

**Meeting Minutes**  
**SCDOT/ACEC/AGC Alternative Delivery Sub-Committee Meeting**  
**5/18/2022 @ 9:30 AM**

**I. Welcome/Introductions**

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

(Attended, Absent) \*FHWA

- In-person vs virtual meetings
  - Request for at least one in-person meeting for Fall 2022 (September?)
    - Following industry review of new RFP Agreement

**II. Project Updates**

- Carolina Crossroads Phases 1 & 2 – Under Construction.
- Closed and Load Restricted Bridges 2021-1 – District 4 with eight bridges. Awarded and executed to Reeves/RK&K.
- Cross Island Parkway Toll Conversion – Construction underway, toll plaza removal finishing up. November for substantial completion.
- 2022 Anticipated Procurements
  - US 301 over Four-Hole Swamp – Three teams short-listed, RFP released for industry review, final RFP imminent.

- 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 released May 11, 2022.
- Carolina Crossroads Phase 3 – RFQ anticipated in Late Summer 2022. New RFP Agreement document still under development. Open forum for industry comment held early May.
- Bridge Package 14 – Five bridges in Cherokee County. RFQ anticipated in June.
- Bridge Package 15 – Bridges in Florence, Anderson, and Chester. RFQ anticipated 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; LNTP issued.
  - 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. New estimate released to Charleston County, anticipated \$2.352 Billion. Phased construction anticipated and FEIS updated accordingly.
  - 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 / Summer 2022. Advertisement imminent prior to next ADSC meeting.
- Note: All project information regarding has been posted to the website: [SCDOT Design-Build Overview](#).

### III. Action Items from 3/16/2022 Meeting SCDOT

- SCDOT to review and discuss examples of commitments from other states (provided by ACEC/AGC) and potential changes/implementation. **[OPEN]**
  - No other examples provided from industry and commitment discussion ongoing.
  - Meeting to be held next Tuesday, May 24<sup>th</sup> with Industry partners.

- Goal is to have commitment change implemented within I-20 over Wateree.
- SCDOT/ACEC/AGC to discuss potential new RFQ language suggestions and/or scoring techniques for SOQ evaluations with stakeholders. **[OPEN]**
  - Still under discussion, no adjusted language has been implemented though you recent RFQs have minor adjustments pending previous conversations. For instance: reduced yearly requirements for APM and others depending on project complexity.
  - Expectations of availability of Key Individuals, primarily PM.
    - SCDOT expects PM to be *fully engaged*, or Assistant PM (if offered), upon contract execution. This means not assigned to any other project at time of contract execution.
  - AGC: “Is the expectation that BOTH PM and APM be available 100%”.
    - SCDOT: Current RFQ language states that if APM is offered as an option, they may be considered the day to day contact contact), with the PM attending and lead weekly status meetings during the design and construction phases, and being available at the request of the SCDOT.
  - Current RFQ language states the Construction Manager can be assigned to another project if the project/their assignment ends prior to the actual start of construction.
  - SCDOT: Pay very close attention to RFQ language and what is presented within resumes, specifically ensure that the key-individuals are qualified and available per the requirements of the RFQ.
  - AGC: “Can a non-key individual be substituted for a key individual if schedule/availability conflicts are discovered” (i.e. can this be cured with a substitution or alternative plan of action within SOQ).
    - SCDOT: If the DB Team is successful, the/a previously identified qualified (i.e. equal or better) non-key individual could be moved temporarily into key-individual role until the CM could fulfill that role. This is subject to SCDOT and evaluation committee approval.
    - SCDOT: Ultimately DB teams should ask questions and/or clearly explain your intent with non-key individuals.
  - AGC: “Can a ‘Plan B’ team be submitted with regards to ‘letters of interest’ or conflicts with additional procurement submittals”.
    - SCDOT: Be clear on your intentions and explain your team clearly in your SOQs.
  - SCDOT’s intent is to have no more than two procurements at any one-time to avoid availability conflicts.
  - Potential additional language to ensure clarity on submitting same team for multiple procurements and allowing proper and equivalent substitution in event of award.
    - Language may need to include reviewing “Plan B” substitutions.
- ACEC/AGC to provide additional data points from other states in consideration of this additional stipend factor. **[CLOSED]**

- Provided Florida and Georgia information and has been reviewed internally.
- Industry can discuss this issue/factor at any point during procurements.
- SCDOT: Historically we have been fairly reasonable in consideration for increasing stipends depending on project type and complexity.
- SCDOT to continue to discuss DBE language and range for percentages and update industry as available. **[CLOSED]**
  - Some, minor, new language implemented in RFP for US 301 over Four-Hole (0.5% for professional services).
  - SCDOT: We will begin indicating, at RFQ stage, what the DBE percentages and expectations will be for the project.
  - SCDOT open to feedback at any point for any procurement/project.
  - AGC: “How does the DBE office come up with the percentages, specifically US 301 project”.
    - SCDOT: Calculations are largely based on DBE Office internal comparisons across industry and in line with our goals.
  - AGC: “Difficult to involve reasonable amount of DBE professional services depending on contract cost”.
    - SCDOT: “Good-faith effort” process is a part of consideration if there are issues with finding DBE professional services. Recommended to reach out to SCDOT DBE office.
    - SCDOT attempts to perform a reasonable balancing act with regards to DBE percentages and project size and complexity.
    - AGC: It is challenging to obtain DBE participation when a higher percentage is required, specifically on bridge packages or projects.
- 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]**
  - Priority for Office of Alternative Delivery, educating senior leadership.
    - Deputy Secretary of Engineering has offered support.
  - Could be introduced at next legislative session.
  - AGC: “This is the time to get it passed, new 2-year session starts in January”
    - This may be the most opportune moment before next session.
- SCDOT to discuss and investigate providing DB team performance evaluation average to industry for each evaluation period. **[OPEN]**
  - Ongoing discussion, will be presented to policy committee.
  - Not opposed to idea, however, performance evaluations take a significant effort of SCDOT staff.
    - Likely to have inconsistent scores and timelines for posting any of this information.
- SCDOT to discuss merits of potential “letters of interest” regarding bridge packages. **[CLOSED]**
  - Ongoing consideration and will be presented to AD Policy Committee.

- Previous discussion regarding RFQ language updates and substitutions may resolve this issue. As this previous topic is tied together, this topic can be closed.
- 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. **[OPEN]**
  - Ongoing, will be presented to policy committee.

**IV. Procurement Documents: Post Award** **SCDOT**

- SCDOT intends to provide certain procurement and evaluation documents upon contract execution.
  - Such as: SOQs, SOQ Scoring spreadsheet, Technical Proposals, etc.
  - PATCs will not be included.

**V. Major vs Minor Quality Contributions** **ACEC**

- Technical scoring and quality assessment question.
- Is there a Likert Scale for added value and innovation?
  - There is a point system/value outlined in the RFP related to added value and innovation. Currently these points are allocated and an adjectival score is determined by evaluation committee during the evaluation period.
- ACEC: “Would SCDOT be willing to share insight on how major and minor items of innovation (i.e. quality) are separated?”
  - Past examples?
    - US 1 over I-20: reduction of ROW impacts with innovation of flyover design
    - Panther Interchange: reduction of ROW impacts with innovation of interchange and pond impacts.
    - General improvements of safety over base condition, improving level of service, minimizing project risk, etc. have been notable major innovations on prior projects. The size/impact of each of these can also be considered minor.
  - Schedule: Schedule certainty, safety improvements, ROW acquisition, etc.
  - Cost: Cost certainty, reduced/alternative materials, etc.
- ACEC: “To confirm, one of the major (i.e. contributions/quality credits) contributions that SCDOT assesses quality would be project savings (i.e. lower cost) on overall construction cost?”
  - SCDOT: No not a percentage of overall construction cost.
- ACEC: “Clarify in RFP on how we’ll evaluate major vs minor quality and innovations”.
  - SCDOT: We list goals for every project, highlighting your contributions with regards to these goals (schedule, safety, etc.) is extremely important in order to score highly.
- ACEC: “ATCs for quality, equal or better, when determined equal from quality standpoint would result in lesser quality scores outside of ATC (i.e. within TP)”.
  - If an ATC is approved, this would not result in quality score deduction.
  - No detriment for submitting anything for quality credit section of RFP (i.e score is not subtracted, only a benefit).

- ACEC: “Commitment matrix could help resolve this very issue”.
- SCDOT intends to provide Likert Scale on website for industry resource.
  - Internally reviewing and improving Likert Scale descriptions to assist industry and evaluation committees with consistent scoring and understanding major vs minor contributions.
- Major vs Minor may not be the appropriate language and is being discussed internally.
- SCDOT will consider providing memo to provide clarity and reduce confusion concerning what constitutes levels (i.e. major vs minor) of quality/innovation contributions.

**VI. Conceptual ATC Review Meetings ACEC**

- Previously specific to US 301 over Four-hole swamp, industry requested ATC review meeting prior to submittal of PATC and committing resources to them.
- SCDOT will implement language to include another, early, meeting to discuss risk associated with project (this can include discussion of ATCs).
  - I-20 over Wateree intends to implement this on the I-20 over Wateree procurement.
  - The timing of the meeting is still being discussed. One option would be the same day as the Industry review open forum meeting for the project. Another would a week or two after the industry review open-forum meeting.
- ACEC: “May have additional discussion if a week later than the initial industry review open forum”
  - Industry agrees that this is the best course of action.
  - One-hour meetings with each team should be sufficient.
- SCDOT plans to implement language regarding additional risk and ATC discussion meeting. **[ACTION]**

**VII. Open Discussion ALL**

- RFQ/SOQ when schedule spans a holiday, industry requests additional time if possible.
  - Currently, SCDOT tries to reasonably consider impacts of holidays and other busy periods.

**VIII. 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 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 will discuss adding language into 4z (preliminary submittal may be waived, at designers risk) for bridge packages. Note: still a project by project approach.
  - SCDOT plans to implement language regarding additional risk and ATC discussion meeting.

IX. **Next Meeting Date: 7/20/2022 @ 9:30 AM**

X. **Adjourn**