

Asset Maintenance (AM) Liaison Committee Meeting Minutes
September 28, 2011 (2:00 pm – 5:00 pm)

Opening: Introductions were made around the room.

Participants: Randall Prescott, Rudy Garcia, Jose Darsin, Michelle Sheplan, Chuck Henningsgaard, David Sumner, Matt Ehrenzeller, Tim Lattner, Mike Sprayberry, Cleo Marsh, Bob Gorski, Dayton Burlarley-Hyland, Jose Quintana, Derrick Jenkins ,Troy Dover, Jennifer Perry, Emmett Heltzel, Jared Perdue, Mark Thomas, Sharon Harris, Adrian Sheppard, John Matthews, Laura Potter, Scott Adam, Maria Connolly, Paul DeAngelo, Amy Burlarley-Hyland, Doug Aarons, Mike Heffinger, Sara Henningsgaard, Mark Kuhn, James Hannigan, Rick Herlich, Scott Carter, Patrick Owen, & Renato Marrero

Old Business:

1. Rest Area Inspection Guide Task Team Discussed

Is the “New” form available?

New form is available now at
<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/statemaintenanceoffice/Rest%20Area%20Insp%20Sheet.pdf>

It has now officially replaced the old form # 850-045-02 in the Forms & Procedures website. The Weigh Station Inspection form is 850-045-03.

When will Department start using?

All Districts should now be using the new form. Since D-2 hard-coded the old form into their AM contract, they will continue to use the old form for contract purposes until new contract is in place.

AM Contractor’s would like to discuss- “Since there has been a wide disparity in the scores between how the Districts have been scoring in the past and how the Guide scores are presently coming in we need to discuss this further.”

Tim Allen will be asked to do a joint study to determine why there is a wide disparity in the scores. We will present his findings at next meeting.

Questions?

One comment stated that the contractor had trouble getting appropriate rest area evaluation score soon after use of the new form & handbook began, but it seems to be working fine now.

2. 3rd Party Crash Reports

Derrick (Jenkins) made a presentation and discusses 3rd Party Reimbursements and how the CARS system can assist AM contractors in getting the FHP and HSMV numbers they need to start their

reimbursement process. Derrick offer to provide an electronic copy of his presentation to whoever wanted one.

3. Discussion Item from Chuck Henningsgaard

Discuss establishment of Department/Industry task team to review and suggest improvements to standard asset maintenance specification. Can we discuss the merits of establishing the committee?

There was mention that some in the Liaison group feel the FDOT makes a decision and then present to industry for comment, while industry would rather have a more active role before decisions are made. The group discussed forming a committee who will report to the Asset Maintenance (AM) Liaison Committee on what is working/what is not working, etc. Proposal is eight "significant representatives" on the committee: three District Maintenance Engineers (or delegate), three from industry, one from Office of Maintenance and one from AMOTIA. The plan is to meet via teleconference periodically with a face-to-face meeting immediately before the Liaison meeting. The committee will discuss ideas for future modifications & improvements of the AM Scope language and Florida's AM Contracting Program in general. An idea was that the committee will assign research/exploratory projects to sub-committees who will report back to the committee. It was noted that the committee's conclusions may not result in immediate changes, but the committee will be creating a volume of work to be implemented at a future time when the Department is ready to make changes.

Continue the discussion started in April on end of contract transition period.

As of now, the group generally does not feel this issue is top priority, but is something to continue considering. Troy Dover suggested having a uniform policy at least on bridge contracts that exclude inspections. It was suggested that this may be the first topic of the new committee.

Can we get a FINAL resolution on the accelerator issue for the QAR?

The ^1.3 accelerator factor for Section 1 of the AMPER will stay as is. Industry is thanked for such health discussion on the matter ☺

FYI-AMOTIA Technical Committee is preparing an industry Performance Contracting Guide to be distributed at the Annual Meeting.

This guide has been completed.

Other Discussion

The group suggested we post for examples of AM Scopes onto the internet for other states and other contractors to see..

4. Supplying Inmate Crews to be utilized on the AM Contract

What is AM Contractor's opinion/philosophy regarding the Department supplying inmate crews to be utilized on the AM Contract?

Concept already implemented in some AM contracts and is working well in D-4, D-5 & D-6. Some mentioned this idea has financial benefit to FDOT. Industry generally thought was a useful idea, but did express some concerns with possible liability to contractors for transporting inmates (Dave Rader). DBI revealed an effective practice was that they own the inmate transport truck and park at the prison.

Does AM Contractor's like the spending range? I.e. must spend at least "this much" money not to exceed "this much"?

Some features on various attempts to implement this idea include:

- Contract has "not to exceed" X hours or dollars for usage allowed by contractor
- Contract has maximum & minimum usage limits with deductions for not staying within limits
- Inmates promised to contractor "come off the top" when divvying out inmate crews – this practically guarantees contractor will always have the number so inmates/crews expected

New Business:

1. District 3 QA/QC on AM Contracts (Mark)

Mark (Thomas) gave a presentation on D-3 last two AM Contracts which included QA/QC programs.

The group requested to consider making this QA/QC language standard AM Scope Language. Some new AM contracts are including the process in the "Other Requirements" section. Office of Maintenance agrees should eventually be in standard language and will do so after more contracts have success using the process.

2. Raising Deductions for certain Characteristics

What does AM Contractor think about raising deductions for certain characteristics?

The incentive of raising deductions for individual characteristics would be to achieve a higher level of performance.

For example: We would like the grass to be cut more regularly but we don't want to determine minimum or maximum cycles. So instead of having a set % deduction for characteristics, make the deduction for mowing ½ of 1% of the contract instead of 1/8.....

Understandably, industry was not generally in favor of increasing their deductions. Sprayberry mentioned use of "Interim MRP Evaluations" to help with consistency issues. There was a suggestion to do deductions each MRP cycle instead of retainage for first two, but this hurts statistical accuracy a bit. The group asked for us to continue to try to figure out how to provide incentives.

3. Discussion Points (Randall Prescott & Laura Porter)

What performance measures could be developed to better reflect how the AM contractor is performing? Is the MRP a good measure?

How can we balance the oversight time that we spend monitoring the AM contracts. In this time of doing more with less and being more efficient. How much time is appropriate?

What are the roles of the AM contractor during an event? Do we feel they are clearly defined?

No notable discussion.

4. Department Tracker-(Todd)

Can the AM Contractors access TRACKER?

No.

Tracker could be a tool for customer service. Do the AM contractors want to use this system?

No, they have their own systems.

Discuss AM Contractor's tracking system?

No notable discussion

5. Additional Topics & Next Meeting

Since using inmates on AM contracts is such a good idea, some requested to change existing AM Contracts to include DOC inmate crews. This may be an option with negotiated money given back to the Department.

Sponsorship Program will be discussed at next meeting.