

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

**FINAL RFP - ROUND 1**

Date Received: 1/30/2025

						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	Section 2.1.1 pdf 264 of 266	On S-23-102, is there a minimum distance that needs to be maintained from structures on the potential historic property on Tract 13? The structure closest to the bridge has a corner that has been cut back, however the roof line is still square and extends out further than shown in the survey.	Environmental	No_Revision	There is no minimum distance established.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Section 2.11 pdf 157 of 267	On S-23-102, if Tract 13 is deemed historic, will any right of way acquisition be allowed on this property?	Environmental	No_Revision	Right of way is allowed. However, acquisition will trigger coordination with the SHPO under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act if there is another federal action (e.g. USACE 404 permit).
3	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Section 2.2 pdf 168 of 267	Can SCDOT provide additional borings for S-23-41 at the wall location. The rock elevations vary drastically at this site based on the roadway and bridge borings provided, and none of those are close to the wall. Given the required wall length of 160-ft, rock excation at this location to construct the wall will be a high risk item without having additional data.	Geotechnical	Revision	Yes, an additional boring is being performed at S-23-41 and S-39-32 and additional information will be provided as soon as it is available.
4	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Section 2.2 pdf 168 of 266	Is there a certain storm event or elevation that the top of the gabion wall on S-23-41 needs to be constructed to?	Hydrology	Revision	Hydraulically, the minimum top of wall elevation shall be 2 feet above the design water surface elevation. Geometrically, the top of wall needs to retain standard grading for guardrail and shoulder break.



5	PIP	Hydraulics	Hydro Memos and Models	<p>On S-23-41, the Low Chord used in the provided models was lowered by more than 2-ft from the existing. The conceptual model utilized the "Energy Only" bridge methodology and StreamStats discharges to lower that elevation. When the StreamStats are used along with the "Pressure and/or Weir" methodology, the bridge still meets the hydraulic requirements of the RFP and PCDM-11.</p> <p>The existing bridge has a USGS Gage attached. The USGS Gage flows for this bridge are a more accurate indication of what is happening at this site, and those flows are approximately 2,000 cfs higher than what is shown in StreamStats. That flow difference has a large affect on bridge geometry. When using the USGS flows, the concept bridge does not meet the design criteria of the RFP and may need to be raised and/or lengthened and could potentially need to be multi-span. Any of those changes will greatly affect property access, right of way, and wall height for the gabion basket wall. We understand that the concept plans are for information only, but if the elevations established for Low Chord from the model are incorrect, the impacts for this site vary greatly, which means costs will vary greatly.</p> <p>Please provide guidance on which flows need to be used for this location, StreamStats or USGS.</p>	Hydrology	No_Revision	The 5180 cfs is not a gage flow. This flow is based on Scientific Investigation Report 2009-5156 which is outdated. Use current stream stats flows for design.
6	PIP	Roadway		Based on the Question 9 from the IR, the teams are required to construct a driveway onto Parcel 18. Based on our review of the topography, CZ requirements, and the location of the property lines, this appears not possible. It appears the owner of Tract 18 and 19 are the same, would SCDOT allow a driveway be constructed along Tract 19 to access Tract 18 and if so, due to the existing contours, would a retaining wall be required?	Roadway	No_Revision	The law allows property owners access to all their properties. However, for Parcel 18, due to safety concerns related to the driveway location, it appears impractical to provide a drive. SCDOT will address this through R/W negotiations (i.e. damages). Provide access for all other driveways.
7	PIP	Roadway	Conceptual Roadway Plans	What design vehicle should be used when designing the S-39-26 driveway between the South Saluda River and the Tributary to South Saluda bridges?	Roadway	Revision	Exhibit 4a will be updated to specify the following requirements: The bridge approaches and trailing ends between the Tributary to South Saluda River bridge and the South Saluda River bridge shall only be required to have the MASH compliant stiffness transitions and TL-2 leading end treatments. A WB-62 will be the design vehicle for a replacement driveway for Tract 13 and a passenger car will be the design vehicle for Tract 2.



8	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Section 2.6 pdf 156 of 266	There are is a set of reverse curves on the S-23-41 bridge over the Middle Saluda River that require 6% superelevation. Even when using the Low Volume Criteria, the curves are too close to each other to develop the superelevation properly. The RDM recommends revising the horizontal alignment, but we are locked at this location due to the parallel stream on the north side and the rock outcrop on the south side. Would SCDOT allow teams to use the AASHTO Low Speed Urban superelevation table for this site?	Roadway	Revision	Yes, AASHTO Method 2 is allowable for S-23-41. Will update Exhibit 4a accordingly.
9	PIP	ROW	Conceptual Roadway Plans	SCDOT Response to Question 9, Non-Confidential Responses to RFP for Industry Review 1 indicated that teams are to provide access to Parcel 18 for S-23-102. The survey data in Attachment B indicates that Parcel 18 and the adjacent Parcel 19 are the same property owner. Given this information, do teams still need to acquire right of way to construct a new drive access for Parcel 18?	ROW	No_Revision	The law allows property owners access to all their properties. However, for Parcel 18, due to safety concerns related to the driveway location, it appears impractical to provide a drive. SCDOT will address this through R/W negotiations (i.e. damages). Provide access for all other driveways.
10	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 2		Since S-94 is allowed to be stage constructed, can SCDOT provide requirements for minimum lane widths, allowable speeds, offsets, etc?	Traffic	No_Revision	Reference SCDOT's Procedures and Guidelines for Work Zone Traffic Control.



**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

Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	SCDOT	
					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.

