

Joint District Construction and Materials Engineer's Meeting Notes
February 20 & 21, 2013

New Business – DCE/DMRE Meeting (02/20/2013):

1) Introductions

Introductions were made recognizing the attendees present.

2) CTQP Requalification criteria – (Ken Cox)

- a) SMO proposal to reduce / eliminate cost of requalification. The focus is on using the IA program to re-qualify rather than going back to CTQP.

Tim Ruelke and Ken Cox presented proposed changes to the current qualification and re-qualification process (see attached handouts related to this item). SMO, as part of this proposal, polled other State DOT's to establish how similar processes are being handled. A majority of polled states reported having in place processes similar to FDOT's current process. A few states reported following a model similar to NICET. SMO indicated that their proposal would be presented to FDOT's Executive Committee in the near future. The group discussed in great detail the options being presented, as well as, other options brought forth by the group, the tracking responsibilities of each impacted office, the re-qualification periods, the anticipated cost savings, the impacts to existing providers, etc.

3) Thicker Open Graded Friction Course – (John Tyler)

- a) Would thicker OGFCs yield better durability and lower paving temps? What's been the experience of other states and pilots in Florida?

D5 inquired as to the status of any on-going research related to this topic. Concerns were expressed related to instances of hydroplaning and drainage when long periods of time occur between final placement of the structural asphalt and placement of the friction course and overbuild of curves as this relates to thickness restrictions. D5 and SMO will coordinate to identify a pilot project or projects where thicker OGFC's may be placed.

4) Contractor Quality Control Plan – (Tim Ruelke/David Sadler/Rudy Powell)

SCO and SMO presented a proposal to modify the existing requirements for project specific QC plans. It was noted that this proposal originated as a result of the departments evaluation of the future of Contractor specific Master QC plans and the proposal does not impact producer plans or plans required for "specialty items" identified in the specifications. DCE's were asked to poll project staff for the purpose of establishing the frequency of and reasons for those instances when contractors project specific QC plans have been pulled and report this information to SCO during the March 2013 DCE meeting.

5) Product/Material tracking in MAC – (Rudy Powell/Ken Cox)

- a) What is the value of tracking all materials accepted by certification (QPL, APL, and certification only) on a project via data entry into the new MAC system?
Discuss details of who and how.

SMO provided a brief update on the development of the MAC system. The group discussed pro's, con's, challenges and benefits of tracking materials accepted by certification in the MAC system. SMO will consider these discussions as they move forward with implementation of the MAC system.

- 6) Transportation Curriculum Coordination Council – (Ken Cox)
Ken Cox presented a history of the TCCC program along with brief highlights for the purpose of promoting the program (see attached handout for additional details). The group discussed how the TCCC program compares to FDOT's CTQP training, and how TCCC may be used in the future to streamline FDOT's CTQP training. It was noted that the TCCC program is available for access by anyone interested in participating in the program.
- 7) Texture Meter – (SMO Pavement Section)
 - a) A new device for identifying and defining pavement surface segregation
The SMO Pavement Section presented a prototype concept developed as SMO which is capable of measuring pavement surface segregation (see attached presentation).
- 8) DDM EAR database development – (Ken Cox)
Tim Ruelke provided an update on the GPS technology distributed to the districts being used to track in place materials related to DDM's and EAR's.

Following the conclusion of the joint DCE/DMRE meeting the DCE group discussed the following items as a de-briefing from the Construction Conference:

A.) DRB and Partnering –

1. *From a Consistent/Predictable/Repeatable perspective, the DRB members should be invited to attend Partnering meetings if the DRB members have been selected (and necessary 3 party agreements have been executed) prior to conducting the Partnering meeting. When the DRB members attend the Partnering meeting, they are to be compensated at the contract rate for a regular DRB meeting.*
2. *In those instances when a Regional DRB is used on a project, it is not necessary for the RDRB Members to be invited to and engaged in the project meetings (partnering, preconstruction conference, etc). However, if issues arise between the Department and Contractor on those projects, it is appropriate and acceptable to begin convening regular RDRB meetings as a means of engaging the RDRB in the project and in an effort to resolve on-going issues.*
3. *Discussed a specific example where SCO was notified that a Statewide DRB member has been compensated by contractor to provide assistance on issue/claim resolution and has corresponded with a project specific DRB member on the same project. SCO is addressing this issue with that member.*
4. *Discussed project specific examples of instances where the DRB members do not appear to be engaged and involved in the process during DRB meetings and hearings. Instances should be reported to SCO when this occurs.*

New Business – DCE Meeting(02/21/2013):

- 1) Consistent/Predictable/Repeatable – (David Sadler)
 - a) CCEI Offer of Final Payment and Certified Final Estimates Package – See [Referenced Attachment](#)
Raised awareness of the Final Estimates procedural requirements governing the timeframe for submittal of FE packages to the DFEO following Final Acceptance of the project. It was suggested that on Lump Sum projects, the timeframe be reduced from 30 days to 10 days. SCO (Final Estimates) will review this and make changes to the manual requirements, as appropriate.

b) Holiday/Special Event Time Extensions – (David Sadler)

See Referenced Attachment

Discussed the referenced attachment related to this item and several project specific examples of time extensions granted for impacts caused by holiday/special event suspensions of contractors operations. It was noted that construction personnel should continue to assess holiday and special event time extensions consistent with the requirements of specifications 8-6.4 and 8-7.3.2 Granting of time extensions for impacts caused by suspensions of operations for holidays and special events should be based upon the impacts to the controlling items of work. In the event a holiday or special event suspension of operation occurs on a day (or days) shown as non-working days or the suspension of operations for the holiday/special event causes no impact on critical path activities, then no entitlement to a time extension exists and no time extension should be granted.

2) Payment of Plan Quantity Items – (Rudy Powell)

- a) How would a plan quantity item be paid if the contractor's means and methods resulted in a reduction of the quantity shown in the plans?

Discussed project specific examples where contractor means/methods have resulted in reduction of quantities on lump sum projects and to those items on conventional projects which are "plan quantity" items. Consensus was reached that these instances should be treated as CSI's. SCO will review the plan quantity specifications to determine if clarifications or changes are needed.

3) Thermoplastic Thickness – (Stefanie Maxwell)

- a) Emphasize the importance of thickness certification requirement in specification and that it be verified prior to Final Acceptance of the project

Raised awareness of the specification requirement for department verification of thermoplastic thickness following placement of the material. Discussed development of an additional form to document department verification. SCO determined that it is sufficient for project staff to perform the required verifications and document on the daily work report as opposed to creating a separate form.

4) Buy America Requirements – (David Sadler/Rudy Powell)

- a) Application of Buy America requirements to Utility Relocation

See Referenced Attachments

- b) Clarification of Manufactured Products under Buy America

See Referenced Attachments

Reviewed and discussed the attached reference documents related to these items. Discussed applicability of Buy America requirements to manufactured products and reimbursable/non-reimbursable utility work (in both those instances when the work is performed by the UA/O or highway contractor and both in advance of or as part of the construction project). Districts expressed concerns of how these requirements will be monitored (especially in the case where the UA/O is performing the work in advance of the construction project). Districts were polled to determine the level of involvement and inspection (by Construction personnel) when this work is being accomplished by the UA/O in advance of an upcoming construction project. The State Utility Engineer's Office

is working to ensure the Buy America requirements are added to future agreements between the department and the UA/O's. SCO and FHWA continue to coordinate required clarifications associated with the attached documents. This topic will be discussed during the March meeting once these clarifications are received.

- 5) Design-Build Specification Packages – (Rudy Powell/Alan Autry)
 - a) Review by Specifications Office
 - b) “Released for Construction” specifications prior to commencement of construction activities
 - c) OGC Review of Technical Special Provisions

The group discussed current practices relative to the preparation, submission, and approval of Specification Packages on Design-Build projects. It was noted that the District Specifications Office should be included in the Departments review of packages, prepared and submitted by DB firms, prior to the package being stamped “Released for Construction.” Legal is to review all TSP's and MSP's developed by DB Firms. The group also discussed whether TSP's or MSP's should be required if a DB firm proposes to extend the Value Added periods of those items covered by Value Added specifications (asphalt, concrete pavement, signalization, lighting, bridge components, etc). It was agreed that this should be not required and that inclusion of those commitments in the Technical Proposal is sufficient. Discussed the applicability of the Technical Proposal to the hierarchy of contract documents on a DB project.

- 6) Construction Training Plan for 2013 – (John Tyler)
 - a) What are District needs?
 - b) What can Central Office provide?
 - c) How can resources be pooled to address common training needs?

John Tyler provided an updated on D5's training plan. The group discussed the future of the SCO training plan in light of potential changes based on the 21st Century plan, district needs, and areas the SCO can assist in meeting those needs. The group discussed providing training related to the development and review of CPM schedules, Project Management, specification updates and CPAM updates.

- 7) SCO update on... – (David Sadler/Rudy Powell)
 - a) Project Administrator salary analysis and implementation

David provided the group an update on the PA position descriptions, salary analysis, and implementation plan. It was noted that the DCE's are engaged in additional discussions with the Directors of Transportation Operations relative to these items. PD's have been submitted to HR for review and approval. Issues related to class and band codes were discussed. The group also discussed implementation of the plan for the CSS positions based on the updated CCEI scope of services, the options to utilize either in-house forces or district wide contracts (or a combination, thereof) to provide the CSS services. Concerns were expressed of having the CSS position provided from a separate contract than that of the other project staff (SPE, PS, Inspectors, etc.). Districts were polled to assess current CSS/RCS positions and forecasted needs for these positions based on future, anticipated workloads. Districts inquired about the number of PA positions required or expected to comply with the V21C transportation staffing plan. Expectation is that the number of anticipated positions is based on future

Work Program and that an appropriate number of PA positions would be available (either through existing or new positions) to meet the expected workload. Districts requested that when the final decisions are made that clear direction be provided with all available tools outlined in the direction. During the meeting, David spoke with Irene Cabral who indicated that a proposal had been made to modify the PA3 position to a PE position. This proposal will be discussed with SCO, the Chief Engineer, the DOTS and DCE's within a week of the meeting.

- b) CEI Cost Savings Initiatives and Negotiations with targeted CEI contracts
David provided the group an update on the list of CEI CSI's that had been submitted to executive management. Districts were encouraged to focus on the initiatives highlighted on the last list provided. Districts reported little success implementing these initiatives on existing contracts.
 - c) Construction Business Plan
David provided the group an update on the status of the business plan that has been finalized and submitted to executive management for review and approval. At a future executive workshop, David will present the plan.
 - d) Increasing the Streamlined Contract threshold from \$2.0M to \$3.5M and 2000 tons to 4,000 tons of asphalt
Rudy provided the group an update on the data along with history related to the use of these types of contracts since July 2010. FHWA is currently reviewing a proposal to increase these thresholds that apply to these projects. Industry (Asphalt Contractors' Association) has also been involved in these discussions and is reviewing the proposal as well. SCO continues to review data, impacts of the proposed change, and results of the streamline contracting program.
 - e) Implementation time frame of the "Hold" Specifications for Streamlined Contracts
Rudy provided the group an update on the proposed changes to the Witness and Hold specifications. Witness requirements will be removed. Hold requirements will remain. Threshold requirements (all projects less than \$3.5M) were discussed. This threshold aligns with the V21C transportation staffing plan and the streamline contracts. It was noted that if the specification is implemented, future CCEI contracts would need to be negotiated with the specification in mind. The group reviewed the proposed specification ([refer to attachment](#)). DCE's were asked to provide comments to Rudy following the meeting. Implementation is pending FHWA review and approval.
- 8) Deletion of motorist aid call boxes replacements from ongoing construction projects – (David Sadler/Rudy Powell)
David informed the group of the department's decision to discontinue use of the motorist aid call boxes. If the districts have on-going construction projects where the boxes or the mounting pads are being upgraded and the new pads have not been installed, they are to send a request to SCO requesting approval to delete these items from the project.
- 9) Specification Change (Fuel & Bit adjustments on Design-Build projects) – (Pat McCann)
D4 had previously submitted proposed changes to the fuel & bit specs on DB projects. SCO has reviewed these changes and will not be moving forward with any change to the specifications at this time. Other than noting that the changes had been submitted and will not be pursued, this topic was not discussed. [See Attachment](#)

Walk-On Items – DCE Meeting:

- 1) Invoice and Progress Estimates on Lump Sum and Design-Build Projects – (David Sadler/Rudy Powell)
The group reviewed and discussed specification 9-5.1 and the attached documents. Districts were polled as to current processes related to payments on these contracts and whether those payments are based on the contractor's submitted requests for payment, the engineer's generated estimate, or reconciliation thereof. SCO will review existing specifications and proposed changes to determine if changes are needed.
- 2) Suggested change to 102-3.2 – (Pat McCann)
 - a) More emphasis on responsibility to deal with after-hour incidents
The group reviewed proposed changes to this specification and the attached document. SCO (Stefanie Maxwell) will review the proposed changes and develop changes as necessary. Districts were polled as a means to gauge contractor's response times as required by the existing specification.
- 3) Suggested change to the Field Office Special Provision – (Pat McCann)
 - a) Special Provision as it exists in the below link. We would like to suggest a change to include providing DSL services to the field office.
<ftp://ftp.dot.state.fl.us/LTS/CO/Specifications/WorkBook/Jul2012/SP1090000.pdf>
The group reviewed proposed changes to this specification and the attached document. SCO (Alan Autry) will review the proposed changes and develop specification modifications as necessary.
- 4) MOT Committee Items – (Rudy Powell/David Sadler)
 - a) Certification of MOT quantities
 - i. Some PAs are changing the certifications. If there is an error or deficiency the contractor is to be notified and request that it be modified. PAs are just paying what they think is correct.
The group discussed this follow-up item from the last MOT committee meeting and the specific situation identified above. It was noted that in those instances when the PA or other project personnel identify these types of errors or deficiencies, that the contractor is to be notified and if changes to the certified invoice are warranted, the invoice should be returned to the contractor for correction and resubmission.
 - b) Certification of materials for MOT signs
 - i. Section 994 is clear that the certification of sign materials is only required for permanent signs.
Raised awareness that the requirements related to certification of sign materials only applies to permanently installed signs, not temporarily installed signs (i.e. Advance Warning MOT signs required by the Traffic Control Plans). If project personnel are requiring these certifications of temporary signs, this practice should be discontinued.
- 5) Computation Manual – (Brian McKishnie)
The group revisited the practice of providing the Computation Manual to the contractors when requested as part of a pre-bid question. The State Estimates and Design Offices are proposing changes to current processes such that this document would be provided along with the plans and specifications. The group expressed concerns related to whether or not the Computation Manual would be included as, or interpreted to be included as, a contract

document. SCO confirmed that a disclaimer would be included with the Computation Manual to address this concern.

6) Copper theft – (David Sadler)

Central Office was recently asked to respond to a national survey related to instances of copper theft on construction projects. Districts were polled to gauge instances where this has occurred. DCE's were asked to follow-up with construction staff and report any instances (including location, frequency, value and items) to SCO.

7) Confidentiality of ATC's – (Brian McKishnie)

The group discussed an item which was presented as part of the Design-Build presentation at the Construction Conference. CO is currently reviewing current practices related to ATC's submitted on DB jobs along with a proposal from Industry to maintain the confidentiality of these proposals. This topic will be addressed by the DB Steering Committee and Alternative Contracting Task Team.

8) OGC (Special Counsel) Review of SA's, WO's and UP's – (Jason Watts)

OGC requested to review contract changes that the DCE determines to be of statewide impact.

NEXT DCE MEETING – March 25, 2013 (Video Conference)

Submit agenda items to Alan Autry by March 15, 2013