
Meeting Minutes

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

5-20-20 @ 9:00 am

I. Welcome/Introductions

A. Attendees

Chris Gaskins (SCDOT)
Brooks Bickley (SCDOT)
Ben McKinney (SCDOT)
John Caver (SCDOT)
Chris Lacey (SCDOT)
David Rister (SCDOT)
Barbara Wessinger (SCDOT)
Carmen Wright (SCDOT)
Clay Richter (SCDOT)
Kevin Harrington (SCDOT)
David Hebert (SCDOT)
Bruce Wells (SCDOT)
Tad Kitowicz (FHWA)
Dave Rankin (AGC)
Rob Loar (AGC)
Pete Weber (AGC)
Lee Bradley (AGC)
Elham Farzam (ACEC)
Paul Raad (ACEC)
Jim O'Conner (ACEC)
Erin Slayton (ACEC)

II. Project Updates

- US 1 over I-20 – Nearing contract execution
- Closed and Load Restricted Bridge Package 2020-1 – Proposal review underway.
- New I-77 Interchange in York County – Permit issued last week, RFQ/RFP nearing completion, anticipating award of grant this summer.
- Carolina Crossroads PH1 SOQ received last week, PH2 RFQ in July.
- Closed and Load Restricted Bridges 2021-1: Next up is district 4 with 9 bridges. RFQ in Q1 2021 to align with funding commitments.
- Carolina Crossroads PH 3 – RFQ in 2022
- Low Country Corridor West –RFQ in 2022 or Beyond
- Mark Clark Expressway – RFQ in 2022 or Beyond
- I-26 over US 1 and SCLRR– Currently on hold

- I-26 over SC 302 – Currently on hold
- I-20 over Wateree – Currently on hold
- US 278 over MacKay Creek – Evaluating project delivery method
- I-95 Widening MM 0-8 – Evaluating project delivery method
- I-26 Widening MM 125-136 – Evaluating project delivery method
- I-26/I-95 Interchange Improvements – Evaluating project delivery method

III. Action Items from 1-15-19

- A. SCDOT to incorporate check writing comments into the ROW Acquisition Language.
- B. SCDOT to revise the entire ROW section in the agreement
- C. AGC/ACEC to review and comment on AGC/ACEC draft language to clarify and define design optimization vs cost sharing in Technical Proposals
 - 1. SCDOT expressed reservations about quality of proposals
 - 2. Tad with FHWA expressed the need to discuss how to hold communications regarding questions surrounding this
- D. SCDOT will provide new language associated with staffing requirements on less complicated/smaller Design-Build projects to the committee later this week. The new language focuses on requiring a Design-Build Coordinator to be fully dedicated to the project in lieu of requiring a PM full time.
- E. SCDOT to determine whether any SUE work will be placed in attachment B so that it can be relied on. SCDOT will include the SUE data in Attachment B when appropriate. CLOSED
- F. AGC to provide proposed revisions to the current schedule language in the RFP
 - 1. Bruce requested that the language address what data will be used to define weather days
- G. ACEC/AGC to provide examples of other State DOT differing site conditions statements – SCDOT has revised the Agreement and will be sharing it with the AGC/ACEC after this meeting and it will be included on the next procurement. CLOSED
- H. ACEC to coordinate with SCDOT on the Utility Discussion
 - 1. Presentation will be scheduled for the July meeting. Oriana and Cedric will be presenters

IV. Design-Build Schedule Requirements (AGC)

- A. Industry wants to include weather calendar in the schedule for projects.

V. Design-Builder Responsibility for Girder Design – FIB Span vs. Depth (AGC/ACEC)

- A. Deviations from the Span versus Depth ratio tables will be considered as long as the following are addressed by the Designer of Record:
 - 1. Load rating – Needs to address the EV 3 truck (heavier than HL-93 vehicle)
 - 2. Lateral stability – girder design needs to address lateral stability
 - 3. Deflection – Girder Deflection must be addressed by DOR

-
- VI. Industry Interest in Design-Build Bridge Rehab Projects (SCDOT)
- A. SCDOT is considering procuring DB Team for three Bridge Rehab Projects. Industry seems interested depending on complexity.
 - B. Would there be competition?
 - C. Packaging of projects - what would be an attractive range?
 - D. Wateree could be a potential complete deck replacement – Is there a requirement to upgrade rails to MASH standards?
 - 1. Would require meeting full design standards
 - 2. If patching deck is satisfactory, the project would fall under maintenance agreement and would not require design exceptions
 - 3. Life cycle cost may point to replacement versus rehab
 - 4. Procurement may be performance-based as opposed to prescriptive
- VII. Q&A Process during RFQ Stage (SCDOT)
- A. SCDOT broadening approach to communication during RFQ stage. Industry welcomes additional communication.
 - B. Currently accept questions and provide 1 of 3 answers.
 - C. SCDOT has backed away from one on one meetings due to concerns over consistent communication between the teams.
 - D. Communication will be non-confidential.
- VIII. Open Discussion
- IX. Action Items.
- A. SCDOT to incorporate check writing comments into the ROW Acquisition Language.
 - B. SCDOT to revise the entire ROW section in the agreement
 - C. SCDOT to provide new language for Design-Build coordinator on less complex Design-Build projects.
 - D. SCDOT to review comments on Design Optimization language in RFP.
 - E. SCDOT to share Differing Site Conditions/ Force Majeure/ and Default/Suspension/Termination sections of the agreement with the Subcommittee.
 - F. AGC to provide proposed revision language on schedules.
 - G. AGC/ACEC to give feedback on Design-Build Rehab concept
- X. Next Meeting Date July 15, 2020, 9:00 AM (ACEC Lead)
- XI. Adjourn