



## MINUTES OF THE SCDOT/CAGC ROAD SUBCOMMITTEE February 10, 2005

### Present:

Tom Cook, US Group, Inc., Co-Chairman  
Lindy Hallman, SCDOT, Co-Chairman  
Danny Shealy, SCDOT  
Jim Frick, SCDOT  
Greg Ashmore, Ashmore Brothers, Inc.  
W. H. "Bill" Bailey, Cherokee, Inc.  
Ben Bass, Jr., Rea Contracting, LLC  
Chris Davis, Sanders Brothers Construction Co., Inc.  
Sally Paul, Sanitary Plumbing Contractors  
David Riley, Weaver Co., Inc.  
John Johnson, SCDOT Dist. 5 Const. Engineer  
Melvin Merck, SCDOT Dist. 3 Const. Engineer  
Marty McKee, Thrift Development Corporation  
Doug Truluck, Sloan Construction Company, Inc.  
Steve Page, CRM East  
Ben Smith, CRM West  
Sammy Hendrix, CAGC

### Absent:

Jim Ewart, U.S. Constructors, Inc.                      Excused  
Stacey Black, Satterfield Construction Co.      Excused

### Call to Order

The scheduled 9:00 meeting was delayed for a presentation by Mr. Tony Chapman, interim State Engineer, on Chip Seal contracts. This item was on the Subcommittee agenda and was presented first because of many non-committee attendees. Mr. Chapman explained to the group that SCDOT had review the problems with the chip seal

treatment and that the projects contracted would go forward with some changes to the specifications using a light weight aggregate. He also noted that the program must be closely monitored by both the SCDOT and Contractor Inspectors during the treatment process if contractors want this highway preservation method to continue.

Mr. Chapman asked all parties who were participating in the chip seal contracts to meet with Danny Shealy at the close of the meeting to set up appointments to discuss each particular project that had been contracted.

Mr. Hallman called the meeting to order at 10:15 am. Introductions were made and a sign-up sheet was passed around for each attendee to sign. Mr. Cook informed the committee that Jim Ewart could not be at the meeting due to a conflict. Stacey Black also had a conflict and could not attend. Mr. Cook informed the committee that we had expanded the membership of the Road Subcommittee as results of the partnering session that CAGC and SCDOT had last fall. The committee has added more contractors and SCDOT added two District Representatives. The committee will now send recommendations to the Joint Committee for approval and implementation. This process should expedite communications and improve the construction process for SCDOT and contractors.

### Old Business

#### A. Update on Work Zone Safety & Flagger

Mr. Hallman asked if any contractors had responded to the Draft Memo to SCDOT Contractors and Sub-Contractors concerning work zone training requirements. Sammy reported that Sloan Construction was the only one that he was aware of that responded to John Gaither in the Safety office. Mr. Hallman stated that he would send Sammy the letter again for distribution to the subcommittee and others. He asked for a response date of March 1, 2005.

#### B. Erosion Control Class

Mr. Hallman stated that the workshop dates, exam dates and locations for the Certified Erosion Prevention and Sediment control Inspector Program Training needed to be distributed. The information will be placed on the Carolinas AGC web page in the Highway Section and mailed to all highway committees. The dates are:

#### **Workshop Dates**

March 1 - Greenville Embassy Suites Hotel at 670 Verdae Blvd.

March 2 - Columbia Metropolitan Convention Center at 1101 Lincoln Street

March 3 – Charleston Embassy Suites Hotel at 5055 International Blvd.

## Exam Dates

March 22 - Charleston  
Columbia  
Greenville

## NEW BUSINESS

### A. Chip Seal Contracts

This was discussed at the beginning of the meeting and noted in the minutes.

### B. Quantity under runs – “major item of work”

Marty McKee stated that either some clarification be made in the new specification concerning what contract items may be combined to meet the definition of "major item of work"(10% of total contract), or that the definition be changed to a lower percentage. His main concern is that many of the more complex contracts have so many different contract items that most single items do not qualify as a major item of work. Thus, there are no methods to request a price modification for large contract items that overrun or under-run the original contract quantity by more than 25%.

Committee Recommendation: *The specification book needs to define some kind of grouping of items to qualify as a major item of work.*

### C. Proof roll requirement – unclassified excavation

Mr. Cook stated that he did not think that proof rolling was necessary on each layer of the fill placement. He stated that different interpretations were being applied to the specifications for this procedure. There needs to be a clarification as to what is necessary.

Committee Recommendation: Review of updated standard specifications prior to publication.

### D. Construction entrances – pay item

It was noted that in the new Borrow Specification that construction entrances are a required item of work for erosion control and the committee request that this be a

pay item. Mr. Hallman said that SCDOT has recognized this problem and that it will be a bid item.

E. Template on project schedules under 5 Million

Mr. Hallman stated that Steve Page had been contracted by SCDOT to design two scheduling templates for all projects. Mr. Page presented two draft specs to the committee for projects under 5 million and for projects over 5 million. He will finalize the drafts and present to the committee and the contracting community.

F. On Call Grassing Contractors

Mr. Hallman reported that SCDOT would like for the road subcommittee to present a list of pay items that might be needed for the department to establish on call grassing contractors. Mr. Cook commented that this committee had a meeting last year with all the grassing contractors doing business in SC to present this idea. He asked Sally Paul to contact these contractors and present a pay item list such as Traffic Control, Testing, Accessibility, etc. to the committee at its next meeting.

G. Safety Issue / Narrow Shoulders

The Joint Committee discussed this issue at its last meeting and asked that the road subcommittee place the item on their next agenda. The issue was discussed at the road subcommittee meeting and it was determined that the problems is occurring when contracts requiring minimal widening on secondary roads causes a problem of basically no shoulders.

*Committee Recommendation: Secondary Roads that do not have adequate shoulder room should not be widened if it will cause the safety intent to be void. If SCDOT can provide adequate funding for the project to be properly widened then we recommend a 4" wide rib edge line on improving the shoulders and signs stating Narrow Shoulders.*

H. Payments – Asphalt & Concrete removal

The committee wanted to make sure that the contractors were fully aware of payment based on the spec book section 202.05 & 202.06 page 125-127. It is our understanding that unless a separate bid item is listed for asphalt and concrete removal by L.F., S.Y. or C.Y., the contractor will be required to perform all removal items at the quoted unit price for removal and disposal of existing pavement. Under these conditions separate payment will not be make for asphalt removal regardless of depth.

## Other Business

### Next Meeting Date / Location

The next meeting date will be April 14, 2005 and the location will be announced at a later date.