary Threshold Limit – (Jon Sands)

What is the actual threshold limit that will be approved?

A couple of comments:

If the threshold limit will now be $3M or even if it is $5M, an exception process would still be warranted. The exception process would be to allow projects (over the threshold amount) to be administered by our In-House PA's to keep them busy with an appropriate work load.

Can the final monetary threshold decision be made within the next few weeks so we can all program the appropriate amount of PH 62 funds while the Work Program Gaming Cycle is still on-going?

This item was covered during the discussion of the topic entitled "Consultant CEI Percentages on Future Contracts" (item 4 above). John Tyler inquired as to the future status of the Consultant RCS positions. David provided an update long with expectations for the program. Various Districts outlined their plan for providing these services.

3) Contract Change Status Request – (David Sadler)

From: *Wiginton, Zach*
Sent: *Wednesday, September 12, 2012 8:41 AM*
To: *Sadler, David A*
Subject: *Contract Status Change Requests (Add to DCE Meeting)*

Dave,

We are working to develop an accurate method to provide needed documentation for the new FACTS requirements.
Carla has asked if I could help identify the person(s) in each District Office that are responsible for sending in a copy of an executed contract or supplemental agreement to the CFM/Contract Payment Section for approval of the status change request (process to status 10).

I am going to ask my EDMS and BQA contacts if they know who the person is, but they may or may not work hand-in-hand with them, and the FACTS issue is facing a tight deadline (Oct. 1).

Can you ask the DCEs to assist in identifying this person in each area (as a short add-on to the meeting today)?

If time does not permit, we can handle outside of that meeting later this week. Thanks for considering. Below is the language I was going to use when requesting.

We are working on some process documentation for use with the new FACTS requirements (Florida Accountability Contract Tracking System). All agencies will be placing basic contract data and details on the new FACTS website. You can view current details already at ***https://facts.fldfs.com/Search/ContractSearch.aspx***

We are trying to identify the person(s) who currently submit the status change requests (for an executed Contract and any executed SAs) to the CFM and/or Contract Payments Sections for processing.
In the example, this document (Executed SA 2) was sent to the CFM Section and Contract Payment Section Outlook Address Groups for processing from a pending status to status 10. A Contract Support Specialist sent the example document. This type of document is generally required to be sent before they will change the status.
Please review and send me the names of the person(s) in your area that handles this process.
If you know of a better source to gather this from, please let me know.

David reviewed the information outlined above with the group. Districts were asked to review this and identify names of the district personnel who coordinate the FACTS entry for their respective districts. These names were identified during the meeting and will be provided to Zach in response to this request.

4) CEI Negotiations – (Steve Potter)

The group discussed current CCEI negotiation practices/policies and inquired as to whether or not changes to the current process were being evaluated by Central Office. David provided an update and feedback from Industry. SCO will coordinate with Carla Perry (Procurement) to review current data and practices related to CCEI negotiations

5) Index 603 – (Steve Potter)

The group reviewed/discussed Index 603 and accompanying MUTCD. Index 603 requires channelization devices on 2 lane section low volume roadway. Contractor complaining that the shifting the traffic for the lane that is closed is putting vehicles onto the shoulder which can damage the existing shoulder on thin shoulders or damage to new work. Index vs. MUTCD have language that differs – 6G04 of MUTCD. Steve will send referenced language to SCO for review.

6) Punch list – (Greg Jones)

Greg offered an opinion related to a contractors claim that they were not required to perform (at no cost) work included on subsequent punch lists received from the Department.

7) CPPR Scores – (Jason Watts)

Item tabled until October meeting. DCE's asked to look at examples where contractor's performance isn't representative of the final CPPR scores. Jennifer mentioned some concerns from contractors that did small, short projects that only get 98 points max.

8) Bond Inquiries (Contract Bond Status Inquiry) – (Jason Watts)

Discussed department responses to letters of inquiry received from Bonding Firms. Item was discussed at previous DCE meeting. Refer to October 2011 DCE Meeting notes. Districts should contact OCG (Special Counsel to Construction) when these types of requests are received to obtain boilerplate response and disclaimer language.

9) Hybrid CCEI Contracts – (Brian McKishnie)

Discussed the current and future use of Hybrid CCEI Contracts. This topic will be discussed in greater detail during the October DCE meeting.

10) Contractor's requests to delay the Start of Construction – (Carrie Stanbridge)

D2 has seen an increase in the number of requests from Contractors to delay the start of Construction project and has been denying said requests lately. Following the meeting David requested the DCE's send data representing these types of requests and the disposition of the request covering the past 18 months. This data will be reviewed and discussed during the October DCE meeting.

11) Statewide Production Rates – (Carolyn Gish)

Discussed the results of the recent Statewide Scheduling Engineers meeting and the outcomes of that meeting. A report from SCO is forthcoming. Also discussed specifically the production rates related to bridge painting activities. SCO will review current rates to determine if adjustments are needed.

12) Primavera License – (Brian McKishnie)

Discussed briefly the Departments Licensure agreement with Primavera and use of the Primavera software. Brian McKishnie will bring additional detail to the October DCE meeting when this will be discussed in greater detail

13) A+B on Bidding on projects w/out I/D – (Carolyn or Carrie ???)

Discussed the use of A+B bidding when Incentive/Disincentive or Bonus clauses are not included in the contract provisions. Previous experience lead to the determination that this practice is currently not allowed.

14) Max Bid Design-Build (Carolyn Gish)

Discussed the use of Max Price in Design-Build projects. SCO currently has a Max Price boilerplate RFP posted on the website for district use. It was noted that the Max Price D-B RPF is used on conjunction with SP00300100BC (Budgetary Constraints Special Provision). Current department policy is such that the use of this SP is required on all projects in excess of $25M.

NEXT DCE MEETING – October 22, 2012 (Video Conference)

Submit agenda items to Alan Autry by October 12, 2012