

SP0090103SLLS MEASUREMENT AND PAYMENT  
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

---

Bob Burleson for Pete Kelley  
FTBA  
850-942-1404  
[bburleson@ftba.com](mailto:bburleson@ftba.com)

Comment: (3-4-14, Internal)

Suspension of prequalification seems pretty harsh. Is this a big problem or is there one or two instances where it has been a problem? I am always wary of punitive specifications like this.

Response: (as per David Sadler, 3-4-14)

We're not creating anything new with spec. This is language that is currently in the standard specs but was removed for streamlined contracting special provisions. We have been having problems with several of the Contractors (usually smaller Contractors) doing streamlined contracts finishing all of the requirements of Section 9 so we are adding this language back into the streamlined specs.

No changes made.

\*\*\*\*\*

Rusty Birchall  
813-917-6010  
[rbirchall@conegraham.com](mailto:rbirchall@conegraham.com)

Comment: (3-17-14)

The following comments are identical to the ones I posted on streamlined contracts. There is an issue on lump sum projects concerning final acceptance if there is an unresolved claim issue between the Department and the Contractor. Under this change, the contractor would be subject to suspension if they don't return the Acceptance Letter as stated in item (a) of 9-8.1. The Acceptance Letter the Department sends out has language in it releasing FDOT from all claims. FDOT will not accept an alternative letter despite the fact that there is no language in the 9-8.1 as to the form of the acceptance letter. The Department will also not accept a "Qualified" acceptance letter on a lump sum job. If a claim goes unresolved for more than 90 days, it is not justifiable to suspend the contractor for failing to return the acceptance letter. If suspension is going to be included as a hammer over the contractor, then some allowance must be made to qualify the acceptance to reserve rights to outstanding claims.

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*

Anonymous

Comment: (3-18-14)

This is a reasonable requirement to ask the contractor to return the needed documents within 90 days. We just need to be uniform with FDOT actions if it does not occur and use the same action for other documents not received. Be consistent.

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*

Sergio Figueroa  
407-482-7828  
[sergio.figueroa@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:sergio.figueroa@dot.state.fl.us)

Comment: (4-8-14)

SP0090103SLLS & SP0090103SLPQ - The proposed change to these industry review #'s is the addition of a paragraph shown below highlighted in red. The paragraph contains the statement "If the contractor fails..., the Department may suspend....". Is there any limitation or a reason to say "may", instead of "will"? Is there any minimum criteria in which the Department wouldn't suspend the Qualification?

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*

D4 Const.

Comment: (4-11-14)

Proposed text reads: "If the Contractor fails to provide all the required documents listed below within 90 days of final acceptance,..."

Shouldn't this be 90 days from the offer of final payment? This would be consistent with the current spec. for non-streamlined projects.

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*