0080302 PROSECUTION AND PROGRESS – PROSECUTION OF WORK
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW
****

Bob Dion
386-740-0665
bob_dion@urscorp.com

Comment: (1-24-11)
A special provision is job specific; you are deleting a portion of a special provision that has the same hierarchy in the governing order of documents per 5-2 of the spec book. Suggest you combine the portions of SP0080302A that will apply to this special provision into 1 special provision; unless it is your intent that 8-3.2.3 thru 8-3.2.8 in it will not be necessary. If your intent is to have 1 special provision, suggest your introduction be 'SUBARTICLE 8-3.2 (Pages 81 and 82) is deleted and the following substituted:'

Response:

****

Flint, Robert
(386)961-7342
robert.flint@dot.stat.fl.us

Comments: (1-21-11)
8-3.2.2 last paragraph
"The Engineer will have 30 days to accept the Contract Schedule or to schedule a meeting, if needed, within that time, with the Contractor to resolve any problems that prevent acceptance of the schedule. Attend the meeting scheduled by the Engineer, and submit a corrected schedule to the Engineer within seven days after the meeting. The process will be continued until a Contract Schedule is accepted by the Engineer."

My suggestion: As indicated in the last paragraph (above), the Engineer has 30 days to review and accept the updated Contract Schedule. In addition, if the Engineer has questions regarding the submittal, a meeting can be scheduled with the Contractor to resolve those issues. However, I am concerned that a 30-day review/meeting period might overlap and conflict with the next 30-day submittals. I propose that we reduce the review/meeting period to 20 days.

Response:

****

Bill Sears
954-934-1115
william.sears@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (1-27-11) Turnpike Construction concurs with the proposed changes but since it is under review, we would suggest the following additional items:

1. In 8-3.2.2, suggest requiring the CPM be grouped by phase and location as follows:

1) a Critical Path Method (CPM) Network Diagram in time-scale logic diagram, by week starting on Monday, grouped (banded) by phase <u>and location</u> and sorted by early start days.

Response:

2. In 8-3.2.2, do we really want the "budgeted cost" for each schedule activity? This requirement is effectively asking for a cost loaded schedule, but doing it in a back-handed way.

2) a report with the following schedule activity information for each construction activity: identification, description, original duration, remaining duration, early start, early finish, total float, percent complete, and "budgeted cost".

Response:

3. In 8-3.2.2, suggest adding the following items in <u>red</u> to the narrative:

b) The report will describe the current critical path of the project and indicate if this has changed in the last 30 calendar days <u>or previous update and compare the path to the accepted baseline schedule</u>. Discuss current successes or problems that have affected either the critical path's length or have caused a shift in the critical path within the last 30 calendar days. Identify specific activities, progress, or events that may reasonably be anticipated to impact the critical path within the next 30 calendar days, either to affect its length or to shift it to an alternate path.

Response:

4. In 8-3.2.2, suggest adding the following items in <u>red</u> to the narrative:

c) List all schedule logic or duration changes that have been made to the schedule since the previous submission <u>and identify all added activities, including additional Work Orders and Supplemental Agreements</u>. For each change, describe the basis for the change and specifically identify the affected activities by identification number.

Response:

****

Randy Cropp
561-310-7711
rcropp@conegraham.com

Comments: (1-28-11)

We need to review all aspects of the schedule including the use of P3 or P6. Other programs exist that are more user-friendly and made more for linear scheduling. Acceptance of the schedule is not a one-way street. The Engineer must show that his rejection of the schedule is based in the specifications or violation of something in the plans. If we are to change the schedule based on how the Engineer wants us to proceed, then it is not our schedule but the Department's. We need to delete resource loading of the schedules. We find no benefit of this and we do not see how the Department would even use this. I was on one of the original task

forces for scheduling and industry made the same suggestions 10 years ago. We need a complete overhaul of this specification.

Response:

****