

Meeting Minutes
SCDOT/ACEC/AGC Alternative Delivery Sub-Committee Meeting
1/28/2026 @ 9:30 AM

I. Welcome/Introductions SCDOT

SCDOT	AGC	ACEC
Jae Mattox	Mike Grey – UNITED	Cameron Nations – ICE
Carolyn Fisher	Matthew Payne – AW	Abdul Fekrat – TERRACON
Maddy Barbian	Greg Cook – BANKS	Chris Jordan – RK&K
David Rogers	Tom Watson – ESW	Ladd Gibson – GFT
Jason Byrd		
Michael Pitts		
Carmen Wright		
Whitney Williams		
Will McGoldrick		

II. Safety Minute ACEC

- **Icy and Snowy Conditions Safety Tips:**
 1. *Plan before travel (check windshield wipers, brakes, etc.) to ensure your vehicle is ready to traverse the conditions.*
 2. *Slow down in inclement weather.*
 3. *Increase following distance, always leave 3 seconds minimum, increase this to 8 seconds in icy conditions. No Cruise Control in icy weather.*
 4. *Leave extra space at intersections to allow extra start-up time in icy conditions.*

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>

- List of contractors/consultants on active procurements will be provided in meeting minutes.
- In procurement:
 - **Long Point Road**
 - **BP 21 contract will be executed before next subcommittee meeting.**
- Future Procurements
 - **Bridge Package 22**
 - Will contain 18 bridges, with RFQ releasing on Feb 19th.
 - **Bridge Package 23**
 - At this time, contains 5 risky sites in Charleston, with a TBD timeframe.

- May pull some other bridges into this package
- Michael Baker should have prep work completed Fall 2026
- **Bridge Package 24,25**
 - In 2027, Bridges in districts 1, 2, 4, and 7
- **Bridge Package 26,28**
 - In 2028, Bridges in Districts 3

IV. Action Items from 11/19/2025 Meeting SCDOT

- **SCDOT/ACEC/AGC** to continue ongoing discussion for potential new RFQ language suggestions and/or scoring techniques for SOQ evaluations with stakeholders. **[Closed]**
- **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, P3, and other methods. **[Closed]**
 - Current legislation has stalled, but there is hope for legislation to be revisited later in the year.
- **SCDOT** will continue to look for ways to improve utility coordination and relocation efforts to better assign responsibility and manage risk. **[Closed]**
 - OAD is going back through entire utility process to determine where coordination can be improved.
 - SCDOT is currently Interpreting ACT36 intent and applying that to internal documents.
 - House/Senate bills are looking at utility coordination changes in ACT36 language, as the current language sunsets. The current language does not directly address design-build projects.
 - The subcommittee acknowledges the importance of having all necessary information upfront to avoid delays and additional costs. This is the challenge that the process is trying to alleviate.
 - AGC/ACEC members expressed a desire for OAD contracts to be more direct in stating whether the intent of utility work for specific Act 36 eligible locations is to be included in the bids or will be handled as a change order after contract execution.
 - There was discussion of including allowances in the bid price, so that each team is on an equal playing field.
- **SCDOT/ACEC/AGC** to continue discussion on feedback for tidal stream/waterway permitting in regards to the future bridge packages. **[Closed]**
- **SCDOT** to check presentation language in RFP template to clarify intent to proposers **[Closed]**
 - This section of the RFP can be interpreted multiple ways, but clarifying language will be coming.

- The intent of the section is to ensure that no information not contained in the technical proposal is introduced in the presentation. Proposers should utilize the submitted Technical Proposal for their presentations.
- OAD is also looking into a standard template for questions asked/answered in presentations between OAD and the DB Teams.
- **ACEC/AGC** to provide feedback for bridge replacement IDIQ
 - OAD is considering IDIQ for low-impact bridges.
 - 3 year contract with multiple teams
 - There is concern from SCDOT leadership that IDIQ will generate higher costs for these bridges.
 - ACEC/AGC indicated that they are not seeing higher costs for these contracts, and they are seeing that over the course of the contract, they are taking losses on some bridges but overall have a modest profit.
 - OAD has reached out to multiple other states to gather information including the NCDOT Express Design Build and the FDOT push-button projects. SCDOT described several approaches to this contracting method with the ultimate acknowledgement that this is a specific type of contracting for construction projects and has constraints required by FHWA and is not done the same as the typical on-call for professional services. ACEC/AGC will gather feedback to bring back to this committee.

V. Permitting Lessons Learned on Bridge Packages SCDOT

- **There are sites where impacts are in thousandths of acres and GP submittals are prepared and submitted. These could be good projects to consider use of Nationwide permits.**
 - Some Nationwide permits don't require USACE coordination, so it is recommended to utilize those when applicable.
 - Nationwide permits only require completing the checklist and then proceeding in some instances.
 - Not all Nationwide permits require mitigation, so there is a savings to be gained in cost as well.
- **Teams should be mindful that even if they design out of a 404 permit, they will still need to acquire the State Nav Water permit. It is also recommended to keep permits in the CPM schedule when wetland and stream impacts are avoided but state navigational permits are still required.**
- **Critical area Permits (Tidal waters)**
 - In prep, OAD will obtain critical line plats, and will provide to proposers. Redoing those plats is a risk for the team, but they can do so.
 - General permit allows 0.5 acres, but once the area increases above that, it changes to an Individual Permit and permitting is estimated to take 12 months on average.

- Critical area permitting is fairly straightforward from a process standpoint but accounting for time in the construction schedule and coordinating with BCM staff can be a challenge, and adds complexity.
- Package 23 has 4/5 tidal sites.
- **408 Permissions**
 - 408 permissions are required where Corps of Engineers have designed/built/or maintained infrastructure (AKA Federal Project).
 - 408 permissions are under the civil works side of the Corps of Engineers, so SCDOT has no control over their workflow or schedule, or payment.
 - If you have a 408 permission, adversarial positions cause longer delays and tend to bring more scrutiny to the submittal
 - SCDOT encourages teams to begin 408 coordination before 404 permits, as the 404 will not be issued before the 408. Hydrology studies need to be at approximately 60% design in order to begin the process of coordinating with the 408 staff at the USACE.
 - SCDOT is averaging a 6 month timeframe on 408 permitting.

VI. New Contract Format (Standing) ALL

- **OAD is starting back at page one to establish a template for ALL projects.**
 - There is a standing meeting each week to review the contract and make changes as needed.
 - The meeting is currently going section by section to clear up issues.
- **The overall goal for OAD is to have one contract for all projects.**
 - This is a challenge, as billion dollar projects and bridge packages require very different provisions to be successful.
 - OAD is also looking to make it more reader friendly, to clear up confusion in interpretation.
 - The 3C contract does a lot of good things, but is perhaps too burdensome in some ways.
- **This committee will be kept up-to date as changes are made and if feedback is requested.**

VII. Open Discussion ALL

- **AGC has asked OAD to consider allowing self-consolidating concrete for girders. They are having issues with acceptance for consolidation.**
- **OAD is also open to a fixed price bridge package.**
 - The concept would be to set a priority list of bridges available, and each bridge would have a point value associated, and give the total contract cost (\$100 Million for example).
 - Teams would bid by selecting which bridges they would pursue, and the highest total point value would receive the full contract.

VIII. Action Items

-
- **AGC/ACEC asked if SCDOT maintained** a list of Consultants/Contractors currently on active **projects**. SCDOT does not have a list but all information is contained on the SCDOT Alternative Delivery website.
 - **ACEC/AGC** to provide feedback for potential IDIQ contracts.

IX. **Next Meeting Date: March 18, 2026**

X. **Adjourn**