

**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS  
Bridge Package 18 - Contract ID 2662300 - Horry County**

**RFP FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW**

Date Received: 7/26/2024

Meeting Date: 8/1/2024

						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	5	Section 2.3.d of Exhibit 6 discusses impacts to tidal wetlands and mitigation. According to the RIBITS tool from USACE, there are no mitigation banks with salt marsh/tidal wetland credits available for this site. Does SCDOT anticipate that coordination with USACE for Out-Of-Service-Area request for salt marsh mitigation will be required?	Environmental	No_Revision	Per Exhibit 6 Section 2.1.e, a SCDOT mitigation bank may be used for tidal wetland credits. Huspa Creek Mitigation Bank may be used for tidal credits.
2	Attach_B	Geotechnical		Please provide geotechnical subsurface data report and field testing data files for S-154 over Murrells Inlet Creek.	Geotechnical	No_Revision	Subsurface information was not obtained for this site since it is just a rehab.
3	PIP	Geotechnical		Please provide geotechnical baseline report for S-154 over Murrells Inlet Creek.	Geotechnical	No_Revision	Subsurface information was not obtained for this site since it is just a rehab.
4	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f		Please clarify what if any embankment design and analysis, including seismic, is required at the S-154 bridge.	Geotechnical	No_Revision	This site is a rehab only. No geotechnical design or analysis is required.
5	Attach_A	Exhibit 6		Please provide the USACE design channel and overbank section at S-31.	Hydrology	No_Revision	USACE were contacted and do not have info to provide. Design should not restrict channel from existing condition and bank protection is to be keyed in as to not cause scour. Channel dimensions should remain unimpacted with design since this is a 408 USACE project site.
6	Attach_B	Structures	N/A	Are there any specifications for the Cathodic Protection Work (Design & Construction) other than what is included in the plan notes on the S-154 over Murrells Inlet Creek Conceptual Bridge Plans?	Other	No_Revision	No. Final design and specifications for the CP systems are the responsibility of the design-build team, per the notes on the Conceptual Plans.
7	RFP	8	34 of 41	The Activity Description shown in the Mileston Schedule on Tuesday, September 10, 2024 is missing a ")" and needs to be clarified.	Other	Revision	Will Revise.
8	Attach_A	Agreement	27 of 92	Should the heading on the last column (Right side) of the table in Section IV.A be "Closure Duration" instead of "Construction Time"?	Other	No_Revision	Section c defines the Construction Time of a bridge as beginning when the bridge is fully closed to traffic and ends at Substantial Completion. For this package, since both bridges have approved detours and are required to be reconstructed on alignment, Construction Time is synonymous with Closure Duration.
9	RFP	4	Pages 16-17 of 41	The RFP stipulates the Conceptual Roadway Plans be on 11"x17" sheets. Will SCDOT consider allowing 36"x22" sheets?	Other	Revision	Yes.
10	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a		Please clarify if the 75' right-of-way width at the bridge is to be obtained at the S-154 bridge.	Roadway	Revision	No, it is not. Will revise Exhibit 4a to clarify.
11	Attach_B	Survey		The surveys provided for Attachment B for S-31 appear to be missing a driveway and gate at approximately STA 556+65 LT. This driveway and gate will be impacted by the proposed bridge as designed. Is it the intent of SCDOT to remove this gate and driveway?	Roadway	No_Revision	The gate does appear to have been missed in the survey. Roadway plans in the PIP are provided for information only. Access to Tract 6 must be maintained within the proposed SCDOT ROW.
12	PIP	Structures		Please provide existing bridge plans for S-154 over Murrells Inlet Creek.	Structures	No_Revision	Existing Plans will be provided to all teams via Projectwise.
13	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b		Please clarify if GFRP reinforcing bars are required to be used in the barriers of the S-154 bridge.	Structures	Revision	Will clarify that GFRP rebar is not required in the barriers.



14	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b		The current SCDOT Load Rating Guidance Documents do not appear to address the load rating of bridges that utilize GFRP reinforcing bars. Will any additional load rating guidance or requirements be provided for load rating S-154?	Structures	No_Revision	Bridge Management Office provided the following response to this question: "BrR does not currently have the ability to select GFRP as a rebar option. However, the load rater can manually calculate and apply Point of Interest Capacity Overrides in BrR. Utilizing BrR is important for OSOW permitting and standardization, and is therefore the recommended method for this case versus using alternate software".
15	PIP	Utilities		Please provide utility reports and information for each project.	Utilities	No_Revision	Information will be provided to teams via Projectwise.

