

FTBA LESS Committee Meeting 1-16-19

Wednesday, January 16, 2019

2:58 PM

1. Discussion of Proposed Changes to Specifications or Standards for LESS Items 5 minutes

- a. 0050104 – Control of the Work – Reduces shop drawing review times to 25 days on non-category 2 submittals. Category 2 submittals will remain 45 days and include bridges and ITS Tolling related items. Comment period ended 12/13/18 and it appears industry had no comments.
- b. 1020601 MOT – Pedestrian Special Detours – Establishes new pay item for the construction of special pedestrian detours. Construction, maintenance and removal of the pavement is covered by new pay item. All traffic control devices to sign and light the detours will be paid under their normal pay item. Ex. Temp signals would be paid per day as they are now.
- c. 0080302DB – Prosecution and Progress – Significant changes being proposed to DB project scheduling requirements. LESS Prime Contractors that perform DB work for FDOT should be aware of the proposed changes. Spec. Committee working with FDOT.
- d. Upcoming???

Above items are scheduled for 7-19 implementation. DJ encouraged the group to review the changes. Derek is working on a spec change due to an FHWA prohibition on certain ITS components made by Chinese companies (security concerns). Anticipated implementation 1-20 specs. Affected products will be removed from APL.

2. Fiber Repairs 5 minutes

- a. Working towards a damage fee for damaged fiber but only on existing fiber
- b. Contractors asked FDOT to consider including new fiber damage fee spec
- c. FDOT has cost estimates and will provide direction
- d. Fred Heery has taken over this effort
- e. Update - ???

Fred wants to reevaluate the options Russell Allen had outlined before his departure. As well finding out the details of how to create a repair fund. Maybe create an interim solution. Fred will meet with Bruce Boyd once travel restrictions end. Task team of Fred, Daniel, Clinton, Bruce, Olivia to get ball rolling again

3. ITS Test Plans – Standardized tests for ITS devices on all projects 5 minutes

- a. Sample Test plans submitted to FDOT ITS Group
- b. Reminder we are trying to simplify/streamline the process
- c. During Nov. 2018 meeting Fred thought CCTV and maybe a few others were finished?
- d. Update - ???

Drafts of 4 items are done. Fred and Derek will coordinate for review with select industry members

4. Division 3 requirements in the Division 2 Specifications 5 minutes

- a. Will require a re-write of Specs
- b. FDOT starting with Spec 671, then Spec 660. Phased implementation due to the number of changes. First updates will show up in Jan 2020.
- c. One thing of note by industry is even newer spec changes, currently under review, are still incorporating Div 3 requirements in Div 2.
- d. Update - ???

Derek is working on 660, 671 is done.

5. Painted Light poles, ground mounted sign post, ped poles 5 minutes

- a. Seeing projects requiring the painting of miscellaneous items – light poles, sign assemblies

- b. Differing requirements on paint warranty: Silent to 1 yr. to 5 yrs.: after Acceptance
- c. Some projects haphazardly tying painting to 649 spec, through 715 and 725 specs – for the 5 yr. warranty
- d. Spec 649 – Covers galvanized steel strain poles, mast arms and monotubes
- e. Spec 649 requires prequalified fabricators, but not of light poles???
- f. FDOT working on spec for painted light poles, ped. poles etc. – using 649 spec as model
- g. Subcommittee to be developed: Lou, Terry, Daniel & Jason Russell. Gevin was on list but has moved to roadway.
- h. Update - ???

First task team meeting to be scheduled in the next few weeks. Discovered a need to include SMO. Looking at a prequalification fabricator list for painting aluminum products. Also, need to look into why we are painting things and the local municipalities responsibility in this if they request the painting.

6. Layer 3 Ethernet Switches/Routers 5 minutes

- a. Project specs lack details on these devices – Optical pathways, Distances, Bandwidths
- b. Substantial Costs differences
- c. FDOT working on process to revise specs to clarify the materials and work required
- d. Scott Geer departed FDOT. Derek and Fred to identify new person to head this up.
- e. Industry suggests adding language to FDM that requires designers to identify important L3 criteria.
- f. Possibly develop standardized table that designers are required to fill out and insert into plans (similar to structures variables tables).
- g. DJ sent Fred & Daniel some criteria that if identified in plans would allow for more accurate pricing at bid date.
- h. Update - ???

Bruce reiterated that specifying a "layer 3 switch" in the plans is not enough information. Additional specifics about the switch are needed to bid the job appropriately. DJ will resend criteria he came up with to Fred. Also a possibility to train designers at ITS Summit.

7. Temporary ITS and ITS Maintenance 10 minutes

- a. Many projects have existing ITS systems that must be maintained throughout the project duration.
- b. There is much work to be performed to provide temporary ITS or to maintain the existing or temporary ITS systems.
- c. FDOT should consider having a separate per day bid items to cover this cost of providing ITS services to a project (similar to Temporary Signals).
- d. Cost varies depending on whether we are just maintaining or relocating. Can vary from \$10 per day to \$100's per day
- e. FDOT seem to agree on the need for this work and a pay item.
- f. FDOT prefers a lump sum item, but designers to provide better information, Industry OK with this.
- g. FDOT to discuss in more depth internally. Daniel to speak with Traffic Ops to get update.
- h. Update - ???

Daniel spoke with Missy Hollis (Estimates) about this. Tolling facilities are asking for a similar item. Looking at possibly a per day maintenance item or a temporary communications linear foot item. This will require Director of Construction input (will have to wait until Dave's position is filled). Industry will talk and provide some options for which pay items will work best

8. Grounding Resistance Testing 5 minutes

- a. Fall of Potential (FOP) Testing

- b. Specs unclear on whether this test is used to confirm the required 5 ohms or just for informational purposes?
- c. FDOT is considering removing FOP requirement but keeping the requirement of 5 ohms?
- d. What if contractor can't reach 5 ohms? Do we still just drive rods A-D and stop?
- e. Turnpike (GTR) will need to be updated too?
- f. Is this test only for ITS or for lighting and signals also? Still some confusion among CEI.
- g. Update - ???

Fred indicated that Russell Allen did not want to eliminate the requirement. Fred and Derek will get with Russell to get a better understanding of why and discuss a resolution.

9. ITSFM 10 minutes

- a. Voluminous work
- b. Needed for new installs only - agreed
- c. Should be a pay item for this task, FDOT disagrees
- d. Work will inflate cost of ITS items. This is more than a simple as built.
- e. DJ sent Daniel and Fred example from recent HSD project to illustrate scope of effort required.
- f. Update - ???

Daniel and Fred didn't get DJ's email - DJ will resend.

10. Thermal Testing of Drill Shafts 5 minutes

- a. Dependable testing process to determine the suitability of a drill shaft
- b. However, have a tight time window to perform this test
- c. Turnpike already performs a thermal test on each drill shaft, in house
- d. FDOT might want to consider making this a requirement of every drill shaft under the Contractor's QC Plan. Process will expedite the acceptance of misc. shafts.
- e. FDOT to consult with Larry Jones, State Geotechnical Engineer and provide update.
- f. Update - ???

As of 1-19 spec book, TITDS is now the first option. Industry would like to test every shaft as part of the Contractor's QC process because it expedites the ability to build on shaft. Daniel recalls FDOT concern for the cost of doing that. DJ will get with Lou to see if the 1-19 455 spec change is sufficient.

11. Mast Arm Bolted connection between the arm and the upright. 5 minutes

- a. Mast arms are being rejected during signal inspections because inspectors can insert thin feeler gauges or see light between the plates.
- b. Understand only need contact for a small distance around the perimeter of bolt. Not at edges of the plate.
- c. Specs should be clarified as to what constitutes an acceptable bolted connection.
- d. FDOT working on a spec change to 649 to be implemented through a DCE memo – use “firm” contact (which is a defined term) versus “full contact”. In the interim, send CEI field issues to Tallahassee and FDOT will clarify that 100% contact is not necessary.
- e. Update - ???

John Westphal was working with Mr. Sadler on this change. However, the item has been tabled until there is a new Director of Construction to make sure they are on board. FDOT to reach out to Paul Lampley about issues in D4.

12. Digital Printed Sign Panels 5 minutes

- a. Yes, FDOT is interested
- b. Currently Dev. Spec 944 is in place.
- c. Contractors to approach FDOT on projects in hand to change signs to Digital Printed Signs.
- d. Update – Contractors still trying to find suitable projects.

Industry would like this technology moved to a permanent spec. Per Dan H., Dev Spec has been used on 1 project in 2016. FDOT will need to discuss with the Product Evaluation Office and Dev Spec Owner (Trey Tillander).

13. 30-Day ITS System Test 5 minutes

- a. Need clarifications on whether it re-starts upon a device failure????
- b. Different CEIs and Districts have different requirements. Previously Russell Allen's opinion was that a single device failure should not restart the clock. Trey (Traffic Ops) suggests having a percentage threshold (10%) for failures. Daniel and Trey to discuss with Dave Sadler
- c. Update - ???

Table until next meeting. Traffic Ops will work on in the interim.

14. Mast Arm Removals 5 minutes

- a. Deep vs. shallow removals
- b. Many utilities in and around intersections
- c. Potential Damages to Pavements, curb and utilities
- d. Department understands, but wants full removal for future work.
- e. FDOT to discuss internally and provide update.
- f. Update - ???

FDOTs position is full removal unless there is new direction from new Director of Construction

15. Material Certifications for Guardrail 5 minutes

- a. At meeting in Nov. Daniel provided brief presentation on which certification forms are required from the contractor and which certification forms are required from the mfg.
- b. Is this still an issue or has it gotten better? If still an issue how do we continue to educate industry?
- c. Update - ???

Remove from agenda - Issue has been resolved

16. Provide Lighting Layout Files as part of Bid Documents 10 minutes

- a. Terry Worthington requested FDOT provide a copy of the AGI file for the lighting layout performed by EOR during design.
- b. Wattage and lumen output, as commonly identified in plans, is not enough info for contractors to determine if alternative APL fixtures will work, potentially saving FDOT money.
- c. Without the information vendors & contractors are left guessing what fixture was used in the design of the project. Makes it nearly impossible to find an 'approved equal' fixture.
- d. Attachment vs Reference Document as part of bid package?
- e. Update - ???

Terry to research AGI conversion and would like a CADD file to test alternative fixtures. Ed will work with Production Support to see if we can make the CADD file available.

17. Mast Arm Pay Items 5 minutes

- a. In an effort to reduce the number of mast arm pay items over recent years now only the arm length can be derived from the BOE.
- b. Vendors and contractors can no longer determine from the BOE if an extended upright is required for a luminaire.
- c. Becoming more of an issue with FDOT's initiative to increase illumination of crosswalks.
- d. Primarily an issue on Pushbutton projects.

Ed to work with Missy Hollis to see if we can clarify payment.

18. Proper Signal Cable Size for Signalized Intersections 5 minutes

- a. Designers are required to identify conductor sizes on ITS and lighting project, but not for traffic signal cable.

- b. Historically industry has taken on that role (and liability) for properly sizing the traffic signal cable an intersection requires.
- c. With the recent deployment of DDI designs it is not uncommon for one traffic signal controller cabinet to service multiple intersections. Signal cable may need to be run >1000'.
- d. Properly sizing the traffic signal cable to ensure voltage drop is properly accounted is important.
- e. Maybe a conductor sizing chart based on length of need can be incorporated into the FDM to standardize this and require designers to indicate conductor size in plans?

Fred H in Traffic Ops to investigate and work on a solution.

19. FDOT Additional Topics, Concerns or Issues 15 minutes

20. Open Discussion 5 minutes