District Construction Engineers' Meeting December 18, 2017 2:00 PM- 3:00 PM Video Bridge 1 / CO Conference Room 479 Agenda

New/Recurring Business:

1) Attendees Present:

Summary Notes: Attendees Present were:

D1 - Jon Sands, Brian Blair, Brian Penny

D2- Carrie Stanbridge

D3 – Ed Hudec, Heather Baril, Ranae Sanders, Johnathan Upfold

D4 - Paul Lampley, Deb Ihsan

D5 - John Tyler, Jennifer Smith

D6 - Mario Cabrera, Heidi Solaun-Dominguez

D7 - Conrad Campbell

TP - Pete Nissen, Bill Sears

CO - Art Berger, Scott Foltz, Latasha Johnson, Tim Lattner, Dan Hurtado, Amy Tootle, David Sadler, Latashi Kitchen, Suzannah Ray

2) CPR Issues (David Sadler/Amy Tootle)

SCO will facilitate a discussion of CPR issues which have arisen since the previous meetings. Districts may bring forward any CPR issues which need to be addresses.

Summary Notes: There are no CPR issues at this time.

3) Specification Updates (David Sadler)

SCO will provide an overview of recent Specification changes. Districts may bring forward any proposed specification changes.

http://www2.dot.state.fl.us/programmanagement/Development/IndustryReview.aspx

Summary Notes: David highlighted the following specifications which are out for Industry Review:

1600000 Stabilizing

2341000 Superpave Asphalt Base 2850900 Optional Base Course

DgnStds2StdPlans Design Standards to Standards Plans

7000401 Highway Signing

4) CPAM Updates (Amy Tootle)

SCO will provide an overview of recent CPAM changes. Districts may bring forward any proposed specification changes. Implementation of any recently completed CPAM updates will be voted on by the group as applicable.

Summary Notes: Amy highlighted the following CPAM Chapter revisions which are out for review:

3.5	Final Estimates Quality Reviews
5.8	Control of Materials
5.16	Earthwork Notes & Documentation
11.1	Asphalt Plant Operations
7.6	Contracting for Governor Declared Emergencies

5) Process Reviews – Lessons Learned (Amy Tootle)

SCO will present highlights of recently completed Process Reviews. Opportunities for improvements and best practices will be presented to the group.

Summary Notes: There are no process reviews to discuss at this time.

6) <u>e-Construction/Mobile Devices (Amy Tootle)</u>

SCO to provide an update on e-Construction and Mobile Devices.

Summary Notes: There are no e-Construction updates at this time.

7) <u>Continued Discussion of the signatures required for Forms 700-050-62 and 700-050-67/68 (Reference Documents Attached) (David Sadler)</u>

David to discuss signatures for forms 700-050-62 and 700-050-67/68.

Summary Notes: The group continued discussion of signatures for these forms.

Action: David asked DCEs to look into this and discuss at the face-to-face meeting in February.

8) General Tolling Requirements (Pete Nissen)

The GTR (General Tolling Requirements, essentially the PPM for tolls elements) states that we should do partial acceptance of the tolling gantries before Tolls personnel begins to install the tolling equipment. This effectively grants final acceptance of the gantry before project final acceptance. This is logical because it eliminates the Contractor being held responsible for damage that may have been done by Tolls personnel. I want to discuss this for several reasons:

- Is everyone aware and are we consistent in how this is done?
- How do we all feel this would impact any third party damage? In theory, acceptance of the gantry would mean that the third party damage spec no longer applies; are we all ok with this or should there be language that states third party damage provisions continue to apply until project final acceptance?
- The GTR only refers to 'site', there may be other elements in addition to the gantry that this applies to.

Summary Notes: The group discussed partial acceptance of toll gantries and third-party damages. The Department owns the toll gantry if it has been partially accepted.

9) <u>Contractor's Specialty Engineer (Reference Documents Attached) (Pete Nissen)</u>

Discuss if a Contractor's Specialty Engineer should pre-qualified. Various spec provisions talk about this to some degree but I could not find anywhere if definitively addressed this as a specific requirement:

Specialty Engineer.

A Professional Engineer registered in the State of Florida, other than the Engineer of Record or his subcontracted consultant, who undertakes the design and drawing preparation of components, systems, or installation methods and equipment for specific temporary portions of the project work or for special items of the permanent works not fully detailed in the Plans and required to be furnished by the Contractor. The Specialty Engineer may also provide designs and details, repair designs and details, or perform Engineering Analyses for items of the permanent work declared by the State Construction Office to be "minor" or "non-structural".

For items of work not specifically covered by the Rules of the Department of Transportation, a Specialty Engineer is qualified if he has the following qualifications:

- 1. Registration as a Professional Engineer in the State of Florida.
- The education and experience necessary to perform the submitted design as required by the Florida Department of Business and Professional Regulation.

Summary Notes: The group discussed the specialty engineer definition and if the language requires revisions.

Action: David to look more into the specialty engineer language.

10) <u>Incorporation of draft Construction Bulletin 17-11 to Design-Build RFPs</u> (<u>Reference Document Attached</u>) (<u>David Sadler</u>)

Effective January 2017, the DB Boilerplate Specification Section 9-2.3.2 requires planned asphalt quantities in the plan summary boxes to be summed in order to establish a basis for applying asphalt adjustments. However, currently there are no requirements in the PPM (currently the Design Manual) which require the Designer to include the Summary of Quantity sheets for pavement for DB projects. The attached draft bulletin will require the Summary of Quantities sheet for asphalt quantities only in DB plans.

For the 12 month lapse the Summary of Quantity sheet and corresponding quantities were not required, how would it be best to handle this? A supplemental agreement to the RFP?

Summary Notes: The group discussed incorporation of draft construction bulletin 17-11. The requirement of the RFC table should be included as part of the RFC plan. The contractors are giving us preliminary quantities and then end up with overbuild and slope corrections.

Action: SCO confirmed the bulletin is only to calculate adjusted plan quantity of asphalt based on G_{mm} .

11) Notice of Intent To Claim (Amy Tootle)

Need to communicate with CEIs and educate new staff that it ok to receive NOIs and that it is a requirement of contract, otherwise the contractor waives their rights.

Summary Notes: Amy discussed contractor concerns regarding NOIs. DCEs were asked to communicate with their staff that Contractors have the right to submit NOIs.

12) Punchlist Process (Amy Tootle)

Amy to discuss the punchlist process.

Summary Notes: The group discussed providing early "punchlist" items and the need for the punchlist items to be completed before final acceptance. Current standard specification provides the Department 7 days from receipt of notification from the Contractor that all work on the project has been completed to perform inspection for acceptance. FDOT needs to be prompt in letting Contractor's

know if the project is not ready for final inspection if FDOT has received Contractor's notice that it is. FDOT routinely will provide early lists of work remaining to be completed or corrected prior to notification from Contractor that they consider the work completed to help facilitate completion of the project.

Action: SCO will look at the specification to determine if the 7 days could be scaled based on the project size.

13) Weather Days Memo (Amy Tootle)

Amy to discuss the weather days memo.

Summary Notes: David discussed the 2016 memo and revising the language to fairly grant time for weather.

Action: David will revise the language to remove holidays and distribute to the DCEs for assistance with the language.

Walk-On Items:

1) Contribution in Aid of Construction (Dan Hurtado)

This occurs when we reimburse the contractor for the cost of a utility company to provide a new service connection, a considerable distance from their existing infrastructure. We cannot determine the cost prior to bidding and have dealt with it by

- Burying the cost in relocation costs
- Making the contractor figure it into his bid
- Reimbursing the contractor via SA.

Summary Notes: The group discussed utilities charging for contribution of aid in remote and undefined areas. This is a variable fee that deals with how far the utility is off the entity and is governed by the Tariff and Public Service Commission. These are most always paid with supplemental agreements. Districts were polled and most are having issues with this.

2) <u>Time (Carrie Stanbridge)</u>

Summary Notes: Carrie discussed time for a 5 day work week. The contractor is granted time for the weekend when there are special events.

3) Hurricane Irma – Idle, Labor, and Equipment (Conrad Campbell)

Summary Notes: The group discussed idle, labor, and equipment for Hurricane Irma. Districts should use the CPAM language.

4) Hurricane Irma - Critical Path Work (Pete Nissen)

Summary Notes: Critical path work and weather days were discussed. Districts should refer to CPAM 7.6 for time extensions. The Department will pay for idle equipment and idle labor, but will not pay not pay for an idle plant.

5) <u>Utility Issues (Pete Nissen)</u>

Summary Notes: Pete discussed issues with utilities. The Department should accept the work before we are billed for it.

<u>Next DCE Meeting - Face-to-Face at the Construction Conference - Wednesday, February 7, 2018</u>

Submit agenda items to Suzannah Ray by January 26, 2018.