

DISTRICT THREE DESIGN NEWSLETTER



Volume 15, Issue 3

July—September, 2010

Inside this issue:

Editor's Desk- Customer Service	1,2
Design Spotlight—Greg Rogers	2
Supplemental Agreement Report	2
Top Ten Quality Control Comments	3

From the Editor's Desk— Customer Service Scott Golden, P.E., District Design Engineer

We are all customers at some time. You may be a customer at a restaurant, grocery store, car dealership or a doctor's office. No matter where you are or what you are doing, when you give something in exchange for goods and/or services, you are a customer with expectations. As transportation professionals, we too offer goods and services and we too have certain expectations by our "customers." I think that many times we tend to get so involved in "design" that we forget who our customers (stakeholders) are and what we need to do to meet their expectations.



Prior to beginning any project, identify each stakeholder within the project corridor. Examples may be (this is not an all inclusive list):

- ◆ Contractors
- ◆ CE&I or CE&I Staff
- ◆ Local, State and Federal agencies
- ◆ Elected officials
- ◆ Business owners in the corridor
- ◆ Residents in the corridor
- ◆ Road users
- ◆ Permitting agencies
- ◆ Pedestrians
- ◆ Bicyclists
- ◆ Environmental/Cultural Resources
- ◆ FDOT District office staff (Design, Construction, Professional Services, Public Information, etc)
- ◆ FDOT Field office staff (Construction, Maintenance, Permits)
- ◆ Public

We then need to determine the needs of each of the stakeholders. Evaluating those needs may be as simple as a phone call. Contacting the area Transportation/Metropolitan Planning Organization or bicycle and pedestrian groups in the area could be beneficial. If your project has a public information meeting, make sure *all* the stakeholders are invited.

Continued on page 2.



District III Quarterly Design Newsletter

Editor.....Scott Golden

Layout/Graphics...Teresa Barfield

CONTRIBUTORS:

.....Teresa Barfield

.....Miranda Glass

.....Lester Forrest

.....Greg Rogers

Next, determine how to best meet those needs. For example, residents and business owners within the project need good access during and after construction. This is extremely important! Many times these businesses depend on this access for their customers who, by the way, are also our customers. Contractors and CE&I staff need a clear concise set of plans to build from without having to make assumptions, filing a claim, supplemental agreement or causing a time or cost overrun. The road users, pedestrians and bicyclists expect a MOT plan that moves them through the work zone safely and efficiently. We need to be receptive to the permitting agencies by understanding what they need and providing them information in timely manner. We should also consider our Maintenance Office since they must maintain what we design and should foresee long-term maintenance impacts of our designs.

Finally, we should implement those ideas in our designs and evaluate those ideas while the project is under construction. We should modify our processes/designs to improve on these ideas, spend time on the project with our CE&I staff and ask questions about what worked well and what did not work so well.

Design Spotlight— Greg Rogers

Scott Golden, P.E., District Design Engineer



Greg Rogers leads the District Three Design Plan Review/Bid Ability Team. Greg came to Design from Panama City Operations in July of 2007 and to the Department from private industry in May 1999. His background in construction and easygoing personality make him a good fit for Design. When asked, he will tell you what matters most in life is family, but NASCAR and speckled trout fishing occupy some of his weekends as well. He is an active member of the Wausau Masonic Lodge and is a proud member of the Shaddai Shrine Buccaneer Unit. He and his wife Linda celebrated their 21st anniversary this year and are looking forward to many more. Both of their children, Mary and Beatrice are attending college, and an empty nest looms in the couple's future. As Greg and his family look to the future, we here in Design are pleased he is a part of our Design family.

Supplemental Agreement Report – July 2010 – September 2010

Miranda Glass, P.E., District Roadway Design Engineer

Following is a sample of Supplemental Agreements for the third quarter of 2010 (July through September). The three (3) categories of Supplemental Agreements that are included in this summary are 007, 108, and 003. This summary is included in the [Quarterly Design Newsletter](#) as a tool to inform designers of errors and omissions that can lead to Supplemental Agreements and unnecessary cost to the public. Below are brief descriptions of those errors or omissions and the department's responses.

Description Code: 007 – Work added to or deleted from 3rd party agreements.

Reason: Improvements under this contract consist of multilane reconstruction.

The road is to be realigned in an effort to leave a 72" Live Oak tree which in the original plan was to be removed. This Live Oak is to remain because of public outcry from area citizens. The back slopes are to change from 1:3 to 1:2. Sidewalks are to be widened and relocated to accommodate the tree. The sidewalk is to be widened from 10' to 15' to include the bicycle lane that is to be removed so as to shift the curb and gutter away from the tree. The 15' sidewalk will be used as a shared use path at this location. Timber walls will be added where the sidewalk meets the R/W. The cost for this work uses the unit rates from the existing pay items; other items have been added to complete the work.

Granted Time: 0 (zero) days

Increase: \$16,220.98

Response: Unavoidable (no remedial action required) / no cost recovery action is recommended.

Description Code: 108– Plans do not describe scope of work.

Reason: The improvements under this contract consist of bridge repair and rehabilitation.

Upon beginning work on the joint rehabilitation it was found the asphalt overlay was much thicker than that shown in the plans. After reviewing the entire project it was concluded the material needed would be more than three times the estimated amounts. Negotiations were entered into with the Contractor to resolve the issue, and an agreement was reached to increase the unit price of the joint rehabilitation pay item. This supplemental agreement will serve to establish a new unit price for pay item 458-1-26 (bridge deck joint rehabilitation).

Granted Time: 0 (zero) days

Increase: \$8224.92

Response: Unavoidable (no remedial action required)/ no cost recovery action are recommended.

Description Code: 003 – Harmonize project with adjacent projects or right of way.

Reason: The improvements under this contract consist of resurfacing and ADA improvements.

- A. The Department and Contractor amended this contract to:
Provide a safe transition over and across the railroad tracks for the traveling public by raising and lengthening the profile of the approach and departure on the outside lane of the right roadway.
- B. Raising the outside lane pavement, the low point of the roadway changed and the existing inlet wasn't providing adequate drainage. To provide better drainage a new inlet was located further away from the tracks. The existing inlet was modified to become a junction box and additional pipe installed to connect old and new structures.

The profile change will assure a safe transition across the railroad tracks and the new inlet will provide adequate drainage. After the new tracks were installed it became evident the railroad track elevation changed. The new crossing did not line up with the planned profile on the outside right lane. To increase the rideability of this lane the profile needed to be adjusted. The profile changes resulted in the need for the drainage structures to be adjusted. This supplemental agreement amends the contract to allow for the performance of this work as directed by the Department.

Granted Time: 14 (fourteen) days

Increase: \$55,151.48

Response: Unavoidable (no remedial action required) / no cost recovery action is recommended.

Top Ten Quality Control Comments July – Sept., 2010

1. When Treatment I will be used for the Shoulder, Pay Item 0162-1-11 would not be necessary in those areas.
2. For Pay Item 0120-2-2, revise the quantity using the 45% Fill Adjustment and the 25% Truck Adjustment used for most areas in District Three unless a Project is located in a coastal area.
3. Per District Construction, add PG 76-22 to all of the Type SP and FC Asphalt mixes used on state roads.
4. The difference between the beginning and ending stations does not match the project length shown in the key sheet Length of Project box.
5. Do not show the line for unpaved shoulder.
6. Show the next municipality for the state roads alongside the location map on the key sheet.
7. Are there any mailboxes within the clear zone that are not frangible, requiring the mailbox pay item?
8. Proposed trees are being placed inside of medians. These trees have the potential of growing to a diameter greater than desired, per the Standard Index.
9. Where ever feasible, separate curb ramps for each crosswalk at an intersection should be provided rather than having a single ramp at a corner for both crosswalks.
10. Detectable warning devices should be called for on all existing Curb Ramps.

I have seen what a laugh can do. It can transform almost unbearable tears into something bearable, even hopeful. -Bob Hope