

Meeting Minutes
SCDOT/ACEC/AGC Alternative Delivery Sub-Committee Meeting
11/16/2022 @ 9:30 AM

I. Welcome/Introductions

SCDOT	ACEC	AGC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chris Gaskins • Jae Mattox • Joy Riley • Brooks Bickley • Ben McKinney • <i>Brad Reynolds</i> • Jason Byrd • Randy King • <i>Chris Lacy</i> • Will McGoldrick • <i>David Hebert</i> • <i>Daniel Burton</i> • <i>Barbara Wessinger</i> • Brian Gambrell • Carmen Wright • Tyler Clark • David Rister • <i>Brian Klauk</i> • <i>Tad Kitowicz*</i> • <i>Michael Pitts</i> • Clay Richter • Greg Davis 	<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 • Leslie B. Clark

(Attended, Absent) *FHWA

- **Moving to Microsoft Teams next year for those not able to attend in person or fully virtual meetings.**

II. Project Updates

- Carolina Crossroads Phases 1 & 2 – Under Construction.
- Closed and Load Restricted Bridges 2021-1 – District 4 with eight bridges. Under construction with progress.
- Cross Island Parkway Toll Conversion – Under construction. Toll plaza removed. November for substantial completion; on track.

- US 301 over Four-Hole Swamp – Bids received and apparent best-value team, Crowder Construction, selected. Contract executed October 31st and NTP to follow in late November.
- I-20 over Wateree, River and Overflow Bridges – Scope: Main river bridges to be replaced, overflow bridges to be rehabilitated. Three Teams short-listed in July. Final RFP available on website. Bid opening March 29th, 2023.
- Carolina Crossroads Phase 3 – RFQ issued on September 15th. Short-list to be announced at end of November. RFP for industry review available in early December.
- Bridge Package 14 – Five bridges in Cherokee County. Three Teams short-listed in mid-August. Final RFP available on website. Technical Proposal Evaluations to be conducted this week. Bid opening December 1st.
- Bridge Package 15 – Bridges in Florence, Anderson, and Chester. RFQ posted September 28th. Short-listed teams announced November 14th. RFP for industry review available now.
- 2023 Anticipated Procurements
 - Bridge Package 16, 17, 20 and 19 in that order.
 - I-26/I-95 Interchange Improvements – Funding available. Procurement to begin on Interchange in late 2022 or early 2023.
 - Separate prep contracts for interchange and widening projects anticipated.
 - Portions of I-26 widening project (MM 125 – 145) to be bid-build.
 - I-95 over Santee (Lake Marion) bridge replacement – DB prep work is underway.
 - Long Point Road/Wando Port Interchange – DB Prep work underway. May be accelerated to early 2023 procurement and awarded at end of 2023 or beginning of 2024. Public Hearing held in Early August. Level 2 CSRA/CER held in November. RFQ in first half of 2023.
- 2024 and beyond
 - Mark Clark Extension – Pursuing Final EIS and related documentation/permits. RFQ anticipated in 2024+. Independent Cost Estimate Verification has been received and provided to Charleston County. Charleston County to coordinate with SIB/BCDCOG to further funding discussions and potential phasing of project.
 - Low Country Corridor East – Currently in project development and NEPA. Procurement timeframe TBD. Public involvement meetings held in October 2021.
 - I-26 Widening – MM 165 to 176 (3rd)
 - I-26 Widening – MM 176 to 187 (1st)
 - I-95 Widening – MM 8 to 21. Anticipated DB prep work starting soon (anticipated with current on-call, team not currently selected). Procurement anticipated in 2024. (2nd)
 - I-95 Over Great Peedee River – Bridge project. Received planning grant (~\$700k). HNTB continuing to work on prep.
 - 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.

- Six teams selected for new On-Call Contract. Contracts with teams have been finalized and executed.
- Note: Additional project information has been posted to the website: [SCDOT Design-Build Overview](#).

III. Action Items from 7/20/2022 Meeting SCDOT

- **SCDOT/ACEC/AGC** to discuss potential new RFQ language suggestions and/or scoring techniques for SOQ evaluations with stakeholders. **[OPEN]**
 - Ongoing discussion through recent procurements.
 - Discussion regarding key individuals below.
- **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]**
 - Additional Feedback not provided but will continue to be solicited. Early 2023 we may be able to schedule a separate committee or group discussion regarding recent industry moves and examples in other parts of the country.
- **ACEC** will review latest Hydraulic information provided by SCDOT and reach out to those on Bridge Package 14 to determine if additional hydraulic data is able to be provided, without issue, at technical proposal/conceptual plan stage. **[OPEN]**
 - ACEC reached out to additional industry partners.
 - Request official statement that the existing conditions model is reliable.
 - Generalize statement.
- **AGC** to review, discuss, and provide particular erosion control items that have been problematic and could benefit from Unit pricing. **[OPEN]**
 - No feedback at this time.

IV. Complex Bridge Peer Review Requirements - Update SCDOT

- Comments from industry incorporated into peer review document and language and sent back out for industry feedback.
- SCDOT: other states have implemented these types of requirements, most states have prequalification requirements that allow the proposers to pick from a list prequalified by the agency (i.e. DOT). We do not, currently, have this type of qualified list in SC for this specific situation.
 - Verifying these qualifications could be handled at RFQ stage.
 - Language to/could be included in RFQ stipulating and referencing needs for project.
 - There will be times when full peer review requirements will not be available.
 - RFP phase of project may create/add additional needs to peer review (e.g. ATCs that introduce complex components).
 - AGC: potential issue with number of proposers and having to “dig into” firms that they are competing against/with and/or may not be familiar with it.
 - AGC: agreed with above statements.

- ACEC: potential pre-qualification of consultants as separate RFQ, rather than as an agency.
- SCDOT: Understood on potential conflicts regarding available engineering teams and procurement/SOQ listing.
- SCDOT: “control” of peer review team.
 - Peer review team example discussion on not being afforded adequate resources to provide proper or high quality review.
 - Proposer would be responsible for hiring, managing, and completing peer review/peer review team. This avoids schedule impacts if Agency is more heavily involved or controlling of the review team.
 - What assurances can the Proposer provide that the peer review team will provide adequate resources, man-hours, etc. to ensure appropriate review is conducted?
 - AGC: “easy ask” to include language in RFP that’s built into schedule. Not overstepping on what type of budget allotment for this peer review team.
 - AGC: no objections to having peer review team put together a schedule and Proposer managing.
 - ACEC: identifying the level of effort is reasonable within RFP or contract requirements.
 - ACEC: controlling assurances within RFP is reasonable. Important that the document itself have language minimum level of effort for each component (i.e. for each interior/end-bents). Identifying actual dollar value would be difficult.
 - ACEC: build in a base level of effort (i.e. minimum) threshold for review of components.
 - SCDOT: peer review would show up in actual design review schedule. May be a good idea to expand that to see the process that each team is proposing.
 - SCDOT: in lieu of providing at RFQ stage, potential to have teams submit their proposed peer review team prior to submittal of technical proposal. Not an extension of procurement time. This would be an “intentional part of one-on-one”.
 - AGC: This would go to bid table with that cost at that point, not post-selection.
 - ACEC: Agreed and it would affect schedule so it’s important to build it into technical proposal and costs.
- SCDOT: intent of statement at end of peer review document: if something during construction changes design, it is possible that the independent peer review team needs to be called back to review if it is considered a complex bridge component.
- SCDOT to review notes and discuss potential changes to proposed process for complex bridge peer review requirements. **[ACTION]**

V. RFQ Key Individuals: Discussion

SCDOT

- Discussion to ensure SCDOT and industry are of same understanding in approach to SOQ submittal expectations and
- Minor changes to PM language in RFQ in order to clarify expected experience.

- Previous: *The Project Manager shall have a minimum of 7 years of progressive experience and expertise in the management of highway transportation projects and must include experience and expertise in the management of projects of similar scope, magnitude, and complexity.*
- New: *The Project Manager must have a minimum of seven years of experience that demonstrates growth in responsibility and expertise in the management of highway transportation projects;*
- *The Project Manager shall provide qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of projects with similar:*
 - *Scope – project requirements, tasks, goals and deliverables;*
 - *Magnitude – workload, contract size, and resources needed to successfully complete the project;*
 - *Complexity – time constraints, sequencing, site accessibility, environmental concerns, engineering, uncertainty and risk.*
- Discussion surrounding Construction Manager (CM) design-build and construction experience.
 - Industry feedback on OAD expectations on recent procurements has been received. It is intended for the CM to have design-build experience. SCDOT: How is the CM typically coordinating with the team, are they just building to the plans or are they discussing elements with Lead Design Engineer (LDE) or PM?
 - AGC: Typically Proposers are just looking for someone who can build the project (i.e. familiarity with type of project) and not necessarily DB experience.
 - AGC: You want a CM that can put work in place, rather than someone with DB experience necessarily. Especially for smaller projects.
 - AGC: CMs are being engaged early and often in discussing how to provide best approach to construction with approach proposed by team.
- AGC: PM timing of projects and available key individuals. Accelerated projects create issues with commitments which were previously planned to have staggered individuals that are available.
- Increase the pool within industry but also within SOQ/RFQ stage to help with getting experience and allow availability for higher level individuals to share responsibilities between multiple projects.
- Internal discussions when to add traffic, structural, or specific engineer roles.
 - ACEC: Potentially tie these specific engineers to quality in order to ensure the additional cost is offset by ability to provide additional quality based on these individuals.
 - ACEC: diluting the LDE portion of SOQ could diminish importance of certain key individuals due to spreading of points.
- ACEC: Lead Design Engineer, limited pool of available qualified individuals that sets their team apart. Assistant lead designer proposed, what is SCDOT thoughts on this?

- SCDOT: Not included as requirements on any recent procurements to our knowledge. Assistants or specific roles have been included from proposers as niceties.
- ACEC: Intent is to offer training in preparation for LDE inclusion in future.
- SCDOT: We need to find a way to allow for/incentivize inclusion of these type of individuals in order to allow for succession and growing of pool of available and qualified individuals.

VI. Procurement Documents: Design-Build Website SCDOT

- US 301 “Procurement Documents” now available on the project’s SCDOT website.
 - This will be the first project this is done for and will continue for the foreseeable future.
- As previously discussed, there are two zip files that include the following:
 - SOQ Evaluations: Proposer SOQs and Final/Signed SOQ Evaluation Spreadsheet
 - Technical Proposal Evaluations: Proposer Technical Proposals and Final/Signed Technical Proposal Evaluation Spreadsheet
 - Bid Opening Spreadsheet
- OAD is open to feedback on names, locations, and delivery method (i.e. zip or individual PDFs).
- SCDOT needs to determine if there is a sunset for these files?
 - OAD to coordinate with internal policy committee on whether or not the availability of these files end at a certain time.

VII. Open Discussion

- Progressive Design-Build
 - Legislation likely to be forthcoming based on AGC conversations with industry and legislature.
 - January 18th, 2023 – AGC Meeting with Legislature (starts at noon into evening).
 - Same day as next ADSC meeting.
 - Brainstorming session to be scheduled in Q1 2023.

VIII. Action Items

- **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.
- **ACEC** will review latest Hydraulic information provided by SCDOT during DB procurements to determine if additional hydraulic data is able to be provided, without issue, at technical proposal/conceptual plan stage.
- **AGC** to review, discuss, and provide particular erosion control items that have been problematic and could benefit from Unit pricing.

-
- **SCDOT** to review notes and discuss potential changes to proposed process for complex bridge peer review requirements.

IX. **Next Meeting Date: 1/18/2023 @ 9:30 AM**

X. **Adjourn**