

0040309 SCOPE OF WORK – VALUE ENGINEERING INCENTIVE
COMMENTS FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW

Steve Plotkin

Comments:

Plotkin comments in Bolded (Red) text.

Paragraph 2: All bridge plans **relating to the VECP** shall be reviewed ~~undergo an~~ *independent peer review conducted* by a single independent engineering firm **referred to for the purposes of this article as** (the **I**ndependent **R**review Engineer) **who is not the originator of involved in** the VECP design, **and is** pre-qualified **by the Department** in accordance with Chapter 14-75 *Rule 14-75, Florida Administrative Code. The independent peer review is intended to be a comprehensive, thorough verification of the original work, to assure giving assurance* that the design is in compliance with all Department requirements. The **I**ndependent **R**review Engineer's comments, along with the resolution of each comment, shall be submitted to the Department. The **I**ndependent **R**review Engineer shall sign and seal **the submittal a** cover letter stating that all of the independent Engineer's comments have been adequately addressed and the design is in compliance with the Department requirements. If there are any unresolved comments the **I**ndependent **R**review Engineer shall specifically list all unresolved issues in the signed and sealed cover letter. *The independent p*Peer review will be **paid for funded** by the Contractor.

Paragraph 3: *The* Contractor shall designate a primary engineer responsible for the VECP design and as such will be designated as the Contractors Engineer of Record for the VECP design. The Department reserves the right to require the Contractor's Engineer of Record to assume responsibility for **design of** the entire structure.

Response:

Jose Danon
813-975-6130

Comments:

After reading the section in the subject above, I recommend that Section 4-3.9 shall require a compliance with Rule 14-75 (any VECP) not just this sub-Section 4-3.9.6 about Category 2 Bridges.

Response:

Tim Brock
D4 Utility/Value Engineer
954-777-4125

Comments:

Rudy,

Hello and good afternoon. While I have no big comments regarding the body of the sub article...please note there is a supplemental specification that deletes the entire Value Engineering Incentive from the book and replaces it with a new 4.3.9. Please note the two intros:

SUBARTICLE 004-3.9.6 (pages 28-29) is deleted and the following substituted: (this is what you have proposed)

This is the current supplemental specification that replaces the entire 4.3.9:

SUBARTICLE 4-3.9 (Pages 26-31) is deleted and the following substituted:

I believe you will need to make your 4.3.9.6 modifications a special provision to modify the supplemental spec...or change and get FHWA approval on the revised supplemental specification. Or you could just ask Clinton to make the adjustments (hello Clinton). Catch up with you later. Thanks for the opportunity to review and comment.

Response:

Tony Garcia
Garcia Bridge Engineers, P.A.
850-531-0005
garcia.tony@embarqmail.com

Comments:

Rudy: Please note the following two comments regarding this change to the VE program.

1. The terminology "Peer Review" needs to be defined someplace. I tried finding this in the PPM and the SDG Manual without success. Currently we are on a team for the Indian Street D/B project and have been asked to do the Peer Review. I prepared a scope of services under my understanding of what a peer review entails and was referred to the RFP. The RFP states (pg 27 of 67), Item IV-A: Design and Construction Criteria, General, 3rd paragraph: "... a peer review analysis by an independent engineering firm... to assure that the submittal is in compliance with all Department requirements."

My understanding of a peer review is a totally independent set of design calculations of the structural components in question, number crunching, to be compared (after the design is done) with the original designer's calculations. Any and all discrepancies would then be resolved. My interpretation is more akin to a QC whereas the RFP's interpretation is more of a QA (compliance with Department requirements).

For example, the Department's requirement is that the structure be designed according to the latest AASHTO LRFD guidelines. A note on the calculations stating that the design is done in accordance with AASHTO LRFD would then satisfy the RFP intent. More could be done: A particular component is designed following an AASHTO section, the

calculations indicate the section and the peer reviewer confirms that the intent was followed. Neither of these situations indicate: 1) that the resulting calculations are correct, nor 2) that the proper section was used.

2. All calculations we submit for a VECP are checked internally (QC) prior to submittal to the contractor for further transmittal to the FDOT. In cases where a structure modification is proposed, the EOR is then called in to check our proposed VECP. Although the intent of this Proposed Specification is for “Major Modifications” on a Category 2 structures, I’m not sure if a “Major Modification” is clearly defined anywhere. In such cases, this requirement may actually reduce the number of VECP’s submitted. We already find it difficult in some Districts in trying to get VECP’s accepted with all sorts of excuses used. I fear that this will add one more, and a costly one, that will further reduce the contractor’s desire to pursue VECP’s.

Response:
