

6110203 – ACCEPTANCE PROCEDURE  
COMMENTS FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW

\*\*\*\*\*

Sheffield, Steven A.  
407-264-3444

Comments:

Lighting and ITS systems could be included.

\*\*\*\*\*

Bill Sears  
954-934-1115

Comments:

Since the Maintaining Agency for signals is the County, the as-builts need to be available at the semi-final inspection. We agree withholding a disproportionate amount (30% seems steep), but would recommend attaching the field testing (spec. 611-4) to the submittal of as-builts by requiring as-builts prior to scheduling the field testing with the Maintaining Agency.

\*\*\*\*\*

Jack Knowlton  
[JackKnowlton@wilsonmiller.com](mailto:JackKnowlton@wilsonmiller.com)

Comments:

I would love it if this spec can get approved.

We have been fighting to get as-builts in the field on a timely basis.

Jack Knowlton

\*\*\*\*\*

Rudy Garcia, P.E.  
District Six Office  
(305) 499-2360  
[rudy.garcia@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:rudy.garcia@dot.state.fl.us)

Comments:

Does this mean that as-built drawings will no longer be a condition precedent to final acceptance as per 611-2.3?

\*\*\*\*\*

Philip C Shaw  
813 918 5010  
[pshaw@hwlochner.com](mailto:pshaw@hwlochner.com)

Comments:

This will create numerous problems for the field personnel. Will the 30% be distributed over the intire pay item list for signals. If ITS work is involved then it is covered by a different spec. Why not just hold final acceptance until all the rtequirements are met. As stated it affects the sub and does not really impact the prime. LD's affect the prime. He has a lot more control over his subs than the FDOT or the CCEI.

\*\*\*\*\*

Jay H. L. Calhoun, PE  
(813) 831-8870  
[www.vanusinc.com](http://www.vanusinc.com)

**Comments:**

This proposed procedure will definately force a contractor to produce as-builts. However, withholding 30% of payment seems a little high. It could impact their ability to pay for materials or labor. Ten to 15% would seem to be more fair, while still accomplishing the FDOT's goal.

\*\*\*\*\*

No Name Comment

**Comments:**

This will cause a problem for small DBE certified firms on projects with a long duration. As-builts are turned in at the end of each project any way.

\*\*\*\*\*

Peggy Hansen  
[Pahconst@aol.com](mailto:Pahconst@aol.com)

**Comments:**

In response to the above referenced proposed specification change, please note that traffic signal contractors do not have 30% markups in their jobs and should not be required to finance the departments projects.

We have installed jobs in various areas of the state and have completed whole intersections which were put into complete operation, but could not complete the balance of the traffic signal work due to phasing or other issues on the job. A specific project this occurred on was FIN Proj No. 238424-1-52-01 in Lake County. We installed one strain pole intersection which operated for more than a year before the project was completed and final as-builts could be prepared and submitted. If the proposed specification had been in effect at the time this job was bid and installed, we would have had more money going out for labor, material, equipment and overhead than we could have collected if only 70% of the pay items for the installed traffic signals were paid as proposed.

The proposed specification change will put an undue burden on the traffic signal contractors, especially the small traffic signal contractors.

\*\*\*\*\*

Fred H. Heery, Sr., P.E.  
850-410-5416

**Comments:**

30% retainage seems a lot for this item. When I was in construction, 5 to 10% retainage was common on a job.

30% seems (is) excessive. It will likely drive up costs when construction costs are already soaring. The longer contractor's have to wait for payment on completed work, i.e., they have to finance our projects, we pay in the end.

Either reduce the retainage or come up with another avenue to suffice (e.g., bond) the issue.

\*\*\*\*\*

Gene Syfrett  
D-3 Traffic Ops.  
850-415-9669

**Comments:**

I TOTALLY disagree with this spec. change for more than one reason. On most contracts the signal contractors is a subcontractor to the contract. The sub will be held hostage to and for all LDs. As-builds are already required in the Specs all we (FDOT Project Administrators/CEI) needs to do is enforce the spec not amend it. Final Estimates in Construction doesn't like this change either.

\*\*\*\*\*

Jim Rosa  
FDOT, Construction Liaison  
813-975-6269

**Comments:**

D-7 requires that the as-built's be given to us before the 48Hr Test can start.

\*\*\*\*\*

Ron Capobianco, Jr.  
(954) 868-0023

**Comments:**

I submit as-buits to BCTED & FDOT seven day prior to inspection date! Per our Signalization procedures written by Broward Operation center & BCTED!

After reading this, I disagree with these changes there proposing! Especially when you have a CEI handling the oversight on state projects(premium cost involved). In D4 you have only 20 days after all pay-items are paid in site manager & all inspections have been completed (signalization) to send in your final estimate package with the acceptance letters from your maintaining agency's! Holding 30% would be impossible !!

\*\*\*\*\*

Ken Zinck  
386-740-3471  
[ken.zinck@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:ken.zinck@dot.state.fl.us)  
Coordinating D5 Comments

**Comments:**

**Mike Ruland, P.E. Comments 386-943-5761:**

70 %/30% seems a bit much – that can be a lot of money for a small signal sub and as-built can't be completed until the job's done. What about holding 10% instead of 30% and make as follows.

611-2.3.3 Compensation: All costs involved with providing as-built plans are incidental to the other items of work associated with traffic signals. Payment for the work associated with traffic signals will be made at 90 70% of the unit price bid for signal installation. The remaining 10 30% of the unit price will be made after submittal and acceptance of the As-Built Plans.

**Tonii Brush's 386-943-5348 Comments:**

6110203 Acceptance Procedure – Agree with change in spec; but with this requirement of only paying 70% of the signalization items before the contractor's as-built plans are submitted, it seems that this would be a good time to have the signalizations items lumped together as a lump sum pay item for the exception of conduit pay items. This would make it easier for the project administrator to apply the 70% pay. Most of the time there is no change between original and final quantity for these items and grouping them together to create a lump sum signalization item should not be a problem for the designer, contractor, or construction personnel.

**John Burnett's Comments 352-326-7739:**

I would say that Tonii makes a good point. It would be a lot of trouble to make sure you have only paid 70% on all the signal items. Lump Sum would be the way to go.

\*\*\*\*\*