

ACTT Steering Committee Agenda  
09/19/19  
12:30pm - 2:30pm  
Tallahassee, Burns Building - Rm 336

1. Introductions (Amy Tootle)

2. Steering Committee Refresh (Amy Tootle)

a. Roles of the Steering Committee and Task Team

- The Task Team is headed up by the ACTT Vice Chair and comprised of any Internal or External Stakeholders that actively participate in the FDOT Alternative Contracting process. Their role is to provide the Chair and Vice-Chair of the ACTT feedback concerning FDOT's Alternative Contracting program. This feedback is then relayed back to the Steering Committee. This team meets once a year in July.
- The Steering Committee is led by the ACTT Chair and is comprised of a select group of Internal FDOT Staff, Contractors and Consultants who are chosen by the Chief Engineer. The Steering committee meets twice a year (March and September) to discuss topics brought forward by the Task Team and determine actions, if any, that are needed.

b. Standardizing Future Meetings

- Steering Committee (Video Conference Available)
  - 2nd Thursday in March (Turkey Lake)
  - 2nd Thursday in September (Tallahassee)
  - 12:30pm - 2:30pm
- Alternative Contracting Task Team (In Person Only)
  - 2nd Thursday in July (Turkey Lake or District 7)
  - 12:30pm - 2:30pm

c. Standardizing RFP Publications

- Publish and Effective January 1st and July 1st to correspond with Specification Book.
- Steering Committee Comments Due November 1st & May 1st

- Send to FHWA Mid-November & Mid-May
    - FHWA Has Two Weeks to Respond
  - FHWA Comments Addressed and Final Language Solidified Mid-December & Mid-June
    - FDOT Has Two Weeks to Respond to FHWA
- d. Future Use of Other Alternative Contracting Methods
- In the future, Steering Committee may need to discuss other alternative contracting methods
3. General Tolling Requirements (Amy Tootle)
- a. Developer Notes (Attachments)
- Larry - Language has been changed in the Boiler Plate
- b. Turnpike Document Review Process
- Ananth -Lots of issues related to toll buildings
  - Maria - Turnpike is taking a step back and looking at processes and making some things standard (adding to Design Plans and Specifications) since not unique anymore. Looking at toll buildings and looking at new ways to standardize but some criteria has to be maintained, such as temperatures, for the tolling equipment.
    - Felipe - What is timeline to incorporate into the standards?
  - Robert - Spend a little time in RFP development instead of just referencing GTR.
- c. Shop Drawings Review
- Ananth - What was once a guide has become a contractual document.
  - Gus - have to submit specific format for TPK and if line item is not right, it is a problem Restricts contractor from moving fast. Room for improvement.
  - Tim Lattner - the standard spec is the same but thinks TPK enforces more than other Districts.

**Action Items:**

1. Christina Colon will send Amy the GTR. Amy will forward to Ananth and Robert for industry to provide comments for consideration.

#### 4. As-Builts (Larry Ritchie)

##### a. Current submission requirements

- Referring to 7-2.3: Permits
  - Larry - RFP says to comply with 7-2.3 and really only speaking to ACOE and WMD permits. The Department doesn't really discuss in CPAM or RFP what asking for As-Builts.
  - Kerrie - Districts haven't really seen quality issues
  - Gus - keeps own records and EOR is still required to make revisions but why is CEI not responsible for this in DB projects?
  - Robert - as DB Design do not certify, we qualify the certifications because they are not out there day to day.
  - Brian - concern years ago because changes were made between EOR and Contractor and CEI didn't have control.
  - Pete - As long as expectations clear they don't care
  - Felipe - as condition of final acceptance have been required to work with EOR to provide As-builts. Thinks CPAM statement should be revised on DB job.

##### b. Future requirements for 3D Models

- Maria - Turnpike has language in RFP about 3D models
- Robert - in the future, designers will be providing 3D models to the contractors.
- Felipe - don't see why in the future can't provide model back to FDOT
  - Robert - FDOT needs to decide on what the deliverable criteria will be. MDX requires it.
- Pete - generally industry is looking for FDOT to commit once and for all. First thing contractors ask of potential partners is what is their experience in 3D? Will still have to give some pdfs to subs.
- Ananth - so in DB, if contractor has inlet moved 3ft, EOR will revise plans and RFM enacted and plans provided back to contractor.

##### c. Withholding Final Acceptance

- Ananth - Is there better way to do it? In striping operations, finish striping night before and can't get As-Builts turned in that last day.
- Brian - If get As-Builts on final day and see issues then contractor needs to get equipment out and not final accept.
  - Ananth - make it get fixed during warranty period.

- John Tyler - Not had experience on DB where this has become issue. More so on DBB. CFX has a good model.
- Discussion morphed into concerns by industry over Liquidated Damages due to As-Builts not being turned in.

**Action Items:**

2. Current Submission Requirements - Construction to review current CPAM and Division I Specification language related to As-Built submission and responsibility and determine if FDOT needs to revise and/or move responsibility back to the CEI.
3. Withholding Final Acceptance - Tabling this topic for now and see how things progress by working on these issues on case by case basis.

5. Design Build Push Button (Larry Ritchie)

a. Establish Task Team Members

- Industry
  - FTBA: AJAX and Cohn and Graham
  - ACEC: Walter Kloss
- Districts
  - D7 will include someone
  - Will get a member from D1
- Larry -Take a look at RFP and Scope Development and what a push button is. Pay Items end up with larger master lists. Go through RFP and remove some of the unnecessary information.
- Gene - How does this work?
  - Felipe - 3-year term with one-year option. Have to design and build in 365 days and less than \$1 million. Department could do better in releasing bids. Unit prices established but final price not known.
- Brian - try to fix what is perceived to be broken and not do away with altogether
- Robert - look at type B contracts

**Action Items:**

4. Larry to reach out to Industry Contacts provided during meeting and District DCEs to finalize the task team names.

## 6. Training

### a. Scoring/Reviewer Comments

- Larry - Previously discussed with team having an overall Design Build Academy but management is still considering. In the past, Industry's biggest ask was training for the reviewers was Scoring.
- Ananth - Industry wants to know where they fell short.
- Kerrie - the TRC members are hesitant to write down negatives because then ends up at Secretary level. They ask the teams to come in and have a one on one. Train the trainer by CO would be good.
- Felipe - Teams will be upset briefly but rather see the negative so can understand where they went wrong. Should Dept develop a rubric for reviewers?
- Robert - Tell firms so not wondering and can't tell why? Just leads to speculation. Would like Dept to take TRC members out and walk jobsite so they see the conditions.
- Pete - As long as reviewers are consistent with the scoring, then ok with how it works. Good to have the constructive comments. Need to be careful about how much we emphasize separation of scores.
- Ananth - Would like the TRC to sit down with the firms beforehand and discuss what they are thinking in terms of scoring
- John - There is an art to providing feedback and needing to help the selection committee as well.

### b. Other Areas?

- No feedback

### **ACTION ITEMS:**

5. FDOT will regroup internally and discuss taking TRC members to the job site for field visits and how to reinforce to the TRC members that they need to provide constructive feedback and consistency of grading amongst the firms.

## 7. CSI's

### a. Value vs. Effort?

- Ananth - National Issue, what is design refinement versus a CSI? Example of taking a 30" pipe down to 24" pipe and Department wants the credit.
- Robert - Talked about thresholds at the past meeting?

- Ananth - wanted 2.5% threshold to address design refinements. Most contractors put in contingency into bid. 2.5% on large project could be large so maybe a specific dollar amount. Let's take a project and try it out.
- Ananth - With the work program, as design advances, contingency is reduced
- Brian - would suggest dollar amount versus percentage
- Dan - Seems like problem is application of the contract
- Ananth - Issue comes if the team put more details, then shoot self in foot
- John - don't see many CSI and could be because of challenges. Think when we entered the modern-day CSI spec it may have got wrapped around the axle. May have created our own problem and a threshold of some sort may help. Think should see how to go back where had more flexibility?
- Ananth - Do we need CSI spec in DB?
  - Felipe - Spec is used so after the fact when other contractors had good idea and then winning contractor can implement another teams' idea. CSI are always seen as; does it change the RFP?

### **ACTION ITEMS:**

6. This topic is being tabled. Dan wants time to discuss with the Districts and try and change the culture on how evaluated.

## 8. RFP Information/Requirements

- a. Available Information at Planned Ad
  - Robert - Want Draft RFP and supporting material.
    - Kerrie - won't have draft RFP by then
    - Larry - be ready for the addendums as things change
      - Industry - ok with having addendums
- b. ROW Encroachment
  - Robert - was in August 1st meeting
  - Steering Committee didn't feel needed to move forward
- c. Availability of Utility Information (Designates and Locates)
  - GDOT providing
- d. Status Update in Shared Risk for Utility Delays

- Still remains issue and District Utility Coordinators need to be engaged. Wait and see if we are having improvements.
- e. Temporary Structures and Public Safety
  - Robert - From August meeting
  - Steering Committee didn't feel needed to move forward
- f. Independent Peer Reviews
  - i. Robert - Concern will be not getting a lot of money for reviews and smaller firms may compete but don't have insurance to cover.

**ACTION ITEMS:**

- 7. Tim Lattner to have further discussions with ACEC.

Attendees:

Amy Tootle  
Larry Ritchie  
Dan Hurtado  
Tim Lattner  
John Tyler (Call in)  
Brian McKishnie  
Maria Connolly  
Kerrie Harrell  
Ananth Prasad  
Pete Kelley (Call in)  
Gene Strickland  
Felipe Jaramillo  
Ryan Forrestell  
Robert Carballo  
Gus Quesada (Call In)  
Walter Kloss