

Meeting Minutes
SCDOT/ACEC/AGC Alternative Delivery Sub-Committee Meeting
9/21/2022 @ 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 • 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>Brian Klauk</i> • <i>Tad Kitowicz*</i> • Michael Pitts • Clay Richter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walker Roberts • Aaron Goldberg • David Taylor • David Russell 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pete Weber • Rob Loar • <i>Lee Bradley</i> • Chris Boyd • <i>Leslie B. Clark</i>

(Attended, Absent) *FHWA

- In-person meeting to be held at SCDOT Headquarters on November 16. Invite to be updated when conference room is secured.
 - ****Update**** In-person meeting will not be held until 2023.
- Moving to Microsoft Teams next year.

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.
 - 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.
 - 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.
 - Bridge Package 15 – Bridges in Florence, Anderson, and Chester. RFQ to be posted September 28th.
 - 2023 Anticipated Procurements
 - Bridge Package 16, 17, 20 and 19.
 - 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. Public Hearing held in Early August.
 - 2024 and beyond
 - Mark Clark Extension – Pursuing Final EIS and related documentation/permits. RFQ anticipated in 2024+. Independent Cost Estimate Verification has been procured and will be submitted in mid-October. Coordination with Charleston County regarding funding.
 - 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
 - I-26 Widening – MM 176 to 187
 - I-95 Widening – MM 8 to 21. Anticipated DB prep work starting soon (with current on-call, team not currently selected). Procurement anticipated in 2024.
 - I-95 Over Great Peedee River – Bridge project. Seeking grant funds to conduct planning or federal grant 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.
 - Six teams selected for new On-Call Contract. Contracts with teams are being finalized.
 - Note: All project information regarding 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]**
 - Discussions held on regular basis internally regarding changes, specifically on upcoming bridge package procurements.
 - Goal is to reduce the amount of effort for teams preparing SOQs and amount of effort/time for SCDOT reviewing and evaluating SOQs.
 - Considering removing “Critical Risk” section from RFQ on bridge packages with low risk profiles (Bridge Package 15 would be first procurement).
 - AGC agrees that the risks are typically generic at this stage of bridge package projects and do not necessarily warrant extensive individual attention from SOQ perspective.
 - SCDOT considering reducing work history form size from 11”x17” to 8.5”x11”.
 - Industry prefers opportunity to “tell a story”; more space is better but is largely project dependent on what needs to be elaborated.
 - Legal yes/no question changes to be discussed 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]**
 - Feedback ongoing and is planned to be included on agenda until such time that additional alternative delivery methods have been implemented.
- **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. **[CLOSED]**
 - Information provided for Bridge Package 14 in Attachment B was “complete”.
 - Industry questions if the information provided is something that DB Teams can rely on and SCDOT will stand behind.
 - ACEC noted that the statement on page 7 of 92, that discusses reliable information within Attachment B, did not include hydro information as reliable (it included survey, etc.).
 - ACEC recommend making adjustments to language or information such that it is reliable/dependable.
 - SCDOT is continuing to evaluate feedback received from industry on usefulness of information included for projects.
 - It was noted that there are assumptions and judgments made within the models provided (by prep team and SCDOT). These assumptions or judgments are considered “preliminary models” and can currently be utilized by DB Teams, at their risk, and ensure they agree with the engineering judgments and assumptions.
 - If a final bridge configuration is not known and would/could affect hydro models provided.

- DB Teams would prefer to avoid conducting an additional analysis that was conducted and provided in Attachment B but not “reliable”.
- Can the assumptions be stated within the RFP?
 - “Based on these assumptions, proposers can use this information.”
- ACEC to review information provided and provide feedback in general capacity as each new project. **[ACTION]**
 - SCDOT will consider revisions based on additional feedback and ongoing discussions for existing and future projects.
- **AGC** to review, discuss, and provide particular erosion control items that have been problematic and could benefit from Unit pricing. **[OPEN]**
 - Additional feedback to be provided.
 - Source of conflict between unit price and lump sum.
 - At contractor’s expense.
 - Adjustment could be benefit from cost perspective.
 - Similar unit cost on a number of items.
 - Will be a challenge to determine quantities with Unit Price.
 - SCDOT inspectors can ask for a “conservative” approach within field.
 - On DB project, when EOR stamped the drawings:
 - Should SCDOT inspector have the say over EOR for erosion control measures in the field?
 - As it is ultimately an SCDOT project, it is ultimately SCDOT responsibility to ensure proper erosion control procedures are being followed. Penalties assessed by DHEC will go against SCDOT, not DB Team but these may be passed on if DB team fails to honor terms of Contract and erosion control procedures.
 - AGC to discuss with industry regarding assumptions (i.e. LF/tonnage and here’s unit price if over that amount).
 - i.e. an “allowance” that helps manage risk

IV. Complex Bridge Peer Review Requirements **SCDOT**

- SCDOT received feedback from industry on proposed requirements. Feedback is currently being considered by SCDOT.
 - FHWA and SCDOT Legal included within reviews and will provide feedback.
 - SCDOT intends to draft responses and make adjustments to the proposed peer review process.
- Industry will be requested an additional round of review after revisions are made to the requirements document.
- Industry expressed timing concerns with project schedules.
 - How long will these Peer Review teams have to review?
- Industry expressed additional cost concerns.
 - It should be clear which items would need peer review to help build into cost estimates and proposals.
 - Would design team give a lump sum number?

- ACEC: Seems reasonable depending on quality/clear scope of work.
- Need a way to define scope up front so teams can properly prepare for Peer Review Team inclusion/contracting.
- Would we have an approved peer review team list?
 - Unlikely that we'd be able to procure a qualification program to certify in SC.
- Is it important enough to be included on basis of short-listing of teams?
 - Or is it within RFP requirements?
 - SCDOT: This is to be determined.

V. Legal Yes/No Questions in RFQ SCDOT

- Section 3.5.2 in RFQ, Quality of Past Performance
 - “Have any projects been delayed.....damages were assessed?”
- Adjustments made due to Industry feedback and internal discussions. Revised language will be used in Bridge Package 15.
- Addition of “Highway” for transportation projects (i.e. not interested in sidewalk projects, etc.).
- Revision of question to “Have any design-build projects or projects of similar scope been delayed more than 30 days such that liquidated damages were assessed?”
- Industry largely finds not issue with the adjustments.
- AGC: Note that “Similar scope” language leaves some projects and experience inclusion up for interpretation.

VI. Quality Credit Matrix Discussion SCDOT

- Available to review on website under “Design-Build Standard Forms” and some procurement documents (e.g. US 301 over Four-Hole).
- Minor adjustments made between procurements and will likely continue.
- Some limitations of the matrix were observed during US 301 procurement.
 - Value, cost, and time associated with each item included within matrix.
 - Demonstrate specifically that teams are committing to it rather than options.
- Adjustments made to quality credit language in that cost in time and/or days MUST be provided for each to be considered for credits.
- ACEC: Difficult to demonstrate added value/insurances for reducing impacts.
 - Flat slab example for US 301.
 - Was self-imposed assurance required in order to reward points?
 - Yes and no; dependent on the type of item in the matrix.
- AGC: How do we explain the benefit to SCDOT (e.g. reduced maintenance costs)? How is this equated to dollars or days?
 - There is an opportunity for quality points if something better is proposed (safety operations, etc.).

VII. RFP Agreement – Updates? AGC

- CCR and SCDOT Legal working to finalize in order to share with Industry.

-
- Substantive adjustments have already been made; minor revisions remaining and to be finalized in next few weeks.
 - Term sheet available on SCDOT CCR website [[Carolina Crossroads \(scdotcarolinacrossroads.com\)](https://scdotcarolinacrossroads.com)].
 - Provides insight into where we're headed with agreement and project.
 - General RFP Agreement for traditional OAD projects remains same.
 - Items from CCR PH3 RFP will make its way into the template.

VIII. Open Discussion

- Industry requested early 2023 for I-26/I-95 start for procurement.

IX. 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** to review hydraulic information provided in upcoming bridge packages and provide feedback for consideration.
- **AGC** to review, discuss, and provide particular erosion control items that have been problematic and could benefit from Unit pricing.

X. Next Meeting Date: 11/16/2022 @ 9:30 AM

XI. Adjourn