

Meeting Minutes

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

2-14-18 @ 10:00 am

I. Welcome/Introductions

a. Attendees

Chris Gaskins (SCDOT)	Brice Urquhart (ACEC)
Ben McKinney (SCDOT)	Hisham Abdelaziz (ACEC)
Jae Mattox (SCDOT)	Bryan Shiver (ACEC)
Tyke Redfearn (SCDOT)	Jeff Mulliken (ACEC)
Hongfen Li (SCDOT)	Dave Pupkiewicz (AGC)
Barbara Wessinger (SCDOT)	Michael Gantt (AGC)
Brooks Bickley (SCDOT)	
Kevin Turner (SCDOT)	
David Hebert (SCDOT)	
Claude Ipock (SCDOT)	

II. Personnel Changes/Subcommittee Member Changes

- SCDOT will have Hongfen Li and Clay Richter join the subcommittee as replacements for Binh Nguyen and Claude Ipock, respectively.
- ACEC members Hisham Abdelaziz and Brice Urquhart will be joining Jeff Mulliken and Bryan Shiver for 2018.
- Welcome new AGC members, Ron Shaw (Lee Construction) and Dave Pupkiewicz (Archer Western). Chad Curran will be the Chair for AGC.

III. Project Updates

- I-85 MM 98 to 106 – The DB Group will accept cost proposals and distribute technical scores in the morning of February 22nd. After Discussions, a public announcement will be made in a new format that afternoon.
- SC 277 NB over I-77 Bridge Replacement – The RFP for Industry Review was released February 13th.
- I-26 MM 85 to 101 – There will be a STIP Amendment made in February. This is now considered a major project and requires additional documentation for FHWA. The RFQ will be released in Late March. The RFP for Industry Review will released in Late May The Final RFP will be released in July followed by a January 2019 Bid Opening. New information will be on the website soon.
- GDOT I-20 Bridge Replacement – The RFQ will be released spring/summer of 2018. The project will be administered by GDOT. They will hold an industry forum in March.
- I-85 Rocky Creek – Possible culvert/bridge replacement project on the horizon.

-
- Lester Road – Possible Future DB Project that consists of three bridges on Lester Road over the black river. The road is currently closed. There are environmental concerns for one bridge. We are waiting on a final permit determination.
 - Arcadia Lakes – Potential candidate for DB now that the Dam has been reconstructed.
 - Carolina Crossroads I-20/26/126 – RFQ is expected in the Fall of 2018 with Award in December 2019.
 - US 1 over I-20 Bridge Replacement – The DB Schedule will be dependent on available cash flow.
 - Closed and Load Restricted Bridges – These bridges will likely be grouped geographically or by district.

IV. Action Items from 11-08-17 Meeting

- SCDOT – Responses to industry comments have been developed and will be sent out after template changes are made to the Work History Form and the RFQ Template.
- SCDOT – Coordinate with SCDOT Environmental on NOI Submittals and approaching SCDHEC regarding expectation of phased or segmented submittals on projects. Early coordination on DB projects with SCDOT and DHEC will lead to the most efficient way to get the NOI approved. It is critical that we accurately account for those days in the project schedules.
- SCDOT – Provide link to new website for ACEC/AGC to review and comment. We are actively making updates to the website and are open to comments from the industry. Website is now live, so no link required. ACEC and AGC will submit comments to SCDOT march 21st.

Other AI Updates:

- SCDOT – DB Team Performance Evaluation Forms and Process – DB group finalized the forms in late 2017 and are now evaluating the lead contractor and lead designer on six projects (77, 20, PAR, 85, Volvo, HR). We will utilize these scores as a part of SOQ evaluations. Beta testing of these six projects will be complete by April 2018.
- Question on Past Performance: How does past performance score reflect on teams that have not done work in SC yet? - SCDOT Answer: We will be utilizing references and work histories also, just as we do currently.
- Question on ATCs – How much alignment offset is considered an ATC? – New language has been added to the RFP Template. The impacts (ROW/environmental impacts) determine if we will accept it as an ATC.
- Question about Pavement design –SCDOT is trying to get the pavement information out earlier in order to ease the industry concerns about teaming and planning.
- Question about Bid Bonds – SCDOT will consider whether it's needed or not for future projects.

-
- How can SCDOT contractually hold the DB Team to the information exchanged in a confidential meeting? There is discussion about using a form similar to the ATC forms to document contractual changes from a confidential meeting. Sometimes the confidential meetings are outside of the realm of an ATC.
- V. ATC Forms
- Can SCDOT improve user friendliness? The industry requests more space in the form to document their ATCs. SCDOT plans to increase the box size for the three criteria that require responses and move all optional criteria to a second page.
- VI. SOQ Scores
- Question - Can SCDOT provide SOQ scores at time of short listing? SCDOT intends to do this.
- VII. Future Competition
- With the size and types of DB projects forthcoming in the next five years, can the DB industry continue to successfully pursue, and if awarded, design and construct these projects with an acceptable level of quality and innovation?
 - SCDOT's intent is to push for the highest quality product and innovation. Question: Could we require a detailed QC plan in the technical proposal? If a detailed QC plan is requested, the teams need 10-15% more space in the technical proposal. The page limit is currently too small, but the industry does agree, there needs to be a page limit. SCDOT will consider adjusting the page limit based on project size. Another option is to include the QC plan in an appendix. The industry would like to be able to include video or graphics in the presentation, but this will need to be evaluated per project because of the associated cost. SCDOT suggests making comments about the graphics/videos during the RFP for Industry Review.
 - The construction industry is struggling with craft workforce. Everyone seems to have a hard time keeping qualified workforce on staff with changing or inconsistent work schedules.
- VIII. Teaming Agreements
- What is the nationwide industry standard for providing the teaming agreements in the SOQs? Is there any concern about providing these as a part of the SOQ? Teaming agreements have been requested by other owners, so it would not be an unusual request. Challenges arise from a design perspective. Engineers are trying to limit liability. Many teaming agreements, like our own contracts include LDs. NOTE: CPM Schedule is not requested in SC, but it is in many nearby states. Industry suggests SCDOT request the CPM schedule, but they admit that providing it in the technical proposal could be a challenge. Question - If SCDOT were to request the teaming agreement with the lead designer, are there concerns about providing this information? The industry could provide a draft of

the template, but past agreements may not be given out due to changes in the agreement.

IX. Award Fee

- Has anyone participated in a DB procurement or contract where an award fee was used to incentivize quality on the project? For example, we put up a ½ % and they put up ½ % of their profit and the award fee is distributed back to the team incrementally based on their performance or lack thereof. Army Corps uses this, it was capped. AI - AGC was tasked with seeing if this is a possibility in the future.

X. Fixed Price Procurement Type

- Does the industry have any concern with SCDOT using a fixed price (aka design-build to budget) on any of its future projects? Past Bridge package projects were done this way. Palmetto parkway was also done like this. Georgia has recently done this, and you have to be careful because it quickly moved to low bid. We don't want to pursue this and it turn into low bid. We would use a two-step procurement process. We would work toward an equation where the A is fixed, and the other scores have a higher value than they have in the past. Quality credits are driven by extra scope provided as well as the base scope. We want to use fixed price as a tool without jeopardizing quality.

XI. Open Discussion – None

XII. Action Items

- SCDOT - Work History Form Comments from AGC/ACEC and RFQ Template Comments from AGC/ACEC – Responses to industry comments have been developed and will be sent out after template changes are made.
- AGC/ACEC – Comments on the new DB Website
- AGC/ACEC – Comments on Award Fee
- AGC/ACEC – Comments on fixed price

XIII. Next Meeting Date: March 29th 2018 at 10:00 AM

XIV. Adjourn