

SP0080307DRB PROSECUTION AND PROGRESS – PROSECUTION OF WORK SPECIFICATION
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Kevin Hayden
386-943-5284
kevin.hayden@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (1/4/21, Industry)

In Section 8-3.7, the first paragraph lists the title "DRB Operation Procedures". However, the first quotation mark is a single quotation mark, while the ending quotation is a double quotation mark.

Response: Thank you for the comment. The typo has been corrected.

N/A

Comments: (12/11/20, Industry)

I am not in favor of the Advisory Opinion. This is going to turn into mini DRB hearings (regardless of the wording). And for either party to get it to that point too early, is not affording the other party enough time to complete it's review of the dispute. In negotiations, there is a point where both parties are fully informed of the issue and the complexities of it. To allow one party to request when the other isn't ready is doing a disservice to the process and may be too heavily relied upon (and discourage resolution as early).

Response: Thank you for the comment. Advisory Opinions have been used successfully in several other States as an early resolution tool.

Carl Harman
941-708-4431
Carl.Harman@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (12/11/20, Industry)

Page 3, first paragraph that starts "For disputes involving non-compensable time extensions..." Why did we single out this type issue above all others? It implies we don't care about impacting the traveling public (our #1 customer). As long as time is non-compensable, merit means nothing. Page 3, second paragraph. Add the following in italics: If entitlement is determined by the Board, "and accepted by the Parties," the Parties should proceed

Response: The language regarding non-compensable time extensions was included to encourage the timely resolution of issues at the project level. The language regarding monetary negotiations is existing language.
