

SCDOT/ACEC/AGC Design-Build Sub-Committee Meeting
SCDOT Headquarters Building
955 Park Street, Room 331
Columbia, SC 29201
07-18-18 @ 9:00 am

Michael Gantt	CAGC/UIG
Chad Curran	Lane Construction
Dave Pupkiewicz	Archer Western
Ron Shaw	Lee Construction of the Carolinas
Hisham Abdelaziz	CDM Smith
Bryan Shiver	Terracon/ACEC
Jae Mattox	SCDOT
Ben McKinney	SCDOT
David Hebert	SCDOT
Eric Dickey (for Brice Urquhart)	Davis & Floyd
Trapp Harris	SCDOT
Hongfen Li	SCDOT
Chris Gaskins	SCDOT
Brooks Bickley	SCDOT

I. Welcome/Introductions SCDOT/ACEC/AGC

- No new members since the last meeting

II. Project Updates SCDOT

- I-85 MM 98 to 106 – NTP on 5-14-18
- SC 277 NB over I-77 Bridge Replacement – Public Announcement 9-18-18
- I-26 MM 85 to 101 – The 2nd Industry Review will be released this week.
- GDOT I-20 Bridge Replacement – RFP released 6-14-18. Bid opening is in October. SCDOT is involved in the procurement.
- I-85 Rocky Creek – Still determining how project will be procured.
- Lester Road & Four Hole – Bid opening on 6-28-18, NTP in August
- Arcadia Lakes – Project has DHEC issues. Off of DB agenda for now.
- Carolina Crossroads I-20/26/126 – Mega projects group will be managing. DB group will do procurement. RFQ is expected in the Fall/Winter of 2018 with award in December 2019. SCDOT construction management being discussed.
- Closed and Load Restricted Bridges – Not on the DB agenda for now. Still expected to be DB, would be late 2019 at earliest. Industry likes the smaller packages in a single district/region with similar geography.
- US 1 over I-20 Bridge Replacement – RFQ still expected in 2019. Starting NEPA process soon (Design-Build Prep).
- Future possible projects from 2020 and beyond:
 - Lowcountry Corridor - 2022
 - I-85 MM 40 - 69 – may be split into two sections in 2024 (52 - 69) and 2026 (40 -51) (Design-Build Prep)
 - I-26 over US 1, SCLRR, and SC 302 – expected to be one project in 2021 (Design-Build Prep)

- I-20 over Wateree – 2022 (Design-Build Prep)
- I-26 MM 15-22 – procurement not scheduled
- I-526 MM 18-30 – 2028
- I-26 MM 212-218 – procurement not scheduled

III. Action Items from 5-16-18

SCDOT/ACEC/AGC

- a. Work History Forms and RFQ Template – Outside council reviewing templates. Once we get the comments incorporated, we will provide them for industry review.
- b. CEI Procurement Timing – Will provide updated info from ACEC at the next meeting.
- c. ROW Acquisition Cost – Mixed results from the poll of other states. There are states doing it both ways. Risk associated with Contractor acquiring the ROW could exceed the benefits. What is the incentive for the Contractor to Reduce ROW (schedule – The less ROW gets them to work faster) **AGC sent 6 states of data to SCDOT at the end of June.**
- d. Utility Relocation Time – Utilities currently have no incentive to move according to schedule, and it is a major risk to the Contractor. **SCDOT to discuss internally and provide feedback.**
- e. Performance Specs – Switch it to a strength requirement
- f. Pavement Quality Credits – AGC will look at language on other RFPs and provide feedback. Why didn't the teams pursue quality credits? The teams had no way of knowing what they provided would provide them with worthwhile credits. SCDOT is attempting to do a dollar for dollar incentive. North Carolina has successfully awarded recent projects to the 2nd lowest bidder.

IV. Preliminary ATC Responses

AGC

- a. It's important that SCDOT provide honest feedback to the teams on the preliminary ATCs. If too many are considered favorable, both sides lose. The industry wants to know the best chances that they have of getting ATCs approved. Realistic answers are needed in order to avoid wasted time. Can we introduce "priority order" language into our RFPs for submitted ATCs? For example, "when submitting preliminary ATCs, you should submit the highest priority first."
- b. This is why the meetings are important. SCDOT should continue to give the preliminary answers before the meeting. We will only provide responses to ATCs in question or those that need information, not the ones that are comfortably favorable or absolutely not favorable.

V. Quantity of ATC's

AGC

- a. More closely match the preliminary and formal ATCs.
- b. The number of ATCs allowed should relate to the type, nature, and size of the project. SCDOT to consider categorizing number of ATCs allowed based on size and complexity of projects.
- c. SCDOT to consider limiting ATCs based on establishing a minimum cost savings amount, on a project-specific basis.
- d. Alignment shifts should not be considered an ATC. Teams can use up all of their ATCs in alignment shifts. It comes down to the NEPA impacts. See current language in RFP

templates; ATC only required when impacts are increased, i.e. alignment shift increases ROW impacts.

- e. If you need a specification for a product or a method, an ATC is required.
 - f. The industry recommends a limit on ATCs, rather than unlimited ATCs, because of the cost associated with ATC development. The industry appreciates our ATC schedule that helps everyone keep up with responses.
 - g. As discussed in Item IV, SCDOT to require prioritization and giving answers before the meeting will help the teams prepare for the meeting and decide which ATCs to concentrate on.
- VI. Design-Build Team Performance Evaluation Forms SCDOT
- a. SCDOT has incorporated comments into the revisions of the forms. The timeline has been shifted to June/January. Beta tested the process on existing projects. SCDOT plans to brief Senior Leadership and implement in July and August 2018.
- VII. Technical Proposal Presentations – Q&A, Clarifications, Timing SCDOT
- a. There will changes coming, SCDOT does not feel that the presentations are reaching their full potential.
 - b. The timing of the meeting will be pushed as close to the submittal of the Cost Proposal and Bid opening as possible.
 - c. SCDOT needs to have the proposals fully reviewed before the presentations.
 - d. Intent of the presentations was for the teams to point out the important aspects of their technical proposals. Provide emphasis on points that the teams want us to be aware of. This also allows SCDOT to develop applicable questions for teams and teams to respond to those questions in order to facilitate a thorough understanding of the teams Technical Proposal before final scores are developed.
 - e. SCDOT considering the best way to phrase some of the questions without allowing the teams to “cure” any deficiencies in the technical proposals.
 - f. SCDOT would like to hear how other states are doing this process. We are doing a design-build research project that covers some aspects of this discussion.
- VIII. Non-Confidential/Confidential Questions
- a. We feel that these meetings are not meeting their full potential. SCDOT wants the teams to be as open as and vocal as possible in these open forum meetings. Other states have been encouraging saying that it will take some time for the Industry to open up. SCDOT intends to document the questions that are made during the meeting and will be sharing them (only the question, not the answers).
- IX. Procurement Time SCDOT
- a. SCDOT requesting feedback on the overall procurement time used over the past 2-3 years. Originally our goal was to squeeze these procurement times down as short as possible. We have developed two schedules now (9 and 13 months) and are using the longer schedule for a project now. Industry has noted that this 13 month schedule may be too long.

- b. If the industry has to struggle to gather information, then the 9 month time frame is very aggressive. It is project and scope dependent. Straight forward bridge projects could be as short as 6 months.
- c. What are the most important time components? IR/ATC/Tech Proposal Development? Do not shorten the Time after the Final RFP is released. That is when the most work happens. SCDOT feels that the Industry Review is most critical to get the RFP correct to avoid Addendums. Industry finds the time after the final ATC determinations until the final technical proposals are turned in to be too short. They are doubling the effort required because they have to pursue multiple designs.

X. Open Discussion SCDOT/ACEC/AGC

XI. Action Items SCDOT/ACEC/AGC

- a. SCDOT to provide information on Work History Forms
- b. ACEC will provide CEI procurement timing position statement prior to next meeting.
- c. SCDOT to provide update on Utility Relocation Time
- d. ACEC to provide feedback on performance specs
- e. Industry to return feedback on procurement time needed.

XII. Next Meeting Date September 19, 2018 (AGC Lead) AGC

- a. SCDOT will most likely reschedule due to conflict with Owners Peer Exchange.

XIII. Adjourn