

District Construction Engineer's Meeting
October 27, 2014
2:00 PM – 4:45 PM
Video Bridge 1 / CO Conference Room 479
Agenda

New/Recurring Business:

1) 2:00 PM – 2:05 PM – Introductions and Agenda Overview

An overview of the meeting agenda will be provided.

CO – David Sadler, Rudy Powell, Doug Martin, Chris Lewis, Paul Martin, Alan Autry, Suzannah Ray, Chad Thompson (FHWA)

D1 – Brian Penny

D2 – Carrie Stanbridge

D3 – Steve Potter, Tim Hendrix

D4 – Carolyn Gish, Deborah Ihsan

D5 – Amy Scales, Valerie Coe, Jennifer Smith, Shailesh Patel

D6 – Mario Cabrera

D7 – Bill Jones

TP – Pete Nissen, Bill Sears

Summary Notes - Introductions were made recognizing those present. In the interest of time the agenda overview was not provided.

2) 2:05 PM – 2:05 PM - CPR Issues (David Sadler/Rudy Powell)

SCO will facilitate a discussion of CPR issues which have arisen since the previous meetings. Districts may bring forward any CPR issues which need to be addressed.

Summary Notes – No CPR issues at this time.

**3) 2:05 PM – 2:25 PM - Specification Updates (Reference Documents Attached)
(David Sadler/Rudy Powell)**

SCO will provide an overview of recent Specification changes. Districts may propose specification changes.

<http://www2.dot.state.fl.us/SpecificationsEstimates/Development/IndustryReview.aspx>

Summary Notes – Rudy highlighted recent specification changes and presented the attached sketch related to the specification changes for thermoplastic paint. SCO is trying to evaluate the performance of thermoplastic while utilizing a 14 day cure period and would like for the Districts to obtain some measurements

(BYK Garnder Colorometer). The group was polled and all Districts are in agreement that a cure time of 14 days is sufficient with the exception of off system projects. Maintenance seems to agree 14 days is sufficient as well. FHWA indicated that their Resource Center folks may have comments relating to this timeframe.

District 4 questioned proposed changes related the field office specification and its use on hybrid CEI contracts. Are the Districts trying to double up so that folks are able to work in the field? How are Districts handling field offices on CEI contracts? D1 hasn't used contractor provided field offices. D2, D3, and D6 don't use field office for hybrid contracts. CCEI staff report to the local offices and/or work out of their trucks. D7 - May have used contractor provided field offices in the past but now requires CCEI to work out of trucks.

4) 2:25 PM – 2:38 PM - CPAM Updates (David Sadler/Rudy Powell)

- SCO will provide an overview of recent CPAM changes. Districts may propose CPAM changes.
- Review/discuss Construction Bulletin 02-14 - Monthly EEO Interview Schedule **(Reference Documents Attached)**. Follow-up discussion from September 10, 2014 DCE Meeting.

Summary Notes – SCO raised awareness of the recently issued bulletin and provided the group with the EEO interview chart which is based on the dollar value of the contract when other the \$20 M threshold.

District 4 saw some discrepancies in the chart provided with the bulletin and presented the table below which will be used instead of the chart.

Monthly Labor/EEO Interview Schedule

Original Contract Amount	Minimum Number of Interviews
Over \$20,000,000 - \$30,000,000	8
Over \$30,000,000 - \$50,000,000	9
Over \$50,000,000 - \$80,000,000	11
Over \$80,000,000 - \$120,000,000	13
Over \$120,000,000 - \$175,000,000	15
Over \$175,000,000 - \$250,000,000	18
Over \$250,000,000 - \$350,000,000	21
Over \$350,000,000 - \$500,000,000	25

SCO will incorporate the above information into a revised bulletin which will be issued.

- Contract Change Root Cause Reason Code for Research Request. SCO has created/assigned Contract Change Root Cause Reason Code (017), CCTS Change Order Type (Research Request) and SiteManager Change Order Reason (PLMO-Plans Modification) as a means to track contract modifications associated with research efforts incorporated into our construction contracts post award. Refer to the Attachment to CPAM Section 7.3 <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/construction/Manuals/cpam/New%20Clean%20Chapters/CodingContractChanges.pdf> for additional information. The request to implement this change was initiated by the State Materials Office.

SCO raised awareness of recent changes made to the reason codes used for contract modifications. Rudy informed the group that reason codes related to payment of 3rd party damages are to be used for tracking of how much we are spending, to evaluate future funding, and to use the data for future changes to the specifications. It's important to remember to use reason codes.

5) 2:38 PM – 2:40 PM - Process Reviews – Lessons Learned (David Sadler/Rudy Powell)

SCO will present highlights of recently completed Process Reviews. Opportunities for improvements and best practices will be presented to the group.

Summary Notes – Rudy provided an overview of a recent Environmental process review performed by SCO.

6) 2:40 PM – 2:48 PM - Collaboration Services for Construction Contracts (Reference Documents Attached) (David Sadler/Rudy Powell/Doug Martin)

Follow-up on discussion items from September 10, 2014 DCE Meeting.

Questions from the group.

1. *What are the top ten tasks identified?*
2. *What training will be provided to end users?*
3. *When will the training be provided?*
4. *Will PB provide training or support for trainers?*
5. *Will training be provided for digital signatures?*
6. *What is the status of the forms to accept the digital signatures?*
7. *Will there be a dropdown menu in Project Solve for all of the different forms?*
8. *What changes can be made once the initial setup in Project Solve is made?*
9. *What outreach with contractors has been performed?*
10. *Is a contractual requirement needed to do business this way?*

11. *What is the plan if a contractor elects to stay with paper?*
12. *What is the status of the digital signatures in offices that interact with construction during a contract such as design, materials, traffic ops, EMO?*
13. *What is the status of the purchase of tablet devices for Department personnel?*
14. *How will software updates be handled?*
15. *What is the status of processing monthly estimates using digital signatures with all of the attached documents?*
16. *What is the status of combining forms to simplify monthly estimates?*

Summary Notes – Doug provided the group with an update. Pilot projects will be ready to roll out by the end of November. Live implementation will most likely take place with February or March lettings. The memorandum of agreement will not be required once this goes live. The specification will be revised to accommodate this process. SCO will work on language and get it to the Districts to put in the jobs. Paperless will essentially cost the contractor less. Two (2) types of training will be offered which is pretty much already developed. Once jobs are identified and the people associated with those jobs, training can begin. SCO website (<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/construction/forms/ElectronicSubmit/electronicformssubmit.shtm>) has guidance on how to obtain and utilize digital signatures for documents which can be included in advertisements. This is hosted outside of the FDOT firewall and can be accessed anywhere. Once forms are ready the documents show up for the next person. That information is put into project site and then automatically goes into EDMS. Doug will provide a “how to” at the next DCE meeting.

7) 2:48 PM – 2:50 PM (only a few minutes) – Coordination of State and District Quality Assurance Efforts (John Tyler)

CPAM no longer requires Quality Assurance Plans from the District Offices, but encourages them to have QA efforts. Are we all going in our own directions? D5 is interested in learning what other District's focus on with their QA efforts and assistance from the SCO's experts in the training and focus of District QA staff.

Summary Notes – D5 questioned the other Districts regarding organized plans for quality assurance. Responses were as follows:

D1 maintains plans and modifies as needed but doesn't submit to the state office. D2 performs an extensive, exhausting review of data. D2 focuses on problem issues. Field personnel have a written plan and it's a collaborative effort with resident engineers.

D3 doesn't have formal QA process. When issues arise they are addressed.

D4 has a checklist for items. D4 has a QA engineer in office that works through the residencies.

D6 still follows the old plan and reviews lessons learned in RE meetings.

D7 reviews the trends.

TP has robust in field inspections as well as PA in the field. TP will be shifting more to field in next few years.

8) 2:50 PM – 2:55 PM (only a few minutes) – Required Proof of MOT Training (Reference Documents Attached) (David Sadler)

A recent FDOT-OIG case proved that project personnel had accepting attendance certificates from a MOT training provider as successful completion of Advanced MOT Training. Attendance certificates are not proof of successful completion of a course. Also, the current MOT Procedure requires a wallet card to be issued as proof of successful completion of a training course. **Action: Have project personnel require the Worksite Traffic Supervisors provide a copy of their valid wallet card as proof for successful completion of Advanced MOT Training. Soon the MOT database will be available to verify trained personnel.**

Summary Notes – David informed the group about MOT wallet cards. Department personnel need to check and make sure the contractor field staff has wallet cards as attendee certificates are not proof of successful completion of the course.

9) 2:55 PM – 3:05 PM – FHWA Projects of Division Interest (Reference Documents Attached) (Rudy Powell/Alan Autry)

Discuss SiteManager coding of these projects and FHWA/FDOT roles and responsibilities.

Summary Notes – The group was informed to treat the PODI and/or POCI projects as if it were a full oversight project. When FHWA receives a submittal, they will provide an email stating whether or not FHWA will need to review and/or approve as appropriate.

10) 3:05 PM – 3:25 PM – Landscape Contracts in SiteManager (Rudy Powell)

Follow-up from September DCE meeting and future changes to programming/administration of Standalone Landscaping Contracts.

Summary Notes - SCO notified the group that beginning in July 2015, Construction will be administering landscape contracts again. The SiteManager system has limitations for allowable days and calendar day contracts. If the contract is allowable, a daily diary should be completed. It was noted that the specifications don't address calendar day contracts.

11) 3:25 PM – 3:26 PM – Attorneys at Department Meetings (David Sadler)

Discuss how to handle when attorneys show up unannounced.

Summary Notes – David informed the group that when contractors attorneys attend project specific meetings without first informing the Department of their plans to attend, please ask them to standby and check to see if Department attorneys are available to attend. If Department attorneys are unavailable to attend, the meeting should be rescheduled.

12) 3:26 PM – 3:35 PM – Contract Administration/Contract Closeout/ Warranty Administration (Carrie Stanbridge)

Discuss how to address/dissolve joint ventures after a Design-Build project is complete.

Summary Notes – SCO educated the group that the Design-Build Joint Venture (DBJV) cannot reassign duties until the Department issues written termination. The DBJV is the entity for warranties, value added, etc.

13) 3:35 PM – 3:52 PM – Summary of FTBA Structures Committee [Reference Documents Attached](#) (Rudy Powell)

SCO to provide an overview of the of the FTBA Structures Committee meeting held on September 30, 2014.

Summary Notes – Rudy went over highlights of the FTBA Structures Committee meeting including roles and responsibilities between Design Bid Build (DBB) and Design-Build (DB) projects. What is the role of the CTQP Pile Driving Inspector on a DB job? Why does the inspector have to physically be there to watch unloading of piles? The Districts are receiving a lot of push back. David showed the group photos of the Department's field visit. Photos were taken of the piles being unloaded and damages occurring. If this happens while Department staff is there, what happens when we aren't there?

Out of tolerances need to be addressed prior to or part of the foundation verification package on DB projects. Are DB Firms allowed to cut piles off at their own risk? SCO is looking at language for practical refusal on a DB job.

Protection of Structures Summary of Changes was reviewed. Protection of existing structures is now moved to a new Section 108. The plans will indicate installation of foundations for miscellaneous structures. Settlement monitoring and inspection is required for roadway compaction operations and has been reduced from 200 feet (originally proposed) to 75 feet.

14) 3:52 PM – 3:55 PM – Major Projects Update session at the 2015 Construction Conference (Rudy Powell)

SCO and Districts to discuss identification of major projects to be presented and who will be the presenter.

Summary Notes – SCO requests the Districts provide information on major projects to highlight at the 2015 Construction Conference. Districts were asked to submit the project, presenter name, and moderator for the session.

SCO has these in mind: I-395, I-4 Ultimate, Sunrail, and Choctawhatchee Bay.

15) 3:55 PM – 3:57 PM – On-line Pre-Bid Question and Answer Reference Documents Attached (Rudy Powell)

Follow-up from September meeting related to posting of questions to the site immediately and SCO's discussions with the Office of Design related to the timeframe of receiving responses from Design PM's and EOR's.

Summary Notes – When questions are submitted to the pre-bid site, they are now posted immediately. If there is a need for the question to be removed, it can be removed immediately. The intent is for the responses to be posted as soon as possible and not wait for the deadline in the specification.

16) 3:57 PM – 4:00 PM – Implementation and Use of 3-D Plans (Bill Jones)

Discuss the implementation and use of 3-D plans.

Summary Notes – Bill questioned the Districts regarding 3-D plans. Conversation with industry at the District level is fine but SCO is already engaged with industry at the state level on this effort.

17) 4:00 PM – 4:07 PM – Operations within the Railroad Right-of-Way Watchman and Flagging Services for CSX Transportation Reference Documents Attached (Rudy Powell)

Refer to SP0071104 / Subarticle 7-11.4.3 - Departments responsibility to provide six month written advance notice to CSXT. Discuss issues districts may be experiencing with this notice on both conventional and non-conventional projects.

Summary Notes - Rudy reviewed the flagging services for CSX. This recently came up on a Design-Build job. The 6 months written notice should be on the DB Firm. If choosing to start earlier, it should be on the DB Firm. SCO will take this back and develop/implement appropriate language for DB jobs.

18) 4:07 PM – 4:09 PM – Adding Incentive/Disincentive or No Excuse Bonus Provisions to On-going Construction Projects (Rudy Powell)

Discuss SCO guidance and expectations when making modifications to active construction contracts which add incentive/disincentive or no excuse bonus provisions post contract award.

Summary Notes – Incentives/disincentives should be included in the original contract documents when anticipated by the District. If this is not done and it is later (post award) determined that a bonus or ID will be added to the contract, project staff shall evaluate the contractors schedule and determine when the contractor originally anticipated completing the project and account for all float in the schedule when setting the bonus or ID dates.

19) 4:09 PM – 4:15 PM – Engineering Analysis Report (EAR) (Rudy Powell/David Sadler)

Discuss the following questions, specifications and definitions as they relate to current practice in the districts and SCO's interpretation of these provisions:

6-4 Defective Materials.

.....As an exception to the above, within 30 calendar days of the termination of the LOT or rejection of the material, the Contractor may submit a proposed scope of work to the Engineer for an engineering or independent laboratory (as approved by the Engineer) analysis to determine the disposition of the material..... A **Specialty Engineer**, who is an **independent consultant, or the Contractor's Engineer of Record** as stated within each individual Section shall perform any such analysis. The report must be signed and sealed by the **Specialty Engineer**.

Specialty Engineer.

A Professional Engineer registered in the State of Florida, **other than the Engineer of Record** or his subcontracted consultant, who undertakes the design and drawing preparation of components, systems, or installation methods and equipment for specific temporary portions of the project work or for special items of the permanent works not fully detailed in the plans and required to be furnished by the Contractor such as but not limited to pot bearing designs, nonstandard expansion joints, MSE wall designs and other specialty items. The Specialty Engineer may also provide designs and details for items of the permanent work declared by the State Construction Office to be "minor" or "non-structural". **The Specialty Engineer may be an employee or officer of the Contractor or a fabricator, an employee or officer of an entity providing components to a fabricator, or an independent consultant.**

Engineer of Record.

The Professional Engineer or Engineering Firm registered in the State of Florida that develops the criteria and concept for the project, performs the analysis, and is responsible for the preparation of the Plans and Specifications. The Engineer of Record may be Departmental inhouse staff or a consultant retained by the Department. **The Contractor shall not employ the Engineer of Record as the Contractor's Engineer of Record or as a Specialty Engineer.**

Summary Notes – SCO’s interpretation of this specification was discussed. It was noted that the engineer signing and sealing the EAR can be an employee of the contractor.

WALK-ON ITEMS:

A.) 4:15 PM – 4:17 PM Cost Savings Initiative Proposals on Conventional Pay Item Projects (Bill Jones)

Summary Notes – The group discussed instances where Contractors are submitting CSI’s to lower quantities and then requesting to renegotiate the unit price for the remaining quantities. It was noted that when this occurs, no renegotiations of the unit price for the remaining quantities should occur.

B.) 4:17 PM – 4:22 PM CEI Selection/Negotiation (Pete Nissen)

Summary Notes – Pete to contact David for a separate meeting and provide additional information.

C.) 4:22 PM – 4:31 PM Hybrid Inspectors (Carrie Stanbridge)

Summary Notes – QA and Administrative functions on these contracts was discussed. It was noted that QA functions are to be considered as part of the firms overhead and should not be direct billed to the Department. The allowable billable hours which had previously been conveyed to the Districts were reiterated. It was noted that no administrative positions will be added or included in these contracts. Firms should develop and provide their own format for the QA form.

D.) 4:31 PM – 4:34 PM Accepting Digital Signatures on Payrolls (Carolyn Gish)

Summary Notes – Carolyn discussed an issue related to the use and acceptance of digital signatures on certified payroll information. It was noted that we need to educate people about what to look for. When annotating payrolls, the document no longer becomes “signed”, according to some contractors and project personnel. It was noted that the contract number should be on the document, not just in the digital signature. On the specific example discussed it was noted that the document did not clearly indicate that it has been digitally signed.

E.) 4:34 PM – 4:38 PM Reducing Plan Notes (Carolyn Gish)

Summary Notes – A recent effort by the Design Office related to analyzing and scrutinizing the use of plan notes was discussed. SCO will follow-up with the Design Office on this subject.

F.) 4:38 PM – 4:42 PM Scanning Project Related Emails (Carolyn Gish)

Summary Notes – Carolyn inquired as to whether or not the Districts are still required to scan project related emails to EDMS? SCO will look further into this issue.

G.) 4:42 PM – 4:45 PM Standardize Turnpike Buildings (Pete Nissen)

Summary Notes – Pete informed the group that TP is standardizing their toll buildings.

Next DCE Meeting – November 24, 2014

Submit agenda items to Alan Autry by November 17, 2014.