

District Construction Engineer's/District Materials & Research Engineer's Joint Meeting
September 14, 2011 8:00 AM
Lake George Conference Room
Orlando Operations Center
133 South Semoran Blvd., Orlando, Fl. 32807
Videoconference Bridge 5 - 850-414-4662

Attendees:

*TP – Ken Morgan, Kurt Stone
D1 – Sam Joseph (representing D1 & D7), Terry Muse
D2 – Stephen Sedwick, Allan Moyle
D3 – Steve Benak, Frank Kreis
D4 – Mayur Patel (representing D4 & D6), Pete Nissen, Pat McCann, Paul Lampley, Kelly Hall, Melanie Sexton (Corradino Group), Eduardo Perez (Corradino Group)
D5 – Roger Schmitt, Frank O'Dea, Lorie Matthews, Jennifer Taylor
D6 – Mark Croft
D7 – Brian McKishnie, Conrad Campbell
CO – David Sadler, Tim Ruelke, Bouzid Choubane, Tom Byron, Nancy Aliff, Jason Watts, Alan Autry, Roosevelt Petithomme*

Joint DCE/DMRE Meeting:

- 1) Process Improvements – (David Sadler/Tim Ruelke)

Various process improvements were discussed throughout the specific topics identified below. Specific to this item, a suggestion was made to streamline the materials certification process on those construction contracts with lower \$\$ values. This process would be similar to how materials certification is handled on maintenance contracts (i.e. with material certification resting at the Project Administrator level).

- 2) Geotechnical Engineer's Meeting w/Industry – (David Sadler)

- a. Comments from AASHTO Conference

David advised the group of an upcoming meeting between FDOT's Geotechnical Engineers and Industry representatives and briefly described the topics which will likely be covered during this meeting. Also, comments from the recent AASHTO conference were shared with the group ([refer to attached document related to DCE/DMRE Item2](#)).

- 3) DDM/EAR Tracking for evaluation during Warranty Period – (Tim Ruelke)

Tim presented a proposal to the group whereby construction materials incorporated into construction contracts via the DDM/EAR processes would be tracked in a data base. It was suggested to incorporate this data into FDOT's GIS system. Various benefits of having this information in a searchable data base along with resource challenges of data entry were discussed. Tim will continue to further develop this process and provide updates to the group as this proposal moves forward.

- 4) CTQP – (Ken Morgan)

- a. Is it time to revise our qualification process?

- b. We had previous discussion about extending certain qualifications if the qualified technician proved through the IA program and lack of strikes they deserved an extension. They would pay an administrative fee, not need to attend a class or take an exam.

The group revisited a proposal made during the June 2011 DCE meeting (NICET presentation) and discussed concerns raised by the training administrators and Industry related to that proposal. Also discussed was the current process by which "strikes" are issued to CTQP Level II personnel. A follow-up meeting will occur in October 2011 to continue the discussion of CTQP process improvements.

5) QC Manager Program – (Ken Morgan)

- a. How is it working out for all of us?
- b. Any tweaks we can agree upon to improve the process?

The group discussed various process improvements related to the QC Manager program. Specific issues were discussed where the department has observed certain QC Managers who are unfamiliar with the asphalt roadway reports and have question whether or not the QC Manager is verifying the validity of the information on these reports. Tim polled the group as to whether or not the overall QC Manager process was working as intended. It was noted that in certain situations CCEI's are correcting information on the asphalt reports as opposed to having the information corrected by the QC Manager/QC Technicians.

6) Any additional areas we can improve performance of our projects and inspections with targeted training, inspector qualifications like concrete coatings, steel coatings, etc. – (Ken Morgan)

The group discussed various process improvements related to the above items. Noted during the discussion were: potentially reviving the Construction Management Academy; current design practices related to design pavement thicknesses; current design practice as it relates to the utilization of ARMI; current requirements related to painting of steel bridges; etc. A project specific example where the contractor requested to substitute No. 67 stone with No. 6 stone as part of the ARMI construction was discussed. Such requests should be denied.

7) What areas need to be improved by our up front design investigations, geotechnical, pavement, existing coatings, ground water conditions, etc. to make projects go better during construction? – (Ken Morgan)

This topic was combined with the discussion of Item 6 above.

8) Discuss 346-9.5 and CPAM 3.3.5.1 – (Tim Ruelke and David Sadler):

"The resolution investigation will determine the strength test results for each of the four or less LOTs. When the QC strength test results are deemed to be the most accurate, the QC strength test results will represent the four or less consecutive LOTs and the Department will pay for the resolution testing and investigation. When the verification strength test results are deemed to be the most accurate, the Department will assess a 5 percent reduction of payment for the quantity represented by the Resolution Investigation."

CPAM 3.3.5.1 Review and Approval

(A) Resident Level Responsibilities

The PA shall furnish a fee schedule that will be used to establish a credit on the monthly estimate in the event that resolution tests performed by a Department compare favorably with the Verification test results. The PA can obtain the fee schedule from the SMO website.

Tim proposed a modification to 346-9.5 whereby the 5% reduction of payment would be replaced with a flat fee. No objection to the proposal was raised and Tim will move forward with a proposed specification change which will go forward via the normal review process. It was mentioned that supporting data for the establishment of the flat fee should be gathered and analyzed prior to moving forward with the specification change.

- 9) Department approval of Contractors request to use Batch Plants or Casting Facilities located within FDOT Right of Way – (David Sadler)

A project specific example whereby a contractor had previously been granted approval to use FDOT RoW to place a casting facility was discussed. Later, FDOT discovered that the contractor was selling precast components made at this casting facility on the open market. It was noted that this should not be allowed in the future and that FDOT approvals of such request are to be project specific. SCO will review the boilerplate RFP document so as to ensure the intended use of FDOT RoW on D-B projects is clear.

- 10) SMO Oversight of Asphalt VT functions (possible S/W consultant) – (David Sadler)

Tim presented a concept to the group for all Asphalt Plant VT functions to be administered by a single contract procured and managed by SMO (similar to the D2 Material Model). The benefits and potential issues of this proposal were discussed. The goal would be to standardize the Asphalt Plant VT process via consistency and to improve communication amongst the districts when major issues were identified. Districts indicated they prefer to continue procuring and managing contracts for this service at the district level, be it via a district-wide or project specific contract. Major, project specific issues should be discussed with the DBE's during the SMO weekly meetings.

Walk-On Items:

- 1) Soil Boring data in contract plans for ponds (Discuss district experiences with this information) – (David Sadler)

Current design practices and project specific related to the amount of soil boring information being included in the plans was discussed. It was noted that based on previous claim history, it is the current design practice of some districts to either provide no pond location soil boring information or to only provide soil boring information to the lowest elevation of the pond cut as part of the plans. It was determined that if the department had complete soil boring information, then information related to the total soil boring depth should be included in the plans.

DCE Meeting:

- 1) I-595 Presentation – (Pete Nissen and I-595 project personnel) Xa, ÁË Jí ÁÚ[b&Áã^ Á

I-595 Team gave a presentation to the DCE group (Refer to attached documents Agenda Item 1)
Ô[ïã[ïÁ] ï[ç^ ^) ò Á[^• ^ } ãã } ÁÁÁÁ ç^• ã @ÁÓÁ[^• ^ } ãã }

- 2) Local Agency Program Oversight & Inspections (follow-up from July meeting) ([Refer to document entitled DCE Item 2 Draft LAP Oversight Procedure](#)) – (Roosevelt Petithomme)

Roosevelt provided an update on the progress of a proposed LAP Manual revision which was discussed during the July 2011 meeting. The group review and revised the attached document.

Roosevelt will take the suggested changes and will incorporate them into the LAP Manual via the normal Manual revision process. During that process the DCE's will have an opportunity to review and comment as necessary.

- 3) Plan Quantity Concept on Streamline Contracts (Tabled from July Meeting) – (Pat McCann)

This item was resolved prior to the meeting and was not discussed.

- 4) Payment of Streamline Contracts via EED (Tabled from July Meeting) – (Jennifer Taylor)

Issues with payment via EED on Streamline Contracts were discussed. A specification change effective with all contracts Let in or after January 2012 which will address this issue has been processed. SCO will continue to develop a process for active Streamline projects to address the issue.

- 5) CTQP Level II Training – (Lorie Matthews)

District Five provided training to the QC/VT staff on how to properly fill out the Asphalt Plant/Roadway paperwork and is going through the cycle again. Would really like to see the CTQP Level II include training related to how to properly complete the paperwork.

D5 suggested the CTQP Asphalt Level II courses be expanded to include training on the proper completion of asphalt related paperwork required as part of the Final Estimates process. This item will be discussed with the Training Administrators, DME's, DCE's and Final Estimates group during the 10/28/2011 meeting.

- 6) Project Limit Extensions ([Refer to document entitled DCE Item 6 – Project Limit Extensions](#)) – (David Sadler)

Current practice related to SCO's approval of Project Limit Extensions and process improvements were discussed. Future modifications to CPAM 7.3.6.2 are under development to align SCO's approval with the requirement of the section 10.2.5 of the PPM. A Construction Bulletin modifying current CPAM requirements will be developed by SCO and disseminated to the districts for implementation.

- 7) Warranty/Maintenance Bonds versus Payment/Performance Bonds and their uses on Construction projects – (Jason Watts)

OGC discussed the difference between Warranty/Maintenance Bonds vs. Payment/Performance Bonds and the appropriate use of each type. OGC should be review Warranty/Maintenance Bonds prior to their acceptance. It was noted that the issuance of Insurance Riders does not meet the requirements of a Warranty/Maintenance bond.

- 8) Assignment Agreements, Takeover Agreements, etc. – (David Sadler)

David reminded the group that SCO and OGC is responsible for these types of agreements and that they should not be processed absent coordination with these offices.

- 9) Landscaping Specifications, direction of "Bold Landscaping" program and Letting Landscaping Projects as Maintenance Contracts – (David Sadler)

David updated the group on the progress of the departments landscaping program and informed of an upcoming meeting with the State Landscape Architect, District Landscape Architect and SCO to further develop and/or modify the current program.

- 10) Update on 3D Plans – (David Sadler/Jon Sands)

David updated the group on the progress of a task team led by the State Surveyor which is developing a process by which electronic information (i.e. dgn files) will be provided to contractors upon request.

11) Use of Damage Recovery Special Provision – (Jon Sands)

Use of this SP may be requested and approved by the DCE. Recent changes to the usage note have been made to the January 2012 specifications workbook noting this change. Also, changes to CPAM 1.2 were recently processed via the Manual Revision process. As part of that update a new section has been added addressing the use of the Damage Recovery SP.

12) Performance Evaluations (Plans Quality & Constructability) on Design-Build Projects ([Refer to documents for DCE Item 12](#)) – (Alan Autry)

Performance evaluation forms were recently created and introduced to the group. These forms are to be used on D-B projects to document the performance of the lead design professional that is part of D-B firms. Information gathered from these evaluations will benefit the department when evaluating LOI's and developing Longlist / Shortlist recommendations for future D-B contracts. The CPM is to use these forms and develop a Quality & Constructability evaluation for each Work Type identified in the D-B project Advertisement. Forms can be accessed at: <http://formserver.dot.state.fl.us/capture/listings/FormListing.aspx?ListType=FormNumber> Form number is 700-011-30 (versions A-H)

Form Number	Project Description	Office	Effective Date	Download Link
700-011-30A	Design-Build Project Performance Evaluation Work Type 3 - Highway Design (Roadway) UPDATED	CONSTRUCTION OFFICE	09/2011	[Excel 2007]
700-011-30B	Design-Build Project Performance Evaluation Work Type 4 - Highway Design (Bridges) UPDATED	CONSTRUCTION OFFICE	09/2011	[Excel 2007]
700-011-30C	Design-Build Project Performance Evaluation Work Type 6 - Traffic Engineering & Ops (ITS) UPDATED	CONSTRUCTION OFFICE	09/2011	[Excel 2007]
700-011-30D	Design-Build Project Performance Evaluation Work Type 7 - Traffic Operations (Design) UPDATED	CONSTRUCTION OFFICE	09/2011	[Excel 2007]
700-011-30E	Design-Build Project Performance Evaluation Work Type 8 - Surveying & Mapping UPDATED	CONSTRUCTION OFFICE	09/2011	[Excel 2007]
700-011-30F	Design-Build Project Performance Evaluation Work Type 9 - Soil Exploration, Material Testing & Foundation UPDATED	CONSTRUCTION OFFICE	09/2011	[Excel 2007]
700-011-30G	Design-Build Project Performance Evaluation Work Type 14 - Architect UPDATED	CONSTRUCTION OFFICE	09/2011	[Excel 2007]
700-011-30H	Design-Build Project Performance Evaluation Work Type 15 - Landscape Architect UPDATED	CONSTRUCTION OFFICE	09/2011	[Excel 2007]

The attached list of D-B projects Final Accepted after January 1, 2011 should be used to confirm that these evaluations have been performed on these projects. Once the forms are completed they should be submitted to SCO (Attention Alan Autry, Alternative Contracting Specialist).

13) Discuss 4-3.2 – (Brian McKishnie and David Sadler)

Labor includes foremen actually engaged in the work; and will not include project supervisory personnel nor necessary on-site clerical staff, except when the additional or unforeseen work is a controlling work item and the performance of such controlling work item actually extends completion of the project due to no fault of the Contractor.

(c) Equipment: For any machinery or special equipment (other than small tools), including fuel and lubricant, the Contractor will receive 100% of the "Rental Rate Blue Book" for the actual time that such equipment is in operation on the work, and 50% of the "Rental Rate Blue Book" for the time the equipment is directed to standby and remain on the project site, to be calculated as indicated below. The equipment rates will be based on the latest edition (as of the date the work to be performed begins) of the "Rental Rate Blue Book for Construction Equipment" or the "Rental Rate Blue Book for Older Construction Equipment," whichever is applicable, as published by Machinery Information Division of PRIMEDIA Information, Inc. (version current at the time of bid), using all instructions and adjustments contained therein and as modified below. On all projects, the Engineer will adjust the rates using regional adjustments and Rate Adjustment Tables according to the instructions in the Blue Book.

Allowable Equipment Rates will be established as set out below:

(1) Allowable Hourly Equipment Rate = Monthly Rate/176 x Adjustment Factors x 100%.

(2) Allowable Hourly Operating Cost = Hourly Operating Cost x 100%.

(3) Allowable Rate Per Hour = Allowable Hourly Equipment Rate + Allowable Hourly Operating Cost.

(4) Standby Rate = Allowable Hourly Equipment Rate x 50%.

The Monthly Rate is The Basic Machine Rate Plus Any Attachments. Standby rates will apply when equipment is not in operation and is directed by the Engineer to standby at the project site when needed again to complete work and the cost of moving the equipment will exceed the accumulated standby cost. Standby rates will not apply on any day the equipment operates for eight or more hours. Standby payment will be limited to only that number of hours which, when added to the operating time for that day equals eight hours. Standby payment will not be made on days that are not normally considered work days on the project.

The Department will allow for the cost of transporting the equipment to and from the location at which it will be used. If the equipment requires assembly or disassembly for transport, the Department will pay for the time to perform this work at the rate for standby equipment.

Equipment may include vehicles utilized only by Labor, as defined above.

The group reviewed and discussed the specification shown above. Project specific examples were discussed. It was determined that should a contractor request compensation for equipment operated by supervisory personnel, on-site clerical staff, etc. then the burden will rest with the contractor to provide sufficient documentation to support such requests.

- 14) Special Events, changes to 8-6.4 effective January 1, 2011 and Roadway Design Bulletin 11-10 – (Matt Price)

<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/specificationoffice/Implemented/WorkBooks/History/Jan12/Files/0080303.impl.pdf>
<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/rddesign/updates/files/RDB11-10.pdf>

Turnpike personnel outlined its current design/construction practices related to the identification of special event days as a contingency quantity as opposed to the method now required by the PPM via Roadway Design Bulletin 11-10. Future use of district specific modified special provisions will no longer be allowed effective the January 2012 letting. Districts should follow the requirement of the bulletin.

- 15) Credits on Lump Sum Projects Issue and General Lump Sum Credit Discussion – (Jon Sands/David Sadler)

The group had a general discussion related to current specifications governing credits on Lump Sum and Design-Build projects. D1 has proposed specification changes which are being reviewed by SCO. These proposed changes will be distributed to the DCE group for review and comment prior to moving forward.

- 16) Signs attached to Barrier Wall – (David Sadler)

Previous direction related to the use of barrier wall mounted sign supports was discussed.

- 17) DRB Member Selection & Meeting Frequency ([Refer to documents for DCE Item 17](#))– (David Sadler)

DRB Operating Procedures:

<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/construction/CONSTADM/DRB/OperatingProcedure.shtm>

2-FREQUENCY OF REGULAR MEETINGS:

In order for the DRB to become familiar with the project circumstances, it will generally meet once per month during the first 3 to 6 months and no less than quarterly thereafter, as mutually determined by the Contractor and the Department. If conditions warrant, the Contractor and the Department, may reduce/increase the time between meetings to better serve their needs. Factors to be considered when setting the time between meetings include work progress, occurrence of unusual events and the number and complexity of ongoing or potential disputes. On projects with unresolved issues, the Board will meet at least monthly until the unresolved disputes are resolved.

The group discussed current practices and expectations related to DRB member selection along with recent changes to the DRB Operating Guidelines project specific and regional DRB's. Recent changes have been made to both of these documents and project personnel are encouraged to review the current versions posted on the SCO website. Redline versions of those changes are attached.

- 18) DBE Ledger ([Refer to document entitled DCE Item 18 – DBE Ledger](#)) – (Lorie Matthews)

The group discussed the DBE Ledger document along with concerns raised by Industry that the effort associated with completing this ledger. OGC will look further into the requirement to complete this ledger as it relates to the CFR.

- 19) Proposal to lower Insurance Requirements on Streamline Contracts – (Frank O’Dea/Jennifer Taylor)

Standard Specification Requirements:

7-13 Insurance

7-13.2 Contractors’ Public Liability and Property Damages Liability Insurance: Furnish evidence to the Department that, with respect to the operations performed, regular Contractors’ Public Liability Insurance providing for a limit of not less than \$1,000,000 for all damages arising out of bodily injuries to, or death of, one person and, subject to that limit for each person, a total limit of \$5,000,000 for all damages arising out of bodily injuries to, or death of, two or more persons in any one occurrence; and regular Contractors’ Property Damage Liability Insurance providing for a limit of not less than \$50,000 for all damages arising out of injury to, or destruction of, property in any one occurrence and, subject to that limit per occurrence, a total (or aggregate) limit of \$100,000 for all damages arising out of injury to, or destruction of, property during the policy period is carried.

Cause the Department to be an additional insured party on the Contractor’s Public Liability and Property Damages Liability Insurance policies that insure the Contractor for the described work that it performs under the Contract.

7-13.3 Contractors’ Protective Public Liability and Property Damage Liability Insurance: Furnish evidence to the Department that, with respect to the operations performed by subcontractors, regular Contractors’ Protective Public Liability Insurance providing for a limit of not less than \$1,000,000 for all damages arising out of bodily injuries to, or death of, one person and, subject to that limit for each person, a total limit of \$5,000,000 for all damages arising out of bodily injuries to, or death of, two or more persons in any one occurrence; and regular Contractors’ Protective Property Damage Liability Insurance providing for a limit of not less than \$50,000 for all damages arising out of injury to, or destruction of, property in any one occurrence and, subject to that limit per occurrence, a total (or aggregate) limit of \$100,000 for all damages arising out of injury to, or destruction of, property during the policy period is carried.

Cause the Department to be an additional insured party on the Contractor’s Protective Public Liability and Property Damage Liability Insurance policies that insure the Contractor for the described work that it performs under the Contract.

Special Provision Requirements applicable to District Contracts less than \$250,000 and all Maintenance Contracts:

SP0070701DC:

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.fl.us/LTS/CO/Specifications/WorkBook/Jul2011/SP0070701DC.pdf>

SUBARTICLES 7-13.2 and 7-13.3 (Pages 70 and 71) are deleted and the following substituted:
7-13.2 General Liability Insurance: Carry and keep in force, during the period of this Contract, a general liability insurance policy or policies with a company or companies authorized to do business in Florida, affording public liability insurance with bodily injury limits of at least \$100,000 per person and \$300,000.00 each occurrence, and property damage insurance of at least \$50,000 each occurrence, for the services and work to be rendered in accordance with this Contract. Certificates of such insurance shall be filed at the time of Contract execution with the District Contracts Administrator.

The group reviewed and discussed the proposed changes as shown above. SCO and OGC will continue to explore these proposed changes.

Walk-On Items:

- 1) 8.6% DBE Goal Effective 10/1/2011 – (David Sadler)
The group was reminded that effective 10/1/2011 the departments DBE goal was increased from 8318% to 8.6%. It was noted that at the time of the meeting, Art Wright's office had received verbal notification of the change with official notification expected within one week.

- 2) Use of Thermoplastic markings
The group discussed current Department policy as it relates to placing thermoplastic markings as part of construction projects. Currently on those construction projects with an original duration longer than 1 year, the practice is exclude the thermoplastic markings from the construction contract and to place the thermoplastic markings following project acceptance via a separate maintenance contract. Districts have the option of using two part reactive/epoxy materials as an option. It was noted that the Department is also exploring the use of high build paint which utilizes double-drop beads similar to what is being used in neighboring states.

- 3) Transportation Vision for 21st Century
The group had a general discussion of this topic and the Construction divisions participation in on-going meetings related to this subject..

NEXT DCE MEETING – October 28, 2011

Submit agenda items to Alan Autry by Friday October 14, 2011