

0080302DB PROSECUTION AND PROGRESS – PROSECUTION OF WORK - GENERAL.
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

David A. Sadler
414-5203
david.sadler@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (10-29-18)
I made one edit.

<p>→ 8-3.2-General: For this Contract submit the following schedules and reports.¶ → → 8-3.2.1-Contract Schedule: Submit to the Engineer for acceptance a Critical Path Method (CPM) Contract Schedule for <u>the first 20% of eContract tTime (D</u> <u>Design and</u> <u>econstruction) of the project within 30 calendar days after execution of the Contract or at the preconstruction conference, whichever is earlier. <u>Open Prior to completion of the first 20% of the original eContract tTime, submit to the Engineer for acceptance a CPM Contract Schedule for the remaining eContract tTime.</u>¶</u></p>	<p>Sadler, David A 1 hour ago Formatted: Highlight</p>
--	--

Response: Change was made prior to Industry Review.

Johnny Blakeney
954-934-1122
blakeney.johnny@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (12-14-18)
As not all Design Build projects come with executed Utility Work Schedules included in the Contract, and where Design Build Firms are the ones executing Utility Work Schedules with the utility companies during construction, please add the following additional language to the existing sentence for accuracy: The schedule must incorporate the utility work schedules included in the Contract Documents, "or executed between the Design-Build Firm and the utility company," unless changed by mutual agreement of the utility company, the Contractor, and the Department.

Response:

K.C. Jose via
Deborah Ihsan
954-777-4387
deborah.ihsan@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (1-8-19)
1. 1st paragraph of 8-3.2.1 – recommend changing the sentence to allow for submittal of the whole project or for the first 20%

Response:

2. 1st paragraph of 8-3.2.1 – recommend requiring a timeframe of when to submit the remainder of the schedule, such as by adding “At least 21 days” in front of “prior to”

Response:

3. 2nd paragraph of 8-3.2.1 – recommend also including Railroad companies per Spec 7-11.4.3

Response:

4. Last paragraph of 8-3.2.1 – recommend changing the “Acceptance by the Engineer” to simply state “Acceptance of...”.... I asked K.C. Jose why he recommended removing the reference to the Engineer, and he explained that with the Senior PE only being billable a few hours per project, there may not be sufficient time to draft the response and the response could be delegated.

Response:

5. Section 7 of 8-3.2.2 – recommend removing the word “Engineer” in the sentence stating “Upon the Engineer’s acceptance of...”

Response:

6. Section 8 of 8-3.2.3 – recommend adding “during the progress of work.” after “longest path”.

Response:

7. Section 15 of 8-3.2.3 – recommend change the period after “WBS summary or task development” to a semi-colon

Response:

8. Section 8-3.2.7 – recommend adding language to the Performance of Work section to aid with the situation of how the Department expects the progress of project to be consistent with the schedule, and yet we continually see slow pace for the first 50% of contract time and then aggressive pursuit of the work during the remaining time, which is inconvenience since it throws away the CEI cost targets. Recommend some time of language noting that any imbalance of 15% or more in time and monies will receive Deficiency warning letters on a weekly basis until the discrepancy is rectified.

Response:
