

# Asset Maintenance (AM) Liaison Committee Meeting Minutes

## March 27, 2012

**Opening:** Introductions were made around the room.

### **Participants:**

Randell Prescott (FDOT-D7)	John Matthews (FL Drawbridge)
Rudy Garcia (FDOT-D6)	Laura Porter (FL Drawbridge)
Michelle Sheplan (TME)	Doug Aarons (DBI)
Chuck Henningsgaard (Jorgensen)	Mike Heffinger (FDOT-D5)
Daniel Strickland (FDOT-OOM)	James Hannigan (FDOT-D2)
Matt Ehrenzeller (TME)	Richard Herlich (Transfield)
Tim Lattner (FDOT-OOM)	Renato Marrero (FDOT-D6)
Mike Sprayberry (FDOT-OOM)	Ernie Molina (ICA)
Bob Gorski (DBI)	Brian Berlanda (DBI)
Jose Quintana (FDOT-D8)	Chris Shaeffer (Colas Infrastructure)
Derrick Jenkins (ICA)	Ademola Adelekan (FDOT-D8)
Jennifer Perry (FDOT-D1)	Todd Hammerle (FDOT-D5)
Mark Thomas (FDOT-D3)	Chris Barone (FDOT-D5)
Sharon Harris (FDOT-D1)	Peter Loughlin (AMOTIA)

### **Agenda Item #1: AMOTIA Annual Meeting (Peter Loughlin)**

Brochures were passed out with information on the 4<sup>th</sup> Annual AMOTIA Conference being held in Ft. Lauderdale at the Harbor Beach Marriott Resort and Spa on September 26-28, 2012. There was suggestion to note (and avoid) religious holidays when scheduling future liaison or AMOTIO or other meetings.

### **Agenda Item #2: Department/Industry Task Team (Chuck)**

Follow-up from Sept 2011 meeting to discuss how a task team could contribute to reviewing and recommending improvements to standard AM scope.

- a) Issue: Keeping Elements & Characteristics at desired criteria each rating period. (Todd)  
Discussion: Action was to develop a task team to further analyze. Team will review options for ensuring certain characteristics (like mowing) are being maintained between periods. Industry stated they want involvement in this team. There was a suggestion to eliminate the "retainage" concept for some characteristics and instead go straight to deductions – this would be in lieu of using the recently used enhanced criteria idea.
- b) Issue: MRP changes. (Tim)  
Discussion: The idea was to change weighting criteria for MRP (elements and characteristics). A decision was made to directly relate/evaluate the use of allocated budget for specific MRP criteria to MRP importance factors. Removing characteristic weights (all go to

factor of 1). Element weights changes as follows: Roadway 5%, Roadside 20%, Traffic 35%, Drainage 15%, Aesthetics 25% (was 24-25, 13-14, 27-30, 13-15, 17-19). In in-house testing, overall looks to drop 2 points statewide and anywhere from 1 to 3 points per District. The "mileage bug" (where a large mileage length imbalance between 2 facility types can cause elevated Element & Characteristic scores in some cases) was not addressed with the new weighting changes.

c) Issue: Contract language for utility bills. (Michelle)

Discussion: There is a major risk factor when bidding on contracts that include payment of utilities. Action was for the Department to provide past information (energy usage, monthly billing amounts, etc.). Another issue mentioned was the statewide contract for phone systems are managed by DMS and they only accept payments from other State Agencies. It was determined that maybe we won't continue to use that contract. Some other notes:

- some AM contractors put utilities in their name (or send bills to them) and this works well

- there are possible complications with paying for bills not on state(AM)-maintained road

- suggested the new sub-team can standardize what info needs to be provided about lighting schematics

- try to allow AM contractors to negotiate straight with utility companies

d) Issue: Recent changes in AM contracts: a) D5 Segment deductions, b) D7 Quality Control evaluation weighting. (Chuck)

Discussion: a) There is an uncertainty of construction projects timelines (and if they will happen) and AM Contractor costs associated with that. Contracts with unknown contraction projects are hard to bid. There can also be additional costs from partially constructed projects with the existing responsibility to AMC. Action was to develop standard language to address this issue. Sprayberry asked if the AM Scope's "Other Contract Requirements" section was adequate – industry said yes, we should keep that flexibility, but this issue may need more standardization. We certainly should not have all the "if this project does not happened then reduce payment by 5%" add up to 100% - this does not allow mobilization and overhead. There was a suggestion to send all "Other Requirements" sections to AMOTIA before we use in a contract, but some thought this does not guarantee all bidders will get to review. If we do this early, FDOT could send similar but non-specific situation to AMOTIA and Liaison instead of actual language used in contract. b) The weight used for QAR part in D7's latest AM contract seemed high (55%). It was noted this matched a recent D3 contract. The idea of high weight was to stress it's importance. Will look to revise/optimize. It was determined to work toward incorporating the Quality Control Evaluation Process

(from D3) into standard language (as a selectable option at first but maybe required in all later) to insure AMC accountability.

- e) Issue: Customer Service concept. (Mike)

Discussion: Sprayberry explained this new concept recently used in an AM contract. Concerns were that the Customer Service Concept needs more tweaking from D7 language but the new language used in D5 should address those concerns for bid ability. There was mention of possibility of "difficult" customers.

- f) Issue: Bridge Work Orders (Mike)

The plan is to combine major and minor bridge work orders. Once the language is finalized, send to AMOTIA.

- g) Issue: Rest Area Directive (Ernie)

Discussion: None.

- h) Issue: Sponsorship Program (Mike)

Discussion: FDOT asked about AMC interest/progress in the program. AMC didn't have much discussion on this topic but may be reluctant to talking about it because of some of the major RA contracts coming to end of duration and may or may not be renewed. The feel is there is some interest but nor real excitement yet. Noted that the RA Sponsorship Program could be pulled out in the future if it doesn't work.

- i) Issue: Qualifying Project Managers (Tim)

Discussion: None.

### **Agenda Item #3: New FDOT Contracts (Tim and Peter)**

The group discussed status of new contracts and the scheduling of the coming plethora of contracts. Tim said there will be \$66 million budgeted annually and \$452 Million allocated for the next 7 years. The group asked/discussed if we can help place employees with AM contract winners. It was suggested to utilize AMOTIA to assist in connecting displaced employees with AMC's.

### **Agenda Item #4: Renewal of Existing Contracts (Tim)**

It was discussed that the option to rebid contracts will be used if a benefit to the State, but the renewal option is still possible on a case-by-case basis. Recently an AM contract was renewed, so the door has been opened.

### **Agenda Item #5: DBE Utilization (Mike and Todd)**

FDOT should emphasize to the contractors that they should commit, seek, and used DBEs up to FDOT goal. D8 pointed out that some "good worker" DBEs are not "certified" due to the difficulty to do all the financial requirements. Todd (D5) stated we can make the effort to help them.

### **Agenda Item #6: Miscellaneous Items**

- a) Contractor reference requests (Tim)

-For consistency, send these to OOM central office for processing.

**b) Political sign removal (Mike)**

-Be sure to be consistent with who gets removed. Daniel Strickland shared a process by which AMC could utilize for the removal of political signage during election time. As opposed to removing, contacting the local code enforcement officer and/or Elections Committee could potentially assess the politician a \$1000 fine for signs located on R/W.

**c) Blue Comment Cards (weigh station comments (Mike)**

-The Blue comment cards at weigh stations are not generally used by the public as intended, so it has been determined they are no longer needed and will be disbanded. There is no longer a need to collect, supply, or process these.

**d) Contractor selection process (Todd)**

-The question was posed "What value are we getting from the significant effort required to prepare (bidders) and review (selection team) tech proposals?" All agreed the current RFP needs revision and the tech proposal process needs refining. A few suggested going to low bid, but most opposed this idea. Also, we still plan to enhance the contractor selection process in the future to include past contractor grades. Todd proposed to champion a Team to review the issue of moving toward incorporating the AMPER results into selection scores, and to reduce RFP complexity and increase effectiveness. Some suggested we skip using a new Team and use the subcommittee to do this.

**Agenda Item #7: What is Happening in Other Agencies (AMOTIA)**

AMOTIA presented performance-based techniques and systems used by:  
Virginia  
Tennessee  
Georgia  
Canada  
Others