

---

## Meeting Minutes

### SCDOT/ACEC/AGC Design-Build Sub-Committee Meeting

1-16-19 @ 9:00 am

- I. Welcome/Introductions
  - Attendees
    - Chris Gaskins (SCDOT)
    - Ben McKinney (SCDOT)
    - Maria Ott (SCDOT)
    - Brad Reynolds (SCDOT)
    - Kate Drafts (SCDOT)
    - Michael Pitts (SCDOT)
    - Barbara Wessinger (SCDOT)
    - Carmen Wright (SCDOT)
    - Chris Lacy (SCDOT)
    - David Hebert (SCDOT)
    - Michael Gantt (AGC)
    - Dave Pupkiewicz (AGC)
    - Pete Weber (AGC)
    - Brice Urquhart (ACEC)
    - Elham Farzam (ACEC)
    - Paul Raad (ACEC)
  
- II. Personnel Changes/Subcommittee Member Changes
  - ACEC: Elham Farzam (ICE) and Paul Raad (CECS) replace Bryan Shiver (Insight) and Jeff Mulliken (Holt) as of Jan 1
  - AGC: Pete Webber (Dane) replaced Chad Curran as of Jan 1, Chuck Gallant (Blythe) will replace Michael Gantt in mid-2019.
  - SCDOT: Replacement still undetermined for Hongfen. Maria Ott and Daniel Burton will replace Trapp Harris and Kevin Turner.
  
- III. Project Updates  
2019
  - Emergency Project 2A Bid Opening was December 21st.
  - Emergency Project 2B Bid Opening in February
  - I-26 MM 85 to 101 – In procurement, set to award in May 2019
  - 4 projects set up for 2019, 3 projects in DB group and Carolina Crossroads in Mega Projects.
    - Carolina Crossroads: RFQ late February to Early March. Set to open bids in 2020

- I-85 over Rocky Creek: late February RFQ (9-10 month procurement schedule). Set to be awarded about the time the construction of the I85/I385 Interchange is substantially complete. Brad Reynolds leading.
- US 1 over I-20: STV on prep working through NEPA. RFQ set for Late April. Jae Mattox to lead.
- Closed and Load Restricted Bridges: Will be spilt along District boundaries. DB Group has package in hand with 16 bridges in District 2. Set for RFQ in September 2019 with approximate value of \$20M.

#### 2020 and beyond

- Closed and Load Restricted Bridges: SCDOT expects to issue a CLRBR package every year for next 10 years with a value in the \$15-30 million range. Next up is District 4 with 10 to 15 bridges. Expect RFQ in September time frame to align with funding commitments.
- Lowcountry Corridor – 2022
- I-85 MM 51 - 69 – 2024
- I-85 MM 40 - 51 – 2026
- I-26 over US 1, SCLRR, and SC 302 – 2021
- I-20 over Wateree – 2022
- I-26 MM 15-22 – Currently on hold
- I-526 MM 18-30 – 2028
- I-26 MM 212-218 – Currently on hold
- Future placeholder dates should be updated on SCDOT website

#### IV. Action Items from Previous Meeting

- Work History Forms and RFQ Template - SCDOT continues to develop responses to comments and will provide as soon as available. SCDOT to incorporate changes from the industry comments before the March 2019 subcommittee meeting.
- ROW Acquisition Language - SCDOT will continue to revise the language for the next meeting in 2019. SCDOT tweaked some of the ROW acquisition language in the agreement to consider taking on just compensation in addition to the premiums. AGC contacted other states and most are writing the checks. SCDOT could fund an escrow account that the ROW consultant has the ability to write checks from. Oscar Rucker, former SCDOT Director of ROW, did this in 2003-04. SCDOT funded and replenished the account each month. Oscar authorized the just compensation amount. The Design-Build Team maintained the book keeping records. This was a CRM project which may have been what allowed this to occur. The agents stated that they could accelerate the process if they had the option to write the checks. Consultants and contractors are able to write ROW checks in 21-30 days. Elham will send report to SCDOT for research on the topic.
- Utility Relocation Time – SCDOT will continue internal discussion and will follow up at next meeting. This will be an innovative move for SCDOT that would

---

provide a schedule for utility relocations or give time for utilities that impact the critical path.

- Performance Based Spec – SCDOT will research and provide data when available. Removing from Action Items moving forward.
- Procurement Time – AGC summarized data from other states and provided to committee. If additional time is added, we want to do it between final determination for ATCs and the submittal of Technical Proposals. SCDOT plans to investigate allowing additional ATCs if an addendum is posted after a certain date. Contractors want to know all of this information as soon as possible. Removing from Action Items moving forward.
- IMR Responsibility - Design-Build Teams will work within the time frame as long as the process is known up front. What is the timeframe from when the Design-Build Team submits concepts to FHWA approval? Traffic engineers need two to three months to develop the IMR. They would get the IMR ready for signature, but do not get it signed. There is concern with the IMR process being wedged into the design-build process. SCDOT is only considering this on service interchanges that are CEs. The group discussed points from Hisham’s email.
  1. Did FHWA experiment with this in other states? No
  2. What stage would NEPA be in? NEPA would be complete
  3. Would this approach be specific to service interchanges? Yes
  4. Will FHWA commit to a review schedule? Yes
  5. Must provide a big enough NEPA shape – SCDOT plans to be as transparent as possible. Looking at multiple alternatives. SCDOT would find the largest construction limits of all of the alternatives. Give a total number of proposed relocations. There could be a hole if there is a property that we do not want to impact. When talking relocations, it may be broken up by residential and commercial, and it may include stream impacts and environmental impacts. The shape would be provided.
  6. Provide alternative designs used to develop the box. – We are trying to drive the Design-Build Teams to be as innovative and open minded as possible. How do these four to five concepts/alternatives impact the Design-Build Teams? Is it too overwhelming to start with no options? Concern from the industry that if SCDOT maintains the current schedule, there would be no fall back if the ATC options fall through.
  7. In scenario where FHWA approval is delayed... - FHWA has confirmed that the review will not delay the approval.
  8. Must provide minimum performance criteria to make sure all teams are providing comparable performing designs. – SCDOT would provide these. If there is criteria that is not going to be allowed for ATCs, it will be provided. TXDOT has minimum design criteria that comes from their preferred option.
  9. Must provide municipal agreements – SCDOT goal would be to provide municipal agreements. Many municipalities are requesting what the project would look like in the future before they sign.

10. Will need 3-4 months to provide initial preliminary designs for consideration in the first “ATC” meeting. – 2 months may be allowed, but there isn’t really 3-4 months in the schedule.
11. Must provide volume development (traffic projections) – that will be provided
12. How will SCDOT handle review time for multiple alternatives in a submittal? We would maintain the process as discussed. If we can fit this in the 2 months, the review time is there.
13. SCDOT must provide specificity in comments. – SCDOT agrees.

Removing from Action Items moving forward.

- Design Reviews – SCDOT is continuing to improve their QA review process and eliminate preferential comments. AGC requests that standard drawings be included in the plans set so that contractors do not have to go to the website to find the specific drawing. SCDOT understands this concern and will consider. Design review firms working for SCDOT are not to create any models without approval, and SCDOT will inform the Design-Build Team that we are working on a model to confirm the calculations. The speed of the review process directly correlates with the quality of the plans. When out of state consultants create plans, ensure that your internal QC checks that the plans meet/match SCDOT plans prep requirements. AGC will provide additional feedback on the design review process at the next meeting. ACEC – look at 10-15% of design fee for design review contract.

V. In Contract Utility Relocations

- Has been done on design bid build projects.
- CCR is looking to create a master agreement with all utility companies
- If they are interested in cooperating, we look to bring them into the contract for CCR.
- Has there been any contact with the utilities on resources? The utility companies have taken the stance that they have one preferred contractor, and SCDOT may want to ensure that this is a priority over other relocation work.
- Is there concern that the Design-Build Team will not want to have the utility relocations in contract?
- Need to clearly lay out who is doing the design, what are the standards, etc.
- How can you get multiple telecoms to agree to be in one duct bank.
- Recent challenges of waiting until all ROW is acquired, that they can start early and work on sections as they become available.
- SCDOT goal is to bring the utility companies on board so that they understand our intentions before the start of the procurement.
- If SCDOT provides a list of the utility prequalified contractors, it may be possible.
- Have there been any conflicts of interest? Usually work with non-disclosure agreements and attempt to describe vaguely the work needed to be done.

- In a project this big, the DB team will likely divide the task of utility relocation among a few firms.

VI. Contract Execution Process

- Cost Proposals received – bid analysis the same day – if no issues move forward with public announcement same day or following day.
- The PM is tasked with delivering the bid analysis along with agreement to the DOC office.
- DOC verifies: prequalification, suspension and debarment, cash-flow analysis.
- FHWA concurrence to move forward with award of the project. Attached to Record of Approval which is signed by the Secretary of Transportation
- After Record of Approval is signed by senior leaders, DOC office sends Notice of Award to Design-Build Team and we post it to the SCDOT Design-Build website. (about 2 weeks from public announcement to Notice of Award)
- Design-Build Team will receive cleaned up agreement
- Design-Build Team is required to submit schedule of values and bonds and insurance within 2 weeks.
- DOC will execute the contract and activate everything in Site Manager and will notify the District that everything has been completed. (2 weeks)
- Once contract is executed, within 45 Days, an NTP will be provided.

VII. Open Discussion

- Coordinating staging between two projects that tie together. This will be an ongoing occurrence in the future. In the past, we have provided a snap shot of the traffic control from the first project in the RFP of the second project.
- Discussion about prioritization of projects. Discuss the schedule of the first project in the procurement of the second project. The Design-Build Teams would want the flexibility to change their plans and would not want to be held to the original RFC plans.
- Would SCDOT consider a design mobilization cost separate from the standard mobilization cost? – SCDOT has payed a design mobilization cost in the past on certain projects based on the timeline.
  - Looking to pay for the 30% design that has been completed prior.
  - SCDOT to research the previous projects where this has been used.

VIII. Action Items

- Work History Forms and RFQ Template - SCDOT continues to develop responses to comments and will provide as soon as available. SCDOT to incorporate changes from the industry comments before the March 2019 subcommittee meeting.
- ROW Acquisition Language - Elham will send report to SCDOT for research on the topic. SCDOT will contact Oscar.

- 
- Utility Relocation Time – SCDOT will continue internal discussion and will follow up at next meeting. This will be an innovative move for SCDOT that would provide a schedule for utility relocations or give time for utilities that impact the critical path.
  - Design Reviews - AGC and ACEC to poll membership for specific issues with SCDOT design review process. -- SCDOT will take this information and continue to improve our process. --AGC will provide additional feedback on the Design Review process at the next meeting.

IX. Next Meeting Date: March 20, 2019. AGC to lead next meeting.

X. Adjourn