Minutes:

1) **Introductions.**
   - Introductions were made around the room, starting with Jeff Bohler who asked everyone to discuss their favorite project of their career as an informal ice-breaker.

2) **MoDOT Staff Changes since last meeting**
   - Jeff B. explained the various changes since they last meeting of the SL ACEC meeting in November, including:
     - Stuart McNeil is now the new South/West Area PM
     - Area Traffic Engineers were announced: Eddie Watkins for St. Charles and North County; Yan Gluzman for Franklin and Jefferson Counties and the City of St. Louis; and Jeff Baird for South/West Area.
     - Chris Morgan is the new RE for South/West Area, replacing John Grana who retired.
     - Statewide, Troy Hughes was named the Administrator of Railroads, and Greg Leary is the new Railroad PM.

3) **Missouri Utility and Private Line Location and Relocation – Code of State Regulation**
   - Tim S. gave an update on MoDOT’s effort to revise the Administrative Rules (Code of State Regulations) on file with the Secretary of State’s office in response to two bills that were enacted into law in 2018.
     - **SB598** stipulated that MoDOT’s utility corridor would be expanded from six feet to up to 12 feet where space is reasonably available. This law also required MoDOT to establish rules for administering the utilities variance process.
     - 7 CSR 10-3.010 and 7 CSR 10-3.020 were sent out to stakeholders in December to share our proposed language changes. MoDOT is holding off
on sending these rule changes to the Governor for his review and approval until after the legislative session ends in May. From the Governor’s office, it later goes to the Secretary of State and is advertised for another 30 day comment period before it gets adopted.

- HB1991 was passed in 2018 in reference to the Small Cell Wireless Deployment Act. It is our intent to write a separate new rule for this Act. Our goal would be to share our proposed draft with our utility stakeholders sometime in April and catch this one up with the first rules.

4) On-Call Update

- Laura Ellen provided an update on the on-call solicitation. She stated that both the LPS on-calls and MoDOT’s on-call listing had been updated on the website, and that it was a very long and arduous process for all those involved at the DOT. While there would not be an opportunity for individual firms to debrief on whether they were selected or not in a given category, Laura did want this group to debrief on the process at our next meeting. Items of interest that could be discussed may include changes in scoring, length of process, number of consultants by category, etc. (Agenda topic for next meeting)
- A question was asked if it was possible to know or understand how many submittals each category received. By the end of the meeting Laura relayed the following numbers:
  - SL Roadway category – 52 submittals (selected 13)
  - SL Construction category – 26 submittals (selected 9)
  - SL Surveying category – 31 submittals (selected 6)
  - Bridge Statewide category – 55 submittals (selected 12)

5) Major Project updates

- Blanchette Bridge – gave contractor an early NTP and it’s expected that most of the work will be completed this year, with just off-peak closures or lane drops next year.
- Meramec River Bridge – the contractor will finish up the westbound bridge in 2021 so the traffic switch and impacts to traffic will remain through the year.
- 22nd Street Interchange – work will progress on this project for the new soccer stadium in downtown SL.
- I-44 – several projects ongoing that will continue this summer, including the section from 39th Street to Kingshighway and the Jefferson Avenue Bridge, both in the City of SL.
- I-270 – Infra grant has been submitted for the gap section, and they expect to hear something this summer, but construction is expected to start June 2020.
- Route N – the Final Draft EA documents are submitted, but since the project is not funded and is not on the long-range transportation plan, these are large hurdles to obtaining the FONSI.

6) SL Upcoming Consultant Opportunities / Funding Outlook

- Tom Evers gave a presentation to the group that he was giving the AGC later in the afternoon. The presentation covered the highlights of the funding outlook for this year and the five years in the current STIP. Some of these highlights included:
  - 2021-2025 STIP includes $4.6B in statewide improvements including three major funding sources: general revenue, bonding, and federal funds.
• General revenue includes the Governor’s cost share program ($50M), the Governor’s $50M for bridge improvements, and $45M of debt service.
• Bonding includes $201M in 2020 and drops to $100M in 2022, which frees up additional funding for new projects in the STIP, which in SL can be system improvements since our district’s maintenance needs are met.
• Federal includes injections like the Infra and FARM grants among others.
• In all, the 2021-2025 STIP includes $1.6B in SL District improvements encompassing 5700 lane miles, including 57 major bridges, 1000 bridges, 1000 traffic signals, and 110 dynamic message signs.

• Jeff discussed several projects that will be coming to consultants in the next few months:
  - Route 50 resurfacing (potentially two projects combined)
  - Bridge rehabs / complete rehab checklists for several sites and bridges
  - I-55/67 Mobility
  - I-64/70/61 interchange scoping
  - Safety 2.0
  - ADA remnant program
  - Replace I-70 structural signs

• Tim Schroeder also alerted the group about a large project in the SE district that includes 10 total miles of preliminary design and of that, 4-miles of final design along Route 67 into Arkansas. This is a major corridor and includes environmental through final design and quickly because of Governor’s Cost Share monies.

7) Potential change for Consultant / PM mixer to late Spring
• Based on a suggestion from a member firm, the group discussed the potential for moving the consultant mixer to the Spring, when more of the STIP was finalized and more of the projects intended for consultants were better identified. This suggestion was received well by MoDOT who agreed.
• Jeff will look for a time in late Spring or early Summer (May) for our final meeting of the year.
• A group suggestion was to also include major construction updates at this meeting as well, so the group can be advocates for safety in and by avoiding work zones to their constituency. This group is constantly asked for information about major projects and construction zones impacting them.

  • Note: due to the recent events, this meeting has not been scheduled and will be postponed until the state of group gatherings is restored.

8) Tom Blair Time (not present)

9) Other / Next Meeting
• Tom Evers pointed out that he has some concerns over how long it was taking consultants to deliver a scope and fee submittal from the time they were selected. He asked the group to think about ways to speed up the process, short of requiring MoDOT to put a schedule within the proposal documents. Several ACEC members spoke about the varying reasons why schedules differ (subconsultants, difficulty of projects, waiting on answers from those with regulatory oversight or others, etc.). The group decided that the best
course of action would be for the PM, at the kick-off meeting, to discuss and settle on a schedule that worked for both parties depending on the project scope.

- Jason mentioned that at a recent ACEC meeting, he heard that the SE District was concerned with what they considered excessive OH rates of some of their firms, and quoted the notes from the liaison committee meeting that said the District was looking for ways to take OH into consideration in future submittals. After Laura Ellen (who fell out of her chair in shock) returned, she assured the group that this practice is not acceptable and would not ever be used in the selection of a consultant. She stated that she would follow up with the Districts and make sure this information was clearly stated.

- JC Murray offered that his company had forbidden (as of 3/3) company travel of any kind, and prohibited their people from attending conferences or seminars because of the outbreak of the Coronavirus. He offered that as a reason why he wouldn’t have staff attending the TEAM conference and wondered if other firms were considering the same? At the time of the meeting, there was no discussion of cancelling the conference but the committee was closely monitoring the events.