
Agenda
SCDOT/ACEC/AGC Design-Build Sub-Committee Meeting
03-17-21 @ 9:00 am

I. Welcome/Introductions

- Chris Gaskins
- Clay Richter
- Brooks Bickley
- Brad Reynolds
- Jae Mattox
- John Caver
- Kevin Harrington
- Will McGoldrick
- Barbara Wessinger
- Brian Gambrell
- Carmen Wright
- Daniel Burton
- Patrick McKenzie
- Gary Linn
- Lee Bradley
- Dave Rankin
- Pete Weber
- Rob Loar
- Jim O'Connor
- Aaron Goldberg
- Walker Roberts
- Erin Slayton

II. Project Updates

SCDOT

- SC 4 over South Fork Edisto River – Emergency bridge replacement, public announcement was on 3/5/21.
- Carolina Crossroads Phase 1 – In procurement
- Carolina Crossroads Phase 2 – In procurement
- Closed and Load Restricted Bridges 2021-1 –District 4 with eight bridges. In project development. RFQ on 3/31/21.
- Cross Island Parkway Toll Conversion – Toll plaza removal, pavement strengthening. RFQ 2nd quarter of 2021. Fixed price with a variable scope.
- I-20 over Wateree, River and Overflow Bridges – In project development to evaluate rehab versus replacement. RFQ in early 2022.
- Carolina Crossroads Phase 3 – RFQ in 2022
- I-26/I-95 Interchange Improvements – Awaiting PE funding, possibly in place late

spring/early summer 2021

- Mark Clark Expressway – Continuing development of Supplemental EIS. RFQ in 2023
- Low Country Corridor West and I-26/I-526 Interchange – ROD is expected in 2022 and RFQ could move to 2027.
 - Five phases are currently being evaluated for delivery method type.
- Low Country Corridor East – Currently in project development and NEPA. Procurement timeframe TBD.

III. Action Items from 01-20-21

- SCDOT to continue to review comments on Design Optimization language in RFP.
 - Baseline standard of expectancy is that anything the DB team is submitting is RFP compliant, do not assume it is being offered as a betterment. AGC/ACEC has again requested to use a table to clarify what the teams are committing to. SCDOT has the option to use the communications process for handling quality credits that may be unclear. SCDOT request AGC/ACEC to give feedback on how other states are handling this situation. - OPEN
- SCDOT to internally discuss DBE findings and report back to Subcommittee a position.
 - AGC/ACEC appreciates the advantage of waiting to commit to the DBE requirement. Many of the larger projects would struggle to get a large enough DBE commitment for professional services. They are in support of the Overall Project Goal, but force fitting the DBE to Professional Services will create problems. DBE office has a list of professional services that they are trying to utilize DBE firms for. DBE office cannot offer comments on the quality of work or the amount of work received, they just determine if they are on the qualified list. Professional services goals are coming and SCDOT is going to do what they can to keep them reasonable to manage. Gary Linn is reviewing the process for identifying the right Professional Services DBE Goal % on Design-Build Projects. A Special Provision will be created to identify the timing requirement for the submittal of Professional Services DBE Commitments (most likely within 30 calendar days from the effective date of the Agreement)- CLOSED
- AGC/ACEC to review Insurance and Bonding requirements and provide comments.
 - Barbara Wessinger received 4 sets of comments on these documents. SCDOT Legal is reviewing the comments with an outside consultant. Some of the suggestions were accepted, some were rejected, and some provisions not raised in comments are being modified. SCDOT will issue revised Insurance and Bonding requirements - OPEN
- AGC/ACEC to provide examples of written responses that left something open to interpretation, and examples of how other states approach this issue. – AGC/ACEC had a hard time finding examples, it's not a wide spread problem, but was an instance where things were unclear. They request that SCDOT scrutinize the responses before posting or providing in the future, but that it's not a widespread problem. - CLOSED
- SCDOT to prepare shop drawing language and discuss at next meeting.
 - Isolated example, Shop drawing comments were returned to the contractor and then

another set was returned later. The process should run concurrently. SCDOT has developed a document on the design-build shop drawing process to supplement section 725 of the SCDOT Standard Specifications. SCDOT to provide to AGC and ACEC for review - OPEN

- IV. COVID Federal Funding SCDOT
- South Carolina will be receiving \$166 Million, of which, SCDOT will be getting \$149 Million. SCDOT will use \$142 Million to pay off debt; \$7 Million will be used for the Interstate Program. The goal is to sustainably grow the program. Pay off of the current debt will free up \$13 Million per year to put toward new projects. It is important to note that SCDOT has managed through COVID without disrupting the construction program unlike other states and will not be using the funds as a bailout, but rather to advance the 10-year plan and address gaps in the MMTP.
- V. Schedule of Values (SOV) SCDOT
- Currently after project award, SCDOT gives the design-build team optional line items to submit as SOV. However, SCDOT Engineer's Estimate quantities developed by SCDOT and the SOV submitted by the Contractor do not correspond. SCDOT is interested in defining a list of SOV items for a project in the RFP that can be selected from by the Contractor. AGC/ACEC is amenable to specifying a list of SOV items in the RFP and prior to SOV submittal by the Contractor.
- VI. Quantities in RFC Plans ACEC
- AGC/ACEC has found that many other states do not require quantities to be submitted with RFC plans on design-build projects because they have already bid that cost as a lump sum. However, SCDOT utilizes these quantities for quality control on design-build projects. In addition, SCDOT puts design-build project plans in the Plans library for reference and these need to be consistent with other design-bid-build projects. SCDOT has no desire to stop requiring quantities as a part of the design-build RFC plan submittal.
- VII. Open Discussion
- Incorporation of ATCs from other teams – Limited Negotiations allows SCDOT to incorporate ATCs typically after award, but prior to contract execution. SCDOT prefers to avoid change orders immediately after project award.
 - AGC suggests using a BAFO with all teams using the ATC to ensure that all teams have a fair chance at winning the project. However, SCDOT believes this approach would give certain teams an unfair advantage.
 - Upcoming CLRB project may be a good candidate for the more limited Key Individuals requirement to be on site based on project size.
 - SCDOT will open its doors to consultants and travel in state on April 19th. The SCDOT Design-Build Group plans to continue to utilize virtual meetings for the foreseeable

future.

VIII. Action Items

- AGC/ACEC to give feedback on how proposal commitments are handled in other states.
- SCDOT to continue to review Insurance and Bonding language comments and provide revised version to AGC/ACEC for further review.
- SCDOT to provide revised shop drawing language to be reviewed by AGC/ACEC prior to May subcommittee meeting.

IX. Next Meeting Date May 19, 2021, 9:00 AM (SCDOT Lead)

X. Adjourn