

**Meeting Minutes**  
**SCDOT/ACEC/AGC Alternative Delivery Sub-Committee Meeting**  
**9/17/2025 @ 9:30 AM**

**I. Welcome/Introductions SCDOT**

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

**II. Safety Minute ACEC**

- ACEC delivered the safety minute at the start of the meeting.
- The safety discussion centered on outdoor housing and weather-related safety, emphasizing heat exposure, proper hydration, and field preparedness.
- Safety while driving in inclement weather was also discussed.
- Attendees were reminded of the importance of incorporating safety reminders at every project meeting to maintain a culture of awareness.

**III. Project Updates SCDOT**

**Bridge Program Discussion**

- 99 bridges were approved in 2024, with an additional 64 bridges under review for inclusion in the 2025 Commission List.
- These 64 bridges will be integrated into future packages.
- OAD intends to spend \$100 million a year, subject to funding availability that SCDOT continues to receive the additional \$200M. Discussion included the potential for creating a “mega package” valued at \$100M.
- The industry expressed support for delivering more large-scale design-build bridge packages to streamline timelines and reduce administrative costs.

**Mark Clark Project Status**

- The Mark Clark project was specifically discussed. It was noted that the recent decision was effectively to stop work on the project.
- However, it was clarified that if Charleston County and SCDOT reach a new agreement or funding arrangement, the project could potentially restart in the future.

**IV. Action Items from 7/16/2025 Meeting SCDOT**

- 
- **SCDOT/ACEC/AGC** to continue ongoing discussion for potential new RFQ language suggestions and/or scoring techniques for SOQ evaluations with stakeholders.
  - **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.
  - **SCDOT** will continue to look for ways to improve utility coordination and relocation efforts to better assign responsibility and manage risk.
  - **SCDOT/ACEC/AGC** to continue discussion on feedback for tidal stream/waterway permitting in regards to the future bridge packages.
  - **SCDOT** to continue reviewing Professional Liability for Crossroads 3C.

---

**V. Residential Visual Buffer****SCDOT****Directive Overview**

- A new engineering directive (ED-59) was introduced concerning residential visual buffers on controlled access roads. <https://www.scdot.org/content/dam/scdot-legacy/business/pdf/engineering-directives/ED-59-UA.pdf>

**Implementation and Cost Details**

- The cost of replanting or berm installation will not be included in the initial bid. These activities will be processed as change orders under “extra work” funded by the department.
- The department is currently reacting to the directive, assessing projects already under construction to determine where the directive applies.
- The intent of the directive is to ensure landscape restoration after project completion, not to influence design parameters or dictate design decisions.

---

**VI. Closed Bridge Incentives****SCDOT**

- Closed bridge incentives are being actively discussed by SCDOT.
- The goal is to implement an incentive framework in future bridge packages to encourage early bridge reopening or completion.
- A disincentive component for failing to meet closure deadlines is also being considered to balance the program and maintain accountability.

---

**VII. Stipend Payment Timing****SCDOT**

- SCDOT confirmed that stipend payments to design-build proposers cannot be released until contracts are formally executed. This ensures compliance with financial procedures and contract regulations.
- It was proposed that a standardized stipend invoice form be developed to streamline the reimbursement process.
- SCDOT will consider creating and implementing this standardized form to improve payment consistency and efficiency.

---

**VIII. DBE Goals for Professional Services****ACEC/AGC**

- Discussion focused on the difficulty of achieving the 14% DBE (Disadvantaged Business Enterprise) participation goal for professional services.
- Participants acknowledged that certain projects, particularly those with limited subcontracting opportunities, make it challenging to meet or exceed the required DBE percentage.
- A new committee-based structure for determining DBE goals will be implemented, incorporating feedback from multiple SCDOT disciplines - including design, construction, and professional services divisions.

- Attendees emphasized the importance of documenting all good-faith efforts to meet DBE goals, especially when targets are not met due to scope limitations.

**IX. Future Topics Discussion ALL**

**Utility Coordination Timelines**

- ACEC and AGC can provide SCDOT with questions regarding prior rights and agreement signatures to discuss at a later date.

**DBE in DB Prep**

- Question was raised by committee member as to whether DBE work in the DB prep phase should count towards the total Goal? SCDOT Response – No

**X. Open Discussion ALL**

**On-Call Proposal Process and Workload Issues**

- A recommendation was made to simplify the on-call selection process by directly awarding contracts to qualified firms, avoiding the two-tier system.
- Concerns were raised that larger firms dominate selection, then cannot compete on the second phase due to workload scoring criteria.
  - It was noted that some top-tier firms may not participate in the second phase of the on-call selection because workload scoring makes them uncompetitive.
- Observations that the costs of pursuing on-call projects on Design Services On-Call are high relative to the success rate.
- OAD clarified that teams scoring 70 or higher will be shortlisted for the new OAD on-call.
- Professional Services has an option to adjust the number of shortlisted teams before scoring is available but is expected to be used infrequently.
- The current 10-page technical proposal requirement for design services on-call task orders is burdensome and time-restrictive.
- A suggestion was made to reduce the technical approach section in task orders for the Alternative Delivery On-Call to one or two pages to make submissions more manageable.

**Presentation Requirements and Technical Proposals in Design-Build Procurements**

- Clarification was requested regarding whether screenshots of technical proposals may be used in presentations.
  - It was confirmed that only officially submitted proposal materials can be presented.
- Committee agreed that using PowerPoint for presenting approved material is acceptable for clarity.

- A plan was made to review and update RFP language to prevent misinterpretation of these presentation requirements.

### **Utility Relocation Challenges**

- Discussion addressed challenges with utility relocations, especially disagreements over prior rights.
- Reference was made to other states' more streamlined practices for determining prior rights and relocation timelines.
- Consensus was reached on the need for stronger communication, clearer protocols, and better workflow coordination to reduce project delays and costs.

### **Low Volume Bridge Criteria**

- A new directive under review aims to revise the low-volume bridge criteria to make delivery faster and more cost-effective.
- Potential expansion of the "low-volume" classification to bridges handling up to 3,000 vehicles per day.
- The location and seismic characteristics of each site should be factored into any relaxation of design standards.
- Feedback requested from all participants on the low-volume bridge directive, due to a short turnaround for implementation.

### **Design Review Process Streamlining**

- Recommendations included eliminating formal preliminary reviews for low-volume bridge projects to save time and administrative effort.
- Successes from design-build projects in removing redundant submittals could serve as models for bid-build projects.
- Emphasis was placed on ensuring accurate concept layouts to satisfy hydrological and regulatory requirements.
- A proposal discussed reduction of bridge setback requirements to enable shorter spans where applicable.

## **XI. Action Items**

- **SCDOT/ACEC/AGC** to continue ROW discussion.
- **SCDOT** to check presentation language in RFP template to clarify intent to proposers.
- **SCDOT** to consider disincentives with closed bridges.
- **ACEC/AGC** to provide feedback for bridge replacement on-call.

## **XII. Next Meeting Date: November, 19<sup>th</sup> @ 9:30 AM**

## **XIII. Adjourn**