

American Council of Engineering Companies of South Carolina
Transportation Committee Meeting
August 12, 2021
Held Virtually on Zoom

The ACEC-SC Transportation Committee was called to order by Chairman David Montgomery, HDR, at 2:00 pm. There were 80+ committee members in attendance virtually, and Montgomery welcomed members. The Transportation Committee Minutes from May 12, 2021, were approved without objection.

Montgomery gave a brief synopsis of the ACEC-SC/SCDOT Partnering Committee Minutes from May 27, 2021. Montgomery said the large portion of the Meeting was about the changes to the Two-Tier selection process. He said ACEC-SC was able to submit questions/suggestions to the changes, and SCDOT did incorporate some of the suggestions.

SCDOT also discussed their return to work. They reiterated they never stopped working. They're meeting in person and have virtual options when needed.

Swearingen noted we did have a called Transportation Committee Meeting to deal with the Two-Tier changes.

Jones noted there are continuing to postpone the Highway Engineers Conference until Spring 2022.

Montgomery said SCDOT is monitoring the number of electric cars/hybrids in the State since it will impact the GAS Tax revenue.

Partnering Committee Agenda Items: Montgomery opened the floor for suggestions for agenda items. Mark Lester, CDM Smith, suggested an update on the pipeline of work coming out. Bridge replacements have been spoken about. Ricky Ward said the Professional Services Committee has spoken with SCDOT about the pipeline. Montgomery said that is one portion of the pipeline, but the Partnering Committee will discuss this with SCDOT.

Emily Swearingen, AECOM, asked if there are any contract issues or payment issues? This is the forum for ACEC-SC to bring up topics that need to be discussed.

John Walsh, Michael Baker, said the use of the on-call contracts. How the money will be used from the American Rescue Plan may also be a good topic.

Another topic can be the QA/QC discussion. Every PM has a different way of doing things, and best practices may need to be developed.

Standing Committee Reports

Midlevel-Designers Group

- Did not meet over the summer
- Looking to see if they should meet in person or virtually.
- Sending out a survey to see if the next Meeting should be in person or virtual.

- Sub-committee meeting following week.

Professional Services Meeting Minutes:

Professional Services upcoming outlook/tentative list.

SCDOT is creating the new upcoming outlook/tentative list based on the results of the load ratings. The first projects are expected to hit the tentative list in October. SCDOT does not know the exact number of bridges that will be advertised. At this point, it appears that approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ of the bridges on the primary system will be advertised for bridge repairs through the Bridge Maintenance Office, with the remainder being bridge replacements procured through Preconstruction. Emphasis will be placed on repairs/replacements required along with the primary roadnetwork.

Professional Services Committee Audit update/summary

SCDOT received the results of the efficiency audit, which identified areas for increased efficiency in the procurement and contracting processes but noted that the Department is moving in the right direction. The study set performance metrics for tracking the processes, with benchmarks set for specific stages of negotiations. As a result of the study, SCDOT has implemented modifications to its internal processes and has seen improvements in the selection process, with improvement still needed with negotiations. It was noted by ACEC that there has been improvement with the SCDOT process, particularly regarding meeting benchmarks during the negotiation phase.

The full report is available on the Office of State Auditors website. Post-meeting, SCDOT provided a copy of the full audit to ACEC, which is appended to these Minutes.

Update on lump-sum pricing on contracts.

SCDOT reiterated that it is in favor of them, provided project scopes can be better clarified. Clemson has progressed on its ongoing standard scope template research project, and Jen Necker sat in on interviews with TxDOT, FDOT, GDOT, KYTC, and NCDOT for information about their processes and templates. If/when approved, lump-sum contracting will not be limited to only large projects.

Jen noted that those states had lump-sum contracts broken up into smaller phases rather than 'cradle-to-grave' scoping. Scoping for future phases is completed as earlier phases reach critical milestones. There is a learning curve involved in implementing this type of process as the DOT and industry learned to develop these milestones. This process allows for efficiency in contracting and reduces risk for the DOT and consultant.

ACEC noted that lump sum projects for some DOTs and municipalities include a contingency that is not part of the original contract but must be approved as a contract modification. However, this modification would not require Commission approval.

Definition of "critical personnel" in RFQs.

Prior to the Meeting, ACEC provided its recommended revision of key/critical personnel verbiage for RFQs. SCDOT approves of the revised wording and will incorporate it into future RFQs. The revision is as follows:

Existing language:

From Section E. Proposal Content:

3. Qualifications for key individuals and all other individuals that are considered critical to the success of the project. Qualifications should include information on experience related to similar projects and previous project work.

From Section I. Instructions to Consultants:

KEY INDIVIDUALS: Key individuals are those personnel deemed critical to the success of the project. They often vary from project to project. It is incumbent on the prime consultant to make a determination as to who they deem "key". In general terms, it can include, but not limited to: the project manager and those individuals listed as leads for each functionally specific discipline on the project organization chart.

Revised language:

Section E. Proposal Content:

- Qualifications for key individuals that are considered critical to the success of the project. Qualifications should include information on experience related to similar projects and previous project work.

Section I. Instructions to Consultants:

- **KEY INDIVIDUALS:** At a minimum, SCDOT considers Project Managers and major discipline leaders as "Key Individuals." Based on the specific requirements of the project, the proposer may identify other key individuals as critical to the success of the project. It is incumbent on the prime consultant to determine who they deem as "Key Individuals."

SCDOT and ACEC agreed that the language will help with preparation and evaluation of proposals

Review of Firm Backlog and Current Tier Two Score reports

SCDOT intends to update the Firm Backlog and Tier Two reports on or about the first of every month. The update is intended to let industry know the approximate current score when preparing proposals. Slight discrepancies may be evident between the two reports as the backlog is based on remaining contract value but the Tier Two score can include the estimated contract value for projects awarded but still under negotiations.

Tier Two score will be locked as of the day of the issue of the RFQ. SCDOT noted that this was changed based on feedback from industry.

Only projects with DOT as a client will be included in the Tier Two scoring (i.e. county projects with the county as a client will not factor into the score). *Release of Proposal Scores/Information*

SCDOT is working on a method for providing proposers with their score from the selection committee prior to waiting for execution of the awarded contract. They are working around debrief flaws with their legal team. SCDOT is considering including a firm's score on its response letter.

SCDOT is considering posting the non-proprietary portions of proposals for consultants to eliminate

the need for FOIA requests for that information, with a thought of possibly putting the proposals on ProjectWise. The proposals would likely be able to be accessed by any firm, whether they proposed or not, due to legal concerns. SCDOT also reiterated that RFP language specifies that entire proposals may not be marked proprietary and that this is being policed.

Meeting with "Industry"

There was a meeting with "Industry" regarding Tier Two on July 26, 2021. The following topics were discussed:

- How the revisions to the Two-Tier system impact industry. As the revisions have just been implemented, SCDOT felt that this discussion was premature.
- Overhead rate/indirect costs/PPP loans. SCDOT reiterated that overhead rates from 2020 will be ignored when calculating fixed fees.
- There is concern from SCDOT that the cost of design and inspection services has increased. SCDOT indicated that historic averages were approximately 10% of project cost for design and 10% for CE&I. However, costs have crept up to as much as approximately 20% of construction cost for these services. SCDOT offered that it's possible that projects have been "overscoped", which could lead to some of this increase. SCDOT noted that they would like ACEC input regarding this issue so it can be addressed jointly because the increase is "unsustainable" and that there is concern from the General Assembly about the rising design costs.
 - ACEC replied that some of the increase in costs is due to items such as the implementation of requirements of the Geotechnical Design Manual, additional Public Involvement requirements, and SUE.
 - ACEC also indicated that no matter the size of the project, the same design process must be followed so costs on smaller projects and TAP projects will almost necessarily have higher relative costs.
 - SCDOT said that they would consider more bundling of smaller projects and would pay close attention to scope to help.
- SCDOT indicated that there has been some concern from contractors regarding the quality of inspections.

As a follow-up to this discussion, SCDOT indicated that they would like industry-SCDOT discussions to go through ACEC and not have random groups trying to discuss these issues with them.

Composition of Partnering Committee

SCDOT currently feels that the Partnering Committee should include decision-making level personnel, rather than mid-level designers or Business Development professionals. SCDOT noted that their similar meetings with AGC, for example, include those decision-makers from both large and small firms and that they would like that with ACEC. ACEC replied that it's a self-selecting group that gets involved, but SCDOT reiterated their preference for decision-making level personnel on the committee. SCDOT also said this message has previously been conveyed to ACEC.

Restrictions for SCDOT Personnel who Enter the Private Sector

SCDOT reviewed the rules for people who leave SCDOT and go to the private sector. Two standards apply, the One Year Restriction and the Permanent Restriction from the State Ethics Code. SCDOT provided a copy of the restrictions, which are appended to these Minutes. SCDOT emphasized that

they will be monitoring if people are not following either restriction.

Communication with SCDOT

SCDOT reiterated that any conversation regarding contract negotiations should go through Professional Services, not the project PM. At a minimum, someone from Professional Services must be included on all conversations from the notice of award. Otherwise, an award could be rejected due to the appearance of collusion. This includes discussions regarding project scope. Conversations with PMs are acceptable before an RFQ is published. SCDOT also noted that this applies to contract modifications, as well.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, October 13 at 10 am in person at SCDOT.

Joint Design-Build Meeting Minutes:

Project Updates

- Carolina Crossroads Phase 2 – Contract Awarded to Archer-United
- Closed and Load Restricted Bridges 2021-1 – District 4 with eight bridges. In procurement. Nearing ATC Phase.
- Cross Island Parkway Toll Conversion – Final RFP Issued, entering ATC phases.
- I-20 over Wateree, River and Overflow Bridges – Scope: Main river bridges to be replaced, overflow bridges to be rehabilitation. Inclusive within design-build contract. RFQ summer 2022, executed contract 2023.
- Carolina Crossroads Phase 3 – RFQ anticipated in mid to late 2022.
- I-26/I-95 Interchange Improvements – Awaiting PE funding. This funding is anticipated to be available shortly. Design-Build prep contract imminent. Full scope of project to be determined (i.e. to potentially include widening further along I-26 to east/west of interchange)
 - Note: funding announced and available for additional widening of I-26. Current project delivery of these widening projects is unknown and may interface with existing and upcoming design-bid-build and design-build projects.
- Mark Clark Expressway – Public Involvement (Information and Hearing) for Supplemental EIS complete. Moving forward with Final EIS and related documentation. RFQ in 2023.
- Low Country Corridor West and I-26/I-526 Interchange – ROD is expected in 2022 and RFQ could move to 2027.
 - Five phases are currently being evaluated for delivery method type.
- Low Country Corridor East – Currently in project development and NEPA. Procurement timeframe TBD, likely 2027 for initial phase. Preliminary engineering documents being worked on.
- US 301 over Four-Hole Swamp – Expedited bridge replacement project, not emergency procurement. Two-phase approach, RFQ mid to late 2022. Anticipated \$10-15,000,000 project. Design-Build prep contract imminent.

I. Action Items from 7/14/2021 Meeting

- SCDOT to continue to review Insurance and Bonding language comments and provide revised version to ACEC/AGC for further review. **[CLOSED]**
 - Updated language developed (includes drone verbiage, railroad liability, etc.)
 - SCDOT to circulate to ACEC/AGC for comment. Industry to provide comments, if any, to Tyler

and Brian

- SCDOT to review and discuss examples of commitments from other states (provided by ACEC/AGC) and potential changes/implementation.
 - Language and committal process discussion ongoing.
- ACEC/AGC to circulate new Shop Drawing Language comments to industry for review and comment. **[CLOSED]**
 - Overall intent is to ensure shop drawing review times do not hold up or delay overall process.
- SCDOT/ACEC/AGC to discuss potential new RFQ language suggestions and/or scoring techniques for SOQ evaluations with stakeholders.
 - Ongoing internal discussion, language update to be provided when available.
 - Overall intent is to heavily scrutinize SOQs to ensure short-listing of only the best teams. Initial focus on key individual for additional language.
 - Additionally, gather feedback regarding when and how SOQ scores should be released? **[CLOSED]**
 - Feedback received and discussed internally. SCDOT does not intend to release SOQ scores on the website or within debriefs.
 - Industry requests that it is known, at RFQ stage, whether or not SOQ scores would be included in weighted score criteria for RFP
 - Director Gaskins agreed that this is the appropriate direction
- AGC to circulate current version of standard of care language to stakeholders for review and comment.
 - SCDOT to discuss with internal Policy Committee **[CLOSED]**
 - SCDOT discussed and developed typical standard of care language to be utilized within design-build contracts. Will circulate to ACEC/AGC as referenced.
 - Considering implementing this into contract templates; would apply to designer related items (i.e. provide clarification on expectations).
 - There is resistance for implementation of this language from AGC (it may make designer/contractor negotiations more difficult) and support from ACEC. Director Gaskins expressed that this is exactly the feedback we need before changes, if any, are implemented.
 - Brian clarified that the language is not intended to insulate or preliminarily exonerate designers from responsibility but rather to provide clarification on expectations related to design and construction as the project progresses through the contract and construction phases.
- SCDOT to coordinate with Director of Construction Office and Field Offices to determine a consistent Schedule of Values for design-build contracts.
 - SCDOT continuing to discuss internally and have been making progress that will be shared with the industry on or before next sub-committee meeting.

Office of Alternative Delivery

SCDOT

- “New” office established within Department. Chris Gaskins hired as Director of Alternative Delivery; reports directly to Deputy Secretary Colvin.
 - Org chart still being discussed and finalized but will be implemented as soon as possible.
- Design-Build Group will largely stay uncompromised and fully functional with same processes and staff as before.
- Design-Build Engineer to become Alternative/Preconstruction Delivery Engineer.
- Construction component to be implemented into Alternative Delivery Group in order to assist with post-award contract administration.
- Mega Projects Office (CCR) and Low Country Corridor Project Staff (Joy Riley) will join the

Alternative Delivery Group.

- Overall intent is to, continue to, provide a centralized group to provide a consistent pre and post-award project development and contract experience for design-build and other delivery methods to come.
 - Exploration of other project delivery methods (i.e. CM/GC, progressive design-build, etc.) will be forthcoming in the years to come but is largely dependent upon legislation and upper management support.

Stipend Discussion (Prep Contracts)

ACEC

- ACEC: How are stipend amounts determined?
 - Typically starts or is estimated as 0.2% of design-build contract cost, complexity of projects (multipliers dependent upon time spent or risk), project size multiplier to be able to increase stipend (eye test); i.e. “right-size” the stipend related to these and other related factors.
 - ACEC: requests consideration of an additional tool/factor related to % of effort required to prepare Technical Proposal related to the amount of prep work or information provided to Designer (i.e. if SCDOT does not provide enough survey information that is additional risk and work for Designer and should be considered within stipend calculations).
 - SCDOT to discuss current stipend determination method and potential of additional factor as requested.
- AGC: Fewer unknowns can lower the contingency funds available.
 - Unknowns are proportional to the amount of time and information related to the preliminary design (i.e. additional effort needed/required and a higher stipend may be appropriate).
 - Requests that SCDOT consider higher stipends related to the previously discussed factors.
- Discussion: award of stipend, if accepted, allows SCDOT to utilize/capture ATCs submitted by all teams. If the selected team utilizes an approved ATC from another team, is this considered within stipend amount/value to project?
- Industry requests demonstration of how we would determine, outside of what’s listed above, the stipend amount.
 - SCDOT to discuss how to best demonstrate stipend development process and potentially present at next sub-committee meeting.
- AGC will discuss and consider sharing how they calculate risks related to funding at time of Technical Proposal submittal in order to assist SCDOT with determining stipend amounts.

Added Value Personnel

SCDOT

- In the past, it has been requested that SCDOT consider allowance of “added value personnel” or “additional key personnel”. This would potentially allow teams to commit an individual, not listed in minimum key individual requirements within the RFQ, to the team/project that they feel will give them a better chance of successful project delivery and short-listing opportunity.
- SCDOT’s intent is always to receive and short-list the best teams.
- Many examples of how to approach are available and have been briefly discussed (e.g. quality credit may be issued for your added key individual).
- ACEC thoughts:
 - Concern with egregious submittal of individuals
 - If pursued, these submittals of added key individuals would be limited.
 - Suggestion to not structure it as a system within RFQ, just open ended allowance in the manner that it is allowed today (i.e. no direct verbiage that limits or rewards this type of submission).
- AGC thoughts:
 - Feels they are already offering these individuals within SOQ (e.g. concrete contractor with superlative record of quality and experience).

- Discussion: Is there a point to reward teams for submitting an additional key individual?
 - Scoring these individuals (global score for key individuals) could be increased as a result of these additional, committed, key individuals.
- All voted to close topic, for now, as they feel the current process is working as intended to achieve goals of SCDOT and all stakeholders.
 - May be revisited in future if perspectives shift related to contract administration of component of Alternative Delivery Group.

Scope of Work: Contractor QC

SCDOT

- Topic submitted from ACEC CE&I committee meeting in order to help clarify requirements and expectations for Contractor QC.
- Currently scope of work related to Contractor QC can be unclear and can cause miscommunications regarding QC expected and what is provided.
- SCDOT is explicit and clear with QA component on projects but may need to further expand on the QC component.
- Clay to discuss scope for Contractor QC further with ACEC CE&I Committee and present feedback.

Action Items

- SCDOT to circulate to ACEC/AGC for comment. Industry to provide comments, if any, to Tyler and Brian.
- SCDOT to review and discuss examples of commitments from other states (provided by ACEC/AGC) and potential changes/implementation.
- SCDOT/ACEC/AGC to discuss potential new RFQ language suggestions and/or scoring techniques for SOQ evaluations with stakeholders.
- AGC to circulate current version of standard of care language to stakeholders for review and comment.
- SCDOT to coordinate with Director of Construction Office and Field Offices to determine a consistent Schedule of Values for design-build contracts.
- SCDOT to discuss current stipend determination method and potential of additional factor as requested.
- SCDOT to discuss how to best demonstrate stipend development process and potentially present at next sub-committee meeting.
- Clay to discuss scope for Contractor QC further with ACEC CE&I Committee and present feedback.

Environmental Committee Meeting Minutes:

M Sizemore offered the following topics in advance to facilitate conversation:

- Latest changes in NEPA discussion
- 401/404 Permitting update
 - 2020 NWPR changing
 - 401 WQ Pre-filing
 - SCDOT General Permit updates
 - SQT impact on mitigation

DISCUSSION:

- Latest Changes in NEPA:
 - CEQ updates. Timeframes & deadlines for EAs EISs. Projects will be front-loaded with data/studies/analyses. Shane Belcher to likely set up workshop or virtual.

- David Kelly & CLong to update noise policy. Cost criteria to increase; reasonableness factor added(optional) to address density bias. Anticipated to complete over next 6-mo.
- Updated NEPA PCE form (online on SCDOT ESO toolshed).
- Public Involvement remains important. SCDOT default is still face-to-face; planning to hire new PI Director.
- Noise on-call is on street.
- General
 - Future separate oncall solicitations (such as, JDs, Permits, PI; wants it set up like the compliance on-call with work-orders. Will be similar to the Noise on-call). SCDOT has not identified when they are coming out.
 - Small Purchase going well.
 - Environmental Compliance contract going well
- 401/404 Permitting update
 - 2020 NWPR changes
 - SCDOT seeing reductions in jurisdictional areas
 - 401 WQ Pre-filing
 - SCDOT spoke to DHEC WQ. DHEC will set up auto-reply to decline pre-filing requirement.
 - Subcommittee is considering OCRM permitting as discussion topic
 - SCDOT General Permit updates (SConnolly): Pending/future GP same as current (expired)general permit we are operating under. Hope to have finalized pretty soon (possibly first of next week).
 - Stream Quantification Tool impact on mitigation
 - (SConnolly) EPermit. Up-and-running end of Sept. Dashboard report which identifies anticipated stream/wetland impacts in HUC. Potential automated JD mapping submittal tool. Use of colors in permit graphics (update in fall), permit graphic streamlining.
- Workshop:
 - SConnolly is working with SC Mitigation Association for workshop on SQT. Would be a workshopthat all consultants could attend (mitigation, WQ, permitting). In-person in 2022. We discussed combining ACEC in as well.
- Old Business:
 - Comments were provided after this Meeting to ESO on the boilerplate Environmental Scope. We discussed during the Meeting that the boilerplate Environmental Scope included blanks which appeared to need hours filled in for environmental services tasks. This appears to be fee negotiation during scoping. SConnolly said that the hour blank could come out or consultants would not be required to fill in hours during scoping.

ACTION ITEMS:

1. JCollum to send boilerplate Scope comments to CLong & SConnolly – Completed 8/5/21
2. SConnolly can send EPermit to subcommittee for comment

Traffic

- *Rochell Garrett reported, they have not met, but will meeting in September.*
- *The new Traffic Design manual spreadsheet will be emailed to the committee.*

Road Design Committee Minutes:

Existing Discussions:

1. Bluebeam Revu
 - a. Status on use for QA review: SCDOT is still working on this internally and is not ready for use on consultant projects.
2. OpenRoads Designer
 - a. Status of Implementation: Stalled due to funding/resource issues, RFP in development for consultant to assist with developing standards. Bentley is still working on workspace items, annotation, quantities. Plan to extend use of SS10 use to 2023, to allow time for implementing ORD. Struggling with converting model to a plan set with proper annotation.
3. Primavera
 - a. Implemented - all projects will use Primavera moving forward.
 - b. Status on guidance: - to be included in the next RDM update.
4. Shoulder rollover max for full superelevation at 8%
 - a. Status on guidance. Tabitha noted they are working on clarifying this issue in the next RDM update. For the time being check rollover as unpaved shoulder is rotated with the roadway.
5. Curbing on Ramps
 - a. RDM 10.5.4 Bullet 3 – Tabitha noted that for ramps, a full width paved shoulder must be provided adjacent to curbs. DOT is working to clarify this in the next RDM update.
6. Vertical Profiles of Intersecting Roads
 - a. RDM Figure 9.2F (pg. 9.2-12) conflict with Chapter 6 regarding grade breaks and design of vertical curves. Iris noted SCDOT is reviewing this issue and Figure 9.2F and it is being addressed but may not be in the next RDM update.
7. Roadway QA Checklist – Detour and MOT Plans
 - a. Checklist General Section – “Detour Plans included if applicable”
 - b. Suggest revision “Detour Plans or Conceptual MOT Plans” to ensure ROW is sufficient.
 - c. Roadway Design Support does not review the MOT/Detour plans. Traffic reviews these plans. Send Traffic subcommittee to determine if they want to bring this up in their
8. RDM Update Status
 - a. Focus on Bike and Pedestrian – included in 2021 update – Chapter 13
 - b. Carol noted that SCDOT is trying to do an update in the spring of each year to incorporate needed revisions/clarifications/changes.
9. Expand on functional class – SCDOT is working to align functional class with the 2018 AASHTO Green Book.

New Discussions

10. Realignment of SCDOT Departments
 - a. Design Support is no longer under Preconstruction. Intent is to avoid appearance of conflict between design and review functions. Engineering Support is now a separate department from Preconstruction.
 - b. DB/Mega Projects has been moved out of Preconstruction into Alternative Delivery group and reports directly to Leland Colvin.

- c. Construction now reports directly to Andy Leaphart.
- 11. PAM4 Quality Assurance Process (Preconstruction Advisory Memorandum)
 - a. Updating the QA review process. Currently in draft stage.
 - b. Process for review – what gets sent to support when, coordination with Engineering Support and design engineers.
 - c. discourage response only submissions, need responses with revised plans
 - d. encourage coordination
 - e. recommendations and compliance issues

Sam Pridgen joined the call.

- 12. PAM4 Discussion lead to a broader discussion about scoping project and establishing design criteria for a project. Sam noted that submitting design criteria early in the project (most new scopes require this) and have conversation regarding appropriate criteria.
- 13. Updated Design Exception Policy – Sam noted that SCDOT is still working on this and ensure that there is one overall policy that works for all design disciplines and providing documentation. There is no timeline as yet, but it is behind the quality assurance process in terms of priority.
- 14. Ped Ramp Callouts – Future Roadway Design Bulletin – have had issues with construction where ped ramp cannot be constructed within the right-of-way. Prefer to have designers check this and provide appropriate call-out.
- 15. Station Equations – Future Roadway Design Bulletin- currently no SCDOT guidance for when needed, format, etc. DOT has identified. Will issue as Roadway Design Bulletins if can be issued before the end of the year.

Hydraulic Design

- No report

The Right of Way:

- No report

Utilities:

Carlos Gittens, PE, KCI, reported the committee has not met, but he has attended the AGC/ACEC-NC/ACEC-SC Utility committee. Recently had a presentation on building risk insurance.

A question was asked if Utilities have to still submit reports. The answer was yes, except for Design Build projects.

Bridge Design Meeting Minutes:

Continued discussions	
2.	<p>Status Updates for New & Upcoming SCDOT Documents, Policies & Procedures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any significant updates regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Structural Design Manual Project – Project is underway. ACEC will be asked to review as chapters are available.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Design Memos/Seismic Design Memos Updates – New Design Memos are forthcoming pertaining to Seismic Design Specifications, Seismic Summary Reports, and Culverts. ○ Standard Drawing Update Project – Project is in the Procurement office’s court. No timeline given for next steps. ○ Use of Bluebeam for all Reviews – Internal testing at SCDOT is underway. No timeline given for full implementation. ○ Open Bridge Modeler – No progress. Negotiations ongoing with Bentley. ○ Plan Review On-Call – This is being worked on with the Department. Other options are being considered including expanding to all disciplines and including independent consultant QA as part of RFPs. ● Terry to provide update on procurement process. – Anything going through the Procurement office right now is slow due to funding, COVID, etc.
New Items	
3.	<p>Load Rating</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Minimum Rating Requirements for New Bridges <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Beam vs. Negative Moment Region ○ Legal Loads ○ This will require additional discussion. The minimum load rating is 1.0. Additional guidance may be developed in future updates to the Structures Design Manual and/or Load Rating Guidance Document. ● Load Ratings on County Projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Delivery ○ QA ○ This will require additional discussion. This may be addressed in future updates to the Load Rating Guidance Document. ● When is the Statewide Load Rating Project “done”? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project is completed by end of 2021. All load ratings are complete. Many bridges are in a state of “limbo” and additional testing and/or analysis completed before finalizing. A new contract is anticipated for future load rating needs.
4.	<p>SCDOT Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Creation of Engineering Services Division and Alternate Delivery Division <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This was an informational item. ● Bridge Development Reports and Conceptual Bridge Plans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SCDOT is working on guidance to provide consistency across RPGs and consultants regarding expectations for review and content of BDR’s.
5.	<p>Technical</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● GFRP Reinforcing – possible uses and training <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SCDOT may be looking to test GFRP on future projects. Likely smaller bridge in coastal area.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T-Mat and Transflex Expansion Joints – possible options for larger joint openings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ These are options for large expansion joints. ○ Steve Nanney with the Bridge Construction Office expressed the desire to continue to use traditional joint types due to contractor familiarity.
5.	<p>Upcoming Training</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSBA Steel Days – Augusta Iron and Steel – September 23 • CSIBridge Training – Access to Training Videos • Possible one day PCI and NSBA Trainings • SCDOT Prestressed Concrete Design Course
6.	<p>Administrative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next Meeting: Prior to Q4 ACEC-SC Transportation Committee Meeting

Survey & SUE

- No report

Geotechnical Committee Meeting Minutes:

Follow-Up Items from Previous Meeting(s)

1.1. PDA vs. No PDA spreadsheet

- ##### 1.1.1.
- Spreadsheet is being used. Some are overriding results from spreadsheet and implementing PDA testing with technical justification. SCDOT is generally happy with how this process is going. They do not want to discourage PDA testing but are more wanting documentation that the process was followed.

1.2. QC checklist is being used sparingly. Need to encourage designers to begin using the spreadsheet. Mr. Cooke mentioned that it would be helpful to use the checklist throughout the design process and not wait until the report is complete. Mr. Harris suggested that language gets added to the scope that points to the QC checklists.

2. New Discussion

2.1. Mr. Ulmer asked if SCDOT is currently requesting compression wave geophysical data on in-house projects. Mr. Ulmer mentioned that the compression wave data on a recent project he worked on did not produce data near the targeted depth of 100+ ft.

- ##### 2.1.1.
- Ms. Chandler replied that SCDOT is still learning the limitations on some of these geophysical tests. Mr. Harman added that most of the time they are only interested in acquiring this type of geophysical data in the upper part of the soil column where Pleistocene and younger soils exist and where soils may be saturated.

- ##### 2.1.2.
- Mr. Hamilton asked if the intent was that the soils had to be BOTH below the water table and be saturated for SSL conditions to exist and no capillary zone was in-play? Mr. Harman replied that yes, that was the intent.

2.2. Mr. Hamilton opened the floor for the SCDOT to provide comments and criticism on the industry performance relative to SCDOT expectations.

- ##### 2.2.1.
- Mr. Harris mentioned that he would like to see more of an integrated team approach

amongst the Design-Build teams. He thinks there is an apparent lack of communication between the design team and the contractors, and, as a result, a lot of RFIs are produced. He did mention that this probably falls more on the Contractor than the Designer(s).

2.2.2. Ms. Chandler had no comments at the time.

2.2.3. Mr. Sizemore mentioned that most of the topics discussed during this Meeting hit on the major items he had identified.

2.2.4. Mr. Harman mentioned that he would like to see more consultants reading the GDM chapters up for review and providing comments back to SCDOT. During the current review process, SCDOT does not feel like they are getting many comments from the industry, and this is bothering them. They do not want to hear any complaints from the industry after the manual is in rotation.

2.2.5. Ms. Gardner had no comments at the time.

2.2.6. Mr. Breland mentioned that he would like to see more QC of the reports and implementation of the scoped amount of work before the final report gets to his office for QA review.

2.2.7. Mr. Jones had no comments at the time.

2.3. Mr. Hamilton asked if SCDOT could consolidate their review comment matrices to a single document instead of 1 from RPG and 1 from PCS. Ms. Gardner mentioned that is mostly a function of the SCDOT Project Manager, and they did not have any say in the matter.

2.3.1. Mr. Hamilton asked about the status of Bluebeam reviews. Mr. Sizemore mentioned that SCDOT is trying to implement it, but they are not ready to start using it yet.

2.3.2. Mr. Sizemore mentioned they are considering assigning only single-level review of submittals instead of both RPG and PCS reviewing.

2.4. Some extensive discussion on the topic of geotechnical movements from seismic activity pushing on the bridge and measuring the response (ie. Caltrans methodology). Mr. Ulmer mentioned that the hydro, structures, and geotechnical engineer need to be talking at the onset of the project. In the past, these types of conversations did not happen until later in the project. Mr. Ulmer recommended that language be added to the GDM and/or the other discipline documents (Bridge Design Manual, etc.) that forces the Structures and Hydro engineers to include the geotechnical engineer in the conceptual design process.

2.4.1. Mr. Hamilton mentioned that BDR level geotechnical reports may be helpful to identify issues during the conceptual design phase and force these types of discussions early in the design process.

2.4.2. Mr. Harmon recommended designers call SCDOT and ask if older geotechnical boring exist in the general project area.

2.4.2.1. Mr. Ulmer requested that available soil borings or other similar data be provided with the scope document.

2.4.3. Mr. Hamilton provided an example of how implementing the new Caltrans process performed on a recent SCDOT project where this new methodology was implemented. Mr. Hamilton mentioned that the stiffnesses increase in the bridge substructure required to mitigate slope instability in lieu of geotechnical ground improvement resulted in 3 rows of HP14x117 piles. The Structural Engineer would then have to start their seismic design process over, which wasn't an option for that particular project, and we ended up implementing EQ drains to provide the required stiffness in the soil rather than the substructure.

2.4.4. Mr. Hamilton mentioned that geotechnical field work needs to be prioritize more towards the front end of projects where this soil-structure interaction process is a potential concern. Mr. Hamilton continued that the entire design team would have to coordinate and make good decisions so that subsurface information is properly located, and that this information is not wasted. Ms. Chandler mentioned that adding another mobilization is an alternate option.

- 2.4.4.1. Mr. Hamilton mentioned that geophysical testing alone would not provide the necessary SSL indications for the level of design required to identify issues at the preliminary or concept level of design.
- 2.4.4.2. Mr. Harman mentioned that SCDOT's intent is to "sound the alarm" before the design is too far along.
- 2.4.5. Ms. Chandler mentioned adding a milestone to the scope for "Design Coordination Meeting" with documentation submitted to the SCDOT proving that this Meeting occurred.
- 2.4.6. Mr. Harman mentioned that some of these topics would be covered in the revisions to the Seismic Design Specs, Bridge Design Manual, Geotechnical Design Manual, etc.
- 2.4.7. Mr. Hamilton discussed potentially adding a third level of geotechnical investigation to further investigate potential seismic issues identified in the initial investigation. Ms. Chandler mentioned adding a mobilization to the preliminary geotechnical field investigation. The Group agreed to add some language to Ch. 4 of the GDM to suggest this notion. The current GDM language implies only two (2) levels of geotechnical investigation: preliminary and final.
- 2.4.8. Mr. Harman is planning on presenting this seismic soil-structure interaction topic at the ACEC/SCDOT annual conference in December.
- 2.4.9. SCDOT is planning on providing training for geotechnical and structural engineers for the new process.
3. ACEC-SC Industry Reviews
- 3.1. GDM Ch. 11-13 due July 30.
4. Action Items
- 4.1. Industry to provide comments to SCDOT for GDM chapters 11-13 by 7/30/2021.
- 4.2. Mr. Hamilton to attempt to generate more response from the industry on the GDM review.
5. Next Meeting
- 5.1. October 5, 2021 – 9:00 am

ACEC-SC Executive Directors Report: ACEC-SC Executive Director, Adam B. Jones, gave the following report in the meeting packet

Legislative Report

- American Rescue Plan Money
 - Legislature to return in September to talk about money from American Rescue Plan
 - SCDOT is looking to get some additional money
 - Water (Drinking Water & Wastewater) is a safe place to invest
 - ✓ Coalition created to advocate for money to be spent in the water realm
 - ✓ ACEC-SC & SCSPE will be crucial for calls to action
- ASCE-SC Infrastructure Report Card
 - ASCE SC Chapter is creating a South Carolina specific infrastructure report card
 - Hosting a press release/press conference to spread the word about what SC's infrastructure really needs
 - Having conversations with SCDOT/SCDHEC to make sure they agree with what is in report card

- ✓ If so, I would want Member Firms' support at press conference to show large numbers (similar to what we had at Engineers Day)
- ACEC National & Infrastructure Bills
 - Senate passed Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act
 - The Senate bill includes a five-year authorization of surface transportation programs as well as investments across a range of infrastructure categories. Highlights include:
 - ✓ \$350 billion for highway programs,
 - ✓ \$107 billion for transit,
 - ✓ \$66 billion for rail,
 - ✓ \$25 billion for airports,
 - ✓ \$65 billion in broadband investment, and
 - ✓ \$55 billion for water infrastructure.
 - The bill did not fix the PPP / FAR Issue.
 - ✓ Pursuing a fix in the House or stand-alone legislation

Engineering Excellence Awards

- 2021 Awards Gala success
- Notice of Intent mailer will go out this month

ACEC-SC/ACEC PAC

- ACEC PAC \$ still needed
 - Fall Sweepstakes underway

SC Engineering Conference

- Successful Hybrid Conference in 2021
- Back at North Charleston Embassy Suites in 2022

ACEC-SC / SCDOT Meeting

- The Planning Committee is Meeting. The agenda is being worked out. There are two Keynote Speakers being considered. We will see if SCDOT has a preference between the two. Planning on in-person, but we are keeping an eye on COVID-19 numbers.
 - December 7, 2021 at the Columbia Metropolitan Convention Center

ACEC National Transportation Update – Melvin Williams

- Williams updated the committee on what National is doing about the Infrastructure Package and PPP.

Other Business: Discussion ensued about S&ME replacing Jayson Jordan, PE as an alternate on the Partnering Committee Meeting. Melvin Williams made a motion to accept Aaron Goldberg as a alternate voting member on the Partnering Committee. Seconded by Mark Lester, passed without objection.

The Meeting adjourned at 4:20 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Adam B. Jones
Executive Director

**ACEC-SC / SCDOT Partnering Committee Meeting
May 27, 2021, at 10:00 AM**

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 10:02 AM by David Montgomery and John Boylston. Brice Urqhart, Chris Gaskins, David Montgomery, Tony Cooper, Andy Leaphart, Cook DB, David Rister, JP Barber, Brent Rewis, , Justin Powell, Jennifer Necker, John Boylston, Phillip Sandel, Leah Quattlebaum, Mark Lester, Mike Barbee, Phillip Hutcherson, Rob Bedenbaugh, Robbie Isgett, III, Shawn Epps, Tameka Bostic, Randall Young, Darrin Player, Nick Pizutti, Jayson Jordan, Emily Swearingen, Steve Thomas, John Walsh, Gina BennettNorris, and Adam B. Jones were in attendance either in-person or virtually.

- Emily Swearingen acted as a fill-in voting member.

Deputy Secretary Leland Colvin Remarks:

- SCDOT stayed open through everything. We're finally coming through the dark side of Covid.
- NPOs and COGs are coming in soon.

Approval of February 25, 2021, Meeting Minutes: David Montgomery/John Boylston

- John Boylston asked if everyone had had a chance to review the meeting minutes. He then called for a motion.

A motion was made to approve the February 25, 2021, minutes by Emily Swearingen, seconded by David Montgomery, and passed unanimously.

ACEC-SC Executive Director Remarks: Adam B. Jones

- Jones noted there will be more upcoming discussion on bill S.422. AGC is still at odds with the bill.
- ACEC-SC hosted all of its Congressional visits virtually and discussed the PPP and FAR issues.
- The ACEC-SC Engineering Excellence Awards Gala is June 16, 2021. The formal invitation is coming soon.
- Next week is the SC Engineering Conference in Myrtle Beach.
- December 7th is the ACEC-SC / SCDOT Annual Meeting.
 - SCDOT announced its conference will be in the spring instead of fall.

Carolina Crossroads Update: David Rister

- A contract has been executed on Phase 1 with an MVP in the next 30 days.
- Phase 2 includes June 2 and August proposal announcements.
- The website is accurate to date.
- An MVP was issued on program permitting response litigation site. Work will start next week on that.
- The demolition contract is ongoing.
- Smaller contracts are going out late summer/early fall.

Two-Tier Selection Proposed Changes: Justin Powell

- The guidance on PPP loans is out, and SCDOT is happy to help.
- The Infrastructure Bill and Reauthorization will be bringing in an extra \$190 million to South Carolina.
- TWO-TIER
 - We have approached the one-year evaluation mark.
 - The SCDOT is open to feedback but wants to move forward quickly. The process goes live on July 1, 2021.
 - The Professional Services Program has grown with funding Acts 98, 275, and 40.
 - Powell said Two-Tier is permitted under the Brooks Act
 - Proposed Changes to TT:
 - Adjust the workload scales.
 - Adjust the workload Likert scales to align to the total distribution of work.
 - Adjust the weighting of workload.

- The current scale goes from 5-25% with virtually no procurements at 20-25%.
- Adjust weighted workload.
 - Adjust the workload calculations to look at the weighted scores of book balance of proposed team inclusive of subcontractors rather than prime score alone.
- Yearly Adjustments: The workload criteria Likert score range will be adjusted yearly to reflect the distribution of workload throughout the program. The weighting of the workload criteria range will also be adjusted yearly to reflect the average contract amount executed the preceding year.
- Risk Adjustments: Workload weight established on notion that higher price will result in higher risk. Will evaluate on case-by-case adjustment is needed up or down one category.
- Subcontract Values: Current financial and accounting software is not capable of adequately tracking subcontract work in a manner that is timely for two-tier purposes. SCDOT is in the early stages of procuring new financial and accounting software and will look to incorporate into solution selected.
- ACEC-SC will get comments on Two-Tier from the membership.
 - SCDOT will have the final say but wants to hear feedback.
 - Feedback will be given back in one document to SCDOT.
- There was a question on workload: "Any thought to capturing design-build workload or other workload that is obtained through other methods?"
 - Powell noted this is a topic of conversation at SCDOT. SCDOT is not making an adjustment on this because price is a consideration. It's an element that is hard to distinguish and doesn't fall under the Brooks Act. \$150 million skewed results so breaking up categories further didn't make sense; it would only complicate state MMO.

Discussion on SCDOT's Return to work? Updates to the Safety Plan: SCDOT

- SCDOT has not stopped working. We are back to pre-pandemic type meetings with no plans to update the safety plan.
 - The joint workforce safety plan was rescinded on April 19. There are no unlimited out-of-state travel and no restrictions anymore. Meetings are back in the auditorium, not alumni center.

Standing Committee Reports

- ACEC-SC / CAGC / SCDOT Joint Design-Build Committee: Brooks Bickley
 - Chris Gaskins
 - There are a couple of new members, including new SCDOT members.
 - There are 13 projects under design or construction.
 - For Carolina Crossroads, phase three is internally fired up with an RFP.
 - 2021 – closed motor bridge package
 - Cross island parkway
 - 2022
 - I-20 over Wateree – rehab or replacement? TBD
 - RS&H – inspection and cost-benefit analysis
 - Motor bridge package
 - How is the list going to be reassigned?
 - Mark Clark Expressway
 - I-26 / I-95 improvements
 - Lowcountry Corridor
 - Recommendation soon – design-build

- Only west part, not east
- 10 discussion topics
 - Shot drawing language
 - Special provision – make timelines faster
 - Out and forthcoming
 - Quantities on Plans
 - Limited Negotiations
 - Award of project – RFP already outlined that allows negotiations before execution – ATCs incorporated
 - Design Optimization
 - What does the design-build contractor have to change after contract execution?
 - DBE Professional Services Goal
 - There is a push for design-build to include DBE – committal time – committed to earlier in the project rather than 30 days before construction.
 - Design Build Prep Contracts
 - Incorporate into contracts and include in design
 - Geotechnical starting to incorporate – survey & SUE next
 - Preliminary Drainage Design
 - There is the appearance of not enough pipe inspection work. We will continue to do preliminary drain design and pipe inspection but will not do so much preliminary drain design that you have to commit to a design only to have things changed later.
- The next meeting is mid-July.
- Mid-Level Designers Group: Philip Hutcherson, Tony Cooper, Tameika Bostic
 - March 4 was the last meeting, and it was virtual. There is no determined date for the next meeting.
 - For the fall, in-person meeting there is no topic yet.

Future Events and Meetings: David Montgomery

- The next two meetings are August 26, 2021, and November 18, 2021.
- b. Mid-Level Designers: TBD – They are considering in-person meeting.
- c. The SC Engineering Conference is June 3-5, 2021, at the Embassy Suites in Myrtle Beach.
- d. The ACEC-SC / SCDOT Annual Meeting is December 7, 2021.
- e. The ACEC-SC Engineering Excellence Awards Gala is June 16.
- 2. Other Business: David Montgomery
 - If the federal transportation bill is approved, there will be \$190 million coming to SC. Are there any plans already?
 - Service transfer reauthorization
 - Formula funding would increase
 - Bridges, off-interstate
 - MPOs & COGs
 - Bridges and pavement rehabilitation
 - There will be a one-time money payment of \$675 million rather than a reoccurring payment.
 - It's more conceptual than a defined plan.
 - The SCDOT believes the definition of infrastructure is “if an engineer is needed.”
 - As the U.S. moves to electric vehicles, is there any SCDOT funding stability?
 - It's on the radar. There are only about 3k electric vehicles in SC.
 - Senator Leatherman is convening a special senate finance committee for electric vehicle adoption.
 - Is SCDOT making sure highways are electric friendly?

- It's on the radar and will be a multi-agency effort.
- With the Reauthorization Bill, there will be lots of recharging stations, etc.
- SCDOT is unsure if electric grids can handle electric cars.

Adjourn:

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting at 11:07 AM by Emily Swearingen, seconded by John Walsh, and passed unanimously.

DRAFT

Meeting Minutes
SCDOT/ACEC/AGC Design-Build Sub-Committee Meeting
7/14/2021 @ 9:00 AM

I. Welcome/Introductions

SCDOT	ACEC	AGC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chris Gaskins • Clay Richter • Brooks Bickley • Ben McKinney • <i>Jae Mattox</i> • Brad Reynolds • John Caver • Randy King • Chris Lacy • <i>Will McGoldrick</i> • <i>David Hebert</i> • Daniel Burton • Barbara Wessinger • <i>Brian Gambrell</i> • Carmen Wright • Tyler Clark • <i>Tad Kitowicz*</i> • Austin Purgason^ • Kevin Harrington 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jim O'Connor • Erin Slayton • Walker Roberts • <i>Aaron Goldberg</i> • Oriana Roumillat^ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dave Rankin • Pete Weber • Rob Loar • Lee Bradley

(Attended, Absent) *FHWA, ^Guest

II. Project Updates

- Carolina Crossroads Phase 2 – In procurement.
- Closed and Load Restricted Bridges 2021-1 – District 4 with eight bridges. In procurement.
- Cross Island Parkway Toll Conversion – SOQ evaluations are complete. Short-listing and RFP development imminent.
- I-20 over Wateree, River and Overflow Bridges – In project development to evaluate rehab versus replacement. Life cycle cost analysis under review. RFQ in early 2022.
- Carolina Crossroads Phase 3 – RFQ anticipated in 2022.
- I-26/I-95 Interchange Improvements – Awaiting PE funding. This funding is anticipated to be imminent.
- Mark Clark Expressway – Continuing development of Supplemental EIS. RFQ in 2023
- Low Country Corridor West and I-26/I-526 Interchange – ROD is expected in 2022 and

RFQ could move to 2027.

- Five phases are currently being evaluated for delivery method type.
- Low Country Corridor East – Currently in project development and NEPA. Procurement timeframe TBD.

III. Action Items from 5/19/2021 Meeting

- AGC/ACEC to give feedback on how proposal commitments are handled in other states.
 - Feedback provided and discussed. Continued industry input is welcome and encouraged. **[CLOSED]**
- SCDOT to continue to review insurance and bonding language comments and provide revised version to AGC/ACEC for further review.
 - Language in final stages of review within SCDOT Legal. Discussion deferred until next Sub-Committee meeting. **[OPEN]**
- SCDOT to provide revised shop drawing language to be reviewed by AGC/ACEC prior to May sub-committee meeting.
 - SCDOT provided comments and updated language to ACEC/AGC. Version of updated language is included in CCR Phase 2 RFP. **[CLOSED]**
 - ACEC/AGC to circulate new shop drawing language comments to industry for review and comment. **[ACTION]** SCDOT to provide update on proposed changes to shop drawing process for CCR Phase 3 as the RFP develops. **[ACTION]**
- ACEC to reach out to Utility and CEI Committee representatives regarding attendance at next or future DB Sub-Committee meetings.
 - ACEC/AGC coordinated with Utility and CEI representatives and gathered information from other discussions. AGC intending to be conduit for exchange of this information. **[CLOSED]**
- SCDOT to follow up with DBE Office regarding future design-build contracts and DBE utilization requirements
 - Professional services will be encouraged but not required. Percentage will vary from project to project.
 - Commitment currently intended to be required 30 days after contract execution.
 - DBE Office currently working on formula to identify specific percentage depending on project variables. **[CLOSED]**

IV. ATC Design Criteria: Location Within RFP

SCDOT

- SCDOT intends to remove certain design criteria from Exhibit 4 that does not pertain to project, specifically ATCs.
- Design criteria, ATC requirements, etc. will be included within Attachment B.

V. SOQ Scoring Within Weighted Criteria Formula

SCDOT

- SCDOT intends to remove SOQ scoring from the weighted criteria formula as the rule,

not the exception, for SCDOT design-build projects.

- SCDOT intends to put even greater emphasis on SOQ Scoring with the intent to only short-list the best and most qualified teams.
- Considering minimum scores for SOQ (i.e. overall, category, sub-category).
- SCDOT/ACEC/AGC to discuss with stakeholders and develop new language suggestions and/or scoring techniques for SOQ evaluations. **[ACTION]**
- ACEC suggested additional language revisions within RFQ to be abundantly clear what is being expected to appropriately address or propose best personnel or other SOQ considerations (i.e. years of experience, type of experience, etc.).
- ACEC noted the updated language/scoring should not limit teams from pursuing projects or stifle competition/innovation.
- AGC cautioned against short-listing a team that is on an uneven playing field with regards to SOQ evaluations and capabilities/likelihood to win project after being short-listed (i.e. two highly scoring teams with one significantly lower but above minimum scoring threshold).
 - SCDOT would consider short-listing only two teams depending on situation (potentially the one described above).
 - Given the situation where SOQ scoring is not included within the weighted criteria formula, every short-listed team has an equal opportunity to win the project with their technical proposal.
 - Intent is to get a team's best proposal/design with emphasis on added value and innovation.
 - SCDOT questions: when is the best time to share SOQ scores with teams?
 - How should the scores be shared (Individually share own score, share all scores, etc.), but recognizes this is irrelevant if the SOQ score will not be included as a factor in the weighted criteria formula? **[ACTION]**

VI. Project Selection Process: Design-Build vs Design-Bid-Build

SCDOT

- SCDOT gave general overview of Chapter 2 from the Design-Build Procurement Manual.
 - Projects presented to design-build group through a variety of internal channels that include Maintenance, RPG's, Construction, etc.
- ACEC questioned if there were exclusionary items that would remove a project from design-build consideration.
 - SCDOT indicated there can be certain constraints or triggers that would encourage design-bid-build project delivery (i.e. level of plan development, lack of schedule constraints, allowances for innovation, etc.) and vice versa.
- SCDOT demonstrated [FHWA CASE Tool](#) utilization for current method for project delivery selection workshop.
 - CASE tool can analyze short and long-term projects.
 - SCDOT indicated that there is still engineering judgment or discretion utilized independent of the results from the CASE tool.

- ACEC questioned if other project delivery methods were analyzed or scored.
 - SCDOT indicated that there are other methods built into each CASE tool analysis to include CM/GC and Progressive Design-Build.
 - SCDOT indicated the Alternative Delivery (AD) Office is in the process of being setup with the Department. AD will include design-build and SCDOT believes other forms of project delivery, such as those referenced above, may be authorized in the coming years.

VII. Utility Presentation

ACEC

- Presentation by Oriana Roumillat.
 - CCR utility challenges highlighted.
 - Early right of way and utility coordination is successful and is encouraged to be developed as a priority on most projects.

VIII. Contract Commitments: Continued Discussion

ACEC

- ACEC/AGC have provided an exhibit from TxDOT that sets forth proposal commitments included within the design-build contractor's proposal.
 - This is included in Exhibit 2, Appendix 1, Design-Build Contractor's Proposal Commitments. This becomes an area of negotiation after contract award but prior to contract execution. These commitments become contractual upon execution.
 - Appendix 2 lists ATCs that the design-build contractor included within its proposal.
- SCDOT has concerns that post award innovation would be sacrificed or stifled if a hard line is taken on the entire Technical Proposal being a commitment.
 - Potential for many paths forward, commitment matrix, technical proposal language/commitments, limited negotiations, scope validation, use of Communications to memorialize commitments, etc.
 - SCDOT will review TxDOT information along with previously submitted language from ACEC and AGC and develop a path forward. **[ACTION]**
- ACEC suggested inclusion of a discussion related to what is/isn't a commitment within the technical proposal when question/clarification discussion occurs.

IX. Standard of Care Language Within RFP

ACEC

- ACEC recommends the language utilized in some recent procurements (i.e. CCR Phase 2) should be included within all RFPs.
 - ACEC advocates standard of care language inclusion wherever applicable.
- SCDOT indicates they intend to incorporate this as boiler-plate language moving forward.
 - AGC requests opportunity to circulate current iteration of language for review/comment. **[ACTION]**

X. CEI Discussion

AGC

- AGC gave an update and indicated this is under discussion, outside of the Sub-Committee, for potential future inclusion at meetings.

XI. MOT Process: Preliminary/Prep

ACEC (Updated from AGC)

- ACEC inquiring on SCDOT approach to inclusion of MOT within technical proposal and prep contracts.
- SCDOT has continued to evaluate how best to include MOT requirements within RFP.
 - The expectation of provided MOT information and criteria is related to project complexity.
 - Conceptual MOT plans have been beneficial on most design-build projects.
- AGC encouraged leaving room for innovation (i.e. not require too much detail or commitments related to MOT at technical proposal phase).

XII. Schedule of Values: Continued Discussion

AGC

- ACEC/AGC requested an update on standard template for Schedule of Values related to design-build contracts.
- SCDOT to coordinate with Director of Construction Office and Field Offices to determine a consistent Schedule of Values for design-build contracts. **[ACTION]**
 - Need to compare/contrast with internal cost-estimating and related bid items.
 - Intent is to utilize or have this Schedule of Values for all design-build projects (i.e. most/all values could be utilized).

XIII. Open Discussion

- No additional items discussed.

XIV. Action Items

- SCDOT to continue to review insurance and bonding language comments and provide revised version to AGC/ACEC for further review.
- ACEC/AGC to circulate new shop drawing language comments to industry for review and comment.
- SCDOT to provide update on proposed changes to shop drawing process for CCR Phase 3 as the RFP develops.
- SCDOT/ACEC/AGC to discuss potential new RFQ language suggestions and/or scoring techniques for SOQ evaluations with stakeholders.
 - Additionally, gather feedback regarding when and how SOQ scores should be released?
- SCDOT to review and discuss examples of commitments from other states (provided by ACEC/AGC) and potential changes/implementation.
- AGC to circulate current version of standard of care language to stakeholders for review and comment.
 - SCDOT to discuss with internal Policy Committee
- SCDOT to coordinate with Director of Construction Office and Field Offices to

determine a consistent Schedule of Values for Design-Build contracts.

XV. Next Meeting Date: 9/15/2021 @ 9:00 AM (SCDOT Lead)

XVI. Adjourn

ACEC-SC Geotechnical Subcommittee

Meeting Minutes

Subject: Discussion and Coordination of Geotechnical Topics

Date: July 20, 2021 9:00AM - 10:00AM

Attendees: Christina Olsen (Insight Group), Matt Cooke (S&ME),
Michael Ulmer (ESP Associates), Nick Harman (SCDOT), Jeff Sizemore (SCDOT),
Nathalia Chandler (SCDOT), Bill Jones (SCDOT), Trapp Harris (SCDOT), Renee Gardner
(SCDOT), Branford Breland (SCDOT)

Location: SCDOT Headquarters & Virtual (Microsoft Teams)

1. Follow-Up Items from Previous Meeting(s)

1.1. *PDA vs. No PDA spreadsheet*

1.1.1. Spreadsheet is being used. Some are overriding results from spreadsheet and implementing PDA testing with technical justification. SCDOT is generally happy with how this process is going. They do not want to discourage PDA testing but are more wanting documentation that the process was followed.

1.2. *QC checklist is being used sparingly. Need to encourage designers to begin using the spreadsheet. Mr. Cooke mentioned that it would be helpful to use the checklist throughout the design process and not wait until the report is complete. Mr. Harris suggested that language gets added to the scope that points to the QC checklists.*

2. New Discussion

2.1. *Mr. Ulmer asked if SCDOT is currently requesting compression wave geophysical data on in-house projects. Mr. Ulmer mentioned that the compression wave data on a recent project he worked on did not produce data near the targeted depth of 100+ ft.*

2.1.1. *Ms. Chandler replied that SCDOT is still learning the limitations on some of these geophysical tests. Mr. Harman added that most of the time they are only interested in acquiring this type of geophysical data in the upper part of the soil column where Pleistocene and younger soils exist and where soils may be saturated.*

2.1.2. *Mr. Hamilton asked if the intent was that the soils had to be BOTH below the water table and be saturated for SSL conditions to exist and no capillary zone was in-play? Mr. Harman replied that yes, that was the intent.*

2.2. *Mr. Hamilton opened the floor for the SCDOT to provide comments and criticism on the industry performance relative to SCDOT expectations.*

2.2.1. *Mr. Harris mentioned that he would like to see more of an integrated team approach amongst the Design-Build teams. He thinks there is an apparent lack of communication between the design team and the contractors, and, as a result, a lot of RFIs are produced. He did mention that this probably falls more on the Contractor than the Designer(s).*

2.2.2. *Ms. Chandler had no comments at the time.*

- 2.2.3. Mr. Sizemore mentioned that most of the topics discussed during this meeting hit on the major items he had identified.
- 2.2.4. Mr. Harman mentioned that he would like to see more consultants reading the GDM chapters up for review and providing comments back to SCDOT. During the current review process, SCDOT does not feel like they are getting many comments from the industry, and this is bothering them. They do not want to hear any complaints from the industry after the manual is in rotation.
- 2.2.5. Ms. Gardner had no comments at the time.
- 2.2.6. Mr. Breland mentioned that he would like to see more QC of the reports and implementation of the scoped amount of work before the final report gets to his office for QA review.
- 2.2.7. Mr. Jones had no comments at the time.
- 2.3. Mr. Hamilton asked if SCDOT could consolidate their review comment matrices to a single document instead of 1 from RPG and 1 from PCS. Ms. Gardner mentioned that is mostly a function of the SCDOT Project Manager, and they did not have any say in the matter.
 - 2.3.1. Mr. Hamilton asked about the status of Bluebeam reviews. Mr. Sizemore mentioned that SCDOT is trying to implement it, but they are not ready to start using it yet.
 - 2.3.2. Mr. Sizemore mentioned they are considering assigning only single-level review of submittals instead of both RPG and PCS reviewing.
- 2.4. Some extensive discussion on the topic of geotechnical movements from seismic activity pushing on the bridge and measuring the response (ie. Caltrans methodology). Mr. Ulmer mentioned that the hydro, structures, and geotechnical engineer need to be talking at the onset of the project. In the past, these types of conversations did not happen until later in the project. Mr. Ulmer recommended that language be added to the GDM and/or the other discipline documents (Bridge Design Manual, etc.) that forces the Structures and Hydro engineers to include the geotechnical engineer in the conceptual design process.
 - 2.4.1. Mr. Hamilton mentioned that BDR level geotechnical reports may be helpful to identify issues during the conceptual design phase and force these types of discussions early in the design process.
 - 2.4.2. Mr. Harmon recommended designers call SCDOT and ask if older geotechnical boring exist in the general project area.
 - 2.4.2.1. Mr. Ulmer requested that available soil borings or other similar data be provided with the scope document.
 - 2.4.3. Mr. Hamilton provided an example of how implementing the new Caltrans process performed on a recent SCDOT project where this new methodology was implemented. Mr. Hamilton mentioned that the stiffnesses increase in the bridge substructure required to mitigate slope instability in lieu of geotechnical ground improvement resulted in 3 rows of HP14x117 piles. The Structural Engineer would then have to start their seismic design process over, which wasn't an option for that particular project, and we ended up implementing EQ drains to provide the required stiffness in the soil rather than the substructure.
 - 2.4.4. Mr. Hamilton mentioned that geotechnical field work needs to be prioritize more towards the front end of projects where this soil-structure interaction process is a potential concern. Mr. Hamilton continued that the entire design team would have to

coordinate and make good decisions so that subsurface information is properly located, and that this information is not wasted. Ms. Chandler mentioned that adding another mobilization is an alternate option.

2.4.4.1. Mr. Hamilton mentioned that geophysical testing alone would not provide the necessary SSL indications for the level of design required to identify issues at the preliminary or concept level of design.

2.4.4.2. Mr. Harman mentioned that SCDOT's intent is to "sound the alarm" before the design is too far along.

2.4.5. Ms. Chandler mentioned adding a milestone to the scope for "Design Coordination Meeting" with documentation submitted to the SCDOT proving that this meeting occurred.

2.4.6. Mr. Harman mentioned that some of these topics would be covered in the revisions to the Seismic Design Specs, Bridge Design Manual, Geotechnical Design Manual, etc.

2.4.7. Mr. Hamilton discussed potentially adding a third level of geotechnical investigation to further investigate potential seismic issues identified in the initial investigation. Ms. Chandler mentioned adding a mobilization to the preliminary geotechnical field investigation. The Group agreed to add some language to Ch. 4 of the GDM to suggest this notion. The current GDM language implies only two (2) levels of geotechnical investigation: preliminary and final.

2.4.8. Mr. Harman is planning on presenting this seismic soil-structure interaction topic at the ACEC/SCDOT annual conference in December.

2.4.9. SCDOT is planning on providing training for geotechnical and structural engineers for the new process.

3. ACEC-SC Industry Reviews

3.1. GDM Ch. 11-13 due July 30.

4. Action Items

4.1. Industry to provide comments to SCDOT for GDM chapters 11-13 by 7/30/2021.

4.2. Mr. Hamilton to attempt to generate more response from the industry on the GDM review.

5. Next Meeting

5.1. October 5, 2021 – 9:00AM

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Date: July 28, 2021

Attendees: Jennifer Necker – SCDOT – Co-chair
Jonathan Sigman – ACEC – Co-chair
Nick Pizzuti – SCDOT
Darrin Player – SCDOT
Justin Powell – SCDOT
Paul Holt - ACEC
Matt Lifsey – ACEC
Ricky Ward - ACEC

1. *Professional Services upcoming outlook/tentative list.*

SCDOT is creating the new upcoming outlook/tentative list based on the results of the load ratings. The first projects are expected to hit the tentative list in October. SCDOT does not know the exact number of bridges that will be advertised. At this point, it appears that approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ of the bridges on the primary system will be advertised for bridge repairs through the Bridge Maintenance Office, with the remainder being bridge replacements procured through Preconstruction. Emphasis will be placed on repairs/replacements required along the primary road network.

2. *Professional Services Committee Audit update/summary*

SCDOT received the results of the efficiency audit, which identified areas for increased efficiency in the procurement and contracting processes but noted that the Department is moving in the right direction. The study set performance metrics for tracking the processes, with benchmarks set for specific stages of negotiations. As a result of the study, SCDOT has implemented modifications to its internal processes and has seen improvements in the selection process, with improvement still needed with negotiations. It was noted by ACEC that there has been improvement with the SCDOT process, particularly regarding meeting benchmarks during the negotiation phase.

The full report is available on the Office of State Auditors website. Post-meeting, SCDOT provided a copy of the full audit to ACEC, which is appended to these Minutes.

3. *Update on lump sum pricing on contracts.*

SCDOT reiterated that is in favor of them, provided project scopes can be better clarified. Clemson has progressed on its ongoing standard scope template research project and Jen Necker sat in on interviews with TxDOT, FDOT, GDOT, KYTC, and NCDOT for information about their processes and templates. If/when approved, lump sum contracting will not be limited to only large projects.

Jen noted that those states had lump sum contracts broken up into smaller phases rather than 'cradle-to-grave' scoping. Scoping for future phases is completed as earlier phases reach critical milestones. There is a learning curve involved in implementing this type of process as the DOT and industry learned to develop these milestones. This process allows for efficiency in contracting and reduces risk for the DOT and consultant.

ACEC noted that lump sum projects for some DOTs and municipalities include a contingency that is not part of the original contract but must be approved as a contract modification. However, this modification would not require Commission approval.

4. *Definition of “critical personnel” in RFQs.*

Prior to the meeting, ACEC provided its recommended revision of key/critical personnel verbiage for RFQs. SCDOT approves of the revised wording and will incorporate it into future RFQs. The revision is as follows:

Existing language:

From Section E. Proposal Content:

3. Qualifications for key individuals and all other individuals that are considered critical to the success of the project. Qualifications should include information on experience related to similar projects and previous project work.

From Section I. Instructions to Consultants:

KEY INDIVIDUALS: Key individuals are those personnel deemed critical to the success of the project. They often vary from project to project. It is incumbent on the prime consultant to make a determination as to who they deem “key”. In general terms, it can include, but not limited to: the project manager and those individuals listed as leads for each functionally specific discipline on the project organization chart.

Revised language:

Section E. Proposal Content:

- Qualifications for key individuals that are considered critical to the success of the project. Qualifications should include information on experience related to similar projects and previous project work.

Section I. Instructions to Consultants:

- KEY INDIVIDUALS: At a minimum, SCDOT considers Project Managers and major discipline leaders as “Key Individuals.” Based on the specific requirements of the project, the proposer may identify other key individuals as critical to the success of the project. It is incumbent on the prime consultant to determine who they deem as “Key Individuals.”

SCDOT and ACEC agreed that the language will help with preparation and evaluation of proposals

5. *Review of Firm Backlog and Current Tier Two Score reports*

SCDOT intends to update the Firm Backlog and Tier Two reports on or about the first of every month. The update is intended to let industry know the approximate current score when preparing proposals. Slight discrepancies may be evident between the two reports as the backlog is based on remaining contract value but the Tier Two score can include the estimated contract value for projects awarded but still under negotiations.

Tier Two score will be locked as of the day of the issue of the RFQ. SCDOT noted that this was changed based on feedback from industry.

Only projects with DOT as a client will be included in the Tier Two scoring (i.e. county projects with the county as a client will not factor into the score).

6. *Release of Proposal Scores/Information*

SCDOT is working on a method for providing proposers with their score from the selection committee prior to waiting for execution of the awarded contract. They are working around debrief laws with their legal team. SCDOT is considering including a firm's score on its response letter.

SCDOT is considering posting the non-proprietary portions of proposals for consultants to eliminate the need for FOIA requests for that information, with a thought of possibly putting the proposals on ProjectWise. The proposals would likely be able to be accessed by any firm, whether they proposed or not, due to legal concerns. SCDOT also reiterated that RFP language specifies that entire proposals may not be marked proprietary and that this is being policed.

7. *Meeting with "Industry"*

There was a meeting with "Industry" regarding Tier Two on July 26, 2021. The following topics were discussed:

- How the revisions to the Two-Tier system impact industry. As the revisions have just been implemented, SCDOT felt that this discussion was premature.
- Overhead rate/indirect costs/PPP loans. SCDOT reiterated that overhead rates from 2020 will be ignored when calculating fixed fees.
- There is concern from SCDOT that the cost of design and inspection services has increased. SCDOT indicated that historic averages were approximately 10% of project cost for design and 10% for CE&I. However, costs have crept up to as much as approximately 20% of construction cost for these services. SCDOT offered that it's possible that projects have been "overscoped", which could lead to some of this increase. SCDOT noted that they would like ACEC input regarding this issue so it can be addressed jointly because the increase is "unsustainable" and that there is concern from the General Assembly about the rising design costs.
 - ACEC replied that some of the increase in costs is due to items such as the implementation of requirements of the Geotechnical Design Manual, additional Public Involvement requirements, and SUE.
 - ACEC also indicated that no matter the size of the project, the same design process must be followed so costs on smaller projects and TAP projects will almost necessarily have higher relative costs.
 - SCDOT said that they would consider more bundling of smaller projects and would pay close attention to scope to help.
- SCDOT indicated that there has been some concern from contractors regarding the quality of inspections.

As a follow-up to this discussion, SCDOT indicated that they would like industry-SCDOT discussions to go through ACEC and not have random groups trying to discuss these issues with them.

8. *Composition of Partnering Committee*

SCDOT currently feels that the Partnering Committee should include decision-making level personnel, rather than mid-level designers or Business Development professionals. SCDOT noted that their similar meetings with AGC, for example, include those decision-makers from both large and small firms and that they would like that with ACEC. ACEC replied that it's a self-selecting group

that gets involved, but SCDOT reiterated their preference for decision-making level personnel on the committee. SCDOT also said this message has previously been conveyed to ACEC.

9. Restrictions for SCDOT Personnel who Enter the Private Sector

SCDOT reviewed the rules for people who leave SCDOT and go to the private sector. Two standards apply, the One Year Restriction and the Permanent Restriction from the State Ethics Code. SCDOT provided a copy of the restrictions, which are appended to these Minutes. SCDOT emphasized that they will be monitoring if people are not following either restriction.

10. Communication with SCDOT

SCDOT reiterated that any conversation regarding contract negotiations should go through Professional Services, not the project PM. At a minimum, someone from Professional Services must be included on all conversations from the notice of award. Otherwise, an award could be rejected due to the appearance of collusion. This includes discussions regarding project scope. Conversations with PMs are acceptable before an RFQ is published. SCDOT also noted that this applies to contract modifications, as well.

11. Next meeting

Wednesday, October 13 at 10am in person at SCDOT.

ACEC-SC / SCDOT Partnering Committee Meeting

May 27, 2021, at 10:00 AM

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 10:02 AM by David Montgomery and John Boylston. Brice Urqhart, Chris Gaskins, David Montgomery, Tony Cooper, Andy Leaphart, Cook DB, David Rister, JP Barber, Brent Rewis, , Justin Powell, Jennifer Necker, John Boylston, Phillip Sandel, Leah Quattlebaum, Mark Lester, Mike Barbee, Phillip Hutcherson, Rob Bedenbaugh, Robbie Isgett, III, Shawn Epps, Tameka Bostic, Randall Young, Darrin Player, Nick Pizutti, Jayson Jordan, Emily Swearingen, Steve Thomas, John Walsh, Gina BennettNorris, and Adam B. Jones were in attendance either in-person or virtually.

- Emily Swearingen acted as a fill-in voting member.

Deputy Secretary Leland Colvin Remarks:

- SCDOT stayed open through everything. We're finally coming through the dark side of Covid.
- NPOs and COGs are coming in soon.

Approval of February 25, 2021, Meeting Minutes: David Montgomery/John Boylston

- John Boylston asked if everyone had had a chance to review the meeting minutes. He then called for a motion.

A motion was made to approve the February 25, 2021, minutes by Emily Swearingen, seconded by David Montgomery, and passed unanimously.

ACEC-SC Executive Director Remarks: Adam B. Jones

- Jones noted there will be more upcoming discussion on bill S.422. AGC is still at odds with the bill.
- ACEC-SC hosted all of its Congressional visits virtually and discussed the PPP and FAR issues.
- The ACEC-SC Engineering Excellence Awards Gala is June 16, 2021. The formal invitation is coming soon.
- Next week is the SC Engineering Conference in Myrtle Beach.
- December 7th is the ACEC-SC / SCDOT Annual Meeting.
 - SCDOT announced its conference will be in the spring instead of fall.

Carolina Crossroads Update: David Rister

- A contract has been executed on Phase 1 with an MVP in the next 30 days.
- Phase 2 includes June 2 and August proposal announcements.
- The website is accurate to date.
- An NTP was issued on Mitigation Site Project. Work will start next week on that.
- The demolition contract is ongoing.
- Smaller contracts are going out late summer/early fall.

Two-Tier Selection Proposed Changes: Justin Powell

- The guidance on PPP loans is out, and SCDOT is happy to help.
- The Infrastructure Bill and Reauthorization will be bringing in an extra \$190 million to South Carolina.
- TWO-TIER
 - We have approached the one-year evaluation mark.
 - The SCDOT is open to feedback but wants to move forward quickly. The process goes live on July 1, 2021.
 - The Professional Services Program has grown with funding Acts 98, 275, and 40.
 - Powell said Two-Tier is permitted under the Brooks Act
 - Proposed Changes to TT:
 - Adjust the workload scales.
 - Adjust the workload Likert scales to align to the total distribution of work.
 - Adjust the weighting of workload.
 - The current scale goes from 5-25% with virtually no procurements at 20-25%.

- Adjust weighted workload.
 - Adjust the workload calculations to look at the weighted scores of book balance of proposed team inclusive of subcontractors rather than prime score alone.
- Yearly Adjustments: The workload criteria Likert score range will be adjusted yearly to reflect the distribution of workload throughout the program. The weighting of the workload criteria range will also be adjusted yearly to reflect the average contract amount executed the preceding year.
- Risk Adjustments: Workload weight established on notion that higher price will result in higher risk. Will evaluate on case-by-case adjustment is needed up or down one category.
- Subcontract Values: Current financial and accounting software is not capable of adequately tracking subcontract work in a manner that is timely for two-tier purposes. SCDOT is in the early stages of procuring new financial and accounting software and will look to incorporate into solution selected.
- ACEC-SC will get comments on Two-Tier from the membership.
 - SCDOT will have the final say but wants to hear feedback.
 - Feedback will be given back in one document to SCDOT.
- There was a question on workload: “Any thought to capturing design-build workload or other workload that is obtained through other methods?”
 - Powell noted this is a topic of conversation at SCDOT. SCDOT is not making an adjustment on this because price is a consideration. It’s an element that is hard to distinguish and doesn’t fall under the Brooks Act. \$150 million skewed results so breaking up categories further didn’t make sense; it would only complicate state MMO.

Discussion on SCDOT’s Return to work? Updates to the Safety Plan: SCDOT

- SCDOT has not stopped working. We are back to pre-pandemic type meetings with no plans to update the safety plan.
 - The joint workforce safety plan was rescinded on April 19. There are no unlimited out-of-state travel and no restrictions anymore. Meetings are back in the auditorium, not alumni center.

Standing Committee Reports

- ACEC-SC / CAGC / SCDOT Joint Design-Build Committee: Brooks Bickley
 - Chris Gaskins
 - There are a couple of new members, including new SCDOT members.
 - There are 13 projects under design or construction.
 - For Carolina Crossroads, phase three is internally fired up with an RFP.
 - 2021 – closed motor bridge package
 - Cross island parkway
 - 2022
 - I-20 over Wateree – rehab or replacement? TBD
 - RS&H – inspection and cost-benefit analysis
 - Motor bridge package
 - How is the list going to be reassigned?
 - Mark Clark Expressway
 - I-26 / I-95 improvements
 - Lowcountry Corridor
 - Recommendation soon – design-build
 - Only west part, not east
 - 10 discussion topics

- Shop drawing language
 - Special provision – make timelines faster
 - Out and forthcoming
- Quantities on Plans
- Limited Negotiations
 - Award of project – RFP already outlined that allows negotiations before execution – ATCs incorporated
- Design Optimization
 - What does the design-build contractor have to change after contract execution?
- DBE Professional Services Goal
 - There is a push for design-build to include DBE – committal time – committed to earlier in the project rather than 30 days before construction.
- Design Build Prep Contracts
 - Incorporate into contracts and include in design
 - Geotechnical starting to incorporate – survey & SUE next
- Preliminary Drainage Design
 - There is the appearance of not enough pipe inspection work. We will continue to do preliminary drain design and pipe inspection but will not do so much preliminary drain design that you have to commit to a design only to have things changed later.
- The next meeting is mid-July.
- Mid-Level Designers Group: Philip Hutcherson, Tony Cooper, Tameika Bostic
 - March 4 was the last meeting, and it was virtual. There is no determined date for the next meeting.
 - For the fall, in-person meeting there is no topic yet.

Future Events and Meetings: David Montgomery

- The next two meetings are August 26, 2021, and November 18, 2021.
- b. Mid-Level Designers: TBD – They are considering in-person meeting.
- c. The SC Engineering Conference is June 3-5, 2021, at the Embassy Suites in Myrtle Beach.
- d. The ACEC-SC / SCDOT Annual Meeting is December 7, 2021.
- e. The ACEC-SC Engineering Excellence Awards Gala is June 16.
- 2. Other Business: David Montgomery
 - If the federal transportation bill is approved, there will be \$190 million coming to SC. Are there any plans already?
 - Service transfer reauthorization
 - Formula funding would increase
 - Bridges, off-interstate
 - MPOs & COGs
 - Bridges and pavement rehabilitation
 - There will be a one-time money payment of \$675 million rather than a reoccurring payment.
 - It's more conceptual than a defined plan.
 - The SCDOT believes the definition of infrastructure is “if an engineer is needed.”
 - As the U.S. moves to electric vehicles, is there any SCDOT funding stability?
 - It's on the radar. There are only about 3k electric vehicles in SC.
 - Senator Leatherman is convening a special senate finance committee for electric vehicle adoption.
 - Is SCDOT making sure highways are electric friendly?
 - It's on the radar and will be a multi-agency effort.
 - With the Reauthorization Bill, there will be lots of recharging stations, etc.

- SCDOT is unsure if electric grids can handle electric cars.

Adjourn:

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting at 11:07 AM by Emily Swearingen, seconded by John Walsh, and passed unanimously.

DRAFT



ACEC-SC Environmental Subcommittee Meeting with SCDOT Environmental Services Office

August 5, 2021
Virtual @ 3:30

ATTENDEES:

<u>SCDOT-ESO</u>	<u>ACEC-Subcommittee</u>
Chad Long	John Collum [JMT]
Sean Connolly	Marcus Sizemore [Stantec]
	Jason McMaster [McCormick Taylor]

MSizemore offered the following topics in advance to facilitate conversation:

- Latest changes in NEPA discussion
- 401/404 Permitting update
 - 2020 NWPR changing
 - 401 WQ Pre-filing
 - SCDOT General Permit updates
 - SQT impact on mitigation

DISCUSSION:

- Latest Changes in NEPA:
 - CEQ updates. Timeframes & deadlines for EAs EISs. Projects will be front-loaded with data/studies/analyses. Shane Belcher to likely set up workshop or virtual.
 - David Kelly & CLong to update noise policy. Cost criteria to increase; reasonableness factor added (optional) to address density bias. Anticipated to complete over next 6-mo.
 - Updated NEPA PCE form (online on SCDOT ESO toolshed).
 - Public Involvement remains important. SCDOT default is still face-to-face; planning to hire new PI Director.
 - Noise on-call is on street.
- General
 - Future separate oncall solicitations (such as, JDs, Permits, PI; wants it set up like the compliance on-call with work-orders. Will be similar to the Noise on-call). SCDOT has not identified when they are coming out.
 - Small Purchase going well.
 - Environmental Compliance contract going well
- 401/404 Permitting update
 - 2020 NWPR changes
 - SCDOT seeing reductions in jurisdictional areas
 - 401 WQ Pre-filing
 - SCDOT spoke to DHEC WQ. DHEC will set up auto-reply to decline pre-filing requirement.
 - Subcommittee is considering OCRM permitting as discussion topic
 - SCDOT General Permit updates (SConnolly): Pending/future GP same as current (expired) general permit we are operating under. Hope to have finalized pretty soon (possibly first of next week).

- Stream Quantification Tool impact on mitigation
- (SConnolly) EPermit. Up-and-running end of Sept. Dashboard report which identifies anticipated stream/wetland impacts in HUC. Potential automated JD mapping submittal tool. Use of colors in permit graphics (update in fall), permit graphic streamlining.
- Workshop:
 - SConnolly is working with SC Mitigation Association for workshop on SQT. Would be a workshop that all consultants could attend (mitigation, WQ, permitting). In-person in 2022. We discussed combining ACEC in as well.
- Old Business:
 - Comments were provided after this meeting to ESO on the boilerplate Environmental Scope. We discussed during the meeting that the boilerplate Environmental Scope included blanks which appeared to need hours filled in for environmental services tasks. This appears to be fee negotiation during scoping. SConnolly said that the hour blank could come out or consultants would not be required to fill in hours during scoping.

ACTION ITEMS:

1. JCollum to send boilerplate Scope comments to CLong & SConnolly – Completed 8/5/21
2. SConnolly can send EPermit to subcommittee for comment



**ACEC-SC / SCDOT Partnering Committee
Bridge Subcommittee Meeting**

Date:	Tuesday, August 10
Time:	10:00am – 11:30am
Location:	Virtual

Agenda Items

1. Introductions

Attendees:

Terry K. (SCDOT)
Ani C. (SCDOT)
Jerry P. (SCDOT)
John C. (SCDOT)
Kati H. (SCDOT)
Steve N. (SCDOT)
Josh Q. (SCDOT)
Glenn P. (SCDOT)
David R. (SCDOT)
Hongfen L. (SCDOT)
Petrina B. (Michael Baker)
Tony S. (Mead & Hunt)
Adam P. (Parrish & Partners)
Nick W. (Kimley-Horn)

Continued discussions

2. Status Updates for New & Upcoming SCDOT Documents, Policies & Procedures

- Any significant updates regarding:
 - Structural Design Manual Project – Project is underway. ACEC will be asked to review as chapters are available.
 - Design Memos/Seismic Design Memos Updates – New Design Memos are forthcoming pertaining to Seismic Design Specifications, Seismic Summary Reports, and Culverts.
 - Standard Drawing Update Project – Project is in the Procurement office's court. No timeline given for next steps.
 - Use of Bluebeam for all Reviews – Internal testing at SCDOT is underway. No timeline given for full implementation.
 - Open Bridge Modeler – No progress. Negotiations ongoing with Bentley.
 - Plan Review On-Call – This is being worked on with the Department. Other options are being considered including expanding to all disciplines and including independent consultant QA as part of RFPs.
- Terry to provide update on procurement process. – Anything going through the Procurement office right now is slow due to funding, COVID, etc.

New Items

3. Load Rating

- Minimum Rating Requirements for New Bridges
 - Beam vs. Negative Moment Region
 - Legal Loads

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This will require additional discussion. The minimum load rating is 1.0. Additional guidance may be developed in future updates to the Structures Design Manual and/or Load Rating Guidance Document. ● Load Ratings on County Projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Delivery ○ QA ○ This will require additional discussion. This may be addressed in future updates to the Load Rating Guidance Document. ● When is the Statewide Load Rating Project “done”? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project is completed by end of 2021. All load ratings are complete. Many bridges are in a state of “limbo” and additional testing and/or analysis completed before finalizing. A new contract is anticipated for future load rating needs.
4.	<p>SCDOT Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Creation of Engineering Services Division and Alternate Delivery Division <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This was an informational item. ● Bridge Development Reports and Conceptual Bridge Plans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SCDOT is working on guidance to provide consistency across RPGs and consultants regarding expectations for review and content of BDR's.
5.	<p>Technical</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● GFRP Reinforcing – possible uses and training <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SCDOT may be looking to test GFRP on future projects. Likely smaller bridge in coastal area. ● T-Mat and Transflex Expansion Joints – possible options for larger joint openings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ These are options for large expansion joints. ○ Steve Nanney with the Bridge Construction Office expressed the desire to continue to use traditional joint types due to contractor familiarity.
5.	<p>Upcoming Training</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NSBA Steel Days – Augusta Iron and Steel – September 23 ● CSIBridge Training – Access to Training Videos ● Possible one day PCI and NSBA Trainings ● SCDOT Prestressed Concrete Design Course
6.	<p>Administrative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Next meeting: Prior to Q4 ACEC-SC Transportation Committee Meeting

MEETING SUMMARY

ACEC-SC/SCDOT Roadway Design Subcommittee

Meeting Date: July 13, 2021 11:00 AM

Meeting Location: Virtual

Invitees:

Sam Pridgen (SCDOT)

Iris Neal (SCDOT)

Tabitha Smith (SCDOT)

Carol Hamlin (SCDOT)

Seth Lown (SCDOT)

Ashar Saeed (SCDOT)

Aaron McHan (TRC)

Daniel Atkinson (Holt)

Charlene Cassidy (CDM Smith)

Chris Rubins Neel Schaffer

Existing Discussions:

1. Bluebeam Revu
 - a. Status on use for QA review: SCDOT is still working on this internally and is not ready for use on consultant projects.
2. OpenRoads Designer
 - a. Status of Implementation: Stalled due to funding/resource issues, RFP in development for consultant to assist with developing standards. Bentley is still working on workspace items, annotation, quantities. Plan to extend use of SS10 use to 2023, to allow time for implementing ORD. Struggling with converting model to a plan set with proper annotation.
3. Primavera
 - a. Implemented - all projects will use Primavera moving forward.
 - b. Status on guidance: - to be included in the next RDM update.
4. Shoulder rollover max for full superelevation at 8%
 - a. Status on guidance. Tabitha noted they are working on clarifying this issue in the next RDM update. For the time being check rollover as unpaved shoulder is rotated with the roadway.
5. Curbing on Ramps
 - a. RDM 10.5.4 Bullet 3 – Tabitha noted that for ramps, a full width paved shoulder must be provided adjacent to curbs. DOT is working to clarify this in the next RDM update.
6. Vertical Profiles of Intersecting Roads
 - a. RDM Figure 9.2F (pg. 9.2-12) conflict with Chapter 6 regarding grade breaks and design of vertical curves. Iris noted SCDOT is reviewing this issue and Figure 9.2F and it is being addressed but may not be in the next RDM update.
7. Roadway QA Checklist – Detour and MOT Plans
 - a. Checklist General Section – “Detour Plans included if applicable”
 - b. Suggest revision “Detour Plans or Conceptual MOT Plans” to ensure ROW is sufficient.
 - c. Roadway Design Support does not review the MOT/Detour plans. Traffic reviews these plans. Send Traffic subcommittee to determine if they want to bring this up in their
8. RDM Update Status
 - a. Focus on Bike and Pedestrian – included in 2021 update – Chapter 13

- b. Carol noted that SCDOT is trying to do an update in the spring of each year to incorporate needed revisions/clarifications/changes.
- 9. Expand on functional class – SCDOT is working to align functional class with the 2018 AASHTO Green Book.

New Discussions

- 10. Realignment of SCDOT Departments
 - a. Design Support is no longer under Preconstruction. Intent is to avoid appearance of conflict between design and review functions. Engineering Support is now a separate department from Preconstruction.
 - b. DB/Mega Projects has been moved out of Preconstruction into Alternative Delivery group and reports directly to Leland Colvin.
 - c. Construction now reports directly to Andy Leaphart.
- 11. PAM4 Quality Assurance Process (Preconstruction Advisory Memorandum)
 - a. Updating the QA review process. Currently in draft stage.
 - b. Process for review – what gets sent to support when, coordination with Engineering Support and design engineers.
 - c. discourage response only submissions, need responses with revised plans
 - d. encourage coordination
 - e. recommendations and compliance issues

Sam Pridgen joined the call.

- 12. PAM4 Discussion lead to a broader discussion about scoping project and establishing design criteria for a project. Sam noted that submitting design criteria early in the project (most new scopes require this) and have conversation regarding appropriate criteria.
- 13. Updated Design Exception Policy – Sam noted that SCDOT is still working on this and ensure that there is one overall policy that works for all design disciplines and providing documentation. There is no timeline as yet, but it is behind the quality assurance process in terms of priority.
- 14. Ped Ramp Callouts – Future Roadway Design Bulletin – have had issues with construction where ped ramp cannot be constructed within the right-of-way. Prefer to have designers check this and provide appropriate call-out.
- 15. Station Equations – Future Roadway Design Bulletin- currently no SCDOT guidance for when needed, format, etc. DOT has identified. Will issue as Roadway Design Bulletins if can be issued before the end of the year.

Executive Directors' Report

Legislative Report

- American Rescue Plan Money
 - Legislature to return in September to talk about money from American Rescue Plan
 - SCDOT is looking to get some additional money
 - Water (Drinking Water & Wastewater) is a safe place to invest
 - ✓ Coalition created to advocate for money to be spent in the water realm
 - ✓ ACEC-SC & SCSPE will be crucial for calls to action
- ASCE-SC Infrastructure Report Card
 - ASCE SC Chapter is creating a South Carolina specific infrastructure report card
 - Hosting a press release/press conference to spread the word about what SC's infrastructure really needs
 - Having conversations with SCDOT/SCDHEC to make sure they agree with what is in report card
 - ✓ If so, I would want Member Firms' support at press conference to show large numbers (similar to what we had at Engineers Day)
- ACEC National & Infrastructure Bills
 - Senate passed Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act
 - The Senate bill includes a five-year authorization of surface transportation programs as well as investments across a range of infrastructure categories. Highlights include:
 - ✓ \$350 billion for highway programs,
 - ✓ \$107 billion for transit,
 - ✓ \$66 billion for rail,
 - ✓ \$25 billion for airports,
 - ✓ \$65 billion in broadband investment, and
 - ✓ \$55 billion for water infrastructure.
 - The bill did not fix the PPP / FAR Issue.
 - ✓ Pursuing a fix in the House or stand-alone legislation

Engineering Excellence Awards

- 2021 Awards Gala success
- Notice of Intent mailer will go out this month

ACEC-SC/ACEC PAC

- ACEC PAC \$ still needed
 - Fall Sweepstakes underway

SC Engineering Conference

- Successful Hybrid Conference in 2021
- Back at North Charleston Embassy Suites in 2022