

0071101 LEGAL REQUIREMENTS AND RESPONSIBILITY TO THE PUBLIC – TOLL FACILITIES
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

William C Wood
407-467-6537

Comment: (8-11-14) (Internal Review)

Would it be appropriate to reference the toll equipment supporting structure- gantry or canopy in the callout list? In incidents involving impact damage, the TEC would need to work with facilities/structures staff to assess these structures for soundness in addition to facilitating necessary repairs? Just a thought.

Response: It would not be necessary to identify supporting structure (gantry, canopy, etc.) in the call out list as these structures are covered under Standard Specifications 7-11. Coordination with Toll Equipment Contractor should take place as needed on a project by project basis. No change.

James E. Beverly Jr
Cell: 407-719-7206
JamesE.Beverly@dot.state.fl.us

Comment: (8-11-14) (Internal Review)

I concur with Bill's comments above. In addition, I would add the toll equipment building and supporting site infrastructure, i.e., diesel generator, fuel tank, and HVAC units, fiber optic cabling, pull boxes, and splice vaults. Damage to these items could also impact revenue collection.

Response: It would not be necessary to identify these items as presented in the call out list as these items are covered under Standard Specifications 7-11. No change.

JC Miseroy
JC.Miseroy@gcinc.com

Comment: (8-10-14) (Internal Review)

1. If the FDOT Toll Equipment Contractor is going to perform his work, there should be some timeframe for the number of hours they have to start repairs. I would expect that is in the contract with the Toll Equipment Contractor.

Response: Coordination with Toll Equipment Contractor will take place as needed on a project by project basis, dependent upon equipment impacted, and/or location, and/or nature of incident. No change.

2. I do not understand why hours have to be rounded up to the nearest hour. Why not use fractions?

Response: Hours are not always rounded up; they are either up or down, depending on the nearest half hour. No change.

Keith A. Waugh, Vice President
352-787-1616
kwaugh@lewarecc.com

Comment: (11-13-14) (Internal Review)

The Special Provisions for each project should provide information regarding the expected costs. It would be nice to know what the cost would be if we damage something. This would help us in emphasizing the importance of preventative measures to our field people.

Response: The objective of the language is to emphasize contractor responsibility to preserve and protect the Department’s toll collection facilities, not to provide potential cost of revenue lost due to damage caused by the contractor. No change.

Ronald Bell
Office: 954-934-1130
Mobile: 954-610-9469

Comment: (8-20-14) (Internal Review)

For the most part, I agree with the language proposed in the Specification. The only concern I have is that it does not identify how the Contractor will be provided the “anticipated” traffic volumes for weekday and weekend day and tolls rates prior to submission of their proposal so that they can fairly include potential costs risk into their proposal. Further, aside from volumes of traffic, will there be any consideration given to the average volume by vehicle classification?

Response: The objective of the language is to emphasize contractor responsibility to preserve and protect the Department’s toll collection facilities, not to provide potential cost of revenue lost due to damage caused by the contractor. Average volume by vehicle classification is site specific and will be provided if an incident occurs. No change.

Gus Quesada
305.726.5981
gquesada@nmdceng.net

Comment: (9-16-14)

I understand the intent is to make the contractor accountable for loss of revenue during construction, I would recommend to have the legal department check if this responsibility can actually be transferred. Something just doesn't sound right when we make the contractor accountable for business losses that are either projected, averaged, or forecasted. With all the other "risk factors" such as LD's, lane rental, mobility (incent/disincentive), weather, holidays, etc. this is another risk that will drive bid prices up. I feel that if the method of calculating is

somewhat complex and would suggest a per-lane charge that way the contractor can assess his risk at bid time. This may be construed as a penalty, but it is clear and somewhat manageable risk factor that the contractor or design builder can place a value on.

Response: Language development was coordinated at all stages with the Department's General Counsel. No change.
