

# Road Subcommittee Meeting

February 19, 2009

## Minutes

### Attendees:

Marty McKee, Thrift Development Corp.  
Sally Paul, SPC, Inc.  
Chris Davis, Sanders Bros.  
Michael Crenshaw, King Asphalt, Inc.  
Greg Ashmore, Ashmore Bros.  
Todd Steagall, SCDOT  
Henry Cross, SCDOT  
Charles Eleazer, SCDOT  
Jamie Kendall, SCDOT  
Ed Eargle, SCDOT  
Joe McNamara, Spectra IS  
Mike Marshall, Spectra IS  
Langdon Mitchell, Morgan Corp.

The meeting was called to order by Marty McKee with introductions.

### **New Business**

Joe McNamara, Mike Marshall and Landon Mitchell made a presentation on the Digital Plan Project – Spectra I.S.

This project is to release electronic files at Bid time. The benefit is speed in getting the bid completed with fewer errors. It should eliminate manual digitizing. What estimating softwares are being used is information needed to complete. Four formats being used are XML, SML DTM, Cross section files (3 versions) and DGN (line work).

The presentation showed how everything is brought together.

Greg Ashmore asked what steps are needed to formally recommend.

Ed Eargle stated a formal request to DOT is needed to pursue putting in more resources. There will be a cost to DOT and this request will support the need. It should be sent to Tony Chapman.

Sammy Hendrix will have the Road subcommittee submit this at the next Joint Committee meeting in March.

### **Borrow pit set-up**

Charles Eleazer related the question is the 80/20 split and when the last percentage is released. RCE's look at the pit before the NOT is submitted. If the pit is being used for another project, when the contractor receives the permit, DOT is considered out and can release the 20 percent. An issue seems to be when the DOT permit is for DOT project.

If it is a DOT permit and the next job is not a DOT job, then the contractor would get a new permit. The RCE will still look at the pit to release so the contractor can proceed.

Marty McKee asked if a time limit such as 30 days after the NOT is submitted could be put in place for the release. This can be recommended to the Joint Committee.

Todd Steagall suggested if it is a 90/10 split, pay the 10 percent on the final estimate.

Marty asked for clarification if "final" is the one sent in by the Resident, or the Estimate that comes after the Final Quantities are reviewed by Columbia? Charles stated a copy of the submitted NOT should be given to the resident for his file.

**Recommendation:** 80/20 split within 30 days after the submission of the NOT. When the item Borrow Pit Set-up is included in the bid items, 80% of the lump sum payment for this item will be made when the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit is approved. The final 20% will be paid 30 days after all pits used on the project have the Notice of Termination submitted or when all pits are closed for that project.

### **New Seeding Spec**

Sally Paul asked for clarification on some of the issues they are encountering with the new spec.

Charles Eleazer gave the following proposal for the watering portion:

Less than ½ acre would be no water

One half to 5 acres would be 54,300 gallons  
Five to 20 acres would be 135,750 gallons  
Twenty and up would be 271,000 gallons.

Marty McKee asked how is the water measured? Charles agreed that this needs to be added to the spec. It is currently the District Engineers decision on whether to water. Sally added that the trucks can have a meter installed to measure.

Concerning the qualified product list, Charles states the companies need to provide specs to Mike Lockman at OMR to be considered for the Qualified Product List.

Charles added the seeding spec on resurfacing will be reviewed. DOT is talking to Clemson concerning fertilizer so that DOT can provide information for the different regions of the state and which fertilizer works best.

Sally added another area that is not always clear is permanent and temporary cover. That needs to be reviewed also.

### **Substantial Work Complete Date on A+B Projects**

Charles reported this was discussed at the Joint Committee meeting and there may be a need for an alternate definition. We need to take into consideration when you bid what are the possible wait times.

Marty added this can be a problem with completion time occurring several months before spring when thermo can be done. When DOT sets the completion date, do they factor in the time for thermo? DOT says yes. With A+B we will need to know when bidding when the thermo has to be done.

Charles noted this change will be in a special provision.

Marty added it would be good to put "revised" or a note on Bidx, at least the first month, that there is a change. Contractors will know to review.

Charles does not think it can be added to Bidx. This is what the special provision is for. A date is referenced on supplemental specs. For now, use the old spec for A+B time.

Decision: A+B falls to the spec currently in the Black spec book.

### **Flex time on resurfacing packages**

Charles Eleazer reported that the stimulus money for resurfacing projects will require completion by the end of November. For example, the contractor will have sixty days from their start date to complete the project but it must be completed no later than the end of November. This will help the contractor schedule his work.

Marty McKee added this is where the problem arises with having the thermo work completed due to the number of projects.

Greg Ashmore noted that if they were bid in March, contracts awarded by April, that would only give contractors 6 months to complete all projects.

Charles agrees this is a legitimate concern and DOT can look into one thermo project to cover all jobs. Note added after meeting: a separate thermo contract will not be used. Thermo will be included in each project, but SCDOT is considering a later completion date for the thermo only.

Marty asked why the November date since the money just has to be obligated in 120 days. Charles added that FHWA has to approve, and be ready for advertising to meet the obligated definition. Chris Davis noted that to get project complete by the November deadline DOT will have to speed up the award process.

Sammy Hendrix added the Commission voted and passed the percentages for \$200M of the stimulus money. It will be 33% resurfacing, 16% interstate, 5% safety and 12% bridge. Charles added that \$50M is for resurfacing to be obligated in the first 120 days and the state resurfacing program will be in addition to that amount.

### **Alternate Pipe**

Ed Eargle explained that the reinforced concrete pipe fill height table is not ready for publication yet. The other pipe materials (SRAP, CAAP, & HPDE) fill height tables have been published in the Department's Standard Drawings for several months.

Ed provided a handout and explained the various ways that alternate pipe will be placed on the plans.

After the review and discussion of three methods to show alternate pipe on the plans, the consensus of the attendees preferred example #1 which dithered the drainage on the plan and profile sheets and added "D" sheets to the plans that would also have the alternate pipe table on the lower portion of the "D" sheet.

## **Pre-Marking Patches Before Bid Letting**

Marty McKee – Some asphalt contractors have reported significant reductions/deletions in Full Depth Patching quantities on some projects. The question has arisen if the patches are being measured before the plans are produced, or if a formula is used based on the length of the road to be resurfaced. If the patches are measured beforehand, could they be marked when measured so contractors could see their locations before bidding?

Greg Ashmore - We cannot figure production if we do not know how far apart the patches are. If they are not marked you can't figure a good bid. Pre-marking confirms if measurements are true and the contractor can determine better the time for the job and the quantities. When the contractor rides the road to bid, we sometimes have to guess what/where DOT wants patched. Also, if the quantities are significantly reduced or deleted it is an additional penalty on the contractor because they may have not bid another project because they thought they had more work than they actually had.

Charles – We need to see if this problem is in certain districts more than others or statewide. Upstate District 3 seems to be having more problems with this.

Marty McKee will poll asphalt contractors in all districts for feedback.

## **CPM Scheduling**

Marty McKee – Monthly update is sent in. Contractor is notified several months later it is wrong. Other updates have been sent not knowing the previous one was wrong. Thus, the Contractor now must correct ALL the updates that have been submitted. This makes additional work on the Contractor and SCDOT.

Patty Gambill– Are the updates on time? If they are being sent per the spec, then the contractor should get a response before the next one is due.

Chris Davis – this has occurred on several projects. The resident and project manager being able to review and understand is a problem. Accountability is needed for the people on the project to respond. They should review before the next estimate is due.

Patty – It should turn around fast if they are receiving on time. Residents do need training. We are working on a new spec and training. There were some areas of confusion in the old spec such as when the 15 days begin, etc. When you get an estimate there should be a fax cover sheet of what items were not provided. Everything needs to be completed to be paid.

Patty also noted that at the Clemson Conference there will be a discussion item on measuring contract status so everyone knows.

The link for the conference is <http://www.clemson.edu/t3s/index.htm>

### **Other Business**

Charles noted that fraudulent letters are being mailed out again that claim to be from USDOT. Be aware of this if you should receive one.

The next meeting is schedule for April 16, 2009.