

**From:** [Tillander, Trey](#)  
**To:** [Hollis, Melissa](#)  
**Cc:** [Toole, Deborah](#); [Thomas, Frances](#); [Harper, Clifton \(Andy\)](#); [Haverty, Ray](#)  
**Subject:** RE: No Pay Items in Stand. Spec.  
**Date:** Monday, September 24, 2012 11:50:08 AM

---

Missy, good comments. Can you add this topic to the next C-Team agenda. Thanks.

*V. Y. "Trey" Tillander III, P.E.*  
State Specifications Engineer  
Florida Department of Transportation  
605 Suwannee Street, M.S. 75  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450  
(850) 414-4140  
[trey.tillander@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:trey.tillander@dot.state.fl.us)

---

**From:** Hollis, Melissa  
**Sent:** Monday, September 24, 2012 8:57 AM  
**To:** Toole, Deborah; Tillander, Trey  
**Subject:** RE: No Pay Items in Stand. Spec.

I'm OK with removing the pay items.

At the same time, I'd watch the remainder of the Basis of Payment closely. Some of them are much better than others. (Same with BOE text- some is much better than others...) Remember that the **BOE is not a contract document**. While I welcome increased comments, the BOE text usually comes from the spec or standard.

Related education to designers- the removal of pay items in the specs does not remove the need for valid pay item notes. Kurt's group could probably provide good and bad examples.

Thanks, Missy

*Melissa Hollis*

## Basis of Estimates Coordinator

FDOT State Specifications and Estimates Office  
605 Suwannee Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450

[Melissa.Hollis@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:Melissa.Hollis@dot.state.fl.us)  
850-414-4182

---

**From:** Toole, Deborah  
**Sent:** Monday, September 24, 2012 8:29 AM  
**To:** Tillander, Trey; Brautigam, Duane  
**Cc:** Hollis, Melissa  
**Subject:** RE: No Pay Items in Stand. Spec.



## *Florida Department of Transportation*

**RICK SCOTT**  
GOVERNOR

605 Suwannee Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450

**ANANTH PRASAD, P.E.**  
SECRETARY

### **M E M O R A N D U M**

**DATE:** October 3, 2012

**TO:** Specification Review Distribution List

**FROM:** Trey Tillander, State Specifications Engineer

**SUBJECT:** Proposed Specification: **4310700 Pipe Liner – Basis of Payment.**

In accordance with Specification Development Procedures, we are sending you a copy of a proposed specification change.

This change was proposed by Rudy Powell of the State Construction Office to delete Pay Item No. 431-2 Pipe Inspection. The cost of inspection is included in the pay item for the pipe liner.

Please share this proposal with others within your responsibility. Review comments are due within four weeks and should be sent to Mail Station 75 or to my attention via e-mail at SP965TT or [trey.tillander@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:trey.tillander@dot.state.fl.us). Comments received after **October 31, 2012**, may not be considered. Your input is encouraged.

TT/dt  
Attachment

**PIPE LINER.****(REV 9-13-12)**

ARTICLE 431-7 (Page 445) is deleted and the following substituted:

**431-7 Basis of Payment.**

Price and payment for pipe liner will be full compensation for furnishing and installing the pipe liner in accordance with the requirements of this Section, including all materials, labor and incidentals required for sealing cracks and joints in the existing pipe, and sealing and grouting the annular space between the liner and interior of the host pipe.

Price and payment for pipe liner will also be full compensation for all equipment, materials and labor required for inspections, and for furnishing videos of the inspections to the Engineer.

Price and payment for flowable fill will be in accordance with Section 121.

Price and payment for desilting pipe will be in accordance with Section 430.

Payment will be made under:

Item No. 431- 1- Pipe Liner - per foot.

~~Item No. 431- 2- Pipe Inspection - per foot.~~

I think this is worthwhile to explore. People tend to forget that the specs are first and foremost written to the Contractor, and if he doesn't need the information, why put it in? ☺

---

**From:** Tillander, Trey  
**Sent:** Monday, September 24, 2012 8:18 AM  
**To:** CO-SPECDEV; Haverty, Ray  
**Subject:** FW: No Pay Items in Stand. Spec.

Let me know your thoughts on this idea. Thanks.

*V. Y. "Trey" Tillander III, P.E.*  
State Specifications Engineer  
Florida Department of Transportation  
605 Suwannee Street, M.S. 75  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450  
(850) 414-4140  
[trey.tillander@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:trey.tillander@dot.state.fl.us)

---

**From:** Tillander, Trey  
**Sent:** Monday, September 24, 2012 8:01 AM  
**To:** Brautigam, Duane  
**Subject:** No Pay Items in Stand. Spec.

My initial reaction is that I like the idea. The spec. typically only shows part of the pay item # anyway, so Contractors and Designers have to go elsewhere for the that info. Simpler and avoids redundancy or conflict with the BOE (and Plans). We might have to put more emphasis on the review and QA of the BOE, but that wouldn't be a big deal. Let me start floating the idea around and see what kind of reactions we get. Thanks.

*V. Y. "Trey" Tillander III, P.E.*  
State Specifications Engineer  
Florida Department of Transportation  
605 Suwannee Street, M.S. 75  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450  
(850) 414-4140  
[trey.tillander@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:trey.tillander@dot.state.fl.us)

---

**From:** Brautigam, Duane  
**Sent:** Monday, September 24, 2012 7:51 AM  
**To:** Tillander, Trey  
**Subject:** FW: Internal Review 4310700 Pipe Liner

This comment is not about 4310700, it is aimed at a broader question ...

With so many of our contracts going lump sum, is it time we considered taking the list of pay items out of our specifications to avoid these niggling changes? There would still be a basis of payment section to define what all is included in a particular spec, but could we eliminate "Payment will be made under ..."?

Even if it we did not do it for every spec, there are certainly quite a few, like this one, that probably

don't need a list. This is not a new idea. I remember it being mentioned in the late 90s by Charles Goodman. The most important point I could make is that the specs are written to the contractors, and I can just about guarantee they never look at our Standard Specs or Supplemental Specs for that information. Perhaps our Special Provisions that address a particular type of work would still list the pay item for that specialty, and TSPs should still list their pay items, but why our statewide specs?

Just sayin ... but this spec is probably a great example of the point, we are going through a process that is a likely to be a total waste of time for everybody.

Your thoughts?

Duane F. Brautigam, P.E.  
Director, Office of Design  
Florida Department of Transportation  
605 Suwannee Street, MS 38  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450  
(850) 414-4175  
[duane.brautigam@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:duane.brautigam@dot.state.fl.us)

---

**From:** Toole, Deborah  
**Sent:** Friday, September 21, 2012 4:09 PM  
**To:** Sadler, David A; Powell, Jr., Rudy; Davis, Greg; Boyd, Charles; Sullivan, Frank; Lattner, Tim; Johnson, Calvin; Ruelke, Timothy J.; Brautigam, Duane  
**Cc:** Burleson, Bob - FL Transportation Builders Assn.; Tillander, Trey; Hughes, Allen; Broxsie, Darrell D.; Toole, Deborah  
**Subject:** Internal Review 4310700 Pipe Liner

Please review the attached document and return any comments to me within 5 days for further processing.

Thanks.....Debbie ☺

Deborah Toole  
Specifications Development Specialist  
State Specifications Office  
605 Suwannee Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0458

[deborah.toole@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:deborah.toole@dot.state.fl.us)  
850-414-4114

