

From: Shepard, Michael
Sent: Friday, September 16, 2022 2:53 PM
To: Hurtado, Dan <Dan.Hurtado@dot.state.fl.us>
Subject: FW: Maintenance Drawings and Standards

Dan,

Executive Summary:

We wish to pull back on the “controversial” changes and only move forward with minor improvements agreeable to the districts. Tim Lattner, Stefanie Maxwell and Scott Arnold concur with the approach.

The outcome will result in minor improvements, demonstrate we are listening/partnering with our customers and will result in a good balance.

More details below on the “why” we shouldn’t create separate standards are outlined below. We have been in communication with the districts that were not initially supportive, and they also support the above approach.

I would have responded sooner, but I wanted to be sure we had concurrence.

Requesting to move forward in the above direction...

Sincerely,

Michael A. Shepard, P.E.
State Roadway Design Engineer
Florida Department of Transportation
(850) 414-4330
<http://www.fdot.gov/roadway>

<http://www.flcompletestreets.com>

From: Sheppard, Derwood
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 2:03 PM
To: Shepard, Michael Michael.Shepard@dot.state.fl.us
Subject: FW: Maintenance Drawings and Standards

Michael,

As you are aware we were proposing revisions to the Temporary Traffic Control (TTC/MOT) *Standard Plans, Index 102-600* to consolidate technical requirements for TTC operations into the Standard Specifications. These proposed changes are what precipitated the comments at the Executive Workshop about creating separate Maintenance Standards. We were still in the process of vetting the changes with Districts Operations staff and actually had a meeting scheduled with the DME’s later the

same day as the Executive Workshop. The proposed changes had been previously discussed at a Joint Directors Meeting, at the request of Will Watts, and at that time it was agreed that creating a standalone Maintenance Special Provision for *Specification 102* would provide maintenance staff with all the necessary information in an easily accessible format. However, when we presented this proposal to the DME's and other operations staff there was still a strong desire to leave the majority of the information in the standard as is.

Following the DME Meeting, Daniel Strickland and I meet one-on-one with District 3 and District 7, as they expressed the most concern with the proposed changes. We discussed the various components of the revisions and our vision for utilizing the Maintenance Special Provision; however, they still felt that the changes would not be user friendly for field staff and that moving certain information would make it more difficult to enforce requirements for various types of field operations (e.g., maintenance contracts, construction inspection, permit projects, and utility work). We also discussed the viability of creating separate Maintenance TTC Standards. There are several logistical issues with creating a separate standard. First and foremost, is the federal and state requirements for the TTC/MOT Training Certifications. The current training program is used to train all personal (internal and external) involved in the design, installation, and maintenance of temporary traffic control. The training is specifically tailored to educate users on navigating the Standard Plans. If there are separate versions of the standards published, separate training programs would also have to be created, District and Provider Network trainers would have offer two different classes, and in many cases FDOT Operations Staff would have to be educated on both standards, as the same staff that enforce TTC requirements on maintenance contracts also review construction projects. There is also the issue of In-house Maintenance versus Contract Maintenance. The same contractors that provide contract maintenance (in particular TTC/MOT Contracts) are the same contractors that provide TTC on Construction projects. These Industry Partners have a strong desire to utilize a single set of TTC Standards for both construction and maintenance contracts. If we use a separate set of TTC standards for in-house maintenance, it would likely led to significant confusion about the which standards are effective for contract work. Lastly, creating a separate set of TTC Maintenance Standards would require additional resources to maintain and currently the State Maintenance Office does not have the expertise to create and manage the document.

After considerable vetting of the proposed revisions it is my recommendation that we do not move forward with consolidating information from *Standard Plans, Index 102-600* into *Specification 102*. There are still some targeted improvements and additions that both our internal and industry partners support; therefore, only those changes will be carried forward. This course of action would allow the current Standard Plans and Specifications to be provided in a format that meets the needs and desires of all users without creating additional/separate documents.

Thanks,

Derwood C. Sheppard, Jr., M.Eng., P.E.
Roadway Standard Plans Administrator
State Standard Plans Engineer
Roadway Design Office
(850) 414-4334
Derwood.Sheppard@dot.state.fl.us



From: Hurtado, Dan <Dan.Hurtado@dot.state.fl.us>
Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2022 9:40 AM
To: Shepard, Michael <Michael.Shepard@dot.state.fl.us>
Cc: Arnold, Scott <Scott.Arnold@dot.state.fl.us>; Sheppard, Derwood <Derwood.Sheppard@dot.state.fl.us>
Subject: Maintenance Drawings and Standards

I'm sure you picked up on the commitment that was just made. Please have an initial conversation with the District Directors of Operations and the District Maintenance Engineers to assess the need, then circle back with me and we can discuss solutions and implementation. Let's move quickly on this. Thank you.

Respectfully,

Dan Hurtado, P.E.
Chief Engineer
Florida Department of Transportation
605 Suwannee Street - MS 57
Tallahassee, FL. 32399-0450
850-414-5203 | 850-556-4287 (cell)
dan.hurtado@dot.state.fl.us