

SCDOT/ACEC/AGC Design-Build Subcommittee
Meeting Minutes – May 17, 2017

I. Welcome/Introductions

a. Attendees

Chris Gaskins (SCDOT)	Bryan Shiver (ACEC)
Brooks Bickley (SCDOT)	Stephen Ross (ACEC)
Barbara Wessinger (SCDOT)	Michael Gantt (AGC)
Claude Ipock (SCDOT)	David Fletcher (AGC)
Sean Connolly (SCDOT)	Kirsten Duffy (AGC)
Ben McKinney (SCDOT)	Chad Curran (AGC)
David Hebert (SCDOT)	Richard Nickel (AGC)
Binh Nguyen (SCDOT)	
Brad Reynolds (SCDOT)	
Chad Long (SCDOT)	

II. Personnel Changes / Subcommittee Member Changes

- a. Robbie Isgett (SCDOT) being deployed to Afghanistan. Kevin Turner (SCDOT) will begin filling in for Robbie beginning in July.

III. Project Updates

- a. Chris Gaskins gave project selection process presentation at the 2017 SC Highway Engineers Conference. Chris gave a quick recap of the presentation. Twelve projects currently planned for design-build as a result of the selection process.

i. Changes/New Projects:

1. Carolina Crossroads – The project is moving forward at an accelerated pace and is planned for award by December 2019. This will be SCDOT's largest project, is planned for a 14-month procurement scheduled (advertised in 2018), and is planned to be awarded as a single project.
2. Lowcountry Corridor – Tentative Final RFP in 2020.
3. I-85 MM 40-69 – Two projects being grouped into one single project with Final RFP dated planned for 2020.
4. I-26/SC 302 Interchange and I-26/US 1 Interchange and SCRR being pushed back to 2022.
5. I-26 Widening MM85-101 – Project is still planned for 2018
6. SCDOT's goal is for all projects on the current list to be under construction within 10 years.
7. The industry inquired about load restricted bridge packages. Current plan is that no bridge packages would be design-build, but may become design-build projects in the future if schedule

dictates. These projects are either currently in or will soon be added to the STIP.

- IV. Action Items from 03-08-17
 - a. RFQ Template
 - i. SCDOT has not yet provided this template to the industry for review and comment. A few minor changes are being finalized and should be sent out soon.
 - b. Quality of Past Performance Form
 - i. Form is still being finalized and will be released with the RFQ template.
 - c. Design-Build Team Performance Evaluation Forms
 - i. Form will be similar to Consultant Performance Evaluation form. There will be in the range of 5 to 10 questions and there will be separate evaluations for Designers and Contractors.
 - d. Design-Build Manual Comments
 - e. Design-Build Subcommittee Meeting Minutes and Agendas
 - i. A link will be posted on the SCDOT Design-Build Website.
 - f. Design Review Process
 - i. ACEC/AGC expressed concern about not being able to see or address design submittal comments prior to the 15 day review period being complete and suggested opening these comments to the Design-Build Teams during the initial review.
 - ii. ACEC/AGC and SCDOT both encouraged more phone communication to expedite comment resolution and suggested more communication during the initial review.
- V. Design-Build Procurement Manual
 - a. The Manual will be posted on the website soon.
 - b. Attachments will not be posted on the website and will be for SCDOT internal use only.
 - c. The Manual should be fully implemented by the July meeting.
- VI. Dedicated Positions
 - a. ACEC/AGC expressed concern that Harbor River required many dedicated positions for what would generally be considered a relatively small project (\$50 million). Forces teams to devote staff solely to one project when they could potentially be working on other projects.
 - b. How should construction manager and superintendent be differentiated?
 - c. QC Manager
 - i. SCDOT Construction expects the QC Manager to be a separate entity from daily on-site construction personnel
 - ii. ACEC/AGC expressed that there is a need to differentiate between QC and QA.

- iii. ACEC/AGC expressed that there seems to be some confusion with the reasoning for why the Contractor for design-build projects is responsible for QC and QA, but SCDOT also performs additional QA.
- iv. SCDOT commented that the superintendent should be focused on production and should not be handling QC responsibilities as it is a conflict of interest.
- v. SCDOT commented that due to the accelerated pace of work on design-build projects, the Contractor needs to have personnel on-site to perform testing and oversee the work. SCDOT's responsibility is not to control the work or troubleshoot for the Contractor.
- vi. ACEC/AGC expressed that SCDOT needs to better define the role and responsibilities of the QC Manager position. Contractors would like the ability to determine if a full time position is needed.
- vii. SCDOT to consider modifying the language in the RFQ and the Agreement in the RFP and look into how other state DOT's identify QC managers and dedicated positions.
- viii. AGC expressed concern that the QC manager must be dedicated solely for QC on the job.
- d. AGC/ACEC would like to see dedicated positions' roles and responsibilities be better defined instead of required full time positions, allowing the DB Team to determine utilization on the project.

VII. Stipends

- a. This discussion was abbreviated and postponed until the July meeting.
- b. What is specifically being given to SCDOT in order to receive a stipend?
- c. Stipends give SCDOT the option to utilize ATC's on future projects or after a project has been awarded. ATC's are confidential prior to award of the project. ATC's are subject to FOIA.

VIII. Technical Proposal Presentations

- a. SCDOT is making every effort to communicate more during procurement phase.
- b. Other State DOT's
 - i. NC – Presentations account for five points of the technical score. After a full review by the committee, presentations are given one to two weeks before the cost proposal is opened, but after it is submitted. Design discipline leads are in attendance for interviews.
 - ii. FL – A short page turning meeting is held right after submittal of the proposals to highlight key points and generally lasts about one hour.
 - iii. GA – Project Manager, construction manager, and design personnel present highlights of the technical proposal prior to opening the cost proposal.
- c. ACEC/AGC expressed that they are in favor of the presentations.

IX. AMG Specification

- a. A new AMG specification has been approved and will be effective July 1, 2017.
- b. AMG is not required, but if used, the new specification should be used.

X. NEPA Box and JD

a. NEPA Box

- i. Allows for more flexibility to the Design-Build Teams.
- ii. Set a threshold for impacts and identify a box in which those impacts occur.
- iii. Keep all quantities for impacts under the threshold and inside the box
- iv. May not be a good option for projects with tidal influence or with community impacts.

b. JD

- i. Currently, if work impacts areas beyond the JD, a 30 to 90-day delay occurs at the beginning of the project.
- ii. Instead of following through with the completed JD, SCDOT recommends potentially allowing the Design-Build Team finish the JD and submit to the US Army Corps. The JD would be submitted under the Design-Build Team's name. The impacts could be fully quantified and the permit obtained.
- iii. AGC/ACEC has expressed concern with their risk associated with the JD not being complete.
- iv. Delineations on an interstate widening project can take days to weeks.
- v. SCDOT commented that they feel a large enough box could be captured for interchanges and the JD could be completed prior to award of the project.
- vi. SCDOT asked if there is an option to incentivize staying inside the box for Design-Build Teams.
- vii. SCDOT stated that the Corps is open to having an oversized box, but that it takes time to delineate and have it approved.
- viii. SCDOT expressed concern over modifying JD's that would need to be prioritized over design-bid-build projects due to schedule.

c. Path Forward

- i. Continue with a few projects and keep the NEPA box approach.
- ii. If the box is appropriately sized, then it is already incentivized due to potential project delays for the permit or JD.
- iii. In summary, the NEPA box allows for a threshold of environmental impacts within a specific area and is mainly intended for projects with CE permits. It generally does not limit where the Design-Build Team can construct the project, such as offset alignments to one side or the other.

- XI. Open Discussion
 - a. Previously, the RFQ template included language that only allows projects that were substantially complete be used for past performance. SCDOT stated that this language has been revised to allow projects that are not substantially complete. This change was made to benefit both Contractors and Designers.
- XII. Action Items
 - a. SCDOT to provide draft RFQ Template to ACEC/AGC for review and comment.
 - b. SCDOT to provide revised Quality of Past Performance Form to ACEC/AGC for review and comment.
 - c. SCDOT to provide draft Design-Build Team Performance Evaluation Form for review and comment.
 - d. SCDOT to post SCDOT/ACEC/AGC Design-Build Subcommittee meeting minutes on website.
 - e. ACEC/AGC to provide comments/feedback on SCDOT design review process.
 - f. ACEC/AGC to provide responses to comments/feedback from ACEC/AGC on dedicated positions.
 - g. ACEC/AGC to research and report on what other state DOT's give for stipends and what the Design-Build Teams must provide to the DOT's in order to receive the stipends.
- XIII. Next Meeting Date July 12, 2017
- XIV. Adjourn