

**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS**  
**Bridge Package 16 - Contract ID 3962240 - Pickens County**

**FINAL RFP - ROUND 3**

Date Received: 3/15/2023

						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Exhibit 6		A parallel stream was identified during field review that is not included on the Waters of the U.S. map attached to the NEPA document. The feature is located along the north side of SC 124, east of the bridge. If the USACE determines this feature to be a stream, the Conceptual Design would exceed the thresholds of the SCDOT General Permit. In this event, would SCDOT provide relief for cost and/or schedule for development of a NPCE, the required Individual Permit, and associated mitigation costs?	Environmental	No_Revision	SCDOT is in the process of confirming the classification of the feature and will provide the findings to the teams as soon as possible.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	Ex. 6, Pg. 2-4; PCEs	Twelve Mile Creek and George's Creek are included on SCDHEC's map of State Navigable Waters; however, the NEPA document and the Permit Determination Form do not state that a State Nav Waters Permit is required. Does SCDOT anticipate the need for a State Nav Waters Permit for SC 183 over Twelve Mile Creek, SC 124 over George's Creek and/or US 123 over George's Creek?	Environmental	Revision	Yes, these are navigable waters and a permit will be required.
3	Attach_B	Environmental	SC 183 over Twelve Mile PCE	Portions of the parallel waterbody identified as Wetland 1 in the PCE exhibits evidence of flow and an ordinary high-water mark. Other portions are ponded. If the USACE determines this feature to be a stream, rather than a wetland, the Conceptual Design would exceed the thresholds of the SCDOT General Permit. In this event, would SCDOT provide relief for cost and/or schedule for development of a NPCE, the required Individual Permit, and additional mitigation costs?	Environmental	No_Revision	SCDOT is in the process of confirming the classification of the feature and will provide the findings to the teams as soon as possible.
4	RFP	4	Exhibit 4e Section 2.2.1.8	Please confirm that stipulation "toes shall not exceed the limits of the existing toe" does not apply to side slopes or the cone where slope transitions from side slope to under the bridge end bent slope.	Hydrology	Revision	It applies to the toe of slope under the bridge including corner transitions to the extent where they would infringe on the hydraulic conveyance opening to exclude side slopes outside of the hydraulic conveyance opening.
5	Attach_B	Hydraulics	Toe-Ditch-Detail	At locations where swale/ditch is located right at the toe of an existing fill, raising the grade or replacing existing with a wider bridge results in 2:1 slope encroaching on the ditch/swale. In this case, will DOT require the ditch to be piped, particularly If moving the ditch would take it outside the right of way?	Hydrology	No_Revision	We should have adequate R/W blockout for ditches. SCDOT will allow piping if necessary.



6	RFP	4	29 of 91	LDs are defined for the Project as \$5000 / day w.r.t substantial completion. Final Completion has \$1250 / day. Will SCDOT consider utilizing ICTs for SC 183 and SC 124, and defining additional criteria at US 123 to eliminate the risk of AT&T performance from the contractor? i.e. Substantial Completion for each site shall be as follows: SC124 ICT LDs for \$XXX starting by TBD date. SC 183 ICT LDs for \$XXX starting by TDB date. US 123 ICT LDs for \$XXX starting by TDB date. Substantial Completion is defined as traffic in its permanent traffic pattern. Final Completion is defined as per the RFP, but shall be no earlier than the date the AT&T lines are relocated + XXX days.	PM	Revision	Contract time and LD rates revised.
7	RFP			Will SCDOT consider increasing the timeframe for the confidential meetings such that ideas can be conveyed and discussed?	PM	No_Revision	No.
8	RFP	4	Exhibit 4a Section 2.7	The section mentions to develop vertical geometry in compliance with the SCDOT RDM. The RDM does not give strict guidance on grade adjustments for vertical curves and states "consider grade adjustments....and where practical provide SSD greater than...". Since most grades at all four (4) sites exceed 3%, are the Teams required to utilize grade adjusted SSD values? Or can SCDOT provide guidance on "practical" instances.	Roadway	No_Revision	Consideration should be made by the engineer per the RDM, but grade adjusted stopping sight distance is not a requirement of this project.
9	PIP	Survey		The updated survey informatoin provided for SC 183 is still lacking all planimetric features on the west side of the bridge. The conceptual plans provided show driveways, trees, the gas existing gas station and houses. This is not available in the updated survey files on 3/9/23.	Roadway	Revision	The supplemental survey information will be provided in Attachment B.
10	RFP	4	Exhibit 4b Section 2.1.24	Exhibit 4b Section 2.1.24 allows for excavated slope 2:1 (or flatter). assuming Exhibit 4b, Section 2.1.24, and Exhibit 4e Sections 2.2.1.3 and 2.2.1.4 are met, what is the minimum "or flatter" slope?	Structures	Revision	"or flatter" will be removed and abutment spill-through slopes will be required to be 2:1. Exhibit 4b 2.1.22 limits level-berm length in front of cap and requires the height of new 2:1 slope to be maximized, while meeting abutment setback requirements in Exhibit 4e.
11	RFP	4	Exhibit 4b Section 2.1.24	If only slope excavation is for construction of new end bent, is riprap still required down to design high water elevation?	Structures	Revision	Yes. Exavated slope must meet the requirements of Exhibit 4e 2.2.1.8 and Exhibit 4b sections 2.1.22 and 2.1.24. Level-berm-length in front of end bent cap is limited to 4-feet and the slope is required to be 2:1.
12	RFP	4	Exhibit 4b Section 2.1.6	What precautions are required regarding excavation of 2:1 slopes in the vicinity of the gravity sewer line at the US 123 site?	Structures	No_Revision	Excavation methods and limits over the sewer line shall be coordinated with the utility owner based on their design requirements.
13	PIP	Structures	R2_Bridge DGN files	Based-on our review of the information provided, the Microstation Bridge DGN files do not appear to be in the proper scale when opened in the SCDOT workspace. When scaled appropriately, the dimensions also scale up making them ineffective. Can new appropriately scaled files be provided?	Structures	No_Revision	No. DGN files are provided for information only and each team is responsible for providing legible drawings, given differences in each firm's pen tables, plot settings, and CADD software limitations.
14	Attach_B	Survey		Survey at SC 183 over 12 Mile Creek end bent 2 left side seems to have missing information. Will SCDOT be providing any updates to the survey?	Structures	Revision	Revised survey file has been added to the website.



15	RFP	8	<p>The schedule for this project has submittal of Technical Proposals on April 28th, 21 days after final disposition of ATCs. Would SCDOT consider extending this schedule to allow teams more time to develop and QC the technical plans? Recent scoring puts a lot of emphasis on the plans, and we would like to have ample time to maximize this score.</p> <p>All roadway and bridge plans are contingent on the disposition of the ATCs.</p>	PM	Revision	Technical Proposals due date extended to Monday, May 1st.
----	-----	---	--	----	----------	---

