

NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
Bridge Package 19 - Contract ID 5362310 - Greenville & Pickens Counties

RFP FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW

Date Received: 1/3/2025

Non-Confidential Meeting Date: 1/13/2025

| | | | | | SCDOT | |
|--------------|----------|----------------------|----------------|--|-------------|---|
| Question No. | Category | Section | Page / Doc No. | Question/Comment | Response | Explanation |
| 1 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4 | 150 | The RFP lists the 2007 Standard Specifications manual, however it is our understanding the 2025 manual now takes precedence. Can SCDOT confirm which manual to use? | Revision | Will provide updated Exhibits to comply with 2025 Spec book. Multiple changes made throughout to refer to 2025 Standard Specifications. |
| 2 | RFP | Agreement Section IV | 27 of 92 | Construction time is defined as calendar days from Notice of Demolition, which is to be submitted 30 days prior to beginning demolition. Does that mean that the actual construction time, starting after the demolition notice period, is 30 days less than the number of calendar days listed in the table on page 28? | Revision | Revised. |
| 3 | RFP | Agreement Section IV | 28 of 92 | The DB Team understands the urgency of re-opening closed bridges, but if additional engineering and construction capacity is available, would SCDOT allow additional bridges to be designed and constructed concurrently if they did not affect the direct path for the S-23 bridges to construction? | No_Revision | Yes. Prioritizing closed bridges to reopen first does NOT preclude concurrent work on other bridges. |
| 4 | RFP | | | If construction timelines overlap with the summer occupancy season for northern long-eared bats and tricolored bats (April 1 – July 15), does SCDOT have a protocol for addressing this with the US Fish & Wildlife Service? Or should all clearing activities wait until after July 15? | No_Revision | Construction activities are allowed. Clearing will need to occur outside restriction times. |
| 5 | PIP | Hydraulics | | Hydraulic computer models provided in the Project Information Package appear to be independently developed models. Will SCDOT provide the official FEMA hydraulic computer models for bridge sites within Zone AE Special Flood Hazard Areas – e.g., S-40, S-310, S-94, and S-26? | No_Revision | SCDOT requested all models from FEMA and have provided all that were available from the engineering library. |
| 6 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4a | 155 of 301 | Section 2.10 states trailing end GR is required for all sites except S-94 and S-102. Conceptual plans For S-32 currently show no trailing GR. Can SCDOT provide clarification on whether or not trailing GR is required for this site? | Revision | Exhibit 4a will be updated to clarify. |
| 7 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4a | 155 of 301 | Section 2.6 of the RFP states to utilize the existing horizontal centerlines for LV sites. S-41 is noted as a LV site, however the plan design files utilize a relocated centerline. Can SCDOT provide information on which horizontal CL to utilize at this site? | Revision | Will revise language to allow for relocated centerlines. |



| | | | | | | |
|----|----------|------------|------------|--|-------------|--|
| 8 | Attach_B | Roadway | | The proposed plans show a relocated centerline alignment for the S-94 site. The public meeting displays discussed that a relocated alignment would utilize traffic staging to keep S-94 open to traffic during construction. However, the RFP mentions an 80 day closure window. Can SCDOT confirm if the site is to be stage constructed or close and detoured. If the site is to be staged constructed, can SCDOT provide design requirements for lane, shoulder, and offset width requirements? | No_Revision | PIP plans are for information only. Site S-94 shall be closed and detoured under an 80 day closure window per the Agreement, Section IV.A. |
| 9 | PIP | Roadway | | At the S-102 site, guardrail is currently cutting off access to Parcel 18. How does SCDOT wish to proceed with this area? | No_Revision | PIP plans are for information only. A relocated driveway will be required at Parcel 18 to accommodate the guardrail design requirements. |
| 10 | PIP | Roadway | | Can the proposed CADD files along with the proposed plan and profile view PDFs for the S-310 site be provided? | Revision | Yes. |
| 11 | Attach_B | Structures | 149, 159 | Under Design References, page 149, AASHTO LRFD Design Specifications, 2017, 8th Edition is cited, but on page 159 Section 2.1.1 AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 9th Edition is cited as the design requirement. Can you confirm which LRFD version is required. | Revision | 9th Edition is correct. Design Reference list will be revised. |
| 12 | Attach_B | Roadway | | At the S-94 site, can SCDOT provide the design requirements for the turn lane into Tract 22, required length of storage? | No_Revision | 150 ft of storage for the right turn lane into the school (Tract 22), Figure A-9 in ARMS Manual. |
| 13 | PIP | Traffic | | Can the proposed detour routes be provided? | Revision | Proposed detour routes will be provided. |
| 14 | Attach_A | Exhibit_3 | 145 of 301 | The scope of work states the sites will be constructed on the existing roadway alignment on the existing centerline. There are multiple sites utilizing relocated centerlines. Can clarification or removal of this statement be made? | Revision | Exhibit 3 will be revised to address off-alignment replacements. |
| 15 | PIP | Utilities | | Can SCDOT provide the preliminary utility package report and SUE CADD files and associated SUE sheets? | No_Revision | SCDOT files will be sent to the short-listed teams. |



NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
Bridge Package 19 - Contract ID 5362310 - Greenville & Pickens Counties

RFP FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW - ADDITIONAL

Date Received: 1/9/2025

| Question No. | Category | Section | Page / Doc No. | Question/Comment | SCDOT | |
|--------------|----------|------------|-----------------------------|--|-------------|---|
| | | | | | Response | Explanation |
| 1 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4e | Section 1.0 pdf 184 of 301 | On the northeast corner of the existing S-23-102 bridge, there is currently an overflow discharge pipe coming out of the adjacent property dam that is washed out. The pipe is located 30-35 foot left of approximate station 790+00. What does SCDOT anticipate teams are to do with this pipe if anything. Our concern is if there is a moderate to extreme event and this pipe washed out, the dam would be severely compromised so close to the roadway. | No_Revision | No corrections to be made to pipe. Bridge shall be designed for entire drainage area and flows. |
| 2 | PIP | Roadway | Conceptual Roadway Plans | Please provide the conceptual roadway plans for S-23-310. | Revision | Yes. |
| 3 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4a | Section 2.10 pdf 156 of 301 | The RFP requires teams to "Provide MASH compliant guardrail and/or barrier on all trailing end quadrants of each bridge." The barrier wall on the trailing end of the northwest quadrant of the S-23-41 bridge is less than 40-feet from the driveway for Tract 16. The conceptual plans do not currently show any GR on that trailing end. Will teams be required to meet this GR commitment or will the RFP be revised to allow no GR at this location? | Revision | Exhibit 4a will be updated to clarify. |
| 4 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4a | Section 2.10 pdf 156 of 301 | On S-23-41, the driveway for Tract 16 does not meet sight distance requirements. Is SCDOT going to allow a design exception for Intersection Sight Distance at this location? | No_Revision | A design exception is not required for driveway sight distance. The team will be responsible for ensuring their design will not degrade the existing sight distance available to the Tract 16 driveway. Every effort should be made to improve driveway sight distances to the current standards, but at a minimum they will be kept equal to the existing condition. |



| | | | | | | |
|----|----------|------------|-----------------------------|---|-------------|--|
| 5 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4a | Section 2.10 pdf 156 of 301 | On S-23-41, the driveway for Tract 4 does not meet sight distance requirements. Is SCDOT going to allow a design exception for Intersection Sight Distance at this location? | No_Revision | A design exception is not required for driveway sight distance. The team will be responsible for ensuring their design will not degrade the existing sight distance available to the Tract 4 driveway. Every effort should be made to improve driveway sight distances to the current standards, but at a minimum they will be kept equal to the existing condition. |
| 6 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4a | Section 2.10 pdf 156 of 301 | The RFP requires teams to "Provide MASH compliant guardrail and/or barrier on all trailing end quadrants of each bridge ." The barrier wall on the trailing end of the northwest quadrant of the S-39-32 bridge is less than 33-feet from the driveway for Tract 1. The conceptual plans do not currently show any GR on that trailing end. Will teams be required to meet this GR commitment or will the RFP be revised to allow no GR at this location? | Revision | Exhibit 4a will be updated to clarify. |
| 7 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4a | Section 2.11 pdf 156 of 301 | The Right-of-Way requirements in the RFP specify that teams "provide a minimum right-of-way width of 75 feet on each side of the structure centerline a minimum of 75 feet from each end of the bridge ". On S-23-40, there is a house left of approximate station 26+80 that will be very close to the new required Right-of-Way. Does SCDOT expect that teams are to still obtain the full 75 foot required Right-of-Way at this location? The conceptual plans do not meet the RFP requirements. | Revision | Exhibit 4a will be revised to clarify. |
| 8 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4a | Section 2.11 pdf 156 of 301 | The Right-of-Way requirements in the RFP specify that teams "provide a minimum right-of-way width of 75 feet on each side of the structure centerline a minimum of 75 feet from each end of the bridge ". On S-23-41, there is a house left of approximate station 16+50 that will be within the new required Right-of-Way. Does SCDOT expect that teams are to still obtain the full 75 foot required Right-of-Way at this location? The conceptual plans do not meet the RFP requirements. | Revision | Exhibit 4a will be revised to clarify. |
| 9 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4a | Section 2.11 pdf 156 of 301 | Will teams be required to provide access to Tract 18 on S-23-102? The conceptual plans do not currently provide access. | No_Revision | PIP plans are for information only. A relocated driveway will be required at Parcel 18 to accommodate the guardrail design requirements. |
| 10 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4a | Section 2.11 pdf 156 of 301 | Will teams be required to reset landscaping outside of new Right-of-Way on S-23-94 right of approximate station 15+00 to 18+50? | No_Revision | No, this will be paid for as part of just compensation. This will be handled by the landowner. |



| | | | | | | |
|----|----------|------------|----------------------------------|---|-------------|---|
| 11 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4b | Section 2.2 pdf 167 of 301 | Please provide a standard drawing or specification detailing how you anticipate the shotcrete facing to be applied to the gabion retaining wall for S 23-41. | Revision | We do not have standard details or specifications available. Based on coordination with a company that has applied shotcrete to gabion walls in District 3 in the past, we are adding requirements for dowels, welded wire fabric reinforcing and revising the shotcrete thickness to 6-inches minimum. The intent is to prevent vegetation growth over time and leave 1-foot height free-draining at the toe of wall. The shotcrete is not a structural component of the wall. |
| 12 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4b | Section 3 pdf 167 of 301 | There is a waterline attached to the existing S-32-39 bridge. Is SCDOT going to allow the waterline to be re-attached to the new bridge, if so, what is the anticipated dead load that needs to be accounted for in the design? | No_Revision | Re-attaching the waterline is not being considered at this time. The utility owner needs to plan to relocate. |

