

Meeting Minutes
SCDOT/ACEC/AGC Alternative Delivery Sub-Committee Meeting
3/16/2022 @ 9:30 AM

I. Welcome/Introductions

SCDOT	ACEC	AGC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chris Gaskins • Jae Mattox • Joy Riley • Clay Richter • Brooks Bickley • Ben McKinney • Brad Reynolds • Jason Byrd • Randy King • Chris Lacy • Will McGoldrick • <i>David Hebert</i> • Daniel Burton • Barbara Wessinger • Brian Gambrell • Carmen Wright • Tyler Clark • David Rister • <i>Tad Kitowicz*</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walker Roberts • Aaron Goldberg • David Taylor • David Russell 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pete Weber • Rob Loar • Lee Bradley • Chris Boyd • Jim Seybert

(Attended, Absent) *FHWA

II. Project Updates

- Carolina Crossroads Phase 2 – Contract awarded to Archer-United
- Closed and Load Restricted Bridges 2021-1 – District 4 with eight bridges. Awarded to Reeves/RK&K.
- Cross Island Parkway Toll Conversion – Apparent best-value team APAC-ICE selected, Contract and NTP imminent. Awarded to APAC/ICE.
- 2022 Anticipated Procurements
 - US 301 over Four-Hole Swamp – Expedited bridge replacement project, not emergency procurement. Design-Build Prep work to be completed internally. Two-phase approach, RFQ March 21, 2022. Early Coordination meeting held March 3, 2022.

- I-20 over Wateree, River and Overflow Bridges – Scope: Main river bridges to be replaced, overflow bridges to be rehabilitated. Inclusive within design-build contract. RFQ expected in May, executed contract 2023.
- Carolina Crossroads Phase 3 – RFQ anticipated in Summer 2022. Alternative Delivery will offer open forum anticipated Early 2022. New RFP Agreement document under development. Open forum to be offered for industry comment on CCR PH3 and template. Scheduled for May 3, 2022.
- Bridge Package 14 – Five bridges in Cherokee County. RFQ in June.
- Bridge Package 15 – Bridges in Florence, Anderson, and Chester. RFQ in September.
- **2023+ Anticipated Procurements**
 - I-26/I-95 Interchange Improvements – Funding available. Design-Build prep contract imminent. Procurement to begin on Interchange in 2023. Current scope planned to include MM 176 – 187 for 2025 and MM 165 – 176 for 2027.
 - Separate prep contracts for interchange and widening projects anticipated.
 - Portions of I-26 widening project (MM 125 – 145) to be bid-build.
 - CECS selected for prep work.
 - I-95 over Santee (Lake Marion) bridge replacement – Pursuing NEPA, DB On-call, and awaiting construction funding.
 - TranSystems selected for prep work; contract in negotiation.
 - Long Point Road/Wando Port Interchange – Currently in the process of a contract modification for preliminary and NEPA services (CDM Smith). May be accelerated to early 2023 procurement and awarded at end of 2023.
 - Mark Clark Expressway – Pursuing Final EIS and related documentation/permits. RFQ anticipated in 2024. CSRA held in early March; related cost analysis to be released once model is complete. USACE/USCG permits have not been submitted currently due to concerns over project funding.
 - Low Country Corridor West and I-26/I-526 Interchange – ROD (community impacts and R/W acquisition) is expected in 2022; first phase RFQ in 2027.
 - Five phases are currently being evaluated for project delivery type.
 - Low Country Corridor East – Currently in project development and NEPA. Procurement timeframe TBD. Public involvement meetings held in October 2021.
- New On-Call contract being developed for additional prep work. Anticipated to be executed Spring or Summer 2022.
- Note: All project information regarding has been posted to the website: [SCDOT Design-Build Overview](#).

III. **Action Items from 1/19/2022 Meeting**

- SCDOT to review and discuss examples of commitments from other states (provided by ACEC/AGC) and potential changes/implementation. **[OPEN]**
 - Ongoing internal and external discussion.

- Additional industry group meeting to be organized to discuss potential suggestions for approaches to this particular topic.
- OAD goal is to have provision/change in place for I-20 over Wateree project procurement.
- SCDOT/ACEC/AGC to discuss potential new RFQ language suggestions and/or scoring techniques for SOQ evaluations with stakeholders. **[OPEN]**
 - Ongoing discussion, however, small adjustments regarding qualifications for Key Personnel will be made in latest procurement.
 - Additional scoring examples are still desired; these adjustments to the RFQ will be forthcoming once further discussed and compared.
- ACEC/AGC to provide additional data points from other states in consideration of this additional stipend factor. **[OPEN]**
 - No feedback from industry at this time. Industry will continue to research and provide information as available.
- Clay/DOC to discuss scope for Contractor QC further with ACEC CE&I Committee and present feedback. **[CLOSED]**
 - Industry would like us to be clear within RFP and Contract on what's expected with QC submittals.
 - SCDOT does not typically dictate what QC is/isn't.
 - QC is more or less considered a "business operation" (i.e. means and methods) for contractor on how they're going to construct the project.
 - Construction manual has SCDOT testing frequencies not necessarily.
 - SCDOT intends to be more prescriptive concerning what's expected of QC plans if it varies from what the Contractor has typically provided in past projects.
- SCDOT to continue to discuss DBE language and range for percentages and update industry as available. **[OPEN]**
 - Latest draft of language circulated senior leadership. It is likely updated language will be available at the next sub-committee meeting.
- ACEC/AGC to poll and involve members in order to look for examples across industry in order to establish positive potential adoption of PDB, CM/GC, and other methods. **[OPEN]**
 - Some industry feedback provided and is being reviewed by SCDOT.
 - Industry to continue to look for examples and update SCDOT as available.

IV. Quality Credits

SCDOT

- SCDOT's goal is for the industry to recognize how quality credits are scored within Technical Proposals and what's important to SCDOT.
- Existing quality credit is a form of a commitment matrix (i.e. proposer identifies what they want scored for quality credits in similar fashion of a similarly functioning commitment matrix).
- Best-Value vs low-bid for alternative delivery projects.

- Low-bid is the exception, not the rule and will primarily be used in emergency/last minute situations.
- Projects listed on the website are planned and intended to be:
 - 50% cost, 50% quality components
 - Current discussion on the amount to assign to quality for each project.
 - Quality credits will be between 5-20% of that entire component
 - Technical score will be remainder of quality component percentage.
- Potential breakdown of scoring range on majority of procurements:
 - 45 to 55% on cost
 - 30 to 45% on technical proposal
 - 5 to 20% on quality credits
- Constraining added value and innovation component while simultaneously encouraging and emphasizing on the importance of added value and innovation
- Goals are listed in RFP Instructions in order to engage industry on, again, what is important to SCDOT. This is to encourage and emphasize specific participation on a variety of factors (i.e. time, innovation, etc.).
 - Improving safety and minimizing impacts are two major goals that are paramount to OAD and SCDOT.
 - Schedule certainty is important and related to the two major goals listed above.
- Minimize the work the proposer has to do up front and incentivize active participation with added value and innovation during procurement.
- ACEC: is there a spot in the ATC process to provide additional insight up front so that proposer's have an idea of where the technical concept stands?
 - Something that will need to be discussed within OAD. Any changes or further thoughts will be submitted before the sub-committee.
- ACEC: What separates minor points from major points of innovation?
 - This is largely team dependent but the amount attributed (i.e. potential point value) should indicate minor/major points.
- ACEC: It can be confusing to see quality scores that are the same/nearly the same on similar 0 to 100 scale. Conveying what the quality score added to their overall score is not clear.
 - Some of this has been due to lower quality component on many projects in the past. As we average higher quality credit percentages this score will begin to separate and clarify team positions with regards to this component.
- There is potential to utilize Likert scale for quality credits when evaluation teams are scoring.

V. Design-Build Team Performance Evaluations: Scoring Scale SCDOT

- SCDOT made adjustments to Likert scale in January from 11 point to 7 point scale.
 - 0 to 6, and 3 "Meets expectations", we START at 3 and go up and down.
- SCDOT often receives confusion or pushback on some of our scores and our process for the DB team performance evaluations.

- Even some of DB “top performers” have received low scores at times but are still included and short-listed on future projects due to improvements made.
- Intent is to improve the process and improve the quality of the product/teams that we receive.
- ACEC: Could you provide an average score for that period in order for each team to compare against?
 - SCDOT to discuss and investigate providing DB team performance evaluation average to industry for each evaluation period. **[ACTION]**

VI. Bridge Packages: Letters of Interest

ACEC

- Industry has received large influx of work (i.e. at times difficult to balance existing and submitting for new projects).
- In order to help firms manage their resources/personnel, would AGC/SCDOT consider pre-qualifying teams for Bridge Packages?
 - A “letter of interest” would be generated and sent for packages that proposers were interested in.
- OAD: Regarding procurement, the bridge packages are already been streamlined and are simplistic such that repetitive work from one to the next could be reused.
- Is it feasible for DB teams to pair up “long-term” for these types of procurements?
- Is it a good thing if a team won multiple packages in a row?
 - OAD: It would depend on the resources available to manage the amount of work between the packages.
 - Concerns over maintaining schedule and productivity.
 - SCDOT expects team to have resources to respond to the commitments within their SOQ.
 - Teams will know whether or not they are shortlisted for one package before another procurement begins.
- Alternatively, if a team “loses” multiple in a row, the industry is finding that some designers are “taking a break” from design-build procurements out of frustration.
- OAD: Competition is paramount to ensure fair and equitable awards to proposers for all procurements.
 - SCDOT is giving consideration for the workload for PMs and junior/assistant PMs from one project to the next.
 - Teams will not be penalized for putting a qualified younger professional in junior/assistant PM or DB coordinator slot. PM will maintain primary role while the junior/coordinator would manage the day-to-day for each project.
 - RFQ should further clarify experience requirements and expectations in order to facilitate selection of a younger professional in the junior/coordinator role.
- SCDOT to discuss merits of potential addition of “letters of interest” regarding bridge packages and further RFQ clarifications for expected and flexible qualifications. **[ACTION]**

VII. **Post-Award: Preliminary to ROW Submittals & Exhibit 4z** **ACEC**

- Only intended to be applicable for Bridge package.
- Some design-bid-build projects skip preliminary submittals in favor of straight to ROW submittals.
 - Would OAD consider allowing a similar approach and eliminate preliminary submittals and move straight to ROW submittals?
- An option would be to offer a project coordination/update meeting rather than full preliminary submittal milestone delivery.
 - With consideration for tight project schedule windows it could save time and help focus on more important submittals (i.e. higher quality plans).
- SCDOT: in the past we've received similar requests on a project to project basis and have worked with teams without many issues.
 - We have also considered allowing, at the proposer's risk, skipping preliminary or even ROW submittals and moving straight to final submittals.
 - Some packages may not even have a ROW component so it's likely to straight to final submittals (i.e. footprint and improvements within existing ROW).
 - It is possible to determine after award, with each proposer, on how they would like to approach this component.
 - Could also be introduced as an ATC.
- 4z is intended to be a comprehensive exhibit that is largely unchanged from project to project.
 - Written in mind with regards to SCDOT specifications.
 - Certain sections are not applicable to certain projects (ITS example).
 - There is potential to have a separate 4z different packages.
- Potential to make minor change in RFP regarding *applicable* deliverables from 4z.
- SCDOT will discuss adding language into 4z (preliminary submittal may be waived, at designers risk) for bridge packages. Note: still a project by project approach. **[ACTION]**

VIII. **Open Discussion**

- No additional topics discussed.

IX. **Action Items**

- SCDOT to review and discuss examples of commitments from other states (provided by ACEC/AGC) and potential changes/implementation.
- SCDOT/ACEC/AGC to discuss potential new RFQ language suggestions and/or scoring techniques for SOQ evaluations with stakeholders
- ACEC/AGC to provide additional data points from other states in consideration of this additional stipend factor.
- SCDOT to continue to discuss DBE language and range for percentages and update industry as available.
- ACEC/AGC to poll and involve members in order to look for examples across industry in order to establish positive potential adoption of PDB, CM/GC, and other methods.

-
- SCDOT to discuss and investigate providing DB team performance evaluation average to industry for each evaluation period.
 - SCDOT to discuss and investigate providing average to industry for each evaluation period.
 - SCDOT to discuss merits of potential “letters of interest” regarding bridge packages.
 - SCDOT will discuss adding language into 4z (preliminary submittal may be waived, at designers risk) for bridge packages. Note: still a project by project approach.

X. **Next Meeting Date: 5/18/2022 @ 9:30 AM**

XI. **Adjourn**