



St. Louis County Department of Transportation  
ACEC/MO Liaison Committee Meeting Agenda



April 15, 2024  
1:30 pm to 2:30pm  
Virtual Meeting

| <u>ACEC MO Liaison Committee Members</u> | <u>St. Louis County Members</u> |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Michael Brown - TREKK                    | Joe Kulesa                      |
| Kevin Kriete - HDR                       | Pamela Thebeau                  |
| Nick Correnti – TWM, Inc.                | Glenn Henninger                 |
| Brian Eades – CMT                        | Dan Howell                      |
| Linda Moen – EFK Moen                    | Adam Spector                    |
| Ryan Hagerty – GBA (Chair)               |                                 |

**Agenda Items**

- 1) Introductions
- 2) Director Update
  - a) No major changes to staffing with some vacancies.
  - b) The County asked the consultant community for insight into how to get projects going faster since it currently is taking between 6 and 9 months from solicitation to contract execution. The following ideas were proposed.
    - i) Solicit prior to the May EWG TIP selections to get a jump on contract negotiations and could have NTP by October. The County has received 7 to 9 projects funded by EWG. The idea is to bundle these projects into 2 or 3 groups and solicit to consultants. The selected consultants could then not have certain projects that get funded and would not be designed.
    - ii) Select consultants before the May TIP selections and then bundle the projects after the County knows which projects were funded.
    - iii) Advertise the anticipated scoring of the applications when putting out the consultants so that the consultants can access the risk.
    - iv) Startup agreement which would allow the consultant to be “under contract” before the actual contract is finalized. The County did not think this idea would be allowed under current ordinances.
- 3) Consultant Solicitations
  - a) 6 Month Lookahead
  - b) Consultant Led Project Management and Design – Status Update or Lessons Learned
    - i) Negotiations are complete with 1 project having NTP and the other awaiting MoDOT funds obligation. No update at this time.
  - c) Refresher on the rules for the Cone of Silence.

- i) Consultants can discuss any project on the 6-month look ahead before the solicitation comes out. After the solicitation is out until the project is under contract there can be no discussions.
  - ii) Any information given by the County will likely end up in the solicitation.
  - iii) The County encourages questions about upcoming projects before they come out so they know what is important to the consultant community.
- 4) CAD Workspace Update
  - a) Status of new County Workspace
    - i) No status update. The next step is to get EFK Moen plugged into the County environment.
- 5) Discussion on Ending Retainage requirements for County Contracts
  - a) Does policy change to stop requiring retainage mean consultants can bill out retainage withheld on current projects and stop deducting retainage on all invoices?
    - i) The terms of the contract will continue for the life of the project and so if there are currently retainage requirements those will still need to be fulfilled.
    - ii) It could be possible to amend the contract and remove the retainage requirements but that will need to be a change order.
    - iii) Any future consultant contracts will not have retainage requirements.
- 6) Discussion on feedback that Consultant community is overpromising on schedules and then not meeting them.
  - a) The County has been experiencing slow response times from consultants and they are in danger of losing funding based upon MoDOT's edict to meet deadlines.
  - b) They believe that this is due to staff shortages.
  - c) Moving forward the County will begin doing consultant reviews at all milestones to track pain points for future projects and the identify early any schedule issues.
  - d) The County will send out the evaluation form shortly.
- 7) Discussion on Right-of-Way
  - a) Possibility of removing excessive information from right-of-way sheets
    - i) The County has not dug into this yet. The County ROW team likes having all of the information on the sheets for negotiations.
- 8) Consultant led Utility Coordination Status and Updates
  - a) Previous meeting mentioned that the County is considering utility only contracts
    - i) Moving to a utility only contract is not in the County's interest right now.
    - ii) In general there has been a mixed bag with utility coordination by consultants.
- 9) Discussion on Survey issues
  - a) Possibility of using 100% consultant provided survey rather than pick up surveys
    - i) Surveying has been evaluated on a project by project basis in order to keep County surveyors busy. They have had great success with consultant surveyors.
  - b) Previous meeting mentioned interest in digital twins
    - i) No progress on this front but the County is interested in this concept and would welcome more discussion.
- 10) Update on STL County committee on County Standards and bid items

- a) The committee is currently focused on traffic calming details. Other than that no updates.

11) Open Discussion

12) Next Meeting

- a) Last week of June 2024

13) Action Items



St. Louis County Department of Transportation  
ACEC/MO Liaison Committee Meeting Agenda  
(Addendum to 4/15/2024 meeting)



April 23, 2024  
11:00 am to 11:30am  
Virtual Meeting

| <u>ACEC MO Liaison Committee Members</u> | <u>St. Louis County Members</u> |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Don Wichern – Bartlett & West            | Joe Kulesa                      |
| Kevin Kriete - HDR                       | Pamela Thebeau                  |
| Nick Correnti – TWM, Inc.                |                                 |
| Brian Eades – CMT                        |                                 |
| Steve Stirnemann – EDSI                  |                                 |
| Ryan Hagerty – GBA (Chair)               |                                 |

**Agenda Items**

- 1) The purpose of this meeting is a follow up discussion from the previously held meeting on 4/15/2024 to discuss the proposed changes to the way in which STL County solicits projects prior to funding obligation as discussed in the previous meeting.
  - a) The liaison committee put forth their opposition to this new proposal because it would be an increased risk to the consultant community. If the projects end up not getting funded and therefore not happening then the consultant would need to put in a significant effort for a project that would never come to fruition and therefore waste resources. The County accepted this position and decided to not move forward with the proposed changes.
  - b) The County brought up other ideas to lessen the amount of contract time. An idea of putting limits on the negotiation time for consultants was brought up. In general, the County would like the initial scope and fee within 1 month of selection, if not sooner. A good timeline would be to have negotiations complete within 2 months of consultant selection. This would in turn reduce the total contracting time by 1 month. The County did recognize that most of the consultant delays that they have been seeing are with subconsultants and not necessarily the prime.
  - c) Another idea the County had to reduce contract time is to implement consultant evaluations at all milestones of the project including the contract negotiations. The goal being to speed up negotiation times.