

ASSET MAINTENANCE LIAISON COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
(February 8, 2007)

1. Introductions/Attendees

Tim Lattner
Troy Dover (ICA)
Alan Hyman
Debbie Hunt
Andrea Warfield (VMS)
Rich Herlich (VMS)
Paul DeAngelo (DBI)
Abe Henningsgaard (JCS)
Richard Thimble (JCS)
Jose Quintana
Jimmy Rodgers
Mike Sprayberry
Ananth Prasad
David Sumner

2. Capital Improvement- District 1 and District 3 had nothing to report at this time. It was reported that Dean Perkin's updated Rest Area study should be completed in March of 2007.

Action item: Districts 1 & 3 will continue to research RA privatization possibilities.

3. **Routine Maintenance-** A copy of the Routine Maintenance Handbook (showing the activity numbers with descriptions) was distributed to the group. Asphalt Repair (1000' limit) and Fencing was discussed as possible items to review. Discussed Definitions to "Routine Maintenance" and explained that there is no such official definition to "non-routine maintenance" (nor is there planned to be, as this term is not one we want to use)

Action item: The Office of Maintenance will work with the Districts to review and make recommendations.

4. **Asset Maintenance (AM) Scope of Service-** After much discussion on the AM Performance Measures it was decided to form a new "working committee" (or task team) consisting of some members of the original AM Contract Task Team (AMCTT) and some members of Industry/Liaison Committee. They will meet face-to-face in Orlando and discuss each performance measure and deduction amounts shown in the AM Scope of Service. This task team is to bring recommendations back to this Liaison Committee at the next meeting.

It was requested to post the cost and description of signs provide by our sign shop on the internet.

A couple of items were discussed as possible revisions to the AM Scope of Service. They are:

- Add language stressing that “double deductions” cannot occur. For example, if guardrail inspections are not performed deduction would be under that performance measure only, do not also deduct for not following Department procedures.
- As MRP is so important, consider increasing the MRP reduction % back to the original % - as is, some suggested MRP deductions are too small to be effective

Action item: Mike (Sprayberry) will set up Orlando meeting, will ensure sign info is posted, and will looking into AM Scope changes.

5. **Directed Work-** Tim Lattner informed the group that if an AM Contractor is directed by the District to perform work, the Contractor shall perform the work, regardless of if they think their contract covers said work or not. If the Contractor feels the requested work is NOT covered in their contract, they must put the Department on notice that extra compensation will be requested. The point is, do the work now and if necessary, settle the monetary side of it later.

No action item

6. **DRB-** The Office of Maintenance is developing a new DRB spec that will fill the needs of Maintenance. The group decided a pay item is not necessary – Maintenance contingency funds will be used to pay any usage of DRB. Ananth mentioned we should place the DRB spec in either all maintenance contracts or in just the ones over a specific dollar amount.

Action item: Mike (Sprayberry) will send out the new DRB spec to the Liaison Committee for review and comments. Also the Office of Maintenance will look into and make recommendation on the size/type contract that will include the DRB Spec.

7. **Incentives-** The Office of Maintenance (OM) revealed they are open to any ideas on how to incorporate incentives into AM contracts. It was also noted that District 1 has included incentives in one of their new Performance Based contracts (not AM). OM will track and see how well the incentive works.

Action item: Please send comments/ideas/suggestions to the Office of Maintenance (Sprayberry & Lattner).

8. **Partnering-** It was noted that Partnering is now included in the AM Scope of Service. Although the Districts are concerned about the cost, most agree that Partnering provides good value. Districts expressed interest in some extra funding for this.

Tim Lattner will look into District financing of Partnering.

9. **Industry Involvement-** Ananth Prasad stressed the importance of including Industry and this Liaison Committee in policies, procedures, and scopes that may affect Industry. It is important for OM and Districts and Industry to work together, engage in open communication, and promote active involvement by all parties.

No Action item – OM will work to more actively involve Industry.

10. **Litter-** Ananth expressed concern with the existing statewide litter problem. Ananth asked Tim to look into several possible areas/ideas. They were:

- Piggy-back on the Miami-Dade County litter campaign.
- Create a new statewide litter campaign. Several liked the campaign slogan used by Mississippi - "I'm not your mommy".
- Look into a possible recycling program.

Action item: Tim will look into some of these options and report to the committee.

11. **MRP-** Mike explained the proposed idea of revising the method of MRP points and calculations. For the purposes of MRP evaluation of AM Contracts, each AM Contract will be treated as a single unique "Cost Center". Along with the MRP sample points provided for each District Cost Center (called "Natural" MRP samples), the Office of Maintenance will also provide the District with 30 additional sample sites per facility type for each District AM Contract (called "Supplemental AM" MRP samples). For AM Contract facility type lengths less than 10 miles, three sample sites per mile will be provided in lieu of the 30 samples. Industry agreed this change will affect AM Contractor's very little other than simplifying how MRP limits are defined and possible volume of points per contract.

Joint MRP was discussed and each AM contractor was asked if they would sign the no cost amendment to their existing contracts to implement the joint MRP and all (VMS, ICA, DBI, Jorgensen) said they would sign the amendment. Some did voice concerns about scheduling of the MRP reviews with their MRP teams that cover more than one district and it was decided that good communication will resolve most issues/concern.

Action item: Mike will present the new language to the DME's at their next meeting.

12. **Construction Projects-** Much discussion on who is responsible for repair in construction zone took place. It was agreed that Contractor would be responsible for items that construction is not working on (not "touching") within the construction zone. The group agreed that AM Contractors should be invited/involved in the final walk thru's of Construction Projects to ensure compliance before taking over the Maintenance. It was noted that the construction contractor is responsible for items of non-compliance for 820 days. It was noted by Industry that certain problems seem to occur repeatedly on completed construction projects. Shoulders are one example; another is MRP requirements not matching up with Design Standards (such as guardrail on slopes).

Action item: Tim Lattner (OM) and/or Brian Blanchard (Office of Construction) will send out a reminder to Districts on invited/including AM Contractors to perform walk thru's and anything else possibly involving AM Contractors. Also it was noted that AM Contractors should ask questions and not wait on a call. Problems areas will be reviewed and discussed.

13. **AM Procedure-** Action item: Mike will present the new AM Procedure to the DME's at their next meeting.
14. Industry asked the Department to send as many people as they could to the Performance-Based Contracting meeting in San Antonio during the week of March 20, 2007. They said that since Florida was the leader in Asset Maintenance it would be of great value to have Florida well represented at this meeting.
15. Next meeting will be May 31, 2007, 8:30 am to 3:00 pm, same location.