

**Meeting Minutes**  
**SCDOT/ACEC/AGC Alternative Delivery Sub-Committee Meeting**  
**5/17/2023 @ 9:30 AM**

**I. Welcome/Introductions**  
**Meeting Attendees**

SCDOT	ACEC	AGC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jae Mattox</li> <li>• Ben McKinney</li> <li>• Maddy Barbian</li> <li>• Jason Byrd</li> <li>• Brian Gambrell</li> <li>• Carmen Wright</li> <li>• Tyler Clark</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Andrew Smith (HDR)</li> <li>• David Russell (JMT)</li> <li>• Michael Ulmer (ESP)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chris Boyd (Crowder)</li> <li>• Lee Bradley (Blythe)</li> <li>• Rob Loar (Reeves)</li> <li>• Pete Weber (Dane)</li> </ul>

**II. Project Updates**  
**In Construction**

- Carolina Crossroads Phases 1 & 2
- Closed and Load Restricted Bridges 2021-1 – District 4 with eight bridges
- Cross Island Parkway Toll Conversion – Substantial completion reached
- US 301 over Four-Hole Swamp
- Bridge Package 14 – Project awarded to Lee Construction on 12/29/22.
- Bridge Package 15 – Bridges in Florence, Anderson, and Chester. Project Awarded to E.S. Wagner on 05/30/23
  - Procurement documents now available on the project website.
- Bridge Package 16- Five primary load restricted bridges in Pickens. In procurement, RFP released 3/9/23. Public Announcement June 15 2023. Bid Summary report now available on the project website.
- I-20 over Wateree, River and Overflow Bridges – Project awarded to Lane Construction.

**In Procurement**

- I-26/I-95 Interchange Improvements – In procurement, Final RFP released 05/04/23.
- Carolina Crossroads Phase 3 – Teams shortlisted and preparing Technical Proposals, December 2023 Award.

**2023 Anticipated Procurements**

- Bridge Package 20, 17, and 19 (in that order).
  - Package 20 (RFQ July 6, 2023), Package 17 (RFQ October), push 19 to Q1 2024

- 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 held 5/2/23. Procurement is anticipated to begin in Q1 2024, no firm RFQ date has been decided; details forthcoming. We are anticipating award in December 2024 and construction to begin in Spring 2025.
  - Received Environmental Assessment approval, Public Hearing held May 2<sup>nd</sup>
- I-85 at I-385 Wall Improvements. Procurement is anticipated in 2023.
  - RFQ planned for July 2023.
- I-77 Exit 26 Interchange & Connecting Roads (Associated with the proposed Scout Motors plant). Procurement is anticipated in late 2023.
  - December procurement anticipated.
  - Waiting on Scout permit submittal to begin NEPA.
  - Could begin procurement before NEPA is finalized, in order to meet overall schedule.
  - RS&H is doing the DB prep work. Contract negotiations underway.
  - Working with Department of Commerce & Thomas & Hutton (developer’s engineer).
  - Graphic on the Scout Motors website.
  - Exit 24 & 27 interchange improvements may be necessary.
  - FHWA meeting forthcoming to determine final scope.

#### 2024 and beyond

- Bridge Package 18
- 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. Design-Build prep work underway with LNTP. Procurement anticipated in 2025.
  - High likelihood to go bid-build. (After Subcommittee meeting, project has been transferred to RPG 1 for bid-build delivery.)
- I-95 Over Great Pee Dee River bridge replacement. Received planning grant (~\$700k).
  - Professional services solicitation advertised
  - 2025
- I-95 over Santee (Lake Marion) bridge replacement – DB prep work is underway.
  - Public Meeting June 1<sup>st</sup>
  - Project is still technically unfunded
  - Pursuing another grant opportunity.
- 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](#).

### III. Action Items from 3/22/2023 Meeting SCDOT

- **SCDOT/ACEC/AGC** to continue ongoing discussion for potential new RFQ language suggestions and/or scoring techniques for SOQ evaluations with stakeholders.
- **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** to review, discuss, and provide particular erosion control items that have been problematic and could benefit from Unit pricing. SCDOT asking AGC to provide a specific list of items.
  - AGC sent something this morning to DOT. **DOT to review & will set up a meeting. [ACTION]**
- **SCDOT** will request David Rister/John Burns to attend & review that list. Will continue this discussion next time.
- **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.
- **AGC/ACEC** to research Geotechnical LNTP approaches by other states & bring recommendations for updating SCDOT's current process. **SCDOT** to consider the benefits of to owning the geotechnical efforts being done if contract is not executed.
  - For bid-build: they can bill up to 50% of the number.
  - AGC will continue discussion with other states. Specifically AGC looking at GA & NC processes.
  - DOT has been raising those LNTP amounts to over 50% of the contract value & that has been working well.
  - Multiple NTPs would help expedite payments for up front work. GA has multiple NTPs. 85/385 may have been multiple NTPs.
- **ACEC** to provide additional feedback on design-build prep teams being utilized for ATC reviews before giving a revised official letter. **SCDOT** will have internal discussion.
  - **DOT to markup letter & suggest changes. [ACTION]**
  - Discussion had on firms that do not pursue any design-build work.
  - Final decision would always remain in DOT's hands.
- **AGC** to research other states' utility approaches. [CLOSED]

### IV. DBE Goals Discussion SCDOT

- Two processes
  - i. Design-bid-build
    - 1. Project factors are put in formula

2. Value of estimated work, cost of construction
    - ii. Design-build
      1. Based on estimated construction cost & type of work
      2. Regulation – number of DBE firms based on skills/abilities, narrowly tailored
      3. Only look at cost of construction
      4. Areas of work: hauling, concrete, traffic, etc.
- 900+ DBE firms, 300-350 are construction related firms
  - Good faith effort is the relief valve (Contractors should be calling DBE office & asking for help/ideas?)
  - Worked with FHWA to change process of meeting DBE commitment until after award. Start of construction is when you submit committals.
  - Law does not allow DBE firms to be kicked out for underperforming.
  - SCDOT has only had one good faith effort complaint in last 6 years.
  - Comments will be able to be received from AGC during the tri-year review that is ongoing.
  - DBE goals will be increasing, to better align with national and federal goals, & SCDOT DBE office is willing to come explain the program & process to anyone who needs further assistance.
  - Emails are unreliable, SCDOT requires you to make the calls to the DBE firms & document.
  - Is there a benefit for extra DBE commitments?
    - i. Not anymore for the contractor, but it is still reported by the State & beneficial to the State's reporting
  - SCDOT DBE goals are race conscious (FL is all race neutral & TX is looking at going race conscious)
  - AGC expressing concern about creep up in requirements.
    - i. DOT looks at it as an overall picture
    - ii. DOT has done an assessment of the last 20-30 projects & the DBE goals were usually exceeded.
    - iii. Law doesn't allow for a set percentage.
    - iv. Federal dollars require more DBE percentage than state dollars
  - Design Build allows for DBE goal waiver, contract cannot be taken away unlike Bid Build.
  - Design-bid-build is different & has to be submitted 3-4 days before price proposal.
  - Future plan is to streamline the DBE list for ease of use.
  - State Goal 5% WDBE & 5% MDBE
  - Cap is 17.5% DBE goal for all SCDOT projects.
  - Schedule does have an impact on DBE goals, some of the faster paced bridge packages don't have time for DBE goals.
  - DBE goal becomes official when final RFP is issued. After that, there is no changing the goal. If Contractor is concerned with a DBE goal during procurement, they

should send an inquiry to the SCDOT point of contact during the Industry Review stage of the procurement & then an internal discussion will take place.

- There are a low number of good faith efforts submitted.
  - i. SCDOT has worked to improve the process so that DBE goals don't deter contractors. Communication is key.
- A letter is forthcoming to detail the DBE/Good Faith Effort program & process to AGC.
- There is no way for SCDOT to use/share past performance history in the DBE list.

**V. Discipline Specific Discussion: Utilities SCDOT**

- Act 36 has changed the process for utility coordination
- Utility companies originally won't do anything until final plans have been developed, but DOT has been working with the companies to get movement before contracts are awarded.
- DOT's goal is a preliminary utility report with every RFP, but some companies make it difficult to provide enough information.
- The inability to change MOA's to reflect the final numbers/market conditions is a concern to firms.
  - i. **SCDOT will bring that up to our legal department [ACTION]**
- Recommendation to train SCDOT personnel in utility relocation detailed installation.
- On-site construction inspection during utility relocation installations.
  - i. Example of issues with US 1 over I-20
  - ii. Oversight is needed, daily once relocations begin.
  - iii. Utility construction inspection scope needed.
  - iv. This is occurring all of the time on construction projects & is a burden the contractor has been shouldering. Impacts are widespread (cost & schedule)
  - v. SCDOT has asked for more information in CPM schedule.
- Discussion on whose responsibility the oversight of the utility relocation is (DOT vs. Contractor).
- **SCDOT will review internal changes to be made to help assist in this ongoing issue. SCDOT/ACG/ACEC review of RFP requirements for additions needed to include. [ACTION]**
- Recommendation to add scope item for utility relocation inspection.
- In GA there is an escalation process. There is no recourse in SC.
- Require utility companies to track installation of utilities as they are installed and provide as-built.
  - i. **Recommend language back in the encroachment permit to track the installation & provide as-built. SCDOT to talk to State Utility Engineer District utility folks about this recommendation [ACTION]**

Provide accurate location of abandoned facilities (test holes if necessary) and provide accurate location of tie points (survey these locations).

- If QL-B is performed before the project is LET include accurate location of abandoned lines in SUE files.
- Content of the preliminary utility report that the DB prep team provides
  - i. Discrepancies
  - ii. Discussing internally what we need within those reports & the language
  - iii. Potential to take cost out of the preliminary utility report
    - 1. No one seems to be using those costs.
  - iv. The report is only as good as the information provided by the utility owner.
  - v. As much SUE location as possible is the most beneficial.
- Joint duct bank construction/relocation would solve a lot of issues.

## VI. Open Discussion

ALL

- Potential for MOT discussion
  - i. Traffic chute changes
  - ii. Temporary pavement and markings
  - iii. Prep package inclusions of existing shoulder conditions
- Hydro – scour
- Pipe culvert inspections
- Schedule time allotment & potential changes

## VII. 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** 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.
- **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 (DOT vs. Contractor). **SCDOT/ACG/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.

**VIII. Next Meeting Date: 7/19/2023 @ 9:30 AM**