

ASSET MAINTENANCE LIAISON COMMITTEE (AMLC) MEETING MINUTES (July 15, 2009)

This Asset Maintenance Liaison Committee meeting was held on the morning of the July 15th (8:30 - 12:00) in Orlando at the Turkey Lake Plaza (Room 3001). The meeting featured a roundtable discussion with the maintenance contracting organization, AMOTIA (Association for the Management and Operations of Transportation Infrastructure Assets). Most members of the AM Liaison Committee are also members of AMOTIA.

Attendees: Sharon Harris (District 1), Jim Hannigan (District 2), Mark Thomas (District 3), Cleo Marsh (District 4), Todd Hammerle (District 5), Bud Nabong (District 7), Jose Quintana (Turnpike), Rick Sulzer (Jorgensen), Scott Carter (Transfield Services), Lee Pauls (Transfield Services), Michelle Sheplan (Transfield Services), Jose Darsin (Transfield Services), Paul DeAngelo (DBI), Bob Gorski (DBI), Ernie Molina (ICA), Derrick Jenkins (ICA), Laura Porter (FL Drawbridge), John Matthews (FL Drawbridge), Robert Bourdon (CAB), Ted Ferragut (AMOTIA), Tim Lattner (Office of Maintenance), Mike Sprayberry (Office of Maintenance)

OLD BUSINESS

1) Review/Present/Discuss/Report on Status of Asset Maintenance Monitoring/Grading Plan (AMMP).

Background- For close to a year and a half, a Task Team consisting of District representatives and Industry representatives have been working to convert the existing Asset Maintenance Monitoring Plan into a system that will generate numerical “grades” or scores of Asset Maintenance Contractor performance. During development, the Districts have been using the new AMMP on a trial basis.

Discussion- The AMMP Task Team progress on the AMMP was presented. It was announced that the AMMP Task Team needed one more meeting to finalize the AMMP and once finalized, the trial period will end and official use will begin. The AMLC expressed some concern over the Structures section being finalized since that section was very recently overhauled and has not had sufficient real-world testing. Also, the AMLC expressed that it is crucial that the AMMP usage handbook be published and hands-on training be provided before the resulting AMMP scores are official.

Action Item- The Office of Maintenance (OOM) committed to providing AMMP training and circulating the AMMP instruction handbook before any AMMP scores are official. Also, since the Structures section is new, any AM contracts with structures will remain in a trial period for another year.

[UPDATE – 10/2/2009]- A couple of months after the meeting, the Task Team completed their efforts in finalizing the AMMP. The next step is to release for official use. However, Industry recently expressed concern that since the AMMP has undergone ongoing changes, updates, and improvement during the 1½-year trial period, they feel that the AMMP is not ready for official use and needs more real-world testing using an unchanging version. Furthermore, since Districts were not given an instruction manual or hands-on training on how to use the AMMP system (part of the testing was observing how different Districts filled out the AMMP in different ways), much better testing data will result for the final version when all Districts are properly trained. Therefore, OOM has agreed to extend the trial period for another year, but during this year, any changes to the AMMP system will be minimal to

none. Also, the Districts will be provided with an instruction handbook and will be trained before using the final AMMP for this final year testing period. These steps will provide a good year of consistent data that can be analyzed to determine if the AMMP system accurately and fairly reflects contractor performance. Once we are confident of this, the final scores can be used in a variety of ways: good scores can boost technical proposal scores for future AM jobs while poor scores can result in contractor suspension from bidding or contractor default.

2) MRP SharePoint

Discussion- OOM presented two new features of the SharePoint MRP System:

- a. There is a new feature to increase sample size, if desired, of characteristics less than 10. The system will now generate extra lines on the Y/N sheet to enter in any extra points evaluated to obtain a minimum of 10 per characteristic. Also discussed current method of handling <10 samples and stressed impact if extra samples are not evaluated: if the AMC agrees to do less than 10 in period, usually because the score was acceptable (such as 3 out of 3), they are stuck with that small sample size regardless of what the annual totals turn out to be. The Districts were informed that when they need this feature for the first time, they need to contact OOM and we will do a quick process to add the feature to their MRP SharePoint files as requested. After the first time, the feature will be there for any future needs.
- b. OOM announced that the MRP archive files can now generate historical reports of past MRP performance.

3) Rest Area Inspection Consistency

Background- When rest areas are inspected, are the inspections/evaluations being done when the rest areas are “at its best” or are the inspections done at a “random moment in time”? And which way do we want it? At OOM Quality Assurance Reviews (QAR), we sometimes get extreme differences between District’s/AMC’s monthly inspection results/scores and OOM’s random QAR results/scores. Either rest areas are being “prepped” before scheduled monthly inspections or there exists great differences in rest area condition interpretation.

Discussion- Some members of the ALMC stated that surly there is some prep work done to the rest areas if it is somewhat known that an inspection is drawing near – any rest area custodian would do this, so it is not surprising, nor is it necessarily a bad thing. So the issue comes down to two things:

- a. Does the Department intend/desire for the required “90 inspection score” to be a random look or a prepped look – there were views from both sides of this argument.
- b. Are rest areas being rated consistently, using identical criteria, between Districts, OOM, and AMCs?

Action Item- It was agreed that the Department will need to work internally to determine if we intend/desire for the required “90 inspection score” to be a random look or a prepped look – there were views from both sides of this argument. As for consistency in rest area inspections, outcome from the established Rest Area Inspection Task Team (described below) should address this issue.

4) Rest Area Inspection Task Team

Background- The objective of the Rest Area Inspection Task Team is to establish a statewide standard for evaluation of Rest Area condition, much like the current Maintenance Rating Program (MRP) criteria. The Team's desired results are consistent, dependable statewide grading/evaluation of all Rest Areas. Concurrently, OOM is developing a Rest Area covering all security & maintenance requirements currently covered by scopes of services and other documents and procedures.

Discussion- Industry members asked if they could be represented in the Rest Area Inspection Task Team in order to participate in development of the Rest Area condition standard. The AMLC thought this was a good idea.

Action Item- Industry members of the AMLC are to e-mail Mike Sprayberry with named representatives, one per AMC, to serve on the Rest Area Inspection Task Team. The Department will add the named AMC representatives to the member list of the Rest Area Inspection Task Team.

[UPDATE – 10/2/2009]- To date, only one AMC (Transfield Services) has submitted their representative for the Task Team. Be sure to submit your representative's name and contact info if you want to be a part of the Task Team.

5) AM Contractor Liability on Structure Damage Events

Background- The issue of AM Contractor liability on structure damage events has been discussed in the past, but deserves further discussion. The concept of limiting liability for a single event was placed in District 3's new Escambia AM contract, but the idea has not been placed in any other contracts.

Discussion- Currently, OOM does not plan to change any existing contracts to add liability limitations. The AMLC members desire that for new contracts, the Districts have the option to include this liability limitation for a single event.

Action Item- OOM will add standard language to the AM Scope Customization System to limit contractor liability on single events. When writing a new contract, the Districts will insert into the standard language the specific amount where liability protection will trigger. If the District desires no Contractor liability limitation for a specific contract, the District can simply specify a very large dollar amount as the trigger limit.

NEW BUSINESS

1) Bridge Maintenance and Repair Handbook

Background- The Office of Maintenance Bridge Division is considering either removing or updating the Bridge Maintenance and Repair Handbook (located on the bridge document page of our website). Is this document necessary for Asset Maintenance contractors? Are any of you actively using the handbook? What if it were eliminated?

Discussion- Most all members of the AMLC agreed that the Bridge Maintenance and Repair Handbook is useful and is used frequently by all. The group prefers that it is not eliminated, but instead updated.

Action Item- OOM will take the AMLC's comments into consideration when deciding to update or eliminate the Bridge Maintenance and Repair Handbook.

[UPDATE – 10/2/2009]- The Office of Maintenance Bridge Division has decided to update rather than eliminate the Bridge Maintenance and Repair Handbook.

2) Best Value Performance-Based Contracts

Background- The Office of Maintenance plans to develop procedures to allow best-value contractor selection methods for certain performance-based contracts. This will be done by converting the “Asset Maintenance Contracts” Procedure into “Performance-Based Contracting” Procedure.

Discussion- OOM presented this concept to the group and the AMLC members generally liked the idea. Once the procedure is developed / converted, the next steps are to develop standard RFP (Request for Proposals) language and standard scope language.

Action Item- OOM will provide updates and progress reports on this project at future AMCL meetings.

3) Recycle Containers at Rest Areas

Background- It has been discovered that on some Rest Area inspection reports, the presence of recycle containers is being marked as a “n/a”. This item should never be marked as “n/a” since recycle containers are required at all Rest Areas – the item must be rated as “no” on the inspection report if recycle containers are not present.

Discussion- Several AMCL members pointed out that some counties that have Rest Areas do not support recycling and that recycling at those Rest Areas is impractical, inefficient, ineffective, cost prohibitive, etc. If this is the case, then we might want to adjust the requirement that all Rest Areas have recycle containers.

Action Item- OOM will track down a list of all counties that do not support recycling and contain a Rest Area. Once the data is collected, a decision will be made if we want to continue the directive that all Rest Areas must have recycle containers

4) Text Message Program for Rest Areas Comments

Background- OOM plans to begin a trial program to allow customers to text message their rest area comments. Each rest area will have a unique text message number and the Districts/AM contractors will respond to the texts just as they respond to comment cards. The Department has generated a new sign to be placed above the comment card boxes to advertise the program and make the boxes more noticeable.

Discussion- It was pointed out that for many rest areas, the comment card boxes will need to be relocated to accommodate the new signs and to place the signs and box in more conspicuous places. District/AMCs were encouraged to “rethink” the placement of the boxes and the used to be placed where there was the most traffic, but now should be placed where they are most visible from anywhere in the Rest Area.

Action Item- Districts/AMCs are to order and install the new signs and relocated the comment card boxes as necessary to allow for the trial program.

[UPDATE – 10/2/2009]- To date, District 3 has ordered and installed all signs. They have been up for around 2 weeks now. All other Districts have order the signs but have not yet installed them.

5) Removal of Newsstands/Racks/Boxes at Rest Areas

Background- District one presented an issue involving inspection and monitoring of newsstands/racks/boxes and their renewal stickers. Blind Services has claimed they do not have the staff or resources to do it. Racks/boxes with expired stickers are being stored on site; Blind Services gives no direction on what to do with them.

Discussion- It is up to Blind Services to identify and decommission newsstands/racks/boxes that have expired renewal stickers. The question was asked if Districts have the authority to remove any improperly stored newsstands/racks/boxes and any stored newsstands/racks/boxes that have expired renewal stickers. The answer is yes, Districts may remove newsstands/racks/boxes if they so choose, but they do not have to if they do not wish.

6) Long-Term Contract Performance Bond Form

Background- The Asset Maintenance Contract Bond Form has been replaced with the new Long-Term Contract Performance Bond Form.

Discussion- OOM presented the new Long-Term Contract Performance Bond Form. This form replaced the old AM Contract Bond form. The form can now be used on AM Contracts or any other long-term contract. The group approved of the form conversion. OOM also asked the group about a new bonding concept where bonds must be renewed each year, but the bond is for two years. The 2nd year of the bond would be lifted upon each renewal. Some AMLC members from industry stated they did not like the 2-year bond concept. They also expressed that they do not think the bonding industry would like the concept. Some others pointed out that this concept would cost the state extra expense.

Action Item- Based on comments from the meeting, OOM will likely not pursue the 2-year bond idea, but will explore the concept of providing an additional six months of protection, while also reducing the amount of the bond from the annual amount to half of the annual amount. This may result in providing the protection the Department is seeking without increasing the cost.

7) Request for Proposal (RFP) / Best-Value Concept for Small-Scale Performance-Based Contracts

Background- This item was an inadvertent repeat of agenda item NEW #2 above, so it was not further discussed.

8) Use of Aluminum Shop by AM Contractors

Background- District 5 presented this item. An AM Contractor asked if they could purchase materials from Oviedo Structures Shop similar to how signs are obtained from the Department's sign shop. This is not provided for in current AM Scopes. Is this something we can consider for future contracts?

Action Item- OOM will research the issue and determine if the concept of allowing future AM Contractors to use the Department's Structures Shop is allowable and desirable.

[UPDATE – 10/2/2009]- OOM has researched the issue and has decided to not allow AM Contractors to use the Department's Structures Shop.

10) AMOTIA Presentation

Discussion- Ted Ferragut of AMOTIA gave a short presentation to introduce the maintenance contracting organization called AMOTIA (Association for the Management and Operations of Transportation Infrastructure Assets). Their website is <http://www.amotia.org>.

12) Next Meeting Date

Discussion- The group did not decide on the next date, time or place.

[UPDATE – 10/2/2009]- The next Asset Maintenance Liaison Meeting will be held January 14-15, 2010 at the Turkey Lake Service Plaza in Ocoee, FL (Orlando).