

Meeting Minutes

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

9-26-18 @ 9:00 am

I. Welcome/Introductions

- Attendees
 - Chris Gaskins (SCDOT)
 - Ben McKinney (SCDOT)
 - Brad Reynolds (SCDOT)
 - Jae Mattox (SCDOT)
 - Hongfen Li (SCDOT)
 - Trapp Harris (SCDOT)
 - Barbara Wessinger (SCDOT)
 - David Hebert (SCDOT)
 - David Rogers (SCDOT)
 - Carmen Wright (SCDOT)
 - Chad Curran (AGC)
 - Michael Gantt (AGC)
 - Ron Shaw (AGC)
 - Dave Pupkiewicz (AGC)
 - Hisham Abdelaziz (ACEC)
 - Brice Urquhart (ACEC)
 - Bryan Shiver (ACEC)
 - Jeff Mulliken (ACEC)

II. Personnel Changes/Subcommittee Member Changes

- None.

III. Project Updates

SCDOT expects to issue an RFQ every four months in 2019.

SCDOT expects to bid one bridge package per year for next 10 years. Value up to \$50M per package.

SCDOT expects to bid one mega project every two years. Bid dates will be updated on DB website by mid October.

- SC 277 NB over I-77 Bridge Replacement – Procurement finished September 21.
- I-26 MM 85 to 101 – In procurement, May 2019 award.
- GDOT I-20 Bridge Replacement – Proposals due today, September 26.
- I-85 Rocky Creek – Expect March 2019 RFQ

- Carolina Crossroads I-20/26/126 – RFQ is expected in the January 2019 with award in December 2019.
- Closed and Load Restricted Bridges – DB Group has package in hand with 14 bridges in the Upstate. RFQ in late 2019 with approximate value of \$30M.
- US 1 over I-20 Bridge Replacement – June 2019 is intended for RFQ. Need to get the NEPA started.

- Future possible projects from 2020 and beyond:
 - Lowcountry Corridor – Bid 2022
 - I-85 MM 51 - 69 – Bid 2024
 - I-85 MM 40 - 51 – Bid 2026
 - I-26 over US 1, SCLRR, and SC 302 – Bid 2021
 - I-20 over Wateree – Bid 2022
 - I-26 MM 15-22 – Currently on hold
 - I-526 MM 18-30 – Bid 2028
 - I-26 MM 212-218 – Currently on hold

IV. Action Items from Previous Meeting

- Work History Forms and RFQ Template – Waiting to review template from SCDOT.
- CEI Procurement Timing – Poll of ACEC members came back with preference split 50/50 over procurement prior to RFQ or after shortlist. With no clear preference by ACEC, issue closed.
- ROW Acquisition Cost – DOT talked internally last week on issue and is open to transferring ROW cost to DOT based on value of preferred alternate shown in RFP. DOT unwilling to take on ROW cost associated with DB Team ATCs but would consider quality credits for reduced ROW alternatives. DOT to provide draft language by next meeting for review and expects to incorporate into Carolina Crossroads.
- Utility Relocation Time – DOT discussed this issue internally and is willing to consider taking on some of the risk associated with utility relocation time. As detailed by AGC, DOT and DB Team come to an agreement of anticipated time required to relocate major utilities for incorporation into project schedule. DB Team responsible for time and cost associated with time agreed to by parties. DOT would provide time extension and cost of extended overhead for time in excess of agreed time. DOT stated that they may want to set the anticipated relocation time rather than have a mutual agreement with the DB Team. DOT would consider quality credits for reduced utility relocation impacts. DOT to discuss further internally and may have more dialog at next meeting. Draft language potentially ready for review in 2019.

- Performance Based Specs – ACEC discussed the following specifications to consider for Performance Based Spec model: muck, median barrier, pavements, vibration monitoring, PDA requirements, high strength geotextiles, and bridge deck. DOT has looked at other states to see what performance based specs have been used previously. DOT asking discipline leads to come up with 3 specs to present as possible candidates. Would be looking for specs that have short validation period to ensure specification is providing desired result. DOT discussed potentially asking for extended warranties to offset unknowns if they implement performance based spec. DOT was cautioned that after 3 years it is really a maintenance issue or a warranty issue. Discussed Texas’ 5, 5 and 5 warranty process as model of extended warranty. DOT must determine where the problem areas are relative to quality and must consider third party liability. DOT to perform research and will present options for potential specs when ready.

V. DB Team Performance Evaluations

Now that the first round of evaluations have gone out to teams, what happens next? DOT evaluated 11 projects and issued 22 evaluations. After evaluations are issued, teams have ability to respond and sign within a week of receiving evaluation. DOT compiles all evaluation data into a spreadsheet and prepares a report for DOT executives to review. Expectation is that this report will be generated within 30 days of the date that the DOT issues the evaluations to the teams. DOT will use past performance scores in evaluating teams during the SOQ stage to determine shortlist. Each evaluation is to represent only the 6 month period defined on the evaluation. DOT is willing to debrief teams with overall scores less than 5 as the process is being worked out. May suspend debriefs in the future once process is better understood by both sides. DOT will not change scores provided in the evaluation but may consider in the short term revising comments after discussion if appropriate. Next round of evaluations scheduled for January 2019.

VI. Procurement Time

DOT currently using 9 and 13 month procurement schedules and looking for feedback on timelines and whether or not there is one size that fits all. Consensus is that there is no one size that fits all procurements. Need to look at how to better utilize time during procurements. AGC gathered some timeline data from procurements in other states, will summarize and send for review by committee.

VII. Size of Projects

DOT asked if there is a project size that is most appropriate or preferred by industry. AGC asked what number of SOQs DOT is looking for to ensure appropriate competition. DOT’s preference is 4 to 6 submitters. Consensus was that \$100M to \$300M project range appears to be the right fit for DOT,

contractors and designers when dealing with interstate widening type projects. Bridge committee likes packages with 10 bridges and recommends bidding packages quicker but allow more construction time so bridge contractors can maximize their resources. Bridge committee does not like A+B type procurement for bridge packages.

VIII. IMR Responsibility

DOT is seeking input on shifting the IMR responsibility to the DB Teams with an idea like the NEPA box concept. DOT does not want to limit innovation or lead the DB Teams down a certain path by obtaining IMR for projects. DOT is considering implementing this on the US 1 over I-20 Project. During procurement, teams would have to present IMR concepts to FHWA to receive “Operational Acceptance”. Teams would present concepts to FHWA in a process and timeline similar to the current ATC process. DOT would provide the traffic studies for teams to develop concepts. A question was raised asking what happens if a team cannot obtain operational acceptance. There was no clear answer to this but DOT is concerned that a team may drop out of the procurement if it cannot obtain operational acceptance. ROW outside of the box defined by the DOT would be the DB Team’s responsibility. The DOT is currently unaware of how many concepts or what level/type of information would be needed by FHWA to review preliminary concepts during the procurement process along with what info would be needed for the one final concept DOT will discuss this with FHWA. Committee agreed to the concept but would need to have better definition of the process, definition of operational acceptance and timeline to obtain final IMR. If teams start developing IMR concepts as soon as DOT publishes project data, teams would have approximately 4 months before submittal of draft concepts for review. If teams wait until after shortlist, teams would have approximately 2 months to develop and submit draft concepts for review. ACEC questioned what type of data would be needed by the DB Team to initiate design of a concept and suggested that good survey data would be a necessity. How much time is appropriate to produce draft concepts and obtain operational acceptance?

IX. Open Discussion

DOT did not hold peer exchange with other states. Meeting is being rescheduled and will share information once exchange is held.

X. Action Items

- Work History Forms and RFQ Template – SCDOT continues to develop responses to comments and will provide as soon as available.
- ROW Acquisition Language – SCDOT will provide draft language by next meeting.
- Utility Relocation Time – SCDOT will continue internal discussion and will follow up at next meeting.
- Performance Based Spec – SCDOT will research and provide data when available.

-
- Procurement Time – AGC to summarize data from other states and provide to committee.
 - IMR Responsibility – AGC and ACEC to discuss and determine if timeline similar to ATC timeline is appropriate.
- XI. Next Meeting Date: SCDOT to provide date options. ACEC to lead next meeting.
- XII. Adjourn