

**Meeting Minutes**  
**SCDOT/ACEC/AGC Alternative Delivery Sub-Committee Meeting**  
**3/22/2023 @ 9:30 AM**

**I. Welcome/Introductions**  
**Meeting Attendees**

SCDOT	ACEC	AGC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jae Mattox</li> <li>• Ben McKinney</li> <li>• Maddy Barbian</li> <li>• Trapp Harris</li> <li>• Brian Gambrell</li> <li>• Carmen Wright</li> <li>• Tyler Clark</li> <li>• John Caver</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Andrew Smith (HDR)</li> <li>• David Taylor (Stantec)</li> <li>• David Russell (JMT)</li> <li>• Michael Ulmer (ESP)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chris Boyd (Crowder)</li> <li>• Lee Bradley (Blythe)</li> <li>• Rob Loar (Reeves)</li> <li>• Pete Weber (Dane)</li> </ul>

**II. Project Updates**

In Construction

- Carolina Crossroads Phases 1 & 2 – Under Construction
- Closed and Load Restricted Bridges 2021-1 – District 4 with eight bridges. Under construction
- Cross Island Parkway Toll Conversion – Substantial completion reached.
- US 301 over Four-Hole Swamp – Under Construction
- Bridge Package 14 – Project awarded to Lee Construction on 12/29/22.

In Procurement

- Bridge Package 15 – Bridges in Florence, Anderson, and Chester. Pending award to E.S. Wagner.
- Bridge Package 16- Five primary load restricted bridges in Pickens. In procurement, RFP released 3/9/23. Public Announcement Q2 2023.
- I-20 over Wateree, River and Overflow Bridges – In procurement, Public Announcement 3/29/23.
- I-26/I-95 Interchange Improvements – In procurement, RFP for Industry Review released 3/15/23.
- Carolina Crossroads Phase 3 – Teams shortlisted and preparing Technical Proposals, December 2023 Award.

2023 Anticipated Procurements

- Bridge Package 17, 20 and 19 (in that order).
  - Won't put Package 17 out until July (TBD), push 19 to 2024
- Long Point Road/Wando Port Interchange – SCDOT and Consultant are working towards finalizing the project's Environmental Assessment and seeking a FONSI by Fall

2023. Public hearing is scheduled for 5/4/23. Procurement is anticipated to begin in Q1 2024, no firm RFQ date has been decided; details forthcoming. We are anticipating award and execution of contract in Q1 2025.

- Received Environmental Assessment approval, Public Hearing May 2<sup>nd</sup>,
- I-85 at I-385 Wall Improvements. Procurement is anticipated in 2023.
  - Still in planning phase & determining how to execute the project.
- I-77 Exit 26 Interchange & Connecting Roads (Associated with the proposed Scout Motors plant). Procurement is anticipated in late 2023.
  - November-January procurement beginning
  - RS&H is doing the DB prep work. Contract negotiations underway
  - Working with Department of Commerce & Thomas & Hutton (developer's engineer)
  - Graphic on the Scout Motors website
  - Potential for multiple DB projects (2 or more)
  - Exit 24 & 27 interchange improvements may be necessary.

#### 2024 and beyond

- Mark Clark Extension – Pursuing Final EIS and related documentation/permits. RFQ anticipated in 2025+. Currently seeking matching funds from SIB/JBRC.
- 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, Changed to Design Bid Build Delivery Method
- I-26 Widening – MM 176 to 187, Changed to Design Bid Build Delivery Method
- I-95 Widening – MM 8 to 21. Design-Build prep work underway with LNTP. Procurement anticipated in 2025.
- I-95 Over Great Pee Dee River bridge replacement. Received planning grant (~\$700k). HNTB to execute work associated with the grant. Decision will be made during that work for the design-build construction grant.
  - Potential for overflow bridge replacement, as well.
- I-95 over Santee (Lake Marion) bridge replacement – DB prep work is underway.
  - Project has been delayed due to grant application timeline, anticipate procurement to begin in 2024.
- Low Country Corridor West and I-26/I-526 Interchange – EJ mitigation in 2023; first phase RFQ in 2028.
  - Five phases are currently being evaluated for project delivery type.
- I-85 @ US 278
  - Public Meeting was held 3/21/23
  - Funding by Anderson County, construction not currently funded
- Note: Additional project information has been posted to the website: [SCDOT Design-Build Overview](#).

### **III. Action Items from 1/18/2023 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.
  - SCDOT has to discuss with policy committee.
  - Room for SCDOT to grow
  - Leave open to encourage discussion & it be an ever evolving process
- **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]**
  - 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.
  - Significant information received from various sources, SCDOT asking for any countrywide information the community hears about.
  - 
  - ACEC and AGC would like to help & move that forward due to nationwide trends in this direction.
  - SCDOT leadership is still considering the best approach to legislative measures.
  - North Carolina is currently pushing this legislation.
  - SCDOT attended the DBIA conference last week. Progressive Design-Build was a hot topic, but many states agree that it is not the answer to all of the challenges with traditional design-build. SCDOT is currently focusing on traditional best-value design-build methods and how to continually improve those processes.
  - ACEC and AGC desires to get that legislative piece in place so that SCDOT can have the option to use Progressive Design-Build when appropriate.
- **AGC** to review, discuss, and provide particular erosion control items that have been problematic and could benefit from Unit pricing. **[OPEN]**
  - Risk shift, but you're united in the approach. Team approach
  - Silt fence, rip rap, check dams, maintenance
  - Limiting to the larger projects, multi-year interstate jobs
  - Maintaining erosion control is hundreds of thousands to millions of dollars.
  - SCDOT asking AGC to provide a specific list of items **[ACTION]**
  - Approach it like patching with unit prices & contractor would estimate an amount & if contractor overruns they get paid based on that unit price.
  - NCDOT is contemplating the same thing.
  - Will request Rister to attend the next meeting & review that list. Will continue this discussion next time. **[ACTION]**
- **SCDOT** to issue memorandum regarding the proposed process for complex bridge peer review requirements. **[CLOSED]**
- **SCDOT** will identify and include other industry design-build projects in future meeting project updates. **[OPEN]**
  - SCDOT to consider County/City DB projects

- Request ACEC/AGC to assist in identifying & SCDOT will include in the meeting minutes **[ACTION]**
- Dorchester County
- Laurens County – small bridges
- SCDOT will prioritize the sharing of data and information as early as possible during pre-procurement meeting/presentation. **[CLOSED]**
  - Noted. Early coordination meeting will be held as early as possible.

#### 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.
  - Being used on CCR Phase 3
    - Addendum issued this week
    - Was never intended to review every single bridge in a project
    - Curved steel girders & seismic, SCDOT capped at 2 requests for independent peer review
    - Independent firm to run modelling check, cannot perform any other work on project
    - Include firm & duration/manhour estimate in Peer Review Package submittal
    - Peer Review Package is a required submittal prior to technical proposal due date. RFP will spell out package requirements
    - Pass/Fail grading with confidential meetings to discuss any concerns prior to approval
    - Revised “long span” structure type to include spans over 300’
    - Removed “may” statement for additional SCDOT requests
    - 26/95 Industry Review did not have these changes, these will be pushed out with the final RFP and continue to evolve as CCR3 version is updated.
    - ATCs could impact the number of reviews. Will be discussed during the ATC process.
    - Once Peer Review package is approved, teams will have clear understanding of what to bid.
    - ACEC – if there are multiple design firms & each require a peer review.
      - Lead Designer making sure peer review comments are dispersed to each design firm where applicable.
      - SCDOT should ask for the consistency in the peer review application.
    - Certification – EOR statement saying the other designs are consistent with the peer review comments made on the other reviews. Alternatively, each EOR from different subs will be subject to the same peer review requirements.

## V. Discipline Specific Discussion: Geotechnical

- LNTF
  - Improvements had been made recently. Design-Bid Build process has recently changed, contractor can bill up to half of the LNTF amount.
  - Contractor/Designers are not getting paid until official NTF. There is often a 3 month gap where they are not getting paid (i.e. geotech mobilization).
  - Schedule dictates the process & geotech is already behind when official NTF is approved.
  - SCDOT is generally doing enough preliminary geotech work up front.
  - ACEC states there is generally enough information to produce a preliminary report, but SCDOT cannot drill the entire job. Drilling sub is the hold up.
  - Same basic concept can be applied, cash flow going earlier. Design mobilization.
  - Design notice to proceed & construction notice to proceed (Georgia?)
    - LNTF 1 & LNTF 2 (85/385)
  - Are any other states doing something similar? Recommendations to approach? [AGC & ACEC] [ACTION]
  - Can SCDOT allow a percentage of the design fee under the LNTF?
  - Contract time is the day after the announcement before the schedule is approved.
  - There is SCDOT benefit to owning the geotechnical efforts being done if a contract is not executed. [ACTION]
- Differing Ground Conditions
  - SCDOT works to identify projects with subsurface risk and provide relief in certain circumstances. Limiting risk (ex. Port Access)
- GDM 2022
  - Educating the industry as a whole about revisions and new content.
  - If there is seismic instability – structural mitigation is now another option in addition to geotechnical mitigation. Structural mitigation design example provided in the Appendix
  - ACEC – we need help identifying where those locations are upfront. During the prep phase, those areas need to be identified. Front loading structural/geotech firms to review.
  - AGC – Consider having all teams bid ground improvements, cost sharing mechanism.
  - SCDOT does not want to be prescriptive to the solution & leave the door open to design innovation
  - Biggest lift is the working together of the structural engineer & the geotechnical engineer during pursuit phase.
  - SCDOT works to alert design build pursuers to any red flag items identified during the prep stage.
  - Prep documents should be as specific as possible with order of magnitude.
- Low Volume Bridges

- More information in the PCDM 2017-11
  - Being revised currently
- The intent is to not have full blown reports for the small bridge packages.
- SCDOT wants to be consistent with Bid Build.
- Concise reports, limit filler.
- MSE walls with piles – accommodating downdrag as wall is built out. Including the downdrag load in pile capacity calculations vs. restriking piles after settlement has ceased. Design-build teams have been stretching piles to the structural limit & reducing cost. Value is not necessarily in the reduction of cost, but in the field being able to handle the unknown issues that arise with some excess available pile capacity.
- BDM update to address downdrag.

#### VI. Temporary Pavement Design

- Implementing a new process, including language in the RFP instructions to allow design teams to submit temporary pavement designs along with ATC's.
- Temporary pavements are typically provided for a minimum 3-year period. The new process allows the DB teams to provide a design based on their specific temporary MOT configurations and durations.
- I-26/I-95 RFP language implementation.
- The intent is to not review 10 different designs, but more alternative materials. Discussion will be had during the ATC process.
- General idea is to match the SN with the timeframe. Will look into language to narrow down the designs submitted.
- AGC asking for more emphasis on shoulder cores.
  - SCDOT identifies this as a risk item. It's a spot location result.
- Up to the DB teams to obtain additional cores. Has been done in the past & some are beneficial & some are not.
- Ultimate responsibility for the temporary pavement design goes to the contractor, but puts the SCDOT at risk.
- This new approach's purpose is the integration of the teams & SCDOT during the procurement process. Past experiences keep SCDOT more involved, 26/95 will be a step towards turning over that responsibility.
- SCDOT will consider adding language to limit to short, medium & long term pavement designs. Brackets of ranges based on temporary MOT duration.
- Minimum section will be provided.

#### VII. Open Discussion

- DB Prep Team ATC Reviews
  - Review of the 2017 letter from ACEC. See November 2017 Meeting Minutes
  - Is there a way to designate certain ATCs not be reviewed by prep team
  - Suggestion to not use the design-build prep team for fear of being offensive to the ATCs, but concerns about how to bring another team up to speed.

- Prep teams are instructed to not be “design-build designers” but more conservative designs that provide proof of concept.
- SCDOT is providing oversight to deter any prejudicial review.
- SCDOT only intends to use the prep team as a technical expertise resources in most cases. Sometimes the team will have to review the entire ATC, but more times it will be a resource.
- ACEC to provide additional feedback before giving a revised official letter. SCDOT will have internal discussion. [ACTION]
- Utility Delays & how the agency is handling them. Consistency
  - Bring in Utility for next meeting or two.
    - ACEC Utility Subcommittee
    - Jason Byrd & Utility Director
  - Dedicated utility coordinators for each project & the utilities just do not respond.
  - LD’s – what’s reasonable to assume when it comes to utility delays
- Bridge Packages
  - Are we getting into more prescriptive design & less ATC’s applicable? Are we losing innovation?
  - Base hydraulic analysis is being provided now, as requested from this committee.
  - During procurement of the emergency packages, it was hard to level the playing field.
  - Minimums have been included to balance the playing field.
  - Best Value – not low bid
  - New list of bridges will be forthcoming.
  - SCDOT is open to feedback into the delivery of the future bridge packages.
    - Less procurements, larger packages are potential.
  - Suggestion to extend procurement duration for the more difficult bridge packages.
  - Utility conflicts are an ongoing issue with each package, SCDOT working to head off issues early.
- Bond issue. CCR Phase 3.
  - Payment bond & performance bonds are on the website now that insurance companies will accept.
- Move back agenda meeting two weeks before subcommittee meeting
- AGC to research other states’ utility approaches. [ACTION]

## VIII. Action Items

- **SCDOT/ACEC/AGC** to continue ongoing discussion for 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.
- **AGC** to review, discuss, and provide particular erosion control items that have been problematic and could benefit from Unit pricing. SCDOT asking AGC to provide a specific list of items

- 
- **SCDOT** will request David Rister to attend the next meeting & review that list. Will continue this discussion next time.
  - **SCDOT** will identify and include other industry design-build projects in future meeting project updates. Request **ACEC/AGC** to assist in identifying & **SCDOT** will include in the meeting minutes.
  - **AGC/ACEC** to research Geotechnical LNTP approaches by other states & bring recommendations for updating SCDOT's current process. **SCDOT** to consider the benefits of to owning the geotechnical efforts being done if contract is not executed.
  - **ACEC** to provide additional feedback on design-build prep teams being utilized for ATC reviews before giving a revised official letter. **SCDOT** will have internal discussion.
  - **AGC** to research other states' utility approaches.

**IX. Next Meeting Date: 5/17/2023 @ 9:30 AM**