

ACEC-SC TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Meeting Agenda

Thursday, February 10, 2022

[Zoom](#)

1. Call to Order Jeff Mulliken, PhD, PE
2. Welcome/Mission Jeff Mulliken, PhD, PE
3. Approval of Minutes (without objection) All
4. Review of Partnering Committee Meeting on November 18, 2021 Partnering Committee Members
5. Partnering Committee Meeting Agenda Items All
6. Transportation Executives Committee Adam B. Jones

7. Standing Committee Reports

Committee Co-Chair(s)



- Mid-Level Designers Group
 - Construction Engineering & Inspections (CE&I)
 - Joint Design Build
 - Environmental
 - Traffic
 - Road Design
 - Hydraulic Design
 - Right of Way
 - Utilities
 - Bridge Design
 - Survey/SUE
 - Geotechnical
 - Professional Services
8. ACEC-SC Ex. Dir. Report - Adam B. Jones
 9. ACEC-SC/SCDOT Annual Meeting Emily Swearingen
 - Later this year (12/14/2022)
 10. ACEC National Transportation Update Melvin C. Williams
 11. Future Meetings
 - Transportation Committee Meetings:
 - May 12, 2022
 - August 11, 2022
 - October 27, 2022 (Elections)
 - Partnering Committee Meetings: (Members Only)
 - March 3, 2022
 - May 26, 2022
 - August 25, 2022
 - November 10, 2022
 - ACEC-SC/SCSPE Winter Meeting: ACEC-SC Environmental Track & SCSPE Business Track (6 PDH) February 16, 2022 at Seawells, Columbia SC.
 - ACEC-SC Scholarship Golf Tournament: 4/18/2022 Lexington Country Club
 - SC Engineering Conference & Trade Show: June 9-11, 2022 North Charleston Convention Center
 - We need speakers.
 - ACEC-SC / ACEC PAC Pinewood Derby w/ ACEC-SC Future Leaders & the Cub Scouts 6/9/2022
 - ACEC-SC Future Leaders Graduation 6/10/2022
 - ACEC-SC /SCDOT Annual Meeting: December 14, 2022

12. Other Business
 - Implementation Team for Bentley Plan Production Software with SCDOT

13. Adjourn

**Partnering Committee Meeting
November 18, 2021, at 10:00 AM
SCDOT HQ**

Call to Order: Called to order at 10:03 am by John Boylston. Steve Thomas, Leland Colvin, Justin Powell, Shawn Epps, Gina Bennett-Norris, John Boylston, Brent Rewis, Jennifer Necker, Darrin Player, Aaron Goldberg, Phillip Hutcherson, Emily Swearingen, Brice Urquhart, Jeff Mulliken, David Montgomery, Michael Fulmer, Leah Quattlebaum, Robbie Isgett, Greg Davis, Bert Shumpert, Andy Leaphart, John Walsh, Adam B. Jones, and Sarah Waldrop were in attendance.

Secretary's Remarks: Secretary of Transportation Christy Hall joined us before the meeting began and thanked SCDOT and ACEC-SC for the partnership. She noted there are a lot of projects upcoming with a 30% boost to the federal aid program and significant state funding. She concluded by stating our partnership is invaluable and that SCDOT will strive to continue to keep open lines of communication.

Approval of August 27, 2021, Meeting Minutes: John Boylston

There was a motion to approve the August 27, 2021, minutes by John Boylston, seconded by Jeff Mulliken, and passed unanimously.

Deputy Secretary Remarks:

Justin Powell commented:

- The IIJA passed, which is good news.
- Funding will be increased for SCDOT.
- There are not a lot of regulatory changes coming.
- There is a ramp-up on bridges and interstate projects.
- There are big resiliency and EV projects.
- SCDOT is advocating for \$100-\$200 million in state matching funds (would be a 20% match for a fully matched program).
- There is \$70-\$90 million in states' excess money coming to us yearly.
- The big focuses are urban congestion, bridges, and discretionary grants.
- The I-95 bridge over Lake Marion would cause national economic chaos if it collapsed.

Leland Colvin commented:

- He thanked everyone for their partnerships and said SCDOT would not be where they are without its industry partners.
- We are ahead of or on time with the 4 major projects.
- Interstate Program:
 - There are timing issues with the ARP money.
 - The widening project for I-26 will be all under construction by 2030.
 - The I-95 plan was briefly mentioned as being in SCDOT's sights.

- The bridge program is being revamped and reprioritized, as well as the load rating program being updated.
- 185 bridges will be commissioned next month – 135 primary bridges and 50 secondary bridges (including some closed).
- There are 20 closed bridges. There are design-build bridge bundles with 5 or 6 bridges to a bundle.
- The primary projects include 100 rehabs and 30 replacements.
- There is going to be a new rehab section at SCDOT, and they will need consultant help with that.
- Rehabs will provide a minimum of an additional 20 years of life.
- The lists will be released after the first of the year after approval passes in December.

Brent Rewis commented:

- MPO and COG Program:
 - It's called the "Regional Mobility Program" now.
 - There will be \$100 million additional increase.
 - There are significant changes on the way, but there will be more to come on that.
 - On-calls are going out by end of year to help with long range plans and complete streets (anything planning related, including multimodal).

SCDOT Updates:

Jennifer Necker discussed the Clemson research project:

- They are creating the starting template language for the projects.
- Subject matter experts submitted comments back to Clemson.
- They are aiming for late spring/early summer for project pilots.
- The final project is set to wrap up in a year.

Darrin Player commented:

- They are behind schedules but working on debrief schedules.
 - SCDOT has developed a plan to put comments on the website for access post-project.
 - Legal is looking at it now before information is released.

ACEC-SC Executive Director Remarks: Adam B. Jones reported:

- ACEC National is still working on the PPP fix.
- The Defense Bill is in the House, and we are hoping for it to pass.
- What is happening with SCDOT with the OSHA and vaccine mandates?
 - Leland Colvin replied:
 - The federal mandate does not apply to direct recipients and their contracts.

- As of now, SCDOT does not see the vaccine mandate affecting them, and there is nothing from the Governor's office.
 - The Governor is prohibiting vaccine mandates.
- ARPA
 - We are meeting with legislators now.
- EEA
 - There are 16 projects.
 - Please join us.
- Environmental Meeting
 - Covid Restrictions:
 - They feel it's time to be back in person.
 - We have adopted "swim at your own risk."
- There are two seats opening on the Registration Board.
 - a. Submit your applications.

Design Software Update: Rob Bedenbaugh reported:

- For Open Bridge and Open Ground, the analytical software will remain the same.
- Leap Concrete and Leap Steel will remain too.
- What is the timeline? After negotiations, we are expecting about a 12-month timeline (several months of those in piloting).
 - a. We are seeking assistance from ACEC-SC with piloting.
- We are finalizing the Steering Committee to help with implementation (internal and external people).
 - We are looking for ACEC-SC representation.
 - Environmental Engineering and Right of Way will be affected.
 - Interactive parameters will be able to be changed on the fly.
 - For the negotiation timeline, we are aiming for the end of the year.
 - Starting fresh in 2023 is the goal.

Project Pipeline Update: Leland Colvin reported:

- There is a 2-year bridge list.
- Colvin stated he has to be careful not to get in front of his Commission. He will not be able to fully disclose the bridge prioritization list.
- Usage of On-Call Contracts
 - John Boylston briefly noted this was already discussed today.
 - Leland Colvin asked what ACEC-SC's desire of balance is on this list?
 - Emily Swearingen responded that she'd like to see the list be used better.
 - There was a suggestion that the TEC (Transportation Executive Committee) should have more in-depth conversation about this.
 - There was a comment that SCDOT will have internal discussions. ACEC-SC was advised to do the same.

Standing Committee Reports:

- **AGC/ACEC-SC/SCDOT Joint Design-Build Committee:** Chris Gaskins
 - Walker Roberts is moving into the chair position.
 - CCR is in Phase 2, and they have executed the contract.
 - There are 2 projects in procurement.
 - In 2022, there is the I-20 over Wateree project, which is in development. In the 2nd quarter, the RFQ will be released.
 - The 301 Bridge RFP will be released in quarter 2.
 - There will be an open forum discussion in December or January (well in advance of the RFP).
 - They are currently drafting with outside counsel to create a new RFP template.
 - The goal is to send it out by Q3.
 - Secondary Bridges
 - Things are tentative. They are moving quickly on these 20 bridges.
 - Once funding is in place, they will try to hit these quickly with a bundle every quarter.
 - 2023 Projects:
 - I-95
 - I-26
 - Wando Port Access Terminal – Long Point Road
 - I-526 – Mark Clark Expressway
 - On-Calls
 - They will utilize the existing DB on-call prep list.
 - Office of Alternative Delivery
 - It is no longer the Office of Design-Build.
 - They retained the pre-construction component.
 - Construction component:
 - a. Focus Question: How do we bring more resources to the table post contract execution?
 - Stipends
 - They are making sure stipends are appropriate.
 - There is an idea of increasing stipends across the board.
 - Insurance and Bonding
 - There is new language being reviewed by a national expert.
 - It is closed now.
 - DBE Language
 - New language is being incorporated.
 - There is less than a 0.5% range (closer to .2%-.3%).
 - It will be required 30 days after contract execution.
 - ATC Language
 - SCDOT is pro-ATC but doesn't like being surprised post-contract execution.
 - They are including language in RFPs that non-traditional designs need to be shown ATC.
 - Standard of Care Language

- This is a controversial topic between ACEC-SC and AGC.
 - SCDOT doesn't feel like they need to intervene.
 - Their position is to not include the standard of care language moving forward.
- Their next meeting is January 19.
- **Mid-Level Designers Group:** Phillip Hutcherson
 - The Contract Documents Zoom with Brad Latham had 108 attendees (35 SCDOT).
 - The next meeting is in January/February of next year.
- **Transportation Committee:** David Montgomery
 - Next year's schedule is in the works.
 - December 7, 2021, is the ACEC-SC/SCDOT Annual Meeting.
 - SCDOT is expecting 200 of its people at the Annual Meeting.
 - Toys for Tots is back again, so please donate.
 - The SC Engineering Conference and Trade Show is June 9-11, 2022.
 - The Legislative Reception is January 12 with SC Engineers' Day on The Hill earlier in the morning.

Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 11:17 AM by John Boylston.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Waldrop

ACEC-SC

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



MEETING MINUTES

ACEC-SC/SCDOT Roadway Design Subcommittee

Meeting Date: January 18, 2022, 2:00 PM

Meeting Location: Virtual

Invitees:

Sam Pridgen (SCDOT)

Iris Neal (SCDOT)

Tabitha Smith (SCDOT)

Carol Hamlin (SCDOT)

Seth Lown (SCDOT)

Ashar Saeed (SCDOT)

Andrew Fisher (Gannett Fleming)

Daniel Atkinson (Holt)

Justin Lyles (RK&K)

Chris Rubens (Neel-Schaffer)

All invitees were present. Introductions were made as Justin Lyles and Andrew Fisher started their 2-year term on the committee.

Ongoing Items:

1. OpenRoads Designer
 - a. Bentley will be developing a workspace for SCDOT.
 - i. Surveys, utilities, drainage, and roadway disciplines to be developed first. Structures & Geotech will follow.
 - b. SCDOT looking to begin pilot projects in August 2022. Pilot projects will likely use projects that have already been designed.
 - i. Users must go through Bentley training before piloting projects.
 - ii. SCDOT and potentially consultants doing pilot projects (pro bono).
2. Autodesk
 - a. SCDOT is developing the workspace and hopes to have it complete by the end of the year.
 - b. SCDOT's goal is to be neutral between Autodesk and Bentley in a few years.
3. RDM Updates
 - a. Possibly an update to the RDM this spring, but it may be pushed back due to coordination with FHWA. The changes already planned are minor in nature.
4. Design Exception Policy
 - a. SCDOT is working on a framework for the 4 design disciplines (Roadway, Geotech, Hydro, and Structures)
 - i. SCDOT is trying to define design exceptions vs. design variances and what information needs to be provided to support each request
5. Superelevation – Method 2 vs. Method 5
 - a. SCDOT prefers Method 5 and Method 2 is for low-speed urban (context sensitive).
 - i. *Action Item: Chris Rubens to send RDM sections to Sam Pridgen and Carol Hamlin that point to Method 2.*
 1. *Sent via email on 1/18/22*

New Items:

1. Geotech/Roadway Coordination
 - a. An open discussion was held regarding communication between Geotech and Roadway. Andrew recommends some coordination at preliminary, but definitely by R/W plans. The amount of coordination is project specific.
2. Code of Federal Regulations Changes & Impacts to Design Guidance
 - a. Green book is codified in Code of Federal Regulations (23 CFR 625). Congress just passed update to approve 2018 Green Book via amendment (87 FR 40)
 - i. This amendment allows 3R (Resurfacing, Restoration, and Rehabilitation) on interstates without utilizing design exceptions as long as 3R procedures or criteria are met. SCDOT is working with FHWA division to determine what criteria will be required.
 - ii. SCDOT will formally adopt 2018 Green Book (most likely with next manual update). SCDOT's long term goal is to make the RDM supplemental guidance to the Green Book.
3. Pilot for QA using consultants
 - a. SCDOT will explore using consultants to do QA on a pilot project. SCDOT is working on who would manage the contract and how the selection process would occur.
 - i. SCDOT would still oversee the QA comments
4. Paved shoulder width in Chapter 13 (13.2.3.1) vs. Functional Classification Chapters
 - a. Chapter 13 widths apply if bicycle accommodations are to be provided per local (MPO/COG) plans or touring routes

Previous items recommended to be closed out (No objections were made to closing out these topics)

1. Bluebeam Revu
 - a. *Resolution: SCDOT has software. Training is available online. Coordinate with SCDOT Project Manager on a per project basis for use in QA.*
2. Primavera
 - a. *Resolution: Software has been implemented on projects*
3. Shoulder rollover max for full superelevation at 8%
 - a. *Resolution / Action Item: Roadway engineer to check rollover as unpaved shoulder is rotated with the roadway. SCDOT working to clarify in the next RDM update.*
4. Curbing on Ramps (RDM 10.5.4 Bullet 3)
 - a. *Resolution / Action Item - Tabitha noted that for ramps, a full width paved shoulder (10') must be provided adjacent to curbs. SCDOT is working to clarify this in the next RDM update.*

5. 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.
 - b. *Action Item: SCDOT is reviewing this issue and Figure 9.2F and it is being addressed but may not be in the next RDM update.*
6. Roadway QA Checklist – Detour and MOT Plans
 - a. *Resolution: Roadway Design Support does not review the MOT/Detour plans. Traffic reviews these plans. Consultant to coordinate with SCDOT PM on when to send Detour and MOT plans to Traffic office for review.*
7. PAM4 Quality Assurance Process
 - a. *Resolution: PCDM-23 was issued September 2021. Submit design criteria early in the project and have conversations about the appropriate criteria.*

Next Meeting – April 21, 2022, 2:00 pm (virtual)

Proposed changes to ASCE38-02 SUE Standards

The Final Balloting is now underway and will conclude on March 2 on the following utility related ASCE standards. For both standards, there was a public review period which ended late December. This final ballot is to accept or reject proposed changes to the standards from public review. Below is a short summary of the proposed changes to these ASCE Standards.

- ASCE 38 – previously designated as ASCE38-02, the revision will be ASCE38-22. The “Standard Guideline for the Collection and Depiction of Existing Subsurface Utility Data” has been the standard for 20 years now for the S.U.E. professional. This revised edition adds tremendous commentary to help the reader understand intent of the standard, updates various aspects of the manual for 20 years of growth and maturity in the industry.
- ASCE 75 – new standard to be designated ASCE75-22. “Standard Guideline for Recording and Exchanging Utility Infrastructure Data” is a companion standard related specifically to location, depiction and data attributes for new utilities being constructed and existing utilities when exposed for maintenance (or any other reason). The goal is to define achievable standards for accuracy of location which are not cost prohibitive and to define standards for sharing of utility data.

Publication of the new standards is expected by mid-year; however, this is very tentative.

Additional Information

ASCE 38 - Excerpt of Interest – quality level definitions

Utility Quality Level: The value, assigned by the professional, of a utility segment or subsurface utility feature that identifies the relative (non-quantifiable) uncertainty of a utility segment's or subsurface utility feature's existence and actual location to that of its documented location.

Additional context: The value is judged and assigned on the source, precision, consistency, collection methods, and interpretation of the data put into context with information from other sources in the possession of the professional at that point in time. A utility quality level is assigned to a utility segment or utility feature of an underground utility for a specific project for a specific time period, usually until substantial project completion or the end of coverage of professional liability insurance.

Utility Quality Level A (QLA): A value assigned to that portion (x, y, and z geometry) of a utility segment or subsurface utility feature that is directly exposed and measured, and whose location and dimensions are tied to the project survey datum. The utility segment or subsurface utility feature shall be tied to the project survey datum with an accuracy of 0.1 feet (30 millimeters [mm]) vertical and to 0.2 feet (60 mm) horizontal for the measurements of the outside limits of the utility feature or utility segment that is exposed.

Additional context: Other measurable, observable, and judged utility attributes are also recorded. If obtained by means of a test hole observation, a verification effort is made, and professional judgment used to assert that the exposed infrastructure is indeed the sought target. The assignment of QLA conveys the lowest level of relative (non-quantifiable) uncertainty of measurable and judged Attributes, and location. QLA is more certain than QLB, QLC, or QLD.

Utility Quality Level B (QLB): A value assigned to a utility segment or subsurface utility feature whose existence and horizontal position is based upon geophysical methods combined with professional judgment and whose location is tied to the project survey datum.

Additional context: A QLB value is assigned to a utility segment when the following conditions are met: (a) the utility segment was detected through the application of appropriate geophysical methods; (b) the geophysical signal was judged to be reliable; (c) the interpreted position was judged based upon knowledge and use of geophysical science, utility design and installation practices, available records, visual features, and influence of site conditions; and (d) the source designation has been tied to the project survey datum with an accuracy of 0.2 feet (60 mm) horizontally. QLB is more uncertain than QLA and more certain than QLC or QLD.

Utility Quality Level C (QLC): A value assigned to a utility segment not visible at the ground surface whose estimated position is judged through correlating utility records or similar evidence to utility features, visible aboveground and/or belowground. The utility anchor point on the utility features shall be tied to the project survey datum with an accuracy of 0.2 feet (60 mm) horizontal.

Additional context: A QLC value judgment is assigned to a utility segment by using visible utility features to approximate the position of a utility segment between or in proximity to the visible utility features and in context with other achieved utility quality levels. QLC only pertains to the underground utility segment(s), not the utility feature(s). QLC data is more certain than QLD and is more uncertain than QLB and QLA.

Utility Quality Level D (QLD): A value assigned to a utility segment or utility feature, not visible at the ground surface, whose estimated position is judged through utility records, information from others, or from visual clues such as pavement cuts, obvious trenches, or existence of service.

Additional context: A QLD data attribute is assigned to a utility segment or utility feature after review and compilation of existing records, oral recollections, One-Call or “private-locate” markings, managed data repositories, context with other achieved utility quality levels, and/or other evidence of existence. QLD data is more uncertain than QLC, QLB, and QLA. QLD data is less uncertain than utilities documented without any utility quality level barring a professional’s statement of fact to the contrary.

ASCE 75 – Excerpt of interest – Positional accuracy. Note that accuracy level 5 is achievable with handheld GPS and a tape measure for depth, but still exceeds nearly all record data in existence today.

Positional Accuracy requirements should be set forth by agreement using the appropriate accuracy levels shown in Table 1 below. Examples of agreements include permits, scopes of services, contracts, and standards of practice.

Table 1. Positional Accuracy Requirements

Positional Accuracy Level	Positional Accuracy ¹ (English Units)	Positional Accuracy ^{1,2} (SI Units)
1	0.1 feet	25 mm
2	0.2 feet	50 mm
3	0.3 feet	100 mm
4	1 foot	300 mm
5	3 feet	1000 mm
0	Indeterminate	Indeterminate

Meeting Minutes - ACEC/SCDOT Professional Services Committee

Meeting #2022-Q1

January 26, 2022, 10:00 AM ET

SCDOT – 955 Park Street, Room 424

Attendees:

Jennifer Necker – SCDOT – Co-chair

Matt Lifsey – ACEC – Co-chair

Nick Pizzuti – SCDOT

Darrin Player – SCDOT

Justin Powell – SCDOT

Paul Holt - ACEC

Eric Dickey – ACEC

Rick Reiff – ACEC

Guest - Chris Gaskins, SCDOT DB

1. Introduced new Committee Members
 - Eric Dickey, D&F
 - Rick Reiff, KH
2. Update on Professional Services upcoming outlook/tentative list and SCDOT plans for “New Money” – (changes since the October 13, 2021 meeting)

Design-build planned advertisements - Chris Gaskins attended part of the meeting to provide an update on upcoming DB projects: (DB project funding and associated RFQ release dates for much of what is shown below is subject to SCDOT Commission action)

- US 301 Bridges over Four Hole Swamp – April 2022 RFQ – (DB prep by SCDOT)
- I-20 BRs over Wateree – June 2022 RFQ – (DB prep by RS&H)
- The first of 7 DB bridge packages scheduled for July 2022 RFQ –
 - Subsequent DB packages advertising roughly every 3 months. SCDOT will attempt to shortlist prior to the next RFQ, but it will be challenging due the timing of numerous DB procurements in 2022/2023.
 - DB bridge packages range in size from 2-11 bridges
 - DB prep to be done for bridge packages 1-4 by one firm from the current DB prep On-call
 - DB prep to be done for bridge packages 5-7 by one firm from the current DB prep On-call
- Carolina Crossroads Phase 3 – Q4 2022 RFQ – (DB prep by HDR)
- I-526 Wando Terminal Interchange – 2023 RFQ – (DB prep by CDMSmith)
- I-95 bridges over Lake Marion –
 - Full project funding yet to be identified
 - DB prep work via current DB prep On-call to begin very soon
 - RFQ 2023/2024
- I-26/I-95 system interchange
 - DB prep via On-call
 - RFQ 2023
- I-26 Widening
 - I-26 MM 176-187 - RFQ 2025

- I-26 MM 165-176 - RFQ 2027
 - Both sections done under 1 NEPA document, but will be separate DB contracts
 - DB prep via On-call
- DB prep On-call re-advertisement
 - The current on call funding maximum will be reached prior to the 3-year term ending
 - SCDOT anticipates readvertising the DB prep on-call earlier (prior to late 2023)

Professional Services Advertisements – Nick Pizzuti mentioned the following Professional Services future advertisements:

- Bridge Repair RFQ anticipated to support the Maintenance Office.
- RFQ for local governments and/or MPO/COG project management anticipated.

Update of use of On-calls – Nick Pizzuti mentioned that they are continually seeking to improve the On-call process.

- SCDOT developing a checklist of when to use on-calls – new process underway
- PMs are not allowed to pick the firm they want. Rather, the PM will perform a “2nd scoring” of on-call firms based on the scope of the anticipated assignment.
- SCDOT may also request a Letter of Interest from On-call firms in some cases for specific on-call Task Orders (DB Prep on-call currently requesting LOI’s).
- Even distribution of funds across on-call firms is not a primary consideration.

Debriefings/FOIA – Nick Pizzuti and Darrin Player discussed debriefings and website information.

- SCDOT has the legal go-ahead to post all rankings, scores, and scoring comments on their website at the time of selection. SCDOT wants to gauge any significant objection to this from ACEC.
- SOQs will not be posted to the website, but will still be available under an FOIA request

3. Update on SCDOT guidance regarding restrictions for SCDOT personnel who enter the private sector – Justin Powell
 - New guidance, in addition to the 365-day rule, is pending approval and should be released in the near term.
4. Update on Fixed Fee invoicing changes - Darrin Player and Nick Pizzuti
 - SCDOT has a new Invoice Cover Sheet, currently be “tested” on a few contracts
 - New Invoice Cover sheet will be used on new contracts (not existing contracts).
 - SCDOT offered to have training for industry if needed
 - Lifsey asked if SCDOT could send an example of new Cover Sheet to the Professional Services Committee for review and distribution to the ACEC. Lifsey also noted that the information needed for the cover sheet may affect how a consulting firm sets the project up initially in their firm’s accounting system.
5. Update on Research Project on Standardized Scopes – Jen Necker
 - SCDOT working with Clemson to develop a scope checklist
 - SCDOT plans to “pilot” the new standardized scopes starting in the Spring 2022
6. Contract Negotiations

- ACEC members noted the improvements in selection timeframes, but also noted delays still exist in negotiation timeframes.
 - SCDOT agreeable to having “phased” negotiations to accelerate NTP
 - SCDOT believes that the new Standard Scope checklist will improve negotiation timeframes
 - SCDOT mentioned that some consultants are not starting their Fee prep until SCDOT asks for it to be submitted.
 - SCDOT noted that improvements can still be made to the Execution phase (signature timeframe) once negotiations are completed.
7. IIJA Implementation and Discretionary Grants – Justin Powell
- MPO/COG funding is increasing
 - Census data is complicating things since boundaries will change (size of MPO vs. size of COG)
 - Governor’s budget includes \$1.3 Billion for SCDOT (1.2B one-time and \$100M recurring)
 - IIJA includes \$100 billion over 5 years in discretionary grant opportunities
 - FHWA taking a unique position on discretionary grants - FHWA supports the highway system regardless of who owns it (non-DOT), effectively signaling local governments to apply for discretionary grants.
 - SCDOT desires local government grant recipients to be “direct recipients” - with funds flowing from FHWA directly to the local entity (not through SCDOT).
 - SCDOT requests the industry to encourage “early-consultation” with SCDOT by local entities for potential grants
 - Roxanne Ancheta is leading the new Local Government Services Office
 - SCDOT in the early stages of establishing an On-call to assist local governments
 - Future on-call RFQs will include grant writing in the scope
8. Establish dates for remaining 2022 meetings (Q2, Q3, and Q4)
- Q2 2022 meeting – April 19, 2022, 10:00 am
 - Q3 2022 meeting – July 20, 2022, 11:00 am
 - Q4 2022 meeting – October 19, 2022, 11:00 am

ACEC CEI Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

February 4, 2022

Attendees (forgive spelling)

Martin Mullis
Nick Waites
Clay Richter
Nick Pizzuti
Tim Antley
Tim Sewell
Russ Touchberry

Old Business

Covid Updates

- 5 days isolation with contact. Mask after 5 days. Temp taken upon entry.

Project Manager Qualifications

- Senior Engineer is expected to have a great deal of experience. Can be 30-year PE.
- Full Time “junior” engineer is expected to more closely match required experience ranges.

RFP

- Procurement office states to contact them with any questions regarding RFP.
- Procurement office will determine if question will be confidential
- Email questions.
- Procurement will provide addendum to all consultants with questions they did not deem confidential
- Berlin Myers RFP Scope was an improvement. All agreed.

QC Requirements

A great deal of discussion regarding this. Design Build office was not present, but is expected to be at the next meeting. The main concern is that firms providing lump sum QC work for a contractor are being asked to perform additional services by the SCDOT. This creates a “who will pay for it” concern. It was discussed that QC should be considered a “deliverable”. Also that the contractor QC on Design Build better mirror that of Bid Build jobs. Firm agreement on the matter was not reached and will circled back to in future meetings. The following suggestions were made

- RFP not to specify QC requirements, but contractor can include it to help score.
- Include in contract that additional QC may be required if contractor has consistent short comings.
- Move toward a more bid-build model where the contractor is expected to provide a quality product and the contractor selects the amount of QC necessary to achieve that goal.

Prompt Payment

- It is the Prime’s responsibility to make sure sub estimates/invoices are provided within the approximate same time frame as the Prime’s invoices.
- It is okay for the Sub invoice to have a 1 to 2 week lag from Prime’s invoices

Two Tier System

It was discussed that the system drives up the cost of work. The reasoning is that larger firms that have available staff are penalized because of backlog although their staff is available. In order to maximize 2 tier process, they must team with a small company with less backlog that may not have the available staff. The lack of utilization of the larger firm staff drives up their overhead multiplier. Firms are not being rated on qualifications, but on backlog.

Martin gave a prospective from a smaller firm’s viewpoint. Although the 2 tier is designed to help firms that do not have back log (small firms, out of state newcomers), It really did not provide much benefit. Maybe a 1-2 point advantage. However, the biggest hurdle for new firm to overcome is the RFP grading criteria regarding “Team” experience. It is consistent that selection committee members place a great emphasis on Teams showing how they and their staff work together on similar projects. A new firm will not have this history and therefore placed in an automatic disadvantage in scoring regardless of qualifications. Furthermore, existing firms are less likely to partner with a new firm for the same reasons.

NEW Business

Conflicts of Interest.

- ACEC committee recommended that SCDOT provide more clarifications of Conflicts of Interest. SCDOT agreed to get legal to provide a clarification.
- SCDOT stated that rule of thumb, if your firm was a Design Engineer of Record, then they will be conflicted out. However, a sub providing minor data and not acting a signatory would not be conflicted out.
- Because Geotech stamps every report they do, they are not considered conflicted out unless they are the Geotech Engineer of Record

Various other topics

- SCDOT Construction is moving to using more on-call and less CEI Project specific contracts.
- Most CEI project specific will be handled through design build.
- Design Build to provide attendance at the next meeting.
- AASHTO to go live in May.
- Video training and dummy version will be made available to consultants for training purposes.
- Regarding the On-call it is okay for Districts to provide work orders well in advance to anticipate existing WO getting close to contract amount.
- CEI firms expected to keep up with their budgets and communicate with SCDOT DCE and Nick Waites if WO amount is close to being reached.
- I-26 Newberry – Still working on scope. Update to be provided next meeting. Possible separate project to perform the Bridge Jacking.

Executive Director's Report

Legislative Report

- IIJA
 - RECAP of Nationwide dollars committed:

Category	Amount
Roads & Bridges	\$351 Billion
Rail	\$66 Billion
Broadband	\$65 Billion
Public Transit	\$91 Billion
Airports & Ports	\$42 Billion
Energy Grid	\$73 Billion
Clean Water	\$55 Billion
 - Implementation of the IIJA continues
 - More details are released regularly.
 - [Competitive Infrastructure Funding Opportunities for Local Governments](#) (also in the packet)
 - 60 Days implementation of IIJA [Report](#) from Whitehouse
 - ACEC updates their [IIJA Resource Page Regularly](#)
 - SC Legislature seems to be in favor of budgeting for the matching funds for SCDOT to take full advantage of the money
 - SCDOT is prepared for the money
 - SCDOT has concerns on 12/16/2021 Memorandum "Policy on Using Bipartisan Infrastructure Law Resources to Build a Better America."
 - SCDOT believes this Memorandum "Will result in unintentional and erroneous application of the IIJA."
 - SCDOT says, "Poorly designed or misused guidance documents can impose significantly costs or limit the freedom of the public."
 - The memo is inconsistent with the law as intended by congress
 - I have reached out to other ACEC MOs in the SE to see if they're hearing similar concerns.
- PPP Fix
 - ACEC National continues to look for a legislative fix
 - Senator Braun (R) & Senator Duckworth (D) have sponsored an amendment for the appropriations bill
 - Met with Senator Scott's Staff on 1/27/2022
 - Scott sits on the Senate Small Business Committee, where we are trying to get support for a legislative fix
 - Scott's aid asked if we had spoken with Graham's camp.
 - We had Senator Graham's support in 2021
 - Scheduling a meeting with him now
 - Sent Scott's staff info from National
- ARPA Funds
 - Movement on how to spend these funds on infrastructure
 - Governor McMaster's recommendations:
 - \$1.2 Billion to SCDOT

- \$500 Million to Water
- Senate Recommendations:
 - \$453 Million for Transportation infrastructure acceleration
 - \$900 Million for Water & Waste Water
- House has not come up with amounts yet
- Rural Infrastructure Authority presented them and stated their needs are \$1.8 Billion
- When given funds the distribution would be 60% for large systems (population > 30,000) and 40% for smaller systems (population < 30,000)
- Breakdown of funds if received:
 - \$425-750 Million in Infrastructure Grants (\$10 Million/grant)
 - \$50-80 Million in Regional Solution Grants (\$10 million/grant)
 - \$10-20 Million in Planning grants (\$1 Million/grant)
- They're encouraging them to use local matches
- The expectation is the House will recommend between \$800 & \$900 Million for Water & Wastewater
- ACEC-SC Hosted and Event with Governor McMaster & Lt. Governor Evette
 - Great event
 - Talked about infrastructure priorities
 - Hope to grow relationship with Executive Branch
- Tracked Legislation
 - ACEC-SC is tracking 80 pieces of legislation
 - New bill: H.3892 "TO AMEND THE CODE OF LAWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA, 1976, BY ADDING SECTIONS [44-96-295](#) AND [48-20-45](#) SO AS TO PROHIBIT THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL FROM ISSUING ANY PERMIT FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITY OR FOR MINING ACTIVITIES, RESPECTIVELY, IF LOCATED WITHIN A CERTAIN PROXIMITY TO A PUBLIC PARK OR OTHER PUBLIC NATURAL AREA."
 - This bill now only applies to mining activities
 - This may hurt the ability to get materials for various projects
 - Coalition forming to discuss how to approach it
 - ACEC-SC
 - CarolinasAGC
 - SCFOR
 - SC Asphalt Pavement Association
 - SC Aggregates
 - Introduced in the Senate Tuesday

Transportation Executives Committee

- ACEC-SC Members met 2/7/2022
- ACEC-SC & SCDOT meeting 3/7/2022

Engineering Excellence Awards Gala

- Moved to April

SC Engineering Conference & Trade Show

- 2022 Registration is open
- Need speakers