

**Meeting Minutes**  
**SCDOT/ACEC/AGC Alternative Delivery Sub-Committee Meeting**  
**3/18/2026 @ 9:30 AM**

**I. Welcome/Introductions** **SCDOT**

SCDOT	AGC	ACEC
Jae Mattox	Mike Grey – <i>UNITED</i>	Cameron Nations – <i>ICE</i>
Carolyn Fisher	Matthew Payne – <i>AW</i>	Abdul Fekrat – <i>TERRACON</i>
Maddy Barbian	Greg Cook – <i>BANKS</i>	Chris Jordan – <i>RK&amp;K</i>
David Rogers	Tom Watson – <i>ESW</i>	Ladd Gibson – <i>GFT</i>
Jason Byrd	Pat McGriff – <i>LANE</i>	
Michael Pitts	Whitney Williams – <i>AGC</i>	
Carmen Wright		
Austin Purgason		

**II. Safety Minute** **ACEC**

Blue Light Trailers:

Concerns were noted with including the speed limit on blue light trailers in work zones, so that those that see it are not slamming on their brakes or trying to “beat” the limit. The committee commented that they believe the current trend in SC of just having the blue lights and “SLOW DOWN” is more effective.

**III. Project Updates** **SCDOT**

***The OAD website is the best place for the most up-to-date information.***

<https://www.scdot.org/business/design-build.html>

- Brad Reynolds has been named CCR Project Director.
- Bridge Program Construction Manager position has been advertised, and interviews will begin soon.
- In procurement:
  - **Long Point Road**
    - Submittal of Technical Proposals is scheduled for March 31<sup>st</sup>.
  - **Bridge Package 22**
    - SOQ evaluation is underway, with a shortlist anticipated at the beginning of April.
  - **Bridge Package 21**
    - The contract has been executed, design review underway.
- Future Procurements

- **Bridge Package 23**
  - At this time, contains 5 high risk sites in Charleston, with a TBD timeframe.
  - May pull some other bridges into this package
  - Michael Baker anticipates having the design-build prep work completed this Fall.
- **Bridge Package 24,25**
  - In 2027, bridges in Districts 1, 2, 4, and 7
- **Bridge Package 26,28**
  - In 2028, bridges in Districts 3
- **I-85 interchange in Anderson County is still on hold**
- **CCR 3D will have an RFQ release in Summer 2026.**
- **PEL Study underway on I-85 Bridges over Lake Hartwell.**
- **I-95 over Great Pee Dee Bridges are awaiting funding.**

#### **IV. Action Items from 1/28/2026 Meeting**

**SCDOT**

- **SCDOT** to provide a list of Consultants/Contractors currently on active projects.
  - This is available on the OAD Website **[Closed]**
- **ACEC/AGC** to provide feedback for potential IDIQ contracts.
  - NCDOT and FDOT have a qualifications based contract set-up for emergency projects that ACEC/AGC are interested in. These are emergency procurement contracts, not for use with programmed projects.
  - SCDOT does work with AGC to determine annual unit costs for emergency work. This is separate from a construction ID/IQ contract.
  - SCDOT must include price as a determining factor when awarding a construction contract based on state procurement law, so qualification based only contracts cannot be done.
  - A benefit of ID/IQ is to have only one procurement in order to deliver low impact bridge replacements faster, and also the added benefit of being able to use that same contract for emergency bridge replacements as necessary.
  - OAD is writing language that will be provided for this committee. **[ACTION ITEM]**

#### **V. Value Engineering in Design Build**

**SCDOT**

- OAD's stance has been that design build inherently incorporates the Value Engineering process and therefore we do not have a VE specification.
- Charleston County is currently using a 50/50 split on all innovation concepts, post-award, on the Main Road / US 17 design-build project, but OAD has some concerns with that approach.
- The concept of "value engineering" in design build is not a black-and-white process, so each innovation needs to be fully vetted in terms of cost benefits to all parties.

- All parties believe that any post-award innovations should be analyzed for cost sharing based on the benefits and the existing contract documents and requirements

## **VI. Proposal Formatting**

**ACEC/SCDOT**

- RFQ and RFP language regarding font size, table usage, and overall formatting in SOQs and Technical Proposals has been updated.
- ACEC/AGC is concerned that the changes will cause important information to get left out due to length requirements; OAD is open to adding extra pages if required on a project specific basis.
- The intent of the changes is to increase clarity and fairness as the use of tables and figures had gotten excessive
- Presentation language and ATC language has also been updated in RFP Instructions template.
- ACEC/AGC suggested that 8 weeks between technical proposal submittal and cost proposal submittal is too long, and suggested a change to 30 days, keeping all other dates the same. This shortens the SCDOT technical proposal review, however.
- ACEC/AGC also requested special attention to the timing between the final addendum and submittal of technical proposals. Subcommittee discussed that there are some items that can be included at a later stage, but that SCDOT should evaluate the content of the final addendum and timing to determine if it would materially change the technical proposals.
- All plans excluding MOT should be fully black and white moving forward. This language currently exists in the RFP Instructions template.

## **VII. Self-Consolidating Concrete**

**AGC**

- AGC has asked for allowance of self-consolidating concrete to alleviate issues with consolidation in girders.
- SCDOT is not favorable to allowing this, as it seems that this issue is isolated to one manufacturer, and would require adding new material to the QPL.
- AGC believes that self-consolidating concrete could improve quality across the board, but understands SCDOT's stance.
- SCDOT is open to evaluating the use of self-consolidating concrete as an ATC, but otherwise, this subject will be closed out.

## **VIII. Phased Design Build**

**AGC**

- There was no further update regarding the PDB or CM/GC legislation; it remains in the current legislative cycle.

- 
- ACEC/AGC - Challenges from owners on new PDB programs ultimately comes down to understanding what is the ultimate goal of the project (speed of delivery, control of design elements, control of costs, etc.) It is also important to understand that the owner needs to be involved early and often.
  - The Independent Cost Estimator (ICE) is a key member of the team, and it was suggested that that entity is either a contractor or highly familiar with construction processes.
  - AGC suggested requiring the ICE to perform “ghost bidding” on several lettings prior to performing estimates for PDB projects to ensure that they are familiar with the industry and bidding history in SC.

**IX. New Contract Format (Standing) ALL**

- SCDOT is conducting weekly meetings with legal and OAD to clarify and condense language so that it is more legible to all parties, especially those who are managing the contract.

**X. Open Discussion ALL**

- Traffic control devices are now working with Google Maps and Waze Navigation, but devices are not always on or off when needed, or turned the wrong direction. AGC recommends making sure these devices are being used properly.

**XI. Action Items**

- **ACEC/AGC** to provide feedback for potential IDIQ contracts.

**XII. Next Meeting Date: May 20, 2026**

**XIII. Adjourn**