

-----Original Message-----

From: Gene Francis [mailto:sgigcf@bellsouth.net]  
Sent: Monday, January 13, 2003 12:57 PM  
To: bburleson@ftba.com  
Cc: Don L Copeland, Jr; Robert A Higginbotham  
Subject: Proposed Specification Change - D5550008 - Directional Bore-Basis of Payment

I agree with the need for a change to this section. Having one pay item for furnish only, and one pay item for install only, gets confusing.

**Response: The pay item is for furnish and install.**

**Response: Unfortunately, all of the comments below are beyond the scope of this change and are not being addressed in it. The language commented on was in the original specification when it was sent out for industry review. Modifications to it would have to be processed a separate specification change. Thank you for your input.**

There are still some challenges with this section. For example, if I choose to directional bore my 630-1-13 (Under Pavement) conduit and my project has both the 555-1 & 630-1-13 pay items. How will it be accounted for by the inspector? Also, If I choose to trench all or a portion of my 555-1 (Directional Bore) conduit & do not have the 630-1-13 (Under Pavement) pay item. Will I get paid under the 555-1 or will I have to submit a change order to add the 630-1-13 pay item?

I would vote to doing away with the 555-1 Pay item all together and go back to the way it was, Conduit, Under Pavement, Furnish & Install. That way there is no debate. I get paid my unit price for each linear foot/meter of conduit no matter how it is installed.

Respectfully,  
Gene Francis  
Estimator  
The Signal Group, Inc.  
Phone: (561) 744-3206 ext. 26  
Fax: (561) 744-3207  
www.signalgroupinc.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Xanders, Greg [mailto:Greg.Xanders@jacobs.com]  
Sent: Monday, January 13, 2003 7:54 AM

To: Bob Burleson  
Subject: RE: FDOT Proposed Specification Changes: D1020012, D5550008  
&D5560008

FIRST ONE LOOKS GOOD. I HAVE A QUESTION ON THE DIRECTIONAL BORING ONE. ITSAYS NO PAYMENT FOR A FAILED BORING INCLUDING FLOWABLE FILL ETC. I PRESUME THAT THIS DOES NOT MEAN THAT A CONTRACTOR WOULD NOT BE PAID FOR AN UNSUCCESSFUL BORE IN THE EVENT THAT THERE WERE UNFORSEEN CONDITIONS SUCH AS AN OLD FOUNDATION THAT THE FDOT DID NOT CATCH/SHOW ON THE PLANS AND THE BORE SITE WAS DICTATED BY THE FDOT IN THE PLANS ??? SOMEHOW THIS NEEDS TO BE CLARIFIED IN THE SPEC....OR ARE WE TO ASSUME THAT THE UNFORSEEN CONDITIONS SPEC APPLIES..... X-MAN

File: D5550008 - Directional Bore-Basis of Payment  
Username: Jordan L. Green, P.E.  
UserEmail: jordan.green@dot.state.fl.us  
UserTel: (386)961-7588 SC 881-7588  
UserFAX: (386)961-7849 SC 881-7849  
ContactRequested:  
Remote Name: 156.75.19.0  
Remote User:

Comments:

This comment pertains to both reviews: If 30% of the unit price is withheld from the contractor until the Dept. has received as-builts as per 556-6.2, what type of withholding would there be if the job is a lump sum contract?

Karen LaBarbera, Resident Estimates Manager  
FDOT, District 2, Palatka Construction  
Phone (386)312-4823 SC 644  
Office FAX (386)312-4840 SC 644  
Nortel FAX (386)961-7917  
[karen.labarbera@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:karen.labarbera@dot.state.fl.us)

Comments from FTBA members:

We disagree with the proposed payment method- may different combinations & components of pipes can be included behind reames size payment is difficult

enough to collect now. Should this become effective all our pricing for item number 5551 and 2551-1 will increase by 30%.

Submitted by Roy Bryan      Phone #813 620-1157  
CEO American Technology, Inc.

PS We are a major driller for DOT in the State of Florida.

Comment: As far as withholding 30% of the payment awaiting as built drawings, many of our jobs have a long time between the time we install some of our conduit and the time the job is close enough to completion to produce a good as built drawing. What is retainage for? If the as built drawings are not delivered to the department at the final inspection, they could withhold their retainage payment and write a deficiency letter that will affect their ability to bid FDOT projects.

We hope these issues will be addressed by the FDOT.

Very truly yours,  
PAH Contractors, Inc.  
John Hanson

Comment: Proposed change is too vague and would create a nightmare for pricing and collection. We would not bid Projects based on this method.

Submitted by Paul Britten      Phone #813 971-0550  
DE Britten Jr.

Comment: I don't understand the reasoning behind this change. This will create a paperwork nightmare. Not only for the contractor, but also for the F.D.O.T. These changes will generate a major increase in cost for performing this scope of work.

Submitted by SOUTHERN underground, Inc.      Phone #813 629-7104  
Steve Brooks.