

ASSET MAINTENANCE LIAISON COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

(July 2, 2008)

Attendees: Sharon Harris (District 1), Andrea Warfield (VMS), Tim Lattner (Office of Maintenance), Mark Garcia (District 5), Mark Thomas (District 3), Jose Quintana (Turnpike)(Telephone), Jim Hannigan (District 2), Rick Sulzer (Jorgensen), John McPherson (Jorgensen) Michelle Sheplan (VMS), Bob Gorski (DBI), Troy Drover(ICA), Derrick Jenkins(ICA), Randy Crews (ESI), Louann Crews (ESI), Bobby Johns (ESI), Mark White (WRS), Laura Porter (FL Drawbridge) (Telephone), Mike Sprayberry(Office of Maintenance), David Sumner (Office of Maintenance) & Kirk Hutchison (Office of Maintenance)

1) Introductions

2) Asset Maintenance Contractor Ordering Signs

A new method for Asset Maintenance Contractor's ordering signs from the Lake City Sign Shop is being implemented. Kirk (Hutchison) explained the new process. There are 11 Asset Maintenance Contracts that reflects the following language. "The Department will provide finished sign panels up to _____ square feet per fiscal year, to be used for routine sign maintenance and repair on the State Highway System, within the project limits." Mike/Tim asked if the Asset Maintenance Contractor's would be in agreement to amend their existing Asset Maintenance Contracts by converting SF to \$ allowed on the contracts, based on an average \$ per SF for the average sized sign.

Comments/Concerns-

The Asset Maintenance Contractor's agreed to their Asset Maintenance Contracts being amended. The Asset Maintenance Contractor's requested more training in this process. Kirk/Tim asked the Asset Maintenance Contractor's to send them a request and they would provide training if possible.

Action Item-

The Office of Maintenance will send a memo out to the Districts requesting the following Asset Maintenance Contracts be amended to reflect \$ (showing formula to convert) in place of SF.

District 1- BD596

District 2- E2H23

District 3- BD967

District 4- BD906

District 4- BDA16

District 4- E4H52

District 6- E6C65

District 7- BD844

District 7- E7C27

District 8- E8G12

3) **Asset Maintenance MRP SharePoint System Update**

Mike went over the following improved areas for the Asset Maintenance MRP SharePoint System.

- Districts do not need to manually enter the MAINFRAME MRP points into the SharePoint system - instead they can be entered automatically.
- The Y/N evaluation results can now be automatically populated in SharePoint.
- Mike is also working on a change to the MRP SharePoint System that will force creation of 10 points for Facility Types with a total length (within contract limits) of less than 30 miles. This will assure all Facility Types get at least 10 points per MRP period so that deductions can occur if warranted. If a Facility Type totals less than 1 miles, then every tenth mile section will be evaluated each time (e.g. a 0.8 mile segment will get 8 points – which will cover entire section). Deductions will be allowed for these less than 1-mile segments since there is zero margin of error (entire limits evaluated).

Comments/Concerns-

The Asset Maintenance Contractor's wanted to get their MRP results as soon as possible to examine what the "X" has been changed to by the Districts. But the AM Contractor's agreed it would be ok to wait until after July 1st (or last day of each period) to get their results. Agreeing to wait until after the official end of each period helps the Department logistically.

Action Item-

Keep everyone updated on future updates to MRP SharePoint System.

4) **Asset Maintenance Contractor Grading Plan (AMGP)Update**

The Asset Maintenance Grading Plan Task Team has had 2 meetings. The first meeting was to discuss the goals and objectives with the AMGP Task Team. At that meeting, District 5 explained their process for Section 1 (Asset Maintenance Monitoring Plan) of the AMGP during the second meeting. District 3 and ICA will present their process in scoring of Section 2 (Rest Areas) at the next meeting.

As we progress through meetings, the Office of Maintenance will modify the AMGP throughout this trial year or as long as the AMGP Task Team is in place. This meaning new scores may be slightly inconsistent with previous scores, but this is ok since the grade will not be used to "officially" evaluate contractors until after the trial period ends and all previous scores are retroactively recalculated using the finally agreed upon AMGP. . The recalculated scores will be used as official AMGP score for the contractor.

The AMGP meeting minutes can be reviewed at

Comments/Concerns-

None

Action Item-

None

5) Risk Limitation

Tim reviewed the Risk Limitation language used on the new District 3 Asset Maintenance Contract. The following is the language used.

The Contractor's shall not be responsible for any single incident costing more than \$_One_ million (construction cost only). The Department shall be responsible for single incident damage repair that cost above the \$_One million cap. The Contractor is responsible for any work (Maintenance of Traffic, etc.) involved in damage repair before the accepted bid is received. The incident cost shall be determined by the accepted bid to perform the damage repair work. The Contractor and Department shall pursue 3rd party reimbursement in accordance to items (a), (b) and (c) above. Such \$_ One _ million per single incident cap does not apply if damage was caused or created by the Contractor's negligence.

Comments/Concerns-

Discussion had on the amount the Asset Maintenance Contractor will receive. \$1 Million was used on the District 3 contract. Different amounts were suggested, but no decision reached.

Discussion on per single event vs. Annual \$.

Action Item-

Will leave existing contracts as is. New contracts will have an established cap amount per incident where if the cost of repair is greater than the cap, the Department will take over control of the incident. The Asset Maintenance Contractor would remain responsible for the Maintenance of Traffic and all other duties needed until repair cost is determined. It was stated that Association for the Management and Operations of Transportation Infrastructure Assets (AMOTIA) was working on new language and they would send their recommended language to the Office of Maintenance as soon as it was complete.

6) District 3 Asset Maintenance Contract Update (Escambia County)

Mark Thomas gave an update on the new Asset Maintenance Contract schedule and unique features. District 3 is using a QC requirement that places the burden of

Administration on the Asset Maintenance Contractor. The QC process will be worth 55 points in grading of the Technical Proposal.

Also District 5 is working on a new Asset Maintenance Contract that will cover Brevard and Osceola counties.

Comments/Concerns-

None

Action Item-

None

7) Rest Area Grading

Discussion had about some Districts incorrectly using partial scoring methods and the need for consistent scoring between the Districts and Office of Maintenance.

Comments/Concerns-

None

Action Item-

The Office of Maintenance will discuss at the next District Maintenance Engineer meeting the development of a new Task Team to review the Rest Area Inspection Sheet, training to develop consistent grading for Rest Areas.

8) Open Discussion

Discussed Third Party Claims- Can an Asset Maintenance Contractor bill for non-damage related costs? - Tim stated that the Legal Office is working on a new policy. Tim will go back to Legal with all the Asset Maintenance Contracts language and get their opinion.

Asset Maintenance Bonding Language- Clay (McGonagill) is working on this issue. Need to review and model like PPP Contracts.

Default and Non-Responsibility Procedures- They will be out for executive review in September, 2008. New Rest Area procedure is currently being developed. This new procedure will absorb the current rest area and security scopes of services.

9) Next meeting will be December 3, 2008 in Orlando.