

# 2018 Henry Fuller Task Team Meeting Agenda

## 1. Recap of 2017 Meeting Action Items

- Utilities on DB Projects and internal meetings on how to work on. Arrange meetings with District level on up to Contractor Utility coordinator
- FDEP and DERM – Tim Ruelke led effort and FDEP has issued new draft guidance.
- Digital Signatures
- Law Enforcement 55mph – Spec changed
- ITS Tolling - working with Traffic ops to provide baseline
- Mono tube structures – details for mounting for DBB structures office working on but for DB up to DB team
- DB QC plans – from ACTT meetings trying to move forward
- Fuel index – fuel burn rates don't match equipment. Equipment watch having issues getting new information from manufacturers.
- Off duty officers
- LDs during storm shut downs
- Signalization timings – no Districts fessed up to requiring this
- Performance turf – measurements changes in BOE for January 2019
- NOI to claim – DCEs to communicate and discussions at industry meetings
- Slow roll pacing – specs revised
- Workforce development
- Cross slope checking
- Curb and gutter tolerances
- Paving bids – lump sum quantity
- DOT 60 and 30 day ads
- Extended Lane closures – Dave Sadler there are statutory requirements and if deviate must elevate for approvals.
  - Needs to have seasonal traffic counts in plans by EOR so CEIs have the discretion with good data
- OJT – on truck drivers – Yes for OJT
- Contract Time on projects
- DBE percentages
- DB Borings
- Accuracy of Plan Quantities
  - *Action Item - Dave Sadler to still review*
- Jack and bore spec
- Dump trucks
- LCIS – gone
- DEP permitting of ponds
- Compensable overhead
  - *Action Item - Still looking for background on change*

## 2. Alternative Contracting

### a. Lump Sum Contracts for Resurfacing and Bridge (Ananth Prasad)

- Explore “modified” Lump Sum approach with actual quantities paid for asphalt and foundations only.

#### NOTES:

- *Brian Blanchard.* - For creek crossings and small non- complex bridges, the FDM already allows
- *Pete Kelley* – Any consideration for pilings or asphalt
  - *Dave Sadler* – we already allow with Special Provisions and adjustments made. If FDOT directed we will pay for it.
- *Bob Schafer.* – If go over do we get adjustment if FDOT doesn’t pay?
  - *Dave Sadler* - need to check on that

**ACTION ITEM: Dave will check on adjustments**

### b. Design-Build CSI (Ananth Prasad)

- Discuss the concept of a % threshold for CSI.

#### NOTES:

PER ACTT Steering committee – Dave Sadler to look at data

- *Ananth Prasad* – recognize good process but we need to get out of trans actual thoughts
- *Pete Kelley* – It’s a pendulum swing. When we first started it was a mechanism to get better costs but seems to have gone the other way. So now we have to share savings and eat overruns.
  - *Dave Sadler* – Original expectation was savings would be built into the design by the proposing teams but around 2009 industry wanted Spec language to allow CSIs and its one way now. So, if going to cost us more money than what was proposed then why would we allow?
- *Ananth Prasad* – reducing pipe length and such should not be deducted.
  - *Iggy Halley* – so if issue comes in where have to double size because of no fault to contractor, FDOT should share on extra cost as well.
- *Ananth Prasad* – Establish threshold before those cost sharing kicks in
- *Pete Kelley* – Bigger issue is traffic control and where changing diversions and minor shifts in alignment
- *Dave Sadler* – Do we need CSI spec?
  - *AJ Demoya.* – no
- *Tom Woods* – would be better to put language in CPAM for CEIs
  - *Ananth Prasad* – take out CSI spec and then go back to the book of promises
- *Gus Quesada* – What about just focus on material change or significant change
- *Iggy Halley*– pushback from EORs on CSIs. Not an inviting process to go through
- *Mike Horan* – It’s a process and have to push through. Construction gets it going but contractors usually don’t have connection with District production.

- *Brian Blanchard – should be escalated if EOR is pushing back and not receptive*
- *Carrie Stanbridge – in D2 works to bring into Construction and better equipped to review*

**ACTION ITEM: Industry to review/discuss elimination of CSI spec and respond back to FDOT.**

c. Design-Build Utility Relocation (Ananth Prasad)

- Status of changes in Department's process to deal with utility relocations on Design-Build projects.

NOTES:

- *Ananth Prasad – still have 9 projects with delays*
- *Brian Blanchard – We are working on what we are doing moving forward*
- *Ananth Prasad – for the existing DB projects that have issues, what is FDOT going to do to remedy because contractor has zero ability to mitigate?*
- *Gene Strickland – Department is not making utility to move using hammer they have*
- *Ananth Prasad – last conversation, FTBA suggestion was that if impact over 25% need to figure out resolution*
  - *Brian Blanchard – Won't resolve these today.*
  - *Ananth Prasad – no but need to do so and move forward*
- *Courtney Drummond – 30-day letter has been working lately. If there is an issue with a utility, let him know and he will call utility up directly.*
- *Paul Lampley– has been working with CO to do flex start if have known utility issue up front*

**ACTION ITEM: FDOT to continue pursuit of resolution.**

d. LAP Projects (Ananth Prasad)

- LAP process and role of the Department when the LAP agency refuses to deal with valid request for equitable adjustments.

NOTES:

- *Dan Weekley – give FDOT the money to do the jobs rather than give money to locals to administer. Had one project where local allowed another local utility to come in and put in a waterline on their project*
- *Ananth Prasad – There are agencies abusing the process*
- *Brian Blanchard – performance measures show not many LAP projects because of these issues*
- *Mike Horan – need to have a task team put together to set parameters on LAP projects*
- *Ananth Prasad – If contractor has problematic LAP projects, need to let FTBA know so they can relay to Brian and possibly decertify that agency. If on state system keep those projects versus the counties.*

**ACTION ITEM: Let FTBA know if they have a problematic LAP project.**

### 3. CEI and Contract Administration

- a. 360-degree evaluations of the project and provide bonuses to Contractor, CEI and Department employees (Ananth Prasad)

#### NOTES:

- *Ananth Prasad – suggested complex projects go to 360 evaluations where all parties evaluate each other on a project. Concept is to reward each other.*
  - *Brian Blanchard – Are any states doing this?*
- *Ananth Prasad – some states are and D5 is doing as partnering survey. Happens quarterly during the project. Would like to pilot in every district on a few projects. Not multi year project.*
- *Pete Kelley – need to identify right people to take survey. On his project, they do survey monkey and management needs to stress to folks they need be fair and take survey*
- *Iggy Halley – afraid if see negative responses and fear of repercussions*
- *Brian McKishnie – Been doing surveys in D7 and its a tool to get things out in the open*
- *JC Miseroy – doesn't think adding bonus for participants would be good*
- *Lots of potential for negative consequences of there being a bonus component as suggested.*
- *Brian indicated FDOT could pilot the concept.*

- b. Moving CEI's to hard bid (Gene Strickland)

- They really don't perform any "Professional Services" any more than the contractor provides. They are not allowed to make any engineering decisions and simply shuffle paper. This could save millions and probably thin out the ranks of CEI's.

#### NOTES:

- *Brian Blanchard – can't low bid because of federal laws*
- *Gene Strickland – what is CEI for professional services*
  - *Amy Tootle– CEIs sign and seal As-builts thus professional services*
- *Ananth Prasad – is there an appetite to make small jobs lump sum*
  - *Gus Quesada – Had a bascule bridge project lump sum but very different from multi phase roadway phases*
- *Gene Strickland – some folks it's the first job and they don't want to make decision but CEIs scared they will get hand slapped and not get another job.*

- c. Fuel Adjustments (Ananth Prasad)

- Opt-in/Opt-out and reduce the number of items that get adjusted

#### NOTES:

- *Ananth Prasad– need to look at fuel factors. What can FTBA do to help? Can we do away with all fuel factors on all items except asphalt and earthwork?*
  - *All agree*

- *Dave Sadler – Bluebook rates are used to calculate burn rates. Was never developed to be project or method specific was updated by using new pieces of equipment and assumed percentages of production rates*
  - *Gene Strickland –It’s the production rates not burn rates that are the issue*
- *Bob Schafer – Are CEIs seeing more onsite earthwork?*
  - *Pete Kelly – think more attributed to being able to dig ponds deeper*
- *Gene Strickland – mostly on base/subgrade that they see issues. So, hauls for lime rock base where not used in the north part of state.*
- *Ananth Prasad– Can we opt in or opt out?*
  - *Dave Sadler – concern is if opt out then if contractors opt out and get hit with fuel increases during the project, concern is that many would come back to FDOT wanting more an adjustment to contract.*
    - *Ananth Prasad – may have emergency situation like a war which can increase fuel prices, so may have those situations and be prepared to address.*
- *Ananth Prasad – adjustments for SAs? Should there be adjustments?*
  - *John Morris – Bid risk into that SA price*
  - *Pete Kelley – most SAs are minor where the fuel adjustments aren’t really relevant*
  - *Bob Schafer – why would anyone want to do the paperwork. Just eliminate fuel adjustments on SAs.*
- *Most of the contractors not in favor of including adjustment for work added by SA. A point to keep in mind is that often SAs will increase quantities of existing pay items that get fuel adjustments and if fuel adjustments are excluded from SAs, then FDOT would have to separate quantities to account for original work that gets an adjustment and SA added work that doesn’t. FDOT is not looking to do that.*
- *Discussed eliminating or limiting the number of items that get fuel adjustments. There is general interest in doing this but would have to see the list of pay items that would retain the adjustment.*

**ACTION ITEM: Dave Sadler to provide list of items to FTBA.**

d. Contractor negotiating with the CEI and then going over their head to FDOT (Jennifer Olson)

NOTES:

- *Jennifer Olson– Conversation starter. Perception is that if you don’t like CEI answer then first call is to District Office. So, if you keep going over head each time, not going to create good relations.*
- *AJ Demoya– How much authority to decision make with CEIs? CEIs need to be given more responsibility.*
  - *Ed Hudec– Only if over riding spec do they need to go to DCE. CEIs want to make decisions.*

- *Dave Sadler – what about courtesy escalation so they tell CEI before going to District?*
- *Ananth Prasad – Need to look at escalation process again*

e. Early completions and sharing CEI savings with both the Contractor and CEI (Ananth Prasad)

- Contractually provide for if a contractor finishes a project early, then the Department, the Contractor and CEI share in the savings in the CEI cost. Would need to establish some thresholds on when this would trigger.

NOTES:

- *Gus Quesada– point is the bonus for CEI doesn't help. CEIs are doing their job and then other folks that are part of process don't get bonus.*
- *Ananth Prasad – trying to get jobs finished early is what we should aim for.*
- *Jennifer Olson– operating margin is based on hours billed and not lump sum. So, don't keep margin if finish early.*
- *How about savings sharing of the contractor's overhead if the project finishes early? OH should be spread across entire duration of the contract.*
- *Dave Sadler - Not a good idea to have CEI or FDOT eligible for cost sharing arrangement if finish early – could lead to bad decisions in order for contractor to complete early so CEI/FDOT could benefit financially. The fact that I've seen bad decisions when there was no financial benefit leads me to this conclusion.*
- *Mixed discussions about influence dollars included bring negative opportunities. Outside parties would not see this favorably. Ananth wants to push the idea of bonus for CEI if project finishes early and include bonus for EOR.*

f. DL letters seen as trust breakers between the contractor and the CEI- (Jennifer Olson)

- They are a tool to manage the contract

NOTES:

- *Jennifer Olson - For CEIs to do their job they are required per CPAM to issue DLs which are a contractual mechanism and need not take personal. Those are used when other mechanisms are not complied with.*
- *Ananth Prasad– viewed by some as a hammer*
- *Brian Blanchard – DWLs issued should not be a surprise*
- *Jennifer Olson– what do you issue DLs for? MOT, Drainage*
- *AJ Demoya – issue is where we have small issues such as chipped wall that can wait more than 24hrs*
- *Lots of general discussion about DCE memo for impact attenuators and temporary barrier installation. Don't blindside either party.*

g. Auditing Claims (Ananth Prasad)

- Should be limited to the claim and not the overall project records so as to take the position that DOT doesn't owe additional monies since the Contractor made profit.

NOTES:

- *Ananth Prasad – hearing rumblings that audit covered entire job and found some jobs seem to be saying contractor made money so not due any money for claim*
- *Iggy Halley – should only be limited to that claim not entire project*
  - *Dave Sadler – depends on what claim is.*

h. Does the DOT track their performance of time between final acceptance and final payout? (Jim Warren)

- Is that reported annually? Is this a big issue to the contractors or are they used to waiting 5-6 months to close out a job? Is there a reason it takes so long?

NOTES:

- *Dave Sadler - we track quarterly on every job and publish. The average time is 33 days from Final Acceptance to final pay. Then contractor has 90 days to turn in all documents. Contractor has 90 days from Offer of Final Payment to submit all required paperwork remaining and to either accept the offer or submit a qualified acceptance letter (QAL). If get QAL, the resolution could take significant time depending on the issues noted in the QAL. We track time from Final Acceptance to Passed and average 166 days (target is 275 days).*
- *John Morris – More issue with time takes to process SA. Sometimes wait for multiple issues to get resolved instead of processing individual.*

i. Unilateral SA and Notice of Intent to Claim (Jennifer Olson)

- These are contractual tools to be used, not an insult to the other party.

NOTES:

- *Jennifer – agree to disagree and just used as tool. Should not be a surprise and means CEI can authorize payment to contractor and get them some money.*

j. Contractor taking ownership of the MOT and environmental compliance at the pre-construction meeting but, during the project they are not proactive in keeping that pledge (Jennifer Olson)

NOTES:

*See discussions above*

k. Digital Signatures (Ananth Prasad)

- Are we going too far? Small subs have expressed concerns as to the amount of OH dedicated to do this. IS there a hybrid approach?

NOTES:

- *Ananth Prasad – small contractor believes FDOT has gone overboard and that causing increase in overhead*
- *Dave Sadler – sounds like they may not know how the process works as it is generally seen as a time/cost saver.*
- *Everyone was fine with Digital Signatures. Need to educate the subs.*

**4. Specifications**

a. Extra Work and Claim Spec revisions (Ananth Prasad)

- Continue the discussion on any outstanding issue with revisions that the Industry submitted and discussed with the Department

NOTES:

- *Ananth Prasad – Any chance to review the proposed changes?*
  - *Dave Sadler – no not yet*
- *Ananth Prasad – Some of suggestions were to go to a mandatory mediation if no resolution*

**Action Item: Dave to review proposed changes**

b. Liquidated Damages and Substantial Completion (Bob Schafer)

- Need to revise the liquidated damages spec to a lesser amount commensurate with the actual damages that the Department is incurring when the Department has the full use of the facility. Example, I-75 being assessed LD's at over \$20k per day due to paperwork (as-builts and permit closeout).

NOTES:

- *Ben Drieling CFX – Substantial completion for CFX taking approach that LDs go down once substantial completion is achieved. Found beneficial but don't have quite as many weather days granted. Final configuration is usually considered substantial completion.*
- *Iggy Halley – we are looking for beneficial occupancy*
- *JC Miseroy - ITS things that don't really affect traffic*
- *Tom Woods – Who has authority to change LD's?*
  - *Dave Sadler – I do*
- *Brian Blanchard– need a way to incentive the contractor to do punch list*
- *Dave Sadler – discussed the requirements in statute 337.18 F.S. that FDOT follows in developing the rates that are included in FDOT contracts.*

c. Third party damages (Bob Schafer)

- Specification needs to be revised. Why is this the Contractor's liability? We have no control over these damages and should be paid in full for repairs. The



Department should pursue an insurance claim rather than simply shifting responsibility to the Contractor.

NOTES:

- *Ananth Prasad- contractors eating 0.2% - 1.5% at no fault of contractor.*
- *Brian Blanchard – old specification was all on the contractor. Weren't we talking about low maintenance attenuator to help with this.*
- *Iggy Halley– Last thing contractor wants to do is go after \$5k in damages which will cost millions of dollars in court costs.*
- *Dave Sadler – discussed that FDOT finds more contractors pursuing third party insurer than deferring to FDOT to do so. Also, discussed standard spec 7-14 which addresses compensation for third party damages.*

**5. DRB**

a. DRB Member Blacklisting (Rammy Cone)

- There have been instances where some of the DRB members from the Contractor side have been rejected over and over again under the rationale that the Contractor is picking the same member over and over again or that the member is perceived to be a “contractor’s” member

NOTES:

- *Ananth Prasad – concern that Department is rejecting member because of this*
  - *Dave Sadler – asked for data from DCE on boards and missing one District. 97 boards and have 53 members on these boards. One member is on 25 boards. Looking further into the data.*
  - *Rammy Cone – 10 meetings per month is limit?*
  - *Mike Horan– Can you ask the DRB member to send them their schedule to review and see how workload is? Yes.*
  - *Pete Kelly- think 2/week is a reasonable limit because if you have hearings it takes time to prepare. So, 10/month is reasonable limitation.*
- *Rammy Cone - If reject recommendation the DRB would like to know reason for rejection beyond ruled outside the contract.*
- *Rammy Cone– on wage rate data from USDOL, DRBs being told they're not able to rule on that. But if rates are in the contract then of the opinion they can offer a recommendation on it.*
  - *Dave Sadler – what is issue?*
    - *Rammy Cone – wrong wage rates executed in contract. Haven't looked at wage rate tables by DOL's*
    - *Dave - addressed that the wage determinations are issued by USDOL and that FDOT offices preparing the contract packages are pulling the required tables. If a question arises on the appropriateness of the wage table, questions to be directed to Patty Vickers in the State Construction Office who will address the issue with USDOL as needed.*
- *Rammy Cone– DRB wants a raise*

**Action Item: Dave to finish reviewing District data once all have submitted – data provided below.**

	Name	Boards	Chair	FDOT pick	Contractor pick
1	Alan Adderley	10	3	6	1
2	Bill Ashton	2	2		
3	Bill Deyo	25	13	10	2
4	Bill Waddell	3	0	3	
5	Cynthia Snow White	4	0		4
6	Dallas Wofford	2	0	1	1
7	Dan Garner	1	0	1	
8	Dave Donofrio	2	0		2
9	David Van Leuven	2	0	2	
10	Don Cronk	5	0	5	
11	Don Henderson	1	0		1
12	Charile Wegman	5	5		
13	Duane Brautigam	5	1	3	1
14	Earle Cooper	2	0	2	
15	Edward Mackiewicz	5	3		2
16	Edward Minchin	8	3	5	
17	Glenn Ivey	1	0	1	
18	James Davis	7	0	6	1
19	Enrique Espino	7	3		4
20	Ernie Wolf	1	0		1
21	Felix Peguero	4	4		
22	Gerald Stanley	3	0		3
23	Greg Xanders	1	1		
24	James Guyer	13	6	4	3
25	James MacLaughlin	4	1	3	
26	Jim Moulton	2	0	2	
27	Jim Vest	1	0		1
28	Jim Weeks	13	3	4	6
29	Jimmy B. Lairscey	3	1	2	
30	Joe Capeletti	4	0		4
31	Ken Fusch	3	0	3	
32	Kent Selzer	1	0		1
33	John Duke	12	7	1	4
34	Kurt Stone	2	1	1	
35	Lynn Gibson	1	0	1	

36	Marshall Dougherty	5	0	5	
37	Matt Michalak	22	11		11
38	Marc Knapp	1	0	1	
39	David (Mick) Jameson	13	2	5	6
40	Mike Stewart	3	0	2	1
41	Murray Yates	14	4	9	1
42	Paul Harkins	10	6	2	2
43	Pat McCann	5	1	4	
44	Patrick W Brannon	1	1		
45	Ralph Ellis	18	8	1	9
46	Rammy Cone	19	1	1	17
47	Phil Hammaker	1	0	1	
48	Robert Cedeno	18	5	1	12
49	Robert Lindquist	1	0		1
50	Robert Taraska	1	0	1	
51	Roger Peters	7	4	2	1
52	Ronnie Klein	12	5	7	
53	Thomas Shafer	5	1	3	1
54	Tom Rice	9	3	1	5
55	Tom Vickers	2	0		2
56	<b>vacant spots</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
	Total Boards	113	113	113	113

55 members on 113 Boards

13 members have double digit boards ranging from 10 to 25.

2 of the 13 have double digit chairman positions.

32 different members picked by contractors to serve on 111 boards.

37 different members picked by FDOT to serve on 112 boards

29 members picked to serve as chairman on 109 boards.

21 members picked as chairman also serve on other active boards.

216 active members listed on FDOT website

FDOT and Contractors using 25% of available membership to cover project boards

b. DRB Advisory Opinions (Rammy Cone)

- See attachment below



wisdot  
drb\_informal.pdf

#### NOTES:

- *Rammy Cone*— look as way to avoid formal hearing. Basically, submit at informal hearing a few pages of bulleted points. Then the board can issue a verbal recommendation and follow up for written recommendation. Verbal though can be misinterpreted.
  - *Iggy Halley*— verbal gives general direction of what board is thinking and like that idea
- *Brian McKishnie* – Doesn't like the informal opinion because partial facts can lead down wrong road. Like the formality.
- *Eddie Green*— cost of hearing was more then the cost of items discussing

### 6. Specialty Engineering

#### a. D1 and D7 Erosion Control Pilot (Ananth Prasad)

- Discuss the developmental specification that requires the contractor to develop the erosion control plan in its entirety and method of payment for erosion control items.

#### NOTES:

- *Ananth Prasad* – Talked to Faller Davis
- *Dave Sadler* – only 5 projects have used the Developmental Spec
  - *Brian McKishnie* – Have some in D7
- *JC Miseroy*- More concerned contractor developing erosion control
- *Ben Seawright* – can we submit something without having 40 plan sheets of silt fence?
  - *Carrie Stanbridge* – tried to do and didn't work. Contractors may have a better way to do it.
- *Iggy Halley* – Has to do with delayed permitting and it's easier to get permit modified than to get approved.
- *Tim Lattner* – D1 does so where have preliminary plans submitted to WMD and then contractor is still required to submit a plan.
  - *Jon Sands* – but still pay item, not lump sum
- *Rammy Cone* – if added the pay items it would be helpful, such as for flocculant

#### b. Buy America (Jeff Nelson)

- Status of Buy America requirements on “building”

#### NOTES:

- *Ananth Prasad* – MAP 21 changed requirements for all State DOTs. Need to go back and evaluate and the jobs that are completely state funded from beginning in order to be exempt from Buy America requirements.
- *Paul Lampley* – the FHWA will no longer issue waivers

- c. Reimbursement for time and costs for projects requiring off-duty officers for lane closures when there is no availability. (Bob Schafer)
- For example, similar to linemen and other electric provider resources, officers are sent to areas impacted by hurricanes leaving a potential for no available off-duty officers. This happened on the Turnpike job with Hurricane Michael.

NOTES:

*Bob Schafer– what about circumstance when everyone goes for hurricane recovery*

- *Dave Sadler – Per spec get non-compensable time*
- *Bob Schafer -what documentation is needed?*
  - *Dave Sadler - a letter from law enforcement agency would be fine. Can also use other law enforcement agencies if FHP unavailable.*

- d. Regulation of pay rates for off-duty officers. (Bob Schafer)

- Pricing often changes based on supply/demand

NOTES:

- *Bob Schafer – So emergency and officers go help and the rest of the available officers raise rates due to increased demand. Is there any regulation of the rates?*
  - *Dave Sadler – no. Have heard that.*
- *Courtney Drummond – if there is an issue we can talk to FHP*
- *Bob Schafer – would be nice if they could lock in a rate per job or establish a set rate like the FHP hireback contract rates.*

- e. Reduction of speed limits through construction zones. (Bob Schafer)

- Requests to do this are frequently rejected placing inconvenience of the motoring public over worker/public safety.

NOTES:

- *Brian Blanchard– the issue goes back to the differential speed between vehicles in work zones when the speed is reduced. Some drivers will drive the posted speed while others will drive the speed they feel comfortable driving with sets up the speed differentials that can actually increase crashes.*
- *Mike Shannon– People are not dropping enforcement just can't enforce because nowhere to pull over. Sounds good but reality doesn't work.*
- *Gene Strickland – use the MAS system, then the speed is dropped.*

- f. Mast arm bolt issue (Bob Schafer)

- D4 is requiring no gaps in flanges around bolts. Department is trying to enforce an acceptance criteria not supported by spec. Subject of statewide DRB. Issue on I-75 Segments C & D.
- Greg's write-up for additional info:
  - The Mast Arm flange issue is #1 a misinterpretation of the specs that is #2 not consistent between districts. Actually not consistent between district

is actually a good thing, but other districts are taking notice and the issue will likely spread.

- Regardless of the outcome at the SDBR, if the Department continues down the path of implementing an incorrectly applied inspection and acceptance criteria, contractor's will likely resort to overstressing some of the fasteners on future structures. Not on every assembly, but on many there are one or more bolts that do not close all gaps. Also true to some assemblies is that grinding of the flanges, which are designed and manufactured with straightness tolerances, is required to achieve the Department's desired criteria.
- The Department is tailoring construction inspection and acceptance to accommodating the FDOT Maintenance Department's 5 year inspection program, that we were told began on 2009. The Department is applying other structures (bridge, etc.) "slip-critical" connection requirements to the "post-tension" connection designed for mast arms. One or a group of FDOT engineers at a very high level with structures design need to investigate and rule on this because the D4 application is wrong...and if overstressing fasteners does occur, that places those fasteners and perhaps the structures at risk of failure.
- In simple terms the Department is attempting to reduce or eliminate problems that are found with the mast arm flanges after a 5 year cycle by forcing current contractors installing new mast arms to meet a requirement that is in contrast with the current specifications.

**NOTES:**

- *Bob Schafer – discussed bolting mast arm to pole*
- *Paul Lampley – FDOT has been going out to projects and seeing daylight between the connection plates and having to go in and tighten to close the gaps.*
  - *Tim Ruelke - SMO has been working on this issue*
- *Tim Ruelke – Manufacturers galvanized and potential for warping and the idea is possibly to ship extra bolts to job and first set to pull plates flat and then replace one by one with a second, permanent set.*

**7. Miscellaneous**

- a. FDOT is issuing conflicting permits to utilities and other companies for work within project limits of roadway contracts. Permits need address this issue somehow. (Bob Schafer)
  - Prohibit work covered under the permit during periods of on-going construction contracts, or
  - Require indemnification and inclusion of Contractor as additional insured with minimum coverage limits.

**NOTES:**

- *Bob Schafer- in middle of night some other permitted entity will come out and work on their projects. We should be notified. How do we handle?*

- *Dave Sadler – Coordination with maintenance in the district when these kinds of permit issues arise.*
- *Tim Lattner – If the utility is performing maintenance on their utility then they only have to give 24 hr notice.*
  - *Carrie Stanbridge – but some utilities will put in a whole new line which they consider maintenance. Also, permits are allowing lane closures during the day when our construction projects have not been able to.*
- *Paul Lampley– issue is when utility has obtained previous permit then don't come out until two years later during a now active construction project.*

**ACTION ITEM: CO needs to conduct a review of utility permitting process as it relates to active construction projects – Lattner/Rudy Powell/Sadler to review.**

**b. Bridge damage due to boom trucks (Brian Blanchard)**

**NOTES:**

- *Bob Schafer – and dump trucks*
- *Brian Blanchard – What can we do differently? Can we do a spec change of some sort?*
  - *Dave Sadler – Last year at HFTT there was a Statute discussion on this*
- *Ben Seawright – there needs to be a speed control in the vehicle if bed is up*
- *Carrie Stanbridge – some districts are looking at clearance issues of bridges and raising*

**c. Building Relationships (Ananth Prasad)**

- *How we can change FTBA Social format to get more FDOT and CEI participation?*

**NOTES:**

*Is there a different format in which we can allow CEIs and FDOT to meet with each other?*

- *Mike Shannon – Working with ACEC to do volunteer activities.*
- *Brian Blanchard– contractor quarterly meeting paid after lunch?*
  - *Mike Shannon– whole idea is to be social and get away from work.*
- *Pete Kelley– rebrand and call networking event*
- *Ananth Prasad – make it an ACEC/FTBA event and provide receipts*
- *Tim Ruelke – Call it partnering*
- *Jim Warren - Had a number of events at SMO in which food trucks came out and that has worked well*

**8. Walk On Items**

**a. Wall Repairs in place**

**NOTES:**

- *Iggy Halley - Can we use a quick set concrete so contractor can repair in place. You will have to close lane no matter what so more ideal to fix in place.*
  - *Dave Sadler - Will look at the procedure*

- *AJ Demoya – could we have where there is a routine maintenance on a certain timeframe so not dropping everything once a night to fix a spall*

**Action Item – SCO will look at the procedure for repairing in place.**

b. Sediment in a Pipe (Jeff Nelson)

- Being asked to go back and clean pipes. Is there an acceptable amount allowed to remain? Especially if surcharged pipe

NOTES:

- *Eddie Green – sometimes asked after removing E&S features*
- *Carrie Stanbridge – Issues with maintenance, they want clean when they get it. Need to look at asset maintenance contracts.*
- *Dave Sadler – Need to get with Rudy Powell on this.*

**Action Item: Dave to touch base with Rudy Powell**

c. Lump Sum asphalt quantities over run (Bob Schafer)

NOTES:

- *Dave Sadler – want to verify with Final Estimates.*
- *Amy Tootle– Check with Rich to see about design giving Plan items for asphalt quantities*

**Action Item: Amy to follow up**

d. MSE Wall Spec (Ananth Prasad)

NOTES:

- *Ananth Prasad – spec saying free draining seal can't be put into after wall erected and that UV resistance which points straight to one manufacturer.*

e. Multi use path asphalt and CPF (Pete Kelley)

NOTES:

- *Dave Sadler - Should we spec out and say no CPF?*
- *Gene Strickland – need to think about that*

**Action Item: Dave to send some draft language to Jim Warren**

f. Summary of Quantities -Litter Removal (Gene Strickland)

- Litter Removal quantities why so many

NOTES:

- *Dave Sadler – was in comp book but now in Summary of quantities*
- *Gene Strickland – Why do we have to have every single area defined*

**Action Item: Tim Lattner going to look at Mowing and Litter Removal and try to simplify.**



g. Changes of MOT (Ed Hudec)

- What happens if changed, what is liability and talking about at Engineers discretion?

NOTES:

- *Carrie Stanbridge – has to be signed and sealed*
- *Ananth Prasad – change has to be by PE*

h. Changes to Summary of Pay Quantity (Tim Lattner)

- The Design Office is looking at what is needed such as if they can break out by FIN Number, can contractor get information but from different source, how look for 3D plan sets and cross sections

NOTES:

- *Carrie Stanbridge – DCE meeting work program need pay items separated by FIN number*
- *Iggy Halley – summary of pay quantity used a lot because don't always have bid tabs in the field.*
- *Carrie Stanbridge - contractor asked for Gen files but design is saying xml files are provided. Need to get construction estimators involved.*
- ***Action Item – Tim Lattner needs to have internal meetings with Design and Construction to determine if deliverable provided. Then a secondary meeting with Industry.***

i. Balanced Lettings (Ananth Prasad)

- Why can't we put something in place where we say we have a balanced letting by FY 2023?

NOTES:

- *Brian Blanchard – circumstances where jobs get pushed to 4<sup>th</sup> quarter but those can be rolled into the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter. We are looking at that for DB and spreading those out.*
- *Jim Wolfe – Valid point and can do better. Hard to move a June job forward.*
- *Ananth Prasad – need to look at month by month and look at production.*
- *Jon Sands – D1 is doing that where looking at design and when projects will be ready and where to let*
- *Brian Blanchard – We need to take some big jobs in June and move to July.*
  - *Mike Shannon – Issues comes in with Spec because now you have to update for new spec books etc. Rule is District has to update plans.*
    - *Dave Sadler – maybe we can make exceptions on project by project basis so the plans would still fall under the previous spec year.*
- *Paul Lampley – Production needs to add about 20% for weather days because production schedules are back to back and then delays caused*