

ASSET MAINTENANCE LIAISON MEETING MINUTES (May 31, 2007)

Attendees

Troy Drover
Amy Burlarley-Hyland
Andrea Warfield
Rich Herlich
Rick Sulzer
Chuck Henningsgaard
Jose Quintana
Tim Lattner
Jimmy Rodgers
Mike Sprayberry
Alan Hyman (by phone)

Old Business

1. Capital Improvements - Jimmy (Rodgers) said the same features that make a Rest Area an attractive candidate for privatization (rural, off-interstate) also make it unattractive for the privateers.

Action Item: Discussion/research on this topic has concluded. Currently it appears that Privatization experiments of Rest Areas will not happen in near future. **No further action.**

2. Update on Sign Shop Website - Mike (Sprayberry) informed the committee that a Sign Commodity Catalog and a sign ordering form has been posted on the Office of Maintenance website.

No action item.

3. Update of MRP process - Mike explained to the committee how the new MRP would work. One of the new features discussed was that all Asset Maintenance Contracts will be considered to be their own unique single "cost center" as far as MRP Procedures and Guidelines are considered. This means that an AM Contract with only one facility type that span three FDOT cost centers will now be evaluated on 30 total points throughout the length of the project limits (currently there would be a set of 30 per cost center for a total of 90). **(UPDATE: Flexibility to do more than 30 is currently being considered, but for now the plan is to generate 30 samples per facility type per contract.) (UPDATE: MRP points for AM Contracts will have a chance to fall on a bridge of an interstate ramp where currently the Mainframe does not generate points in these areas.)** Another feature provides the Districts a way to grant "exceptions" for "No" ratings on specific points. If a District decides that a "No" rating is "excusable", the "N" rating can be replace with an "X" rating on the Random

MRP Generator & Scoring System (Excel Spreadsheet). The authority for the MRP field teams to make this decision was discussed with no resolution. **(UPDATE: MRP field teams will be given this authority).** Whether an “X” rating will count as a “Y” or not be counted (n/a) for AM Contractor scoring purposes was discussed with no resolution. **(UPDATE: an “X” rating is an “N” rating officially, but will count as a “Y” for score calculation purposes.)**

Action Item: MRP teams will be receiving training on the new MRP process. The MRP Generator & Scoring System should be released about the 2nd week in July.

4. Maintenance Dispute Review Board (MDRB) Specification - The new MDRB Spec has been developed and will be placed on the State Maintenance Office website soon. It was asked if more people specializing in Maintenance can be added to the pre-established MDRB members. The group agreed that the members primarily need to be familiar with contracts and contracting in general, some getting Maintenance folks is not a priority. In the future we may try to get more Maintenance folks on the Board.

No action item.

5. Incentives – Reviewed the current three possible options being considered for positive incentives. Ask Districts to volunteer to try incentives on a contract. D-5 volunteered to try one on a Performance Based (non-AM) contract.

Action Items: Track D-5 contract and continue to look at methods/options.

6. Litter Task Team - Discussed the progress of the Litter Task Team with everyone agreeing that tracking litter is going to be a difficult task. Industry agreed to help track litter and help in anyway they can.

Action Item: The Litter Task Team will continue to meet and develop a process to improve litter tracking.

7. Construction/Maintenance Joint Memo – Office of Maintenance created a letter (memo) reminding Construction to invite Maintenance AND AM Contractors to review projects before Final Acceptance. Some revisions were suggested including changing the “remind” wording to stronger language.

Action Item: Office of Maintenance will revise letter and distribute.

8. Status of AM Procedure – Review process has been completed. Comments are being addressed and procedure should be ready for the June Executive Council meeting. **(UPDATE: All comments addressed and modifications made – the Executive Council will review the AM Procedure on June 21, 2007.)**

No action item.

New Business

1. D-3 Escambia AM Contract Update – Jimmy asked for input from industry on how to proceed with reletting/restarting this contract. Many ideas were presented by Industry on what D-3 should do. Some of the comments included:
 - Pull the Design-Build portion of the ITS section out of the contract (DBI)
 - Use a negotiated process (VMS)
 - Give more say on the technology used to the selection committee (VMS)
 - The 10+10 contract length is good (10 years w/ 10 year renewal) (VMS)
 - The 10+10 contract length is bad - long contracts present a risk of unknown inflation making them unattractive (Jorgensen)
 - Industry consensus (DBI, VMS, ICA) like the 10+10 length, so this is what will be done
 - Jorgensen does not like the new AM scope

Action Item: D-3 will use these suggestions to determine appropriate direction.

2. EM Response Contract Modification – Industry vented about hurricane issue (lack of payment). Districts and Industry agreed that the modification can be done knowing that pieces of the EM modification language can be removed if it does not agree with the scope of the original contract. When asked how many contracts have not yet been amended, ICA reported 8, VMS reported 1, DBI reported 1, and Jorgensen reported 2.

Action Item: Districts & Industry will get together and get the AM Contracts amended ASAP. Office of Maintenance will check to be sure this gets done.

3. Update on the Performance Measure Task Team (AMPMT) meeting – Minutes of this meeting were distributed to the group. Mike discussed the minor Performance Measures revisions that the Task Team agreed upon. Also, although most on the AMPMT agreed that the volume of Performance Measures in the new AM Scope are probably not needed, all agreed to keep them as-is for now to see how the well Performance Measures work on the new AM contracts using the new AM Scope.

Action Item: Office of Maintenance and Districts will monitor these new AM contracts and continue to look to improve Performance Measures if needed.

4. Guidelines for Post-Event Governor declared emergency role of AM Contractor – A VERY rough draft of guidelines was distributed to the group. These guidelines are intended to define what is meant where the AM Scope says “assist the Districts in damage assessment.” Discussed the rough draft along with several ideas/revisions.

Action Item: Office of Maintenance will revise and submit (e-mail) new guidelines to District and Industry for their review and comments.

5. Customer Service Tracking Log – Industry presented an issue where some Districts are requiring AM Contractors to enter in issue into the FDOT Tracker system. Mike reported that the Tracker system was not developed for the AM Contractors – it was meant to make sure FDOT personnel are doing a good job in responding to complaints.

Action Item: Office of Maintenance will work with Districts on requiring the same process to be used statewide and to try to ensure data is entered into only one system.

6. Improvements and revisions to the Standard AM Specification – Chuck (Henningsgaard) presented a plea to the FDOT to revised their AM Scope and how industry can provide input.
7. The Issue of utility locates for Department installed electrical system – Chuck described obstacles and issues concerning Construction’s abuse of requesting utility locates from AM Contractors. Chuck thinks utility locates may be outside of AM Scope. FDOT responded that it is AM Contractor responsibility by default since AM Contractors do not want their electrical lines torn up. Chuck asked for support/help from FDOT to ensure Contraction does not abuse locate requests.
8. Department support of AM Contractor’s third party claims – Chuck suggested an FDOT-generated letter may help AM Contractors collect from 3rd parties’ insurance companies. FDOT stated a letter such as this exists and has been attached to some contracts.

Action Item: Office of Maintenance will send this pre-existing form letter to Jorgensen to see if it suits their needs.

9. Non-agenda issue – Mike reminded the AM Contractors to remind all workers at Rest Areas (maintenance folks and security folks) of the rules concerning service animals. We repeated are getting complains concerning security or janitors forbidding admittance of service animals into rest rooms. Here is the rule: we can ask if an animal is a service animal but if they say “yes” then we MUST accept that answer and let them into the facilities with the animal. This is true regardless of appearances - if the animal is a Chihuahua and the person looks like a decathlon athlete and they say their little dog is a service animal, then we have no authority to question that.
10. Date, time, place for next meeting - The Office of Maintenance will send out this information.