
Agenda
SCDOT/ACEC/AGC Alternative Delivery Sub-Committee Meeting
7/16/2025 @ 9:30 AM

I. Welcome/Introductions

SCDOT

Meeting Attendees

SCDOT	ACEC	AGC
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Jae Mattox• Ben McKinney• Maddy Barbian• Austin Purgason• Brian Gambrell	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Abdul Fekrat (Terracon)• Cameron Nations (ICE)• Hisham Abdelaziz (CTEA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Chris Boyd (Crowder)• Matthew Payne (Archer Western)• Pat McGriff (Lane)

- Design-Build Prep On-Call
 - i. Advertisement upcoming within the next few weeks.
 - ii. Design-Build Prep On-Call will be awarded based on a point threshold. Teams scoring higher than a set score (most likely 70 points) will be placed on the on-call list.
 - iii. Selection of teams from the on-call will follow the same process as other on-calls. Consensus from committee would be to reduce and limit additional work to pursue task orders.
- Design-Build Manual (2017) has been updated and is now the Alternative Delivery Manual Version 2.0.
 - i. Manual was published on SCDOT website earlier this month.
 - ii. The plan is to update the manual more frequently, and the change process undergo a more streamlined approval process.
 - iii. Construction chapters are coming and should be published by early 2026.
- Progressive Design Build legislation still pending.

II. Project Updates

SCDOT

- Low County Corridor Construction manager and CCR Project Director are currently vacant, with Brad Reynolds currently serving as the Interim CCR Project Director.
- The website is up to date and has all current procurement dates.
 - Bridge Package size and schedule may change in future
 - OAD is currently screening a new bridge list and may increase size or combine planned bridge packages.

III. Action Items from 5/21/2025 Meeting

SCDOT

- **SCDOT/ACEC/AGC** to continue ongoing discussion for potential new RFQ language suggestions and/or scoring techniques for SOQ evaluations with stakeholders.
 - i. Alternative Delivery Policy committee approved a change to RFQ that was implemented in the Long Point RFQ. This change requires Lead Contractor to report any claims submitted over \$250K.
 - ii. AGC member had some concerns about being non-responsive based on interpretation of this language, but was advised to air on the side of caution when submitting. More information is generally better than less.
- **ACEC/AGC** to poll and involve members in order to look for examples across industry in order to establish positive potential adoption of PDB, CM/GC, and other methods.
 - i. Ongoing
- **SCDOT** will continue to look for ways to improve utility coordination and relocation efforts to better assign responsibility and manage risk.
 - i. Still working to improve, CCR and Longpoint Early Coordination has been positive.
- **SCDOT/ACEC/AGC** to continue discussion on feedback for tidal stream/waterway permitting in regards to the future bridge packages.
 - i. Ongoing
- **SCDOT/ACEC/AGC** to continue ROW discussion.
 - i. Review ROW language
- **SCDOT** to continue reviewing Professional Liability for Crossroads 3C.
 - i. Insurance Discussion
 1. The new language ensures that subs are properly insured and gives prime contractors clarity on what insurance their subs need.
 2. Insurance limits are scaled based on each project, with the limit set at estimate of worst case scenario.

IV. ATC Meeting Timing

ACEC/AGC

- Discussion is on Meeting Timing during the ATC Phase
 - i. General Timeline on standard length procurements:
 1. Conceptual ATCs 1 month after industry review
 2. Final RFP 2 months after industry review
 3. PATC 1 week after Final RFP
 4. Confidential meeting 2 weeks later
 5. 2 months after Final RFP, Formal ATCs for initial review
 6. Confidential meetings 2 weeks after
 7. Final ATC submittal 1 week after

- 8. 2 weeks for review until final determination
 - 9. 30 days from final determination until proposal submittal minimum
- Goal is to provide clear direction during process before accepting or denying ATCs.
 - i. ACEC would like for responses to be more clear, and meetings to be more direct in identifying issues.
 - ii. ACEC/AGC suggested that most timing issues are with a project with no established preferred alternative. When SCDOT provides an established alignment, there is always a fall back option if an ATC is not approved.
- ATC Timing
 - i. ACEC/AGC contends 1 month is not enough time to shift direction/alignment after learning an ATC is denied.
 - ii. SCDOT Traffic Engineering should be involved as early as possible when ATCs have a traffic component.
 - iii. Is it possible to present Conceptual ATCs before meetings so that SCDOT staff can be better prepared for confidential meetings?
- Should the Prep Consultant be part of concept meetings? Pride of authorship is a concern, but is abated by SCDOT instructing the prep consultant to stick to a more “bid-build” approach when looking at early alternatives. This leaves more room for innovation on the backend, and doesn’t put the prep consultant in a position of attachment to any particular design.

V. RFP Questions

ACEC/AGC

- Non-Confidential Questions vs. Confidential Questions
 - i. Non Confidential identifiers:
 - 1. “Please clarify”
 - 2. “Is the intent?”
 - 3. “Change design criteria OR use a different method for design” which is not included in the criteria
 - 4. “It appears the RFP requires...”
 - 5. “Please provide information regarding...”
 - ii. Confidential identifiers:
 - 1. “Would SCDOT consider an ATC to...”
 - 2. “Can different beam types be included in one ATC...”

3. "Hydraulic model provided modeled the bridges as a single structure. We are proposing to model as separate structures. Is this allowed?" No ambiguity as both methods are allowed. Proposed path forward for team.
 4. "Does SCDOT have an opinion on utilizing a temporary causeway for bridge construction..." Not restricted by criteria and related to means and methods.
- Small amount of ATCs on constrained (ROW, Utilities, etc) small projects will be considered. This model has worked on recent emergencies.
 - Is SCDOT open to Value Engineering after award?
 - SCDOT is open to the idea when it is in best interest of SCDOT, but there is no current policy on the concept.

VI. Future Topics Discussion

ALL

- Use of Self-Consolidating Concrete in Precast Girder Fabrication
 - i. Many Bridge Girders are being rejected due to consolidation.
 - ii. Self-Consolidating Concrete does not meet current SCDOT specs.
 - iii. Non-conformities during girder fabrication due to high strength mixes and increased reinforcement
- Confidential questions meetings in Procurements with no ATCs
 - i. Will discuss this at next meeting after Old Vaucluse project, which is utilizing this process.
- Stipend Research update
 - i. Research on national stipend data will be presented.

VII. Open Discussion

ALL

- Public Announcements – In person, virtual, or both?
 - Committee agrees that having a virtual option for public announcements is almost always preferable. Teams are generally willing to be available for in-person meetings the day after public announcement.
- Carolina Crossroads project agreement

-
- SCDOT plans to use this new agreement on the Long Point Road project. SCDOT is also considering its use on other projects moving forward.
 - This new agreement clarifies the roles of the Contractor vs the role of SCDOT.
 - SCDOT is open to feedback on this new agreement.
 - A new safety section of ACEC/AGC Meeting will be added
 - Plan to do a short segment on safety at the beginning of the meeting to promote a safety culture with the industry.

VIII. Action Items

- SCDOT to distribute new ROW language.

IX. Next Meeting Date: September, 17th @ 9:30 AM

X. Adjourn