

ASSET MAINTENANCE LIAISON COMMITTEE (AMLC) MEETING MINUTES

(August 6, 2010)

This Asset Maintenance Liaison Committee meeting was held on the morning of August 6, 2010 (9:30am-12:30pm) in Orlando, Florida at the Turkey Lake Plaza (Room 3001)

Attendees: Sharon Harris (District 1), Lizbeth Yates (District 2), Cleo Marsh (District 4), , Christine Webb (District 5), Sam Al-Said (District 6), Mike Sprayberry (Office of Maintenance), David Sumner (Office of Maintenance), Ademola Adelekan (FL Turnpike), Matt Ehrenzeller (TME), Patrick Owens (TME), Michelle Sheplan (Transfield Services), Jim Beach (ICA), Scott Carter (Transfield Services), Jose Darsin (Transfield Services), Dayton Burlarley Hyland (DBI Services, LLC), Bob Gorski (DBI Services, LLC), Doug Aarons (DBI Services, LLC) and Wendy Yannuzzi (DBI Services, LLC)

OLD BUSINESS

1)UPDATE OF ASSET MAINTENANCE CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT (AMPER) DISTRICT DISCUSSION (NEW TASK TEAM CREATION)

Background – After an initial AMPER testing/study period of about 1½ years, changes and improvements to the AMPER necessitated a second study period. The new task team will focus on the data from this second (1) one year study which began January 1, 2010.

Discussion – The procedure and goal for the new task team will be discussed at the initial meeting. Looking for nominations for the task team with individuals needed from each company that can bind the company in future procurement decisions. Trying to keep lawyers out of meetings until a groundwork is laid. This initial meeting will be open to multiple representatives from each interested party via teleconference, but subsequent meetings may be limited to one or two representatives. Privacy issues were discussed on the scores being posted and will be further discussed at the initial task team meeting. January 1, 2011 is the goal for task team completion. AMPER scores currently received are working well. Collected data seems appropriate to what the District's assessments are.

Action Item – The Office of Maintenance (OOM) will develop a task team to discuss objectives, usage of results, and future of the AMPER. A part of the task team's tasks will be to look at previous AMPER scores and discuss the results. Mike Sprayberry requested that all the AMPERs completed since July 2009 be posted to the shared point website ([click to link](#)). An official email will be sent out by Mike Sprayberry to establish date, time and representatives for the initial meeting. This task team will determine what will be done with the AMPER results and how the scores will be used. There are at least three suggested usages of the AMPER that the task team will need to discuss:

1. Poor AMPER scores (two consecutive less than a 70, or some other combination) earned by the contractor would trigger the District to consider starting the Non-Responsible declaration process (suspend from bidding on new jobs).

2. At the end of an AM Contract, all AMPER scores will be somehow combined to result in a final overall score that represents the life of the contract. This final score will be used as a grading criterion for determining future contract bid winners (thus merging price, tech proposal score, and past AMPER scores).
3. After a contractor has scored poorly enough to be declared non-responsible, continued poor AMPER scores may trigger the District to consider starting the Default process.

2) REST AREA INSPECTION TASK TEAM UPDATE

Background – Task team is now in progress, chaired/coordinated by Tim Allen. A proposed grading sheet has been drafted for the rest area inspections, and has been sent out for review.

Discussion – Industry will be invited to the next meeting to discuss the initial draft. In the current procedure all rest areas require a 90 grade. Discussion on whether the inspections should be scheduled or unannounced. Standards need to be addressed by the task team. Recycling update – the Department may not want recycling containers if there is no way to recycle the material without exorbitant costs. Costs should not be a factor in decision to recycle unless it is extremely excessive. Central office to look at costs.

Action Item – Submit to Mike Sprayberry what materials at what rest areas we are recycling and what we are not and why. Also, if contractors feel the cost of recycling at a specific rest area is extreme, submit these costs for the recycling and who is removing the material. Deadline for submittal is September 6, 2010.

3) BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE-BASED CONTRACTS UPDATE

Background – The OOM has developed the procedures to allow Best Value contractor selection methods for Performance Based contracts, in other contracts than just AM.

Discussion – The Performance Based contracting procedure has been completed and is official including the following 3 sections: Asset Maintenance, Low Bid Performance Based contracts and Best Value Performance Based contracts. District 1 is writing the first Best Value Performance Based contract for striping and reflectivity requirements. The Department would like to elevate striping to an annual inspection (like guardrail, attenuators and signs) that requires all yellow lines and a percentage of the white lines to meet a pre-establish retro reflectivity requirement. This evaluation is currently in development process. There was some discussion about methods of evaluating retro reflectivity, hand held instrument or mobile instrument.

Action Item – OOM will keep this committee updated on progress.

4) LONG-TERM CONTRACT PERFORMANCE BOND UPDATE

Background – Long Term Contract Performance and Bid bond requirements were in question as to consistency between maintenance & construction.

Also, OOM had presented an idea of overlapping annual performance bonds for long term contracts by 6 months each renewal.

Discussion – Qualifications were verified and no modification is necessary, as the Federal Registry requirements are the same for construction & maintenance for bid bonds. The performance bond language is also the same, but does not require the Bond Company to be listed on the Federal Registry. Since most of the time the Bond Company will be the same one used for Bid and Performance Bonds, the only time there may be a problem is when the bid bond is waived which is only for small contracts less than \$150k.

The idea of overlapping performance bonds will not be implemented or pursued further at this time.

Action Item – None – remove from agenda.

5) STATEWIDE MAINTENANCE CONFERENCE UPDATE

Background – Statewide maintenance conference has not been held in four (4) years and needs to be. AMOTIA to assist in facilitation and logistics the next time it occurs.

Discussion – The conference was replaced in 2010 by the statewide webinar in May. The webinar was successful. The plan for future is to alternate years between a webinar and an in-person meeting. 2011 will hopefully be the first in person meeting.

Action Item – OOM to keep committee posted on this and will provide the districts and industry contractors with more notice on the webinars.

6) COMPLIANCE WITH THE FS CHAPTER 320, FL REGISTRATION OF OUT OF STATE VEHICLES UPDATE

Background – It was formerly stated that all contractor vehicles working in the state had to have FL license plates.

Discussion – Vehicles must be registered in FL – unless one of the following criteria is met: Vehicles are properly registered in Alabama, Indiana, Georgia or Michigan; or if registered through the IRP apportioned method or if in FL for less than 11 days consecutively. A letter from the DMV might be required to state that the vehicles are registered in the above 4 states due to the verification of expiration, Mike to follow up on this.

Action Item – None

NEW BUSINESS

1) REVIEW OF QAR SCHEDULE – INDUSTRY CONCERNS WITH QAR RATING FORMS AND RATING PROCESS

Background –

Discussion – See Item I in Old Business above.

Action Item – This was Chuck Hennigsgaard's item, and as he was not available to discuss, we will address at next meeting.

2) DISCUSSION ON THE FORMATION OF JOINT DEPARTMENT/INDUSTRY TASK FORCE TO REVIEW AND SUGGEST IMPROVEMENTS TO THE STANDARD ASSET MAINTENANCE SPECIFICATION

Background – Industry believes this task force subcommittee should be re-established with higher level Industry and Department executives included.

Discussion – The OOM's bridge section is hosting a task team currently looking at AM scope standard bridge language. They are currently looking at modifying the levels/descriptions of the repairs. Other discussion concerned end-of-contract turnover requirements, including creation of a checklist identifying all documentation to be handed over to successor contractor.. Additional discussion was brief and limited to re-establishing the task force.

Action Item – OOM to review the probability to re-establish the task force and update this committee. If it will occur, volunteers will be solicited. This task force could also work to develop end-of-contract hand over requirements.

3) DISCUSS MRP RATINGS FOR CONTRACT #E7G51 AND THE CORRESPONDING DEDUCTIONS/RETAINAGE ON THE REVIEW OF ONLY 2 RATINGS

Background – New contract in District 7 is starting January 1, 2011 and the question was presented as to what is done with the MRP collected from the 1st period and 2nd period scores, when technically the contract is beginning in the 2nd period.

Discussion – Since data from all three periods should be combined to obtain statistically valid numbers on which deductions can be based, some adjustments must be made and contract begin & end. Retainage will be held on the 3rd period of the first year (not a deduction). The following year will be collected as normal and the retainage will be refunded on the first year 3rd period after the second year. Too few MRP periods will also result at the end of the contract as well. In this case, however, the final period will be handled as a deduction even though there are less than three periods; as such there are expectations of leaving the job in a particularly

good condition in order to absorb the possible increase in MRP results margin of error. There was further discussion of the language on current contracts expiring and who handles the deliverables of the overlapping contract (see new item #2 above).

Action Item –The Districts are to make sure language is spelled out in the Scope/RFP’s for all future contracts that fall into the same MRP period situations. OOM may address this with standard language in future,

4) DISCUSS THE IMPORTANCE OF CORRECT RCI

Background – The trend in new contracts is that Districts are electing to take the responsibility of the RCI, instead of including RCI in the contract requirements. Some reasons are the fact that the accuracy is extremely important to the Department, as it affects their budget as well as asset inventories. Also, since RCI collection is rare (a 5-year cycle) event and requires some specialty to perform, it may not be the best value to ask the contractor to perform.

Discussion – For contractors who are required to do RCI, make sure the changes of the RCI are kept up to date, since these numbers are so important to Department budget. Districts need to make sure all planning groups are sending out notifications for new additions so that the Route data in SharePoint MRP Generator can remain accurate.

Action Item – District’s may keep RCI responsibilities in house. If AM contractors are doing RCI’s, please reinforce diligence in timing and accuracy.

5) DISCUSSION OF ITS INCLUSION ON FUTURE AM CONTRACTS

Background –The FL Turnpike recently discussed including ITS in its next procurement.

Discussion – The ITS will not be a part of AM contract for the Turnpike currently but the criteria will be redeveloped and they will be included at some point in the future. ITS firms in FL have to be certified so it is difficult to partner.

Action Item – Each District to independently decide if they will or not include ITS – but most are leaning to not including.

6) TRACKING OF AM CONTRACTOR 2ND TIME REQUESTS TO LOCATE UTILITIES

Background – Industry has indicated that they sometimes are requested to perform several duplicate utility locates on construction contracts.

Discussion – Mike contacted on-call for suggestions on handling this issue. Do not want to charge for locate. Compile a list of who conducted duplicate locates.

Action Item – Industry to advise Mike Sprayberry directly on all duplicate locates that are being done and they will be tracked accordingly and a review will be done as to who the offenders are and OOM and Central Office will take care of this with the offending subcontractors.

7) REST AREA PHONES/CALL BOXES

Background – ALL rest areas are to have a public phone and/or call box.

Discussion – Discussion of directives and how they are handled on both sides. Handicap signs were discussed and changing them to say what the maximum fine is. The AM contractors should be following the directives that the District's Maintenance Offices are being given. If this is an excessive financial burden – it will be discussed. Shared responsibility is the goal.

Action Item – AM contractors to review their rest areas for compliance. It may be less expensive to have a phone company install a pay phone and pay the monthly fee over new call boxes. (Update: recent quote for new call box installation is approx. \$13,000. This will be discussed with OOM and Districts.)

8) ADDITIONAL TOPICS

Discussion – Cleo Marsh – Concerns of new NPDES requirements in Palm Beach County and meeting these requirements. Inventory is required annually and the maintenance activity on these items. It is currently a DRAFT. Inspections will be looked at and reporting your maintenance activity on those items.

Action Item – Cleo to forward the information to everyone and advise accordingly if and when this becomes official. Cleo to also update all as this progresses.

Mike Sprayberry – Is the system that handles the MRP scores from the shared point generator working ok for everyone? Dayton Burlarley-Hyland – expressed concern of receiving calculated MRP scores weeks after the MRP was performed in a particular District. Several months ago, Dayton discussed a solution (provide the “dropped points” to contractor soon after MRP evaluation) with Sprayberry, but it did not work as expected. It seems there was simply a miscommunication with the third party MRP team. The DME to take care of this issue and communicate with the AM contractor.

9) NEXT MEETING

Facilitating Contractor – ICA

Location – Orlando, FL

Date – February 2011 - 10:30-1:30 (working lunch) – specific date to be determined