

SCDOT/AGC/ACEC Design Build Subcommittee

March 13, 2013

Meeting Minutes

- I. Claude welcomed everyone and had introductions. See attached list of attendees.
- II. Project Updates
 - a. I-85/385 system interchange-Greenville County-RFQ April 2013
 - b. SC 701 bridges in Georgetown/Horry counties – RFQ Fall 2013
 - c. SC 41 Wando – RFQ in March, April 2013
 - d. I-26 rehab in Lexington, Newberry and Richland counties mile marker 60 to 75 and 89 to 101 RFQ Fall 2013
 - e. I-95/301, I-26, Bridge Package “B” are all in the procurement phase.
- III. SCDOT Provided Load Test w/DB Procurements

SCDOT is currently performing load test on the SC 701 project and requested input on whether this test information would be beneficial for the design build teams up front. If SCDOT would allow the contractors and designers to use this information, it would reduce the amount of testing that would have to be done by all the D-B teams especially if there were some unique soil conditions that were known to be in the area. SCDOT will consider providing this information in the procurement process.
- IV. RFP Milestone Schedule

A sample milestone schedule was distributed (see attached). After the confidential question period, the design build teams usually have additional questions. Some of these questions may be just for some clarification. It was agreed that some modification in the RFP language to allow additional questions after the deadline for confidential questions but give SCDOT the discretion to answer or not. SCDOT does not want to be bombarded with questions at the ninth hour and not have time to investigate and answer.
- V. Design Review

There was a lot of discussion about the time frames associated with the design reviews, especially to comments and responses to comments. SCDOT has 21 days to respond to design submittals and sometimes has comments relating to the design that need another response from the design build team. This is when the time on responses begin to stall and on projects with A+B component, this effects the time associated with completing the project. It was discussed that maybe time frames can be associated with responses to comments and if not resolved, move to the escalation clause and schedule a meeting to resolve.

- VI. CEI Procurement and Eligibility
SCDOT would like the design build subcommittee to assist in establishing a process or guidelines to decide what firms are eligible to perform duties under a design build contract or a CEI contract. A lot of firms are associated with a design build team and a CEI team submittal on the same project. A lot of discussion as to how the procurement process could be handled but a small subcommittee will be established after the next ACEC meeting.
- VII. RFP Evaluation
Sample portion of RFP package distributed and discussed the type of questions being asked (see attached). The questions allow SCDOT to determine what the design build team submitting a proposal is doing above and beyond the minimum contract requirements. These questions cover the areas the SCDOT deems important. It was agreed that questions 9, a thru I could be moved up front as a requirement and then the proposers could answer questions 1 thru 9 concerning the plans submitted.
- VIII. Open Discussion
FHWA initiative "Every Day Counts" was discussed and an action plan for the Design Build Program was distributed (see attached).
- Design Build projects sampling and testing requirements were discussed relating to the material certification that has to be performed at the end of the project. Language may be added to the contracts that would require a submittal of item quantities for quality assurance and independent assurance testing frequencies can be established as defined in the construction manual.
- IX. Action Items
Determine whether load test data is beneficial up front for the design build teams.
Modify language in RFP to allow additional questions to the program manager.
Modify language to set time frames for response to comments and set meetings.
ACEC to provide information on direction to SCDOT on CEI procurement process.
Modify RFP section V relating to the questions.
Add language to require quantities on items requiring sampling and testing per the construction manual.
- X. Next meeting: May 8, 2013 @ 9:00 am
- XI. Adjourn

Advertise Request for Qualifications (RFQ) ↑ 4 WKS

Deadline for Submittal of ten (10) printed copies and one (1) electronic copy (in PDF for) ↓ 5 WKS

Selection of Short-listed teams ↑ 0-1 WK

Issue RFP for Industry Review ↑ 2 WKS

Deadline for PROPOSERS to submit Comments/Questions ↓ 4 WKS

(FHWA Construction Authorization just prior to Final RFP)
Issue Final RFP

Preliminary ATC Submittals (Start Date) ↑ 2 WKS

Confidential RFP and ATC Questions submitted by Proposers prior to

Confidential RFP and ATC One-on-One meetings with PROPOSERS ↑ 1 WK

Begin Formal ATC Process ↑ 3 WKS

All ATC's SHALL be submitted prior to

Submittal of Proposals ↑ 4-6 WKS

Bid Opening (with team representatives present) ↑ 1 WK

Notification of Selection ↑ 1 WK

Award/Contract Execution

Proposed based on RFQ date	
Sample project schedule	
	2/13/2013
	3/13/2013
	4/17/2013
	4/24/2013
	5/8/2013
	6/5/2013
	6/5/2013
	6/19/2013
	6/26/2013
	6/26/2013
	7/17/2013
	8/21/2013
	8/28/2013
	9/4/2013

V. PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT

Proposals must be submitted concurrently in two parts, a Technical Proposal and a Cost Proposal. The Technical Proposal shall contain no more than xxxxxx (XX) pages, excluding any plans and appendices. The Technical Proposal shall be single sided, with minimum twelve-point (12) font and double line spacing for text. The Cost Proposal shall be bound and sealed separately from the Technical Proposal. The Cost Proposal shall be clearly marked as "Confidential Proprietary Information" by the PROPOSER and shall include the completed Cost Proposal Bid Form. Responses should address each of the following three (3) categories, Project Approach, Project Delivery, and Qualitative Considerations in the same order as listed below. If a PROPOSER does not, at a minimum, submit responses to these items, the submittal may be considered non-responsive and returned without further review/evaluation. In order to meet the minimum requirements of this RFP, PROPOSER must provide responses to each of the items listed. **Beyond the minimum requirements**, a maximum of XX quality credit points are available to the PROPOSER based on the commitments to the bolded items below. **Responses must be in the form of commitments in order to receive quality credit.** Conceptual plans that conflict with RFP requirements, and are not submitted under the ATC process, may result in the proposal being deemed non-responsive. Any concepts that conflict with the RFP specifications discovered after award of the project, and which are not approved as an ATC, shall not prevail over RFP specifications. Point values for each of the bolded items are shown at the end of each item. PROPOSERS are advised that SCDOT reserves the right to conduct an independent investigation of any information, including prior experience, identified in the responses. PROPOSERS are responsible for affecting delivery by the deadline date. Late submissions will be rejected without opening. SCDOT accepts no responsibility for misdirected or lost proposals.

Technical Proposal

In order that evaluation may be accomplished efficiently, the Technical Proposal shall be prepared in the following sequence:

Under Project Approach, Delivery, and Qualitative Considerations, the Proposal at a minimum shall:

1. **Describe the approach and team commitment in design, construction, and agency coordination to minimize impacts to the environmental resources. Quantify and describe all environmental impacts associated with the approach and project delivery. (X points)**
2. **Describe and quantify the team's commitment to minimizing utility impacts including any special utility design considerations. (X points)**
3. **Describe the proposed design submittal process and sequencing and the proposed plan that will minimize the number of submittals and will allow SCDOT to conduct efficient and complete reviews. (X points)**
4. **Identify the proposed sequence of construction of the Project to minimize disruption to communities, the motoring public, and the human environment including how traffic will be detoured or maintained for each bridge replacement and how each site will be**

accessed for demolition and replacement throughout the duration of the Project. (X Points)

5. Describe additional Project risks assumed by the PROPOSER beyond those assigned in this RFP and Agreement. (X points)
6. Describe any proposed warranties that are above and beyond what is required for this project. (X point)
7. Describe any additional enhancements that will be included in the Project. (X points)
8. Describe the Maintenance of Traffic for the project and any unique features that will minimize the impacts to the public.
9. Provide Conceptual Bridge and Roadway Plans including:
 - a. Title Sheet
 - b. Plan and Profile of roadway
 - c. Typical Sections for all roadways
 - d. Proposed R/W & C/A limits
 - e. Plan and Profile of the bridge showing the proposed type of superstructure and substructures and existing ground profiles at the bridge site
 - f. Permanent retaining walls and temporary shoring
 - g. Superstructure cross section showing pertinent structural elements
 - h. Bridge rails, sidewalks, and/or shoulders
 - i. Horizontal and vertical clearances.

The plans should identify commitments of materials, designs, and construction methods that would minimize maintenance costs in the future to the Department and benefit the project (X points)

Every Day Counts Action Plan– South Carolina

Initiatives	Champion		Desired Outcome	Action/Performance Measures		Milestones	Schedule / Status		
	SCDOT	FHWA							
<i>Design-Build</i>	Matt Lifsey Claude Ipock	Tad Kitowicz	Consistent and early identification of DB projects	Develop a written Best Practice for systematically identifying candidate DB projects.	Develop a draft criteria	August 2013	In progress		
					Finalize the Best Practice	November 2013	Not started		
					All DB projects clearly identified in the STIP as DB	January 2014	Not started		
						Continue SCDOT's frequency of DB contracting annually	Authorize on average 4 DB contracts annually	January 2014	In progress
					Allocate resources necessary to consistently develop, procure, and administer SCDOT's active and projected DB projects/contracts	Develop a stand-alone DB division of SCDOT	Include as a goal in SCDOT's Strategic Management Plan, the creation of a DB division	July 2013	In progress
				Formally submit for approval a proposed org chart for a DB division			May 2013	In progress	
				Develop a draft implementation plan for the approved DB division			December 2013	Not started	
				Develop a written SCDOT Policy and Manual for DB		Develop draft Best Practices for DB	September 2012	Complete	
						Identify a committee (Engr., Legal, Procurement, FHWA) for development of a DB Policy	September 2013	Not started	
						Develop an outline of items to be addressed in the DB policy/manual	January 2014	Not started	
	Formally submit a draft DB Policy and Manual for approval	December 2014	Not started						

<i>Alternative Technical Concepts (ATC)</i>	Matt Lifsey Claude Ipock	Tad Kitowicz	Fully utilize the ATC specification and process in DB construction contracts	Develop a system to consistently identifying good candidate DB projects to implement the ATC process.	Develop a draft criteria for ATC utilization	August 2013	In progress
					Finalize the Best Practice on ATCs	December 2013	In progress
				Develop a system to archive the approved ATCs for future reference, cost savings, and applicability to specific DB project types		December 2013	Not started