

Agenda
SCDOT/ACEC/AGC Alternative Delivery Sub-Committee Meeting
5/20/2026 @ 9:30 AM

I. Welcome/Introductions SCDOT

II. <u>SCDOT</u>	AGC	ACEC
Brian Gambrell	Mike Grey – UNITED	Cameron Nations – ICE
Carolyn Fisher	Whitney Williams – AGC	Abdul Fekrat – TERRACON
Wyatt Powell	Greg Cook – BANKS	Chris Jordan – RK&K
John Caver	Tom Watson – ESW	Ladd Gibson – GFT
Jason Byrd	Pat McGriff – LANE	
Michael Pitts		
Carmen Wright		
Dede Elmore		

By way of introduction to the Office of Alternative Delivery staff, Carolyn Fisher passed out an up-dated organizational chart for clarification/review, attached to these minutes, and noted Alex Cartledge as the new Alternative Delivery Construction Manager for the CLRB program and the departure of Maddy Barbian, the Design Manager for LCC.

II. Safety Minute ACEC

Abdul Fekrat discussed how TERRACON is promoting safety on the job through a “Safety Week.” During this time, employees take a monitored driving class and learn how to stay safe not only while driving, but also while working. Further discussion with the group regarding “fatigue awareness.”

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>

- In procurement:
 - **Long Point Road Interchange Improvements**
 - Public Announcement is scheduled for June 2, 2026.

-
- **Bridge Package 22**
 - Public Announcement is scheduled for October 22, 2026.

 - Future Procurements:
 - **Bridge Package 23**
 - In a “neutral” position now.
 - **Bridge Package 24, 25**
 - In 2027, bridges in Districts 1, 2, 4, and 7.
 - **Bridge Package 26, 28**
 - In 2028, bridges in District 3
 - Lowcountry Rapid Transit (LCRT) managed out of OAD Office:
 - Bid/Build scheduled for January 2027 letting
 - Carolina Crossroads Program:
 - **Phase 3A**
 - Set for December 2026 letting
 - **Phase 4, 5**
 - Set for February 2027 letting
 - **3D**
 - Working on draft RFP. RFQ release in July/August. SCDOT anticipates releasing a draft RFP (not for formal industry comment; just as a courtesy) concurrently with the RFQ.
 - Low Country Corridor
 - CII contract in April 2027

IV. Action Items from 3/18/2026 Meeting **SCDOT**

- **IDIQ:** SCDOT has worked with several divisions (Bridge Management, Engineering Support, Special Projects) in discussions with IDIQ. Action item continues that SCDOT will work on framing a draft OAD Manual chapter on the process and will provide to subcommittee for review. This is ongoing.

V. Construction Chain of Command **SCDOT**

-
- Ensure that after contract execution, the RCE is the main point of contact, not OAD. OAD works closely with the RCEs throughout construction, but things like Requests for Information, Contract Change Requests, etc. still flow through the RCE. Any site visits or inspections need to be coordinated with the field as well.

VI. Quality Credit – Future Maintenance Items SCDOT

- Open discussion on ensuring that everyone understands quality credits for future maintenance items
- All agencies were on the same page in terms of future maintenance. Bridges are a big item for maintenance. Bridges need to meet inspections with a high level of detail outlined in spreadsheets. SCDOT uses numbers from Bridge Maintenance. Future costs are also taken into consideration.

VII. As-Built Load Ratings SCDOT

- Through coordination with Bridge Management Office (BMO) SCDOT realized that we are doubling efforts with respect to as-builts for our projects.
- In order to meet FHWA requirements, BMO must load rate new bridges within 4 months of opening; this process includes as-builts. Since OAD already requires as-builts we can work with BMO to provide those in an adequate timeline to avoid paying for that effort multiple times
- SCDOT will work to update the as-built requirements section of the RFP template to include language on this and coordinate with BMO and the subcommittee to ensure that we adequately explain what we need and the time limits
- OAD will work with the DCEs to determine comment length for as-built reviews
- OAD will work with BMO to come up with a form/template that complies with FHWA guidelines to denote when a load rating has no change
- This has the potential to affect final completion contractual language which is ok with SCDOT. Along with this, the industry requested a more clear definition of “open to traffic” potentially being tied to final configuration, final stage of construction, etc.

-
- ACEC commented that the as-built manual likely needs some revising as well
 - SCDOT is considering a new type of liquidated damages with an interim completion date, or something similar, to help enforce load ratings, so this is done in a timely manner. The wording might be written into agreements. Consistency is important.

VIII. Cross Slope on Design-Build Projects SCDOT

- Clarification: This refers to cross slope on new interstate pavements or widenings
- Design Build has higher expectations since the Contractor is responsible for design, means and methods, and construction quality.
- Contractors will be able to sparingly use EOR stamped justification for any spot locations that are out of tolerance in conversations regarding acceptance with SCDOT. This is not a commitment that those areas will be accepted, just an option for design-build projects exclusively. This pertains to certain spot locations and should be used sparingly. SCDOT expects criteria to be met since on a design-build job other agencies designed and built the project.

IX. SOQ Formatting ACEC/AGC

- Discussions are on-going while looking for a happy medium. Graphics and tables need some requirements concerning font size, etc. There needs to be consistency.
- ACEC/AGC suggested different page limits or formatting requirements based on the size of the projects.
- ACEC/AGC requested review of any proposed formatting changes so that they can run those through their marketing departments
- A majority of the concern has to do with formatting tables and special emphasis areas
- SCDOT indicated that one of the aspects of our language for review is the ability to take off points rather than deeming proposals non-responsive.

X. Procurement Schedule (Technical Proposal vs. Cost Proposal)

AGC

- ACEC/AGC expressed concern that there is too much time between submittal of technical Proposals and submittal of cost proposals. They proposed 4-6 weeks would be sufficient.
- SCDOT uses the time between technical proposals to do a cursory review and come up with questions, then hold interviews, then perform a detailed consensus scored evaluation meeting, and then opens cost proposals. In order to get all subject matter experts and everyone’s schedule, it takes time.
- SCDOT said that cost proposals could be submitted ahead of time, but that they would not be opened until the technical proposal evaluation was complete. To cut down on the time between technical proposals and cost proposals, submitting cost proposals can be one week after the technical proposals and that would be fine with SCDOT.
- SCDOT now has the confidentiality in place to be able to receive cost proposals early and maintain confidentiality as long as the industry is amenable. SCDOT Procurement to confirm.
- The SCDOT’s goal is to provide at least 45 days after final ATC approval and last “significant” addendum prior to submittal of the technical proposal.

During this discussion, time was given to Whitney Williams, Director of SC Government Relations and Divisions to update the meeting on the Governor’s Modernization Bill. She said it was a done deal and was law, signed on Monday, May 18th. It will go into effect July 1, 2026.

XI. CMGC/Phased D-B/P3 Discussion (Standing) SCDOT

- No projects have been identified yet. SCDOT has an outline but has work to do.
- SCDOT requested input from the industry about any other states that have great processes for either of these contracting methods.

XII. New Contract Format (Standing) ALL

-
- SCDOT is still working on this and the pros and cons of this new contract format.
 - Requested that the industry continue to review the 3C contract and make any comments or concerns and bring those to future subcommittee meetings

XIII. Open Discussion

ALL

- Key Individual replacement requirements were updated about 10 years ago. However, the execution of a job doesn't allow for progression on the same job. "Equal or better" wording means there are times when you might end up with someone better or conversely, someone who isn't very good. The problem comes into play when you attempt to promote someone; the opportunities for advancement are almost nil.
- The possibility of a justification that the person is a benefit to the team and the project might be a possible solution. SCDOT needs to keep track of what is being done.
- Potential to update this section, but ultimately SCDOT is open to key individual replacements as long as it doesn't become a pattern or a "bait and switch" situation. This would be very dependent on the timing of the project, the individual, and how well the project is progressing. Justification to replace key individuals is the onus of the Contractor and SCDOT has, and will continue, to be open to thorough justifications.

XIV. Action Items

- SCDOT Procurement Schedule. SCDOT to take into account previous items to determine if there is a better schedule for submitting cost proposals; and also ensure that ATCs/addendum are released appropriately.
- ACEC/AGC to provide cost for warranty bonds
- ACEC/AGC to provide any language from other states regarding CM/GC or PDB that could assist SCDOT with new procedure
- SCDOT to continue to work on IDIQ
- SCDOT to draft language with as-builts to be used for BMO load rating

- SCDOT to draft language on new/consistent formatting standards for SOQs and technical proposals.
- SCDOT PMO Contracts.

XV. **Next Meeting Date:** July 15, 2026

XVI. **Adjourn**

