

Meeting Minutes

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

7-17-19 @ 9:00 am

I. Welcome/Introductions

- Attendees
 - Chris Gaskins (SCDOT)
 - Ben McKinney (SCDOT)
 - Jae Mattox (SCDOT)
 - Will McGoldrick (SCDOT)
 - Brad Reynolds (SCDOT)
 - Maria Ott (SCDOT)
 - Chris Lacy (SCDOT)
 - Clay Richter (SCDOT)
 - Barbara Wessinger (SCDOT)
 - Dave Pupkiewicz (AGC)
 - Michael Gantt (AGC)
 - Brice Urquhart (ACEC)
 - Hisham Abdelaziz (ACEC)
 - Elham Farzam (ACEC)
 - Paul Raad (ACEC)

II. Project Updates

- I-26 MM 85 to 101: Executed contract with Archer Western
- Carolina Crossroads: Due to lack of competition, original procurement was cancelled. Phased approach being pursued by SCDOT. RFQ to be released early 2020.
- I-85 over Rocky Creek: Final RFP to go out next week. Set to be awarded about the time the construction of the I85/I385 Interchange is substantially complete.
- US 1 over I-20: Finalizing the RFP for IR and initiating the IMR process.
- Closed and Load Restricted Bridges: 16 bridges in District 2. September 2019 RFQ.
- New I-77 Interchange in York County – Expedited timeline with RFQ in early 2020
- US 15 over Indian Fields Swamp Bridge Replacement in Dorchester County – March 2020 RFQ.
- Closed and Load Restricted Bridges: SCDOT expects to issue a CLRBR package every year for the next 10 years each with a value in the \$10-20 million range. Next up is District 4 with 5 to 10 bridges. RFQ in September 2020 to align with funding commitments.

- Low Country Corridor West – RFQ in 2022
- Mark Clark Expressway – RFQ in 2022
- I-26 over US 1, SCLRR, and SC 302 – RFQ in 2022
- I-20 over Wateree – RFQ in 2023
- I-85 MM 51 - 69 – TBD
- I-85 MM 40 - 51 – TBD
- Low Country Corridor East – TBD
- I-26 MM 15-22 – Currently on hold
- I-26 MM 212-218 – Currently on hold

III. Action Items from Previous Meeting

- Work History Forms and RFQ Template – SCDOT sent out responses for review. AGC questioned the RFQ Template language regarding personnel availability for the duration of the contract. AGC suggests that everyone on the Org Chart does not need to be available for the duration of the contract. SCDOT to clarify in the RFQ that the personnel are only needed when their services are required during the duration of the contract.
- ROW Acquisition Language – SCDOT to send out ROW language revisions for review.
- Utility Risk Sharing – SCDOT has concluded that this Utility Compensation (Time or Money) is not currently feasible. ACEC requests that SCDOT establish Prior Rights during procurement. (Remove from Action Items)
- Contract Time commitments (ensuring adherence) –
 - AGC Comments:
 - The industry is pro incentive and anti-disincentive and interested in Alternative methods for schedule bidding on projects where schedule is non-critical.
 - SCDOT is considering implementing multiple internal milestones with incentives /disincentives during the project completion. Will the manipulation of the disincentive encourage the team to finish on time? If the Design-Build team is at fault for the delay they are more likely to finish as soon as possible versus if SCDOT is at fault for the delay. AGC to provide feedback on whether the size of LD coupled with Incentives affects performance.
- Dispute Review Board –
 - Industry is concerned with using the term “Ad-Hoc” in the name of the dispute review board. The review board will be project specific. They would establish the members of the board, meet and hold progress meetings throughout the project. AGC submitted SCDOT language to the

Dispute Review Board Foundation and comments were returned. AGC will provide the comments for SCDOT review.

- CEI Contract Improvements –

- This item is being handled at a Joint Committee level. Goal is to better align CEI contract requirements with DB contract requirements. (Closing this Action Item.)

IV. Redacted Proposal Language –

- SCDOT receives FOIA requests constantly. Currently SCDOT is redacting confidential information manually. In the future SCDOT will require a standard and redacted version of the proposal be submitted. SCDOT will provide Redacted Proposal Language to Subcommittee.

V. MOT Implementation Manager –

- SCDOT believes this person is experienced in the administration and execution of the MOT scheme. Not the original MOT designer. SCDOT is unsure if this is an actual person that teams have on staff. The industry calls it an MOT superintendent/manager who is in charge of implementing lane closures and traffic shifts. Industry typically require 5 years of experience for MOT superintendent. MOT Implementation Manager should be listed under the construction management team and are not responsible for the design of the MOT or performing traffic analysis. Roadway and MOT engineers do not typically perform detailed traffic analysis. Lead Roadway Engineer are the designer of MOT plans and Traffic Engineers are responsible for traffic analysis. These roles should be separate for projects where traffic analysis is a key component of design.

VI. Open Discussion –

VII. Action Items –

- SCDOT to clarify in the RFQ that the personnel are only needed when their services are required during the duration of the contract.
- SCDOT to send out ROW language revisions for review.
- AGC to provide feedback on whether the size of LD coupled with Incentives affects performance.
- AGC will provide the Dispute Review Board comments for SCDOT review.
- SCDOT will provide Redacted Proposal Language to Subcommittee.

VIII. Next Meeting Date: September 18, 2019. AGC to lead next meeting.

IX. Adjourn