

Design-Build Subcommittee

April 13, 2011 minutes

Attendees:

Claude Ipock	SCDOT
Mark Monreal	UIG
Tad Kitowicz	FHWA
John Boylston	SCDOT
Barry Bowers	SCDOT
Rob Bedenbaugh	SCDOT
Fred kicklighter	LPA
Greg Schuch	F&H
David Glenn	SCDOT
Billy Coleman	Coleman-Snow
Barbara Wessinger	SCDOT
Matt Lifsey	SCDOT
George Hassfurter	Lane Construction
Richard Nichols	Carolina Bridge
Danny Shealy	CAGC

Claude opened meeting with introductions.

Waivers from adhering to county, municipal or other local ordinances, codes, permits and fees.

Barbara updated the group on the following items:

State Statue 6-9-110 building code section. Highway construction may be exempt from the building code but any vertical construction would need to comply with any building code requirements. SCDOT requirements would trump any local ordinances for cutting trees but SCDOT would have to pay any fees associated with tree removal (section 6-29-770). Business licenses would apply to contractors and subs.

Any sign structures would require permits. Action item: Determine the risk allocations associated with obtaining permits.

General Liability Insurance: Issue is to obtain any liability insurance above the amounts already stipulated in the standard specifications. Action item: Research the levels of liability insurance obtainable, George Hassfurter to research and report back to group.

RFP Preliminary Data

Fred Kicklighter reported on the following items:

Surveys – define the projects as small construction projects (bridge replacements, intersections etc.) or large construction projects (new location, large widening projects). Small construction projects would not require any surveys or area mapping, just a detailed scope of work. Large construction projects would need control points set and maintained by SCDOT with mapping and some as-built cross sections of existing pavements on widening projects. Action item: SCDOT would set control points and area mapping on large projects. Also classify projects and determine what level of surveys are needed prior to advertisement.

Geotechnical information: On roadway embankment and bridges, borings should be provided with the analysis of the material tested so each firm proposing on the project would not have to perform these duties up front. Action item: SCDOT provide borings, boring logs and analysis at a minimum at the bridge ends, intermediate intervals and embankment areas and allow the use of these results if they fall within the guidelines of the geotech design manual. Intermediate borings on bridges will be determined by the length of bridges. Establish language to allow the DOT borings logs to be used by the firms for design purposes.

Design Criteria: Specify the intended scope of the project and any restriction and let the design build teams use the design manual and green book to design project. Also allow the Alternate Technical Concepts to come into play in this area.

Hierarchy of Documents: There are a lot of conflicts with the documents and exhibits referring to special provisions and supplemental specifications. Action item: Claude and Rob to research the documents and establish hierarchy.

Roadway Design: The only information needed is the conceptual plans or whatever is needed to obtain the EIS or NEPA documents. If any hydrology analysis has been performed, it should be provided for information.

Fred to provide more details on the recommendations from his group on these different items.

QC/QA requirements: Claude reported on the QA/QC language and felt this could be clarified in the contract language up front to specify who is responsible for control and acceptance.

RFQ/RFP submission: In both the one step and two step process, allow confidential one on one meetings and discussion of confidential questions during the RFP process. Claude and his group to work more on these issues.

Evaluation Process: Identify the areas of scoring with the associated points for each category and adjust the bids accordingly. Identify areas such as management, responsiveness, maintenance, maintenance of traffic, safety plan, etc. with related points associated with the scoring process. Then the bids will be adjusted based on the ratings of each category. Also looking at a pass/fail criteria to establish baseline for short listing. David received some information from NCDOT and will continue to research.

Next meeting: May 11th, 2011 at LPA's office, proposed time 9:00 to 4:00