



SCDOT/CAGC Joint Committee Meeting  
September 22, 2010  
Minutes

Attendees:

Marty McKee, Thrift Development Corp.  
Sally Paul, SPC, Inc.  
Grady Wicker, Eagle Construction Co., Inc.  
Scott Fant, Sloan Construction Co., Inc.  
Benjy Hardee, A.O. Hardee & Son, Inc.  
Ken Atkinson, Palmetto Corp.  
Ben Whetstone, C. R. Jackson/Satterfield Construction  
Randy Snow, United Contractors  
John Jordan, Cherokee, Inc.  
Greg Cook, Mountain Creek Contractors, Inc.  
Todd Steagall, SCDOT  
Stephanie Jackson-Amell, SCDOT District 3  
Charles Matthews, SCDOT  
Charles Eleazer, SCDOT  
Jim Feda, SCDOT  
Lee Neighbors, SCDOT District 2  
Andy Johnson, SCDOT – OMR  
Carolyn Penry, FHWA  
Jim Porth, SCDOT, District 7  
Kevin DuBose, SCDOT, District 5  
Doug McClure, SCDOT  
Robbie Isgett, SCDOT, District # 1  
Mark Attaway, SCDOT  
John Walsh, SCDOT  
Leland Colvin, SCDOT  
Dennis Garber, SCDOT  
Ray Vaughan, SCDOT

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

**Old Business**

CPM Schedule Spec Update

Charles Eleazer reported Patty Gambill is making some final changes to the spec and we should have something more concrete at the November meeting.

#### Waterborne Paint/Thermo Shortage

Charles Eleazer reported paint is not the issue now as much as the thermo. There is a meeting today to discuss options available. Some suggestions are that the subs may request through the primes to delete thermo with documentation and do a good paint line. Then thermo can be done in the spring. It may not be possible to delete the thermo on some ARRA projects or interstate projects.

Jim Feda asked about responsibility for putting together contracts to replace the deleted thermo. Charles added some help will be necessary from maintenance.

Grady Wicker – It is getting better, but there is still a shortage and the price has not come down. Charles answered SCDOT is trying to ease the shortage impact to keep the sub contractors in business.

Epoxy requires a different machine and subs may not have this equipment, and it is more expensive to purchase.

SCDOT hopes for a final word within a week.

For projects finishing now (already bid), this does not apply? Todd Steagall responded they are reviewing case by case.

#### Borrow Material Spec Issues

Marty McKee - This was sent to the Road Subcommittee from the July Joint Committee meeting for discussion. Jeff Sizemore (SCDOT) attended the August Road Subcommittee meeting and discussed geotech requirements and reasons for the spec in specific projects. Soil samples are tested and the project is designed around what is locally available. The District offices have the information as to where the material is available.

The contractors discussed several issues/concerns:

- Where the soil is available may be a small section and not enough quantity to complete the project. Additionally, you have cost of getting a borrow pit permit, trucking, and also the fact that some land owners will not sell the land to provide the borrow.

- More information is needed before bidding to know where it is available so all are bidding the same. It is risky to bid anything other than what is in the contract.
- An issue is the time line available from the ad being published until bid date. The contractor has to find the soil, have a lab test, and if the test says no, have to find another sample, etc. etc. in time to bid the project. These tests can cost up to \$3,000. There have been situations where none of the samples were consistent and the material is not readily available. This results in contractors bidding differently. The contractors bidding correctly often are not awarded the project.

Suggestions to consider:

- 60 day award/time line
- Note in special provision
- Using GEO Grid in lieu of specified material

#### Update – EPA Effluent Limitations

Ray Vaughan reported that the Small Business Administration and the Homebuilders have challenged the proposed EPA ELA requirements. . EPA has admitted the 280 NTU number is flawed. For now the 280 NTU ruling is abated for 18 months. They will revisit this and issue another ruling (approximately 02/12).

All other areas remain in force and most of these areas are already being complied with such as seeding in 14 days, pollution prevention, how debris and trash are handled, where trash receptacles are placed, concrete wash discharge, sediment basins, vehicle fueling. Porta toilets are also addressed as to where they can be placed.

#### Update – Certification Courses

Tri County Tech is now handling these courses. Go to [www.tctc.edu](http://www.tctc.edu) and go to inspector services. They will schedule more classes as the ones posted are filled.

#### **New Business**

##### Right of Way Surveys

Todd Steagall reported that SCDOT is to mark the right of way and is developing a spec for this to identify where to place pins, monuments and spacing. John Walsh added LLR made these changes and there is some vagueness. The plat has to comply with the law. Any time SCDOT acquires a right of way, a plat will be needed to comply. It will be a lump sum item.

### Pipe Specifications Issues

There are projects where “smooth wall pipe” on the plans is not specific to the type or class of the pipe. The plans need to designate the class of the pipe to be used.

Charles Eleazer talked with Henry Cross. There was a period of time where the plans did not address and the burden was put on the contractor. As of August, plans being developed will include if the pipe is to be anything other than Class 3. We do not think it will be a separate bid item.

For plans on projects prepared before August the contractor must determine pipe class.

Flowable Fill is sometimes shown as a bid item. However, often when it is used to back fill pipe, it is not paid for as it is considered included in the price for the pipe. Need to standardize quantities when flowable fill is required as backfill when a paved road is crossed.

Slope drain pipe – new pipe spec and select fill is not intended for this item.

Protecting the ends of driveway pipe, especially in the upstate needs to be reviewed.

### Design Build Subcommittee

We have discussed forming this committee but have not done so. Leland Colvin reported the ACEC is looking at moving this to CAGC. Leland is a member of the committee and will follow through to make sure this happens.

Need the names of contractors and SCDOT to be on the committee with ACEC. Three representatives from each group is suggested. Send the names to Mary McKee or Leslie Hope for contractor reps.

The purpose of this committee is to look at procedures in other states that SCDOT could take advantage of. There are lots of opportunities to present alternative designs that will make everyone more competitive. Contractors spend a lot of money just to bid a Design/Build project and this will be honest disclosure between everyone to be sure you are going in the right direction.

### Contractor Pay

There seems to be a slowness in contractors getting check/payments. Charles Eleazer has asked questions of the Accounting Office they are getting the payments out within the time frame the law requires which is 21 days from when accounting receives approval to pay from the Construction Office. Unless contractors have a specific situation for SCDOT to review, we cannot identify further issues with late payment.

Marty McKee added he is hearing this is an on going problem. Some are seeing 35 to 48 days to receive payments.

Charles Eleazer reported that 25% of the projects are more than 10% behind schedule.

### **Subcommittee Reports**

#### Road Subcommittee

Several areas have already been discussed.

Todd and FHWA are working on update of recycle base spec. The FHWA has the replacement spec to review and anticipate the new spec first being used in the December or January letting.

Brian Parnell reported at the meeting that all forms used on projects are now on the Extranet. They can be completed there or printed to complete. The updated correct form will always be on the extranet.

#### Bridge Subcommittee

Charles Matthews reported.

Fast track projects were discussed. No surveys are done for these and site excavation is a bid item. Also discussed was raising the grade and using asphalt. SCDOT allows the use of asphalt but does not pay for it.

Rebar support on bridge decks require plastic chairs. This is noted on the plans as there was an error in the spec books. The plans override the spec book so contractors need to be sure to read the plans.

Stay in Place Forms – plastic chair, metal – looking at price and durability.

Crane safety specifications will have to be changed. OSHA will have tighter requirements where everyone has to be certified. We have to comply with OSHA and may not be able to use the AGC course.

#### Project Development Subcommittee

Did not meet.

#### Utility Subcommittee

The Subcommittee did not meet. Greg Cook reported on the status of the Utility legislation.

The recent explosion in San Francisco will wake up a lot of people as to what can happen.

The utilities did not come to the table. The Senate understands and the bill is being written based on what AGC presented. We are moving forward.

#### Supplier Subcommittee

The next meeting is being scheduled for November, 2010.

#### **Other Business**

The next meeting is November 17, 2010.

The meeting was adjourned.