

**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
Bridge Package 31**

RFP for Industry Review #1

Date Received: 12/4/2024

Meeting Date: 12/5/2024

						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	RFP		26 of 85	Will SCDOT consider a time extension to submit the CPM Schedule - say 60 days, allowing the first two months progress payments be submitted and approved while the schedule is being developed, reviewed and finalized?	Construction	No_Revision	No; the project completion date is of great importance to SCDOT and we will need immediate assurance the date of completion will be met.
2	Attach_B	Survey		Will any more survey files for S-52 and S-147 be provided?	DM	No_Revision	Limited surveys have been performed at these sites. It will be the contractor's responsibility to provide full topographical surveys.
3	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z		Due to expedited nature of the projec and close and detour bridge replacements, can teams skip preliminary and/or ROW submittals?	DM	Revision	4z will and the Agreement language will be revised to allow teams at their on risk to go from TP plans directly to Final Bridge Plans. Any sites requiring R/W may at the teams risk go from TP Roadway plans to R/W Roadway plans. For Sites not requiring R/W teams may at their own risk go from TP roadway plans to Final Roadway Plans.
4	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z		Can roadway and bridge submittals for any site be combined into a single submittal package?	DM	Revision	4z and Agreement will be revised to allow submittal of a Roadway and Bridge as one submittal provided the submittal conforms to other requirements and is site specific (do not snd roadway from one site and bridge from another or vice versa).
5	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	284/298	Exhibit 6, Section 2 states that PCE's will be provided in Attachment B prior to final RFP. Please verify the PCE's are being provided for all four (4) sites. Language in previous RFP's in Section 2.6 on the PCE's was removed from this RFP.	Environmental	No_Revision	PCEs will be provided for 3 sites. State Park site will have no PCE or NEPA document prepared by SCDOT.
6	RFP		8 of 85	"CONTRACTOR shall perform all functions within its power to obtain the permit, including mitigation, and SCDOT will fully cooperate in this effort and perform any functions that must be performed by SCDOT. " Will SCDOT pay stream mitigation and/or wetland fees? i.e. for the gabion basket wall at S-147? If not, can SCDOT provide a mitigation fee per foot/acre for DB Teams to use in bidding?	Environmental	No_Revision	All projects are utilizing nationwide 3 for repairs. Mitigation is not anticipated to be needed for repairs. If stream impacts are part of the design, the contractor should utilize USACE Charleston Distruct stream mitigation worksheet for linear footage impact mitigation requirements.
7	RFP		41 of 85	If a NW3 permit is not applicable and/or if after the fact permitting is required, will CONTRACTOR be afforded additional time and/or compensation?	Environmental	No_Revision	After the fact permit will be SCDOT's responsibility.



8	RFP			Will the NEPA document allow for the temporary closure of the Swamp Rabbit Trail – Orange line during construction of S-147?	Environmental	No_Revision	Yes. Coordination with the City has taken place and closure is addressed.
9	RFP			Are tree clearing restrictions anticipated at any sites?	Environmental	No_Revision	No.
10	PIP	Geotechnical		Will any geotechnical information be provided for the four (4) bridge sites.	Geotechnical	No_Revision	Yes, geotechnical information will be provided for all sites by posting of the Final RFP. Some draft information may also be provided in the interim.
11	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f		When will geotech data be available?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	Yes, geotechnical information will be provided for all sites by posting of the Final RFP. Some draft information may also be provided in the interim.
12	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f		Will Attachment B geotech data fully satisfy GDM requirements? If not and considering the aggressive schedule, can GDM requirements be reasonably relaxed to help facilitate timely exploration?	Geotechnical	Revision	GDM Requirements may be relaxed only at the one inaccessible end bridge at the Jones Gap site at the GEOR's discretion. Meet all GDM requirements as per the RFP. Revision only for Exhibit 9.
13	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f		Will borings be required at both bridge abutments for the Jones Gap State Park bridge?	Geotechnical	Revision	No. A revision has been made to Exhibit 9 at the GEOR's discretion.
14	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	Page 4	Will a variance for the minimum setback distance from the top of bank to the abutment toe from Hydraulic Design Bulletin 2019-4 be granted. The current span configurations do not appear to meet this criteria.	Hydrology	Revision	Yes.
15	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	Page 4	Should channel contraction scour be applied to the proposed gabion wall along the Reedy River for S-147. If so what design event should be used to estimate channel scour depths?	Hydrology	Revision	Follow HEC-23 and HDB guidance.
16	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	Page 5	Requesting clarification for what is the intent of the required 2D model. All of the bridges appear to meet this criteria. The current requirements listed in the RFP do not indicate any results from the 2D model would change the design of the bridge replacements. Scour per hydraulic design bulletins specify envelope curves to be used which would not use any output from the 2D model.	Hydrology	No_Revision	2D output can be used with envelope curves. This criteria is included because of the improved modeling that 2D provides with pressure flow, overtopping, and angle of attack greater than 15 degrees.
17	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	Page 4	Will Scour countermeasures be required on S-147 due to the location of the North West abutment near the channel bend as well as the proposed gabion wall parallel to the River?	Hydrology	Revision	Yes - we are adding a requirement in exhibit 4b for riprap at the toe of the gabion wall and for the full height of the 2:1 spill-through slope as it transitions from end of wall around the northwest corner and to a bench elevation underneath Span 1.
18	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	Page 1	Confirm that any improvements to the existing 10' wide box culvert on S-147 will not be included on this project to correct any hydraulic deficiencies.	Hydrology	Revision	Confirmed. Revision in exhibit 4e will be made.



19	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	141 of 298	Can SCDOT clarify pavement design requirements for driveways?	Pavement	Revision	This will be clarified.
20	RFP	4	8 of 23	Section 4.2 - Is the sealed envelope required?	PM	Revision	No, the teams may submit via electronic process detailed in this section.
21	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	PDF Page 128	Section 2.5 states that Total Shoulder Width for S-52 shall be 6 ft while the Typical Section in Attachment B shows a shoulder width of 4'. Please clarify.	Roadway	Revision	6' shoulder is correct. Typical section will be updated.
22	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	129 of 298	S-80: Is leading guardrail required with 35 mph design speed and curb and gutter section?	Roadway	No_Revision	A moment slab barrier is acceptable if MASH compliant guardrail cannot be implemented.
23	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	129 of 298	S-147: Due to location of the end of the bridge and the need to maintain access to the sewer easement and power easment, can guardrail be eliminated on the trailing end of the bridge to the south?	Roadway	No_Revision	Yes. A moment slab barrier is acceptable.
24	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	129 of 298	S-147: Due to the Swamp Rabbit Trail location with respect to the beginning of the bridge, can the approach guardrail be eliminated? Does the swamp rabbit trail need to be relocated to be beyond the MASH barrier treatment?	Roadway	No_Revision	Yes. A moment slab barrier is acceptable.
25	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	129 of 298	S-52: Is pre-MASH barrier allowed on the trailing ends of the bridge to avoid driveway relocations?	Roadway	Revision	Yes. Exhibit 4a updated to allow for S-52 only.
26	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	128 of 298	S-52 shoulder width shown as 6 ft. Roadway typical section shows 4 ft. Please clarify required shoulder width.	Roadway	Revision	6' shoulder is correct. Typical section will be updated.
27	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b		Exhibit 4B of the RFP states "Seismic Design Summary Reports are not required." but Exhibit 4Z lists Preliminary, Final and RFC Seismic Reports as design deliverables. Please clarify.	Structures	Revision	They are not required. Exhibit 4z will be updated.
28	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	PDF page 133	Span arrangement for the S-147 site is defined as 40'-70'-40' but the total bridge length is defined as 140'. Should it be 150' instead?	Structures	Revision	Yes.
29	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	PDF Page 139	A gabion wall has been prescribed for the S-147 Bridge over Reedy River site. No length has been indicated and no criteria specified to determine it. Will SCDOT provide this criteria?	Structures	Revision	Yes. Minimum length will be 200-feet to cover the full length where the river runs along the embankment.
30	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	PDF Page 139	SCDOT provided a detail for gabion revetment; however, the RFP requests a gabion retaining wall. Can SCDOT please provide a detail for the gabion wall and confirm that the intent is to install a gabion wall as opposed to gabion revetment?	Structures	No_Revision	Confirmed that a custom-designed modular gravity wall (earth retaining structure) is required in accordance with the GDM. The draft revetment details in PIP were provided to show an example of the embedment depth calculation, which is consistent with HEC-23 methodology required by Exhibit 4e. SCDOT does not have standard details for gabion walls. See GDM 18.6.3 for a description and Figure 18-12 for a detail.
31	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	133/298	In Section 2.1.7 of Exhibit 4b, should total bridge length for S-147 site be 150'?	Structures	Revision	Yes.



32	RFP		293 of 298	In Section 3.2.2 of Exhibit 9, "the surveyed top of existing concrete bent caps" needs to be provided for the Jones Gap State Park Bridge. Currently there is no survey information provided for this site in Attachment B or the Project Information Package.	Structures	Revision	Survey information for this site will be provided and it should include top of existing bent cap shots.
33	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	133 of 298	Please clarify minimum bridge length of S-147 is 150 ft.	Structures	Revision	Confirmed, will be updated.
34	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	135 of 298	Please clarify that deck drains are not required at Jones Gap.	Structures	Revision	Confirmed. The bridge has no railing, curb, or cross-slope requirements.
35	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	135 of 298	Piles shown do not include any low overhead pile installations. Will SCDOT consider additional pile types such as helical piles, micropiles, or other to avoid costly utility relocations?	Structures	Revision	Micropiles will be added as an allowable end bent pile type for S-147 end of bridge, in the vicinity of the overhead transmission lines.
36	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	138 of 298	Can SCDOT clarify the length of gabion wall required? i.e. provide a minimum station? Define as the tie in point of the roadway to existing? Provide a minimum length from bridge end?	Structures	Revision	200-ft long minimum length will be specified, to cover the full length that the river runs parallel to the roadway embankment.
37	Attach_B	Traffic		The ADTs listed on the 3 Detour Graphics are significantly less than the 2025 Open Year ADTs provided in Exhibit 4a Section 2.3. The ADTs provided in the DFR plans for S-80 do not correlate to either of the previous listed ADTs. Please confirm the correct ADTs for all sites.	Traffic	Revision	The volumes in Exhibit 4a control. The detour drawings will be revised to remove the volume information.
38	Attach_A	Exhibit 7		Are any of the Wet utilities expected to take part of ACT36, if so, how will MOA process work post award?	Utilities	No_Revision	SCDOT has not recieved requests for Act 36 funding at this time.
39	Attach_A	Exhibit 7		Two of the bridges currently have water lines attached to them, will they be allowed to reattach to the new bridges?	Utilities	No_Revision	This is still being determined.
40	Attach_A	Exhibit 7		SJWD noted that they have an 8IN WM bored under the creek at site S-52 but it appears the 8IN DIP is attached to the bridge, is there a second water main that has been bored?	Utilities	Revision	SJWD verified that their line is actually attached to the structure at this site. The RFP will be revised.
41	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e		Exhibit 9 - Page 8 - There is fiber line currently crossing the old bridge location along with a pedestal adjacent to the bridge location, will this change the anticipation that there will be no utility coordination for the Jones Gap State Park Site?	Utilities	No_Revision	SCDOT is waiting for final direction on the conduits. This will be decided prior to Final RFP.

