
Meeting Minutes

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

3-20-19 @ 9:00 am

I. Welcome/Introductions

- Attendees

Chris Gaskins (SCDOT)	Claud Ipok (SCDOT)
Ben McKinney (SCDOT)	Michael Gantt (AGC)
Maria Ott (SCDOT)	Dave Pupkiewicz (AGC)
Brad Reynolds (SCDOT)	Pete Weber (AGC)
Barbara Wessinger (SCDOT)	Eric Becker (AGC)
Carmen Wright (SCDOT)	Ronald Shaw (AGC)
Chris Lacy (SCDOT)	Hisham Abdelaziz (ACEC)
David Hebert (SCDOT)	Brice Urquhart (ACEC)
Kevin Herrington (SCDOT)	Elham Farzam (ACEC)
Clay Richter (SCDOT)	Paul Raad (ACEC)
Daniel Burton (SCDOT)	Cole White (AGC)

II. Personnel Changes/Subcommittee Member Changes

- AGC

- Chuck Gallant (Blythe) will replace Ron Shaw immediately;
- Dave Rankin (Lane) will replace Michael Gantt in September 2019.

- SCDOT

- Replacement for Hongfen Li still undetermined.

- New AGC subcommittee

- Created to increase communications between AGC and the Design-Build Subcommittee;
- An aid in generating agenda topics and identifying potential new Design-Build Subcommittee representatives;
- Will meet before subcommittee pre-agenda prep meeting to gather topics.

III. Project Updates

- 2019 Projects

- Emergency Project 2A – In design review phase.
- Emergency Project 2B – results announced 3-18-19 after BAFO
- I-26 MM 85 to 101 – accepted Technical Proposals today 3-20-19
- Carolina Crossroads: RFQ late February to Early March. Bid Opening 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.
- US 1 over I-20: STV on prep working through NEPA. RFQ set for late April.

- Closed and Load Restricted Bridges: Will be split 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 CLRB package every year for next 10 years with a value in the \$10-20 million range.
 - Lowcountry Corridor East and West – West RFQ in late 2021
 - I-26 over US 1, SCLRR, and SC 302 – RFQ in 2021
 - I-20 over Wateree – RFQ in 2022
 - Mark Clark – RFQ in 2022
 - I-85 MM 51 - 69 – RFQ in 2024
 - I-85 MM 40 - 51 – RFQ in 2026
 - I-526 MM 18-30 – RFQ in 2028

IV. Action Items from Previous Meeting

- Work History Forms and RFQ Template
 - SCDOT has finished addressing comments from AGC/ACEC
 - AGC and ACEC to review responses and discuss at the next meeting.
 - Updates to the RFQ template will be included in the US1 over I-20 Project.
- ROW Acquisition Language
 - SCDOT has made changes to the ROW acquisition language and is sending to the ROW office for review, then will send to the Subcommittee for review
- Utility Relocation Time
 - This will be an innovative move for SCDOT.
 - TXDOT has some language regarding utility work that may be applicable
 - SCDOT/AGC/ACEC not aware of any agency compensating cost for delays.
 - Elham will send TXDOT information to SCDOT.
- Design Reviews
 - Design review for emergency contracts does not seem to be as urgent as the rest of the emergency construction project. The industry feels that the review time should directly correlate to the construction time.
 - SCDOT has reduced time for reviews on emergency projects from 15 to 10 business days, but ACEC/AGC suggested lowering to 5 business days.
 - SCDOT is reviewing comments and eliminating some via an internal audit process before they are sent from the design review firm to the Design-Build Team.
 - SCDOT should consider requiring a comment resolution meeting.
 - SCDOT should reconsider using LDs on all bridges in package.
 - ACEC suggested a maximum of two weeks to get to RFC plans.
 - SCDOT was asked to review the process used on the I-85 bridge that was hit Cherokee County and delivered as an Emergency Design-Build Project, that project is the “bar”.
 - ACEC has sent out survey asking for examples of preferences vs non-compliance

-
- Not a lot of feedback – only 2 comments – minor in nature
 - They acknowledge SCDOT has improved

V. Post award design optimization versus ~~value engineering~~ “cost sharing” (AGC)

- Design-Build Teams want to know what enhancements in their proposal affected their score. It was also stated that SCDOT needs to do a better job informing the Design-Build Teams what is really wanted from the commitments. A full debrief is needed for the winning and unsuccessful teams.
- Design-Build Team cannot vary the design if they were scored on those aspects without approval from SCDOT. If any changes made are in accordance with the RFP, they can be considered a design optimization. If a change is not a deviation of the RFP or obligations in the contract, then it should be allowed for optimization with no cost sharing.
- Post award, any changes from the original proposal should be brought up to SCDOT. If something is proposed in the technical proposal that SCDOT values, or if an item is a goal, scope, or requirement of the RFP, but during construction they want to eliminate any of these items, the Design-Build Team should submit an Issue Paper and the cost/time deviations would be identified and cost would be shared.

VI. Seismic Design (or other) Peer Review

- Maryland Transportation Authority has used this because of resource constraints. On some of their larger projects, they do not have the depth of knowledge.
- Independent Design Quality Manager (IDQM), i.e. seismic design peer reviewer, is in contract with the Design-Build Team, i.e. Contractor, just like the Designer, and is a Key Personnel in the SOQ.
- Having a IDQM on the Design-Build Team could improve the design review process for all parties.
- ACEC and AGC will provide additional samples of this practice from Texas and Maryland.

VII. Contract Time commitments (ensuring adherence)

- SCDOT is concerned with how to ensure adherence to contract time commitments identified in the “B” time of a Design-Build Team proposal, or as identified in the Contract Time section of the agreement.
- SCDOT wants to more accurately evaluate the “B” time in proposals.
- The labor market could impact these commitments.
- Is AGC open to having SCDOT set time, eliminate B, and use incentive/disincentives?
- It is appropriate during the Industry Review to bring up concerns with contract and design review times.
- If the construction time was held consistent, the industry would prefer to have incentives rather than LDs for holding the schedule.

-
- AGC suggested less weight on “B” component and/or asking for detailed post award schedule in the Technical Proposal.
 - AGC to provide feedback on most effective use of time component in a design-build contract and any potential impact from resources, or lack thereof, on a Design-Build Team.

VIII. Open Discussion

- Currently Appendix A in the Technical Proposals is all 11x17 and Appendix B is all 8.5x11.
 - AGC/ACEC request to swap Appendix A and Appendix B so that the paper fits better in the technical proposals.
- Can MOT plans allow color? With black and white, it is too complicated to view it.
 - SCDOT already allows color to be used in MOT conceptual plans as a part of the Technical Proposal.

IX. Action Items

- Work History Forms/RFQ Template – to be closed at next meeting after review of the comments.
- ROW language - SCDOT will send to ROW for review.
- Utility Relocation Timeline – Sub-committee to consider a separate meeting with the utility subcommittee to cover all topics
- Design Review Concerns – SCDOT to discuss design review time frame for emergency projects. SCDOT to continue to discuss clear concise comments and reporting with the design review teams.
- ACEC to provide RFQ language from Texas and Maryland for seismic design peer review (IDQM).
- AGC to develop position on if the use of a “B” component is causing schedule delays, the use of fixing the contract time in the agreement, and the use of incentives/disincentives?
- SCDOT to develop timeline for meeting minute development, review, and posting.

X. Next Meeting Date: May 15, 2019. ACEC to lead next meeting.

XI. Adjourn