

Meeting Minutes
SCDOT/ACEC/AGC Alternative Delivery Sub-Committee Meeting
7/19/2023 @ 9:30 AM

I. Welcome/Introductions
Meeting Attendees

SCDOT	ACEC	AGC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jae Mattox • Ben McKinney • Maddy Barbian • Carmen Wright • Tyler Clark • John Burns • Levi McLeod 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Andrew Smith (HDR) • David Russell (JMT) • Michael Ulmer (ESP) • David Taylor (Stantec) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chris Boyd (Crowder) • Rob Loar (Reeves) • Pete Weber (Dane)

II. Project Updates

SCDOT Updates:

David Rister has retired

John Burns – new Construction Manager

Michael Pitts – new PM

OAD Vacancies: Assistant PM, Design Manager, Construction Manager, Construction Alternative Delivery Engineer, Lowcountry Corridor Project Director

In Construction

- Carolina Crossroads Phases 1 & 2 – Under Construction (United Archer Western JV)
- Closed and Load Restricted Bridges 2021-1 – District 4 with eight bridges. Under construction (Reeves)
- US 301 over Four-Hole Swamp – Under Construction (Crowder)
- Bridge Package 14 – Project in construction (Lee)
- Bridge Package 15 – Project in construction (ES Wagner)
- I-20 over Wateree, River and Overflow Bridges – Project in construction (Lane)
- Bridge Package 16 – Project awarded to Palmetto Infrastructure Inc. on 6/2/23

In Procurement

- I-26/I-95 Interchange Improvements – In procurement, Final RFP released May 4, 2023. Public Announcement scheduled for October 25, 2023.
- Carolina Crossroads Phase 3 – Teams shortlisted and preparing Technical Proposals, December 2023 Award.
- Bridge Package 20 – RFQ released July 6, 2023

2023 Anticipated Procurements

- Bridge Package 17
- I-85 at I-385 Wall Improvements. Procurement is anticipated in 2023 (late August/early September). Will have early coordination meeting potentially in August.
 - Still in planning phase & determining how to execute the project.
- I-77 Exit 26 Interchange & Connecting Roads (Associated with the proposed Scout Motors plant). Procurement is anticipated in December 2023.
 - NS Railroad Bridge will be a separate bid-build project to meet RR schedule. Anticipated June 2024 letting. Needs to be in place by end of June 2025 in order for railroad to build their yard on the Scout site.

2024 and beyond

- Bridge Package 19
- Bridge Package 18
 - AGC brings up concern about only having 2 bridges in a package. Recommend trying to add any bridges from the lower portion of the state. Not attractive to contractors as it currently stands. Multiple concurrences.
- Long Point Road/Wando Port Interchange – SCDOT and Consultant are working towards finalizing the project’s Environmental Assessment and seeking a FONSI by Fall 2023. Public hearing was held May 2, 2023. Procurement is anticipated to begin in Q1 2024 (TBD), no firm RFQ date has been decided; details forthcoming. We are anticipating award and execution of contract in Q1 2025.
- Mark Clark Extension – Pursuing Final EIS and related documentation/permits. RFQ anticipated in 2025+. Currently seeking matching funds from SIB/JBRC.
- Low Country Corridor East – Currently in project development and NEPA. Procurement timeframe TBD. Public involvement meetings held in October 2021.
- I-95 Widening – MM 8 to 21. Changed to design bid build delivery method.
- I-95 Over Great Pee Dee River bridge replacement. Received planning grant (~\$700k). Professional Services contract advertised June 15, 2023 to execute PEL study.
 - Potential for overflow bridge replacement, as well.
 - Decision on what the project looks like is dependent on the PEL study which is currently in procurement.
- I-95 over Santee (Lake Marion) bridge replacement – DB prep work is underway.
 - Project has been delayed due to grant application timeline, anticipate procurement to begin in 2024.
- Low Country Corridor West and I-26/I-526 Interchange – EJ mitigation in 2023; first phase RFQ in 2028.
 - Five phases are currently being evaluated for project delivery type.
- I-85 @ US 278
 - Public Meeting was held 3/21/23
 - Funding by Anderson County, construction not currently funded

- Note: Additional project information has been posted to the website: [SCDOT Design-Build Overview](#).

Other Design-Build Projects (Not SCDOT)

- Charleston County – Main Road (in procurement)
- Laurens County – Bridge Package (in procurement)
- Dorchester County – Bridge Package (in procurement)
 - Evaluating bids, have not awarded
- City of Charleston – Pedestrian Bridge (in procurement)
 - BAFO – Public announcement scheduled for 8/18/2023

III. Action Items from 5/17/2023 Meeting SCDOT

- **SCDOT/ACEC/AGC** to continue ongoing discussion for potential new RFQ language suggestions and/or scoring techniques for SOQ evaluations with stakeholders.
 - Has there been any thought on releasing evaluation notes prior to the debrief? Carmen Wright confirmed these are released after the contract execution. Bridge Package 15 is currently up on the website, I-20 Wateree will be up soon. SCDOT works to ensure our comments/notes are clear & concise.
 - Request for clarification on SCDOT not wanting multiple people reporting to the SCDOT. Org chart for Crowder was scored low on I-20 over Wateree due to having 4 team members reporting directly to SCDOT.
- **ACEC/AGC** to poll and involve members in order to look for examples across industry in order to establish positive potential adoption of PDB, CM/GC, and other methods.
 - AGC provided examples
- **SCDOT** to review AGC list of particular erosion control items that have been problematic and could benefit from Unit pricing & will set up a meeting. **SCDOT** will request John Burns to attend July meeting & review that list.
- ~~SCDOT will identify and include other industry design build projects in future meeting project updates. Request ACEC/AGC to assist in identifying & SCDOT will include in the meeting minutes.~~
- **SCDOT** to markup letter previous ACEC submitted letter for design-build prep teams being utilized for ATC reviews & suggest changes.
 - ACEC Executive committee will need to review (Barry Still is the chairman).
 - Will discuss in September Subcommittee meeting.
 - Transportation meeting is August 10th & David R. will bring it up.
- **SCDOT** will discuss with our legal department the concern about the inability to change Utility MOA's to reflect the final numbers/market conditions.
- **SCDOT** will review any internal changes to be made to help assist in the ongoing issues of whose responsibility the oversight of the utility relocation is (SCDOT vs. Contractor). **SCDOT/AGC/ACEC** review of RFP requirements for additions needed to include to resolve future issues.

- **SCDOT** to talk internally about recommendation of previously included language to be added back into the encroachment permit to track the installation & provide as-builts.

IV. Erosion Control Unit Pricing SCDOT

- Point of contention for contractors on the sites. Could an allowance be a potential solution?
- Can't anticipate how many storms you're going to have in a 3 year job, for example.
- How will this look? Minimum BMPs? Unit price at the time of bid?
- AGC wants unit pricing for major items (eg. Silt fence, silt basin, erosion stone)
- Suggested just for interstate work/long duration jobs & not for CLRB.
- Unlikely that long linear jobs will be design-build in the near future.
- SCDOT can see spread of bids on erosion control lump sums. SCDOT agreeable to working on this in the future.
- Weekly erosion control reports & contractors are repairing on a weekly basis.
- Emphasis on RCE's personal standards & contractors being held to differently standards. Maintenance is appearing to be subjective.
- Internal SCDOT working group with AGC to come up with a solution/ideas. SCDOT will come up with our point of view & schedule a meeting. **[ACTION ITEM]**
- Unit prices & budget for erosion control has to be included in the bids.

V. Pipe Inspections & Inspection Reports SCDOT

- Feedback from other state DOTs has been sought out.
- SCDOT has been getting a lot of questions on pipe inspections & recommendations. Reports may not be as accurate as possible.
- SCDOT working to improve the process. 3 other DOTs are using a similar process, with small changes.
- District concerns about service life of the pipes unless they are pristine. Replacement unless they are in excellent condition.
- Differences are District based evaluations.
- Florida DOT doesn't like to line pipes anymore & usually requires replacement.
- Virginia DOT has two systems (either do inspection before or don't). Assume all pipes need to be replaced for bidding, credits back to VDOT for not replacing if no pipe inspections are completed before. VDOT has a scope validation period.
- Georgia DOT lets the EOR include a statement about systems being retained. They have a special provision that covers the requirements of the hydraulic capacity.
- SCDOT is reviewing the information gathered & the costs associated with this information from other DOTs to see how SCDOT get more accurate with the information we are providing.
- AGC confirms if every team goes in with the same methodology that would be fair.
- SCDOT approach is to replace anything the inspections can't get to.

- Pipe inspections won't be conducted if the Districts just want full replacement.
- Teams can take risk to do their own video pipe inspection during procurement.
- SCDOT has been only utilizing visual inspection for structural integrity, not sampling. If the project will have significant fill over the pipes or cuts to decrease the cover, the EOR is responsible for the structural integrity.
- There is an element of judgement for the treatments of each pipe.
- SCDOT has seen recommendations not being accurate & bids have been made based on those recommendations. Seeing large change orders for lining pipes based on the actual field conditions of the pipes.
- There are no standards for pipe inspection recommendations. That is where the variety of report recommendations come from. Based on each engineer's approach.
- SCDOT is considering ways to enhance the accuracy of the pipe inspection reports. Currently the EOR does not sign the reports, should that be the requirement?
- Overall the ending result in these situations is replacement of the existing pipes and allowing teams to submit ATCs for retaining pipes.
- Video pipe inspection on the smaller pipes isn't as helpful. Culverts should be inspected, not necessarily video.
- Baseline should be replacement & putting the inspection/design decisions on the teams.
- Contractors' responsibility is the cleaning/upgrading of any pipes/drainage systems that are being retained.
- DOT to consider anything less than 36" not available for rehabilitation.
- Hydrology is going for resiliency. Requirements will be changing in the future (10-12 years out).
- SCDOT to continue investigating this topic & will report back to the subcommittee. SCDOT to consider service life of pipes in place. **[ACTION ITEM]**
- Poll past design-build projects. US 1 over I-20 was majority replacement, 277 was majority replacement.

VI. MOT Oversight Discussion

SCDOT

- MOT managers SCDOT is seeing are not qualified/experienced personnel.
- SCDOT expectation is to be able to transition between MOT phases seamlessly. Acquiring products/materials. Coordinate complete transitions.
- Feedback from public is frustration.
- MOT manager should hold pre-activity meeting before any major shift/opening.

- MOT manager should be coordinating the efforts & not out operating the equipment.
- Position is turning over a lot on SCDOT contracts rather than being completed utilizing the original organization chart provided.
- How do you hold up construction progress & get the personnel you want?
- More submittals, more meetings before switches/opening occur.
- MOT manager is a part time job on some projects
- Add in RFP the requirements the specific times the MOT manager is required on site. Requiring them to sign submittals & be a part of the meetings to prepare for these major shifts.
- EOR & MOT manager plan for the phase changes that are submitted to DOT for approval.
- Problem is that the org chart candidate submitted is great, but the person who shows up is not experienced enough.
- What certifications are required? Other than experience.
- Required coordination to be included in the RFP.
- SCDOT to consider a MOT specific meeting during construction. Checklist for the action items for each shift.
- Contractor providing MOT narrative/plan in between shifts, but during construction to allow for flexibility. Put requirements in RFP. Contractor will be more familiar with the construction site & conditions of traffic.
- DOT bringing up detailing that's not included in standard construction plans (ie. Blue lights, EMS rerouting).
- Time & schedule is a concern. Craft language so it's not so restrictive to cause schedule backups.
- Meetings would be for big items only, not small switches.
- On-site construction manager & MOT manager & EOR need to be a part of these meetings. For all views of the project.
- SCDOT to work on adding language into RFPs regarding MOT manager requirements. Add coordination into special provisions & subcommittee will review. Will expand on MOT manager role & their responsibilities. Potential for them to be part time. **[ACTION ITEM]**
- AGC concerns on another submittal, preference to a meeting attempt first to solve the issue.

VII. **Open Discussion**

ALL

- Dates for open forums are not on the milestone schedules. Can week of open forums be put in the schedule? Just the day. **[ACTION ITEM]**
- Construction Schedule review, third party scheduler. A lot of scrutiny of schedule. Seems there is a program reviewing with many pages of comments. Taking a lot of time & heavy on the feedback. DOT using external reviewer to protect interests. (Four Hole Swamp was the issue for Crowder). Normally the process takes 1-2 weeks & the

time for this project was at least doubled. DOT will look into & agrees it shouldn't take that long. **[ACTION ITEM]**

- Georgia DOT contract, unique approach to handling delays. Money flow. Tracking delays & days. AGC will provide to subcommittee.
- CCR Phase 3 – allowances for utility delays. Goal is to reduce risk to industry & put DOT into the process.
- Package 16 – price spread
 - DOT feels confident with the decision to award.
 - If stipend is not accepted, ATCs are not made public.
 - DOT would welcome an example of ATCs not being made public/refusing stipend.
 - Teams could potentially discuss sharing/buying of ATCs away from the DOT discussions.

VIII. Action Items

- **SCDOT/ACEC/AGC** to continue ongoing discussion for potential new RFQ language suggestions and/or scoring techniques for SOQ evaluations with stakeholders.
- **ACEC/AGC** to poll and involve members in order to look for examples across industry in order to establish positive potential adoption of PDB, CM/GC, and other methods.
- **SCDOT** will review any internal changes to be made to help assist in the ongoing issues of whose responsibility the oversight of the utility relocation is (DOT vs. Contractor). **SCDOT/AGC/ACEC** review of RFP requirements for additions needed to include to resolve future issues.
- **SCDOT** to talk internally about recommendation of previously included language to be added back into the encroachment permit to track the installation & provide as-built.
- **SCDOT/AGC** to set up a working group to come up with a solution/ideas for Erosion Control Unit Pricing. **SCDOT** will come up with our point of view & schedule a meeting.
- **SCDOT** to continue figuring out path going forward to improve pipe inspection reports & the process of pipe replacement/rehabilitation, and will report back to the subcommittee. **SCDOT** to consider service life of pipes in place. Will follow up with FL, NC, and GA.
- **SCDOT** to work on adding language into RFPs regarding MOT manager requirements. Add coordination into special provisions & subcommittee will review. Will expand on MOT manager role & their responsibilities. Potential for them to be part time.
- **SCDOT** will look to include dates for open forums are not on the milestone schedules. At minimum include the week anticipated.
- **SCDOT** will look into construction schedule reviews being completed by the third party scheduler.

IX. Next Meeting Date: 9/20/2023 @ 9:30 AM

Bat update - Will