

NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
Bridge Package 32 - Contract ID 5772040 - Bamberg, Calhoun, and Orangeburg Counties

RFP for Industry Review #1 - UPDATED

Date Received: 2/17/2025

Meeting Date: 2/19/2025

						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1			9 of 85	Since roadways are already closed, can the construction of non-permanent work be expanded to include removal of existing structures?	Construction	No_Revision	Yes. An early demo MOT submittal package will be accepted for demolition of existing structures.
2				Does SCDOT have a preference for the order in which the bridges are replaced?	Construction	No_Revision	No.
3	Attach_B			Does SCDOT have an order of magnitude for bridge sites to be opened to the public?	Construction	No_Revision	No.
4	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	PG 69	Does SCDOT have a full depth patching required amount broken out per road?	Construction	No_Revision	No, FDP is a lump sum for the whole contract with locations to be directed by the RCE.
5	Attach_A	Agreement	26	Section IV. Contract Time, A. Project Schedule paragraph 1. Time for Completion of Project; We are given approximately 1 year to complete this project, will SCDOT please reconsider this duration by adding an additional 6 to 8 months?	Construction	No_Revision	No.
6	Attach_A	Agreement	7	Section II.B.2 of the Agreement - Can SCDOT change "may rely on geotechnical and survey information provided in Attachment B", to "may rely on all information provided in Attachment B"?	Construction	No_Revision	No changes will be made to this section.
7	Attach_A	Agreement	61	Based on other recent emergency projects, DOT stated when the NTP would be issued. Does DOT have any anticipated dates?	Construction	No_Revision	SCDOT has noticed that much of the time to execute a Contract is dependent on the Contractors or other third-party entities and we are not going to list an execution date in the Contract. However, these emergencies are taking an average of 3 weeks from public announcement to NTP.
8	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	4	Simultaneous design of more than one site at a time will be needed to meet the schedule. Can more than 1 site be submitted at the same time in one submittal package for preliminary, ROW submittal or Final submittals?	DM	No_Revision	No.
9	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	4	Will SCDOT allow the Technical Proposal Conceptual Plans to be submitted as Preliminary Plans post award for the purpose of expediting utility relocation?	DM	No_Revision	Yes. 4z section 1.2 allows for this.



10	PIP			Would SCDOT consider extending all deadlines at least 1-week since no survey, geotech, CADD files, etc. have been provided to the DB teams?	DM	No_Revision	No.
11	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	4	Section 2.0 - Are preliminary plan submittals required for all 6 sites?	DM	Revision	Currently yes. If desired, SCDOT can revise 4z to allow for teams to begin plan submittal at the R/W phase at their own risk.
12	Attach_A	Agreement	10	Section II.D.3 - "A complete submittal package shall be limited to one phase (ex. Preliminary/Right Of Way (ROW)/Final/Release For Construction (RFC)) of one roadway segment or structure and include all design deliverables specified in Exhibit 4z". Will SCDOT allow roadway and structures submittal packages be combined as one submittal package for a single site (similar to Package 29 RFP verbiage)?	DM	Revision	Yes. 4z will be revised to allow for a roadway and bridge submittal to occur simultaneously for single sites.
13	Attach_A	Agreement	10	Section II.D.6 - Will SCDOT allow more than one site submittal package to be submitted together as one package? Or is each site submittal package to follow the 5 day requirement in Agreement Section II.D.6?	DM	No_Revision	No.
14	Attach_A	Agreement	10	Section II.D.6 states that no more than one new submittal package shall be uploaded to ProjectWise within a five business day period. Given the accelerated nature of this project, will SCDOT consider allowing more than one new submittal package per five day period for preliminary and/or ROW packages?	DM	No_Revision	No.
15	RFP			Would SCDOT be open to allowing a limited number of ATCs similar to Emergency Package 2020-2, where only Formal ATCs were submitted?	DM	No_Revision	No due to time constraints.
16	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	4	Section 2.0 - Are ROW plan submittals required for all 6 sites?	DM	Revision	Currently yes. If desired, SCDOT can revise 4z to allow for teams to begin plan submittal at the Final phase at their own risk.
17	Attach_A	Agreement	41	Section IX.A - Can SCDOT please verify that USACE Nationwide 3 Permit (NW3) are applicable to all 6 sites? Please also verify that SCDOT will be obtaining these permits and not the Contractor?	Environmental	No_Revision	Yes. SCDOT will provide the NW3 checklists.
18	Attach_A	Agreement	42	Section X - Will SCDOT be conducting Environmental Compliance inspections or contractor?	Environmental	No_Revision	SCDOT will conduct compliance inspections but the contractor is required to comply with commitments and permit conditions as applicable regardless if SCDOT inspects or not.
19	Attach_A	Agreement	42	Section X. Environmental Compliance, paragraph 1; It is noted that a revised Exhibit 6 will be provided prior to the Final RFP. Does SCDOT have an anticipated date for when environmental information will be provided?	Environmental	Revision	This information will be provided alongside RFP for IR #2.
20	RFP			Item 14 of the NWP 3 checklist requires a PCN if impacts exceed 1/10 acre of WOTUS. Will the Contractor responsible for preparing a PCN if impacts are expected to exceed 1/10 acre?	Environmental	No_Revision	Yes. If impacts exceed the 0.1 ac threshold, the Team shall prepare the PCN with associated supportin information and provide to the Department. The Department will coordinate with the USACE.



21	RFP			If a PCN is required, can it be submitted during / post construction? Or is USACE approval required before construction can begin?	Environmental	Revision	If impacts require a PCN, the contractor shall prepare the PCN prior to construction and SCDOT shall coordinate with the USACE.
22	RFP			Is the contractor responsible for wetland mitigation?	Environmental	Revision	If impacts require a PCN and mitigation, the Team shall identify an approved mitigation bank with the appropriate service area and quantify necessary mitigation credits. The Department will coordinate the acquisition of the credits during coordination with the USACE on the permit.
23	RFP			Item 14 of the NWP 3 checklist requires a PCN if impacts exceed 1/10 acre of WOTUS. Will the Contractor responsible for preparing a PCN if impacts are expected to exceed 1/10 acre?	Environmental	No_Revision	See answer to Question 20.
24	RFP			If a PCN is required, can it be submitted during / post construction? Or is USACE approval required before construction can begin?	Environmental	Revision	See answer to Question 21.
25	RFP			Is the Contractor responsible for compensatory mitigation?	Environmental	Revision	See answer to Question 22.
26	Attach_B	Geotechnical	N/A	When is geotechnical information expected to be posted to website?	Geotechnical	Revision	This will be provided prior to issuance of RFP for Industry Review #2.
27	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	4	Section 2.2.2 - Does the existing model mean the pre-washout condition or the washed out condition?	Hydrology	Revision	Existing model refers to the pre-washout condition. These locations most likely do not have existing models and will have to be created.
28	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	4	Section 2.2.1.4 - Does the backwater need to meet the pre-washout condition or washed out condition?	Hydrology	Revision	Backwater comparison shall be based on pre-washout condition.
29	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2	Section 2.2 - The SCDOT's PCDM-11 Low Volume Criteria states "The freeboard should be at least 1 foot for the design event. Additionally, free surface flow should be maintained through the bridge for the 100-year (1% AEP) event"; this statement is vague and leaves the contractor at risk as to what the Department views as what "should" be utilized for criteria. Can the SCDOT provide more definitive criteria for freeboard within Exhibit 4e such as "shall" statements (i.e. free board shall be one foot or greater at all applicable sites) for bridges which are applicable to the PCDM-11 Low Volume Criteria?	Hydrology	Revision	Exhibit 4e changes will be made.



30	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	3	Section 2.2.1.5 - RFP states "Low Chord elevations shall meet HDB 2019-4 criteria for S-22 and S-39." HDB 2019-4 states "The low chord of a replacement bridge should not be below the low chord of the existing bridge". Can SCDOT please clarify if the proposed bridge low chord is required to at a minimum match the existing low chord for S-22 and S-39 sites?	Hydrology	Revision	Exhibit 4e changes will be made.
31	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	3	Section 2.2.1.5 - What are the existing low chord elevations for S-22 and S-39? It will not be possible to determine this with survey data since the bridges have failed.	Hydrology	Revision	Existing structures had no low chord. Changes to exhibit 4e will be made.
32	PIP	Hydraulics	N/A	Can SCDOT please provide any additional hydro models? How were remaining 5 sites bridge/culvert lengths estimated?	Hydrology	No_Revision	SCDOT has provided the info that the department has available.
33	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	3	RFP says shall use HDB-2019-4 for backwater; HDB 2019-4 states "All bridges should be designed so that backwater for the 1-percent AEP flood is one (1) foot or less when compared to the unrestricted or natural conditions in the stream reach upstream of the proposed bridge". Is the one foot or less proposed backwater a requirement for S-22 and S-39 sites?	Hydrology	No_Revision	Yes.
34	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	3	Section 2.2.1.4 - Will SCDOT consider allowing S-39 over Cooper Creek to match existing backwater condition and not necessarily meet 1' maximum? Based on our hydro modeling it appears that the proposed back water is an issue with this criteria, and a bridge longer than 100' may be required to meet the backwater requirements. If the bridge is greater than 100' to meet backwater then there is not an allowable alternative that can be used for this bridge with the way the current RFP is written. Can flat slabs be used for bridge lengths greater than 100'?	Hydrology	No_Revision	S-39 shall meet the 1 foot of backwater criteria. A single span cored slab / box beam bridge is preferred at this site to eliminate need for seismic modelling. If a 100' box beam bridge definitely cannot meet criteria, please let us know.
35	PIP			Will SCDOT provide HECRAS models for the other 5 sites?	Hydrology	No_Revision	SCDOT has provided the info that the department has available.
36	PIP	Survey	N/A	When are surveys and SUE expected to be posted to SCDOT website? Will all 6 surveys and SUE be posted at the same time?	PM	No_Revision	Survey information will be provided as received but no later than 2/27. Geotechnical information will be provided 2/18. Other information will be provided as it becomes available. There will be no SUE information outside of what is or will be provided in Exhibit 7 and PIP.
37	RFP	9	23	Section 9.0 - Provide RFP for Industry Review #2 milestone schedule shows February 13, 2025, please verify?	PM	Revision	This was an oversight from a previous schedule. This will be adjusted. RFP for IR #2 will be posted this Thursday, 2/20.



38	Attach_A	Agreement	72	Section XVIII - Can SCDOT please provide the Project Numbers (P0xxxxx) for S-1210, S-634, S-191 and S-458?	PM	Revision	The RFP will be updated per this request.
39	RFP	9	23	Section 9 - NCQ/CQ questions due by 8am on Mondays requires the bidding teams to work/upload the questions over the weekends. Can the 8am be pushed to the afternoon, say 2pm, or Tuesdays at 8am?	PM	Revision	We will shift submittal times to Mondays by 12:00 PM.
40	Attach_A	Agreement	39	Section VII. Utilities and Railroad Coordination, B. Railroad, paragraph 3; On the fifth line of this paragraph 'CONTRACTOR SCDOT' appears, and we believe one should be removed, can SCDOT please revise?	PM	Revision	This will be corrected.
41	Attach_B	Survey		Will survey files, geotech & lead & asbestos reports, SUE, CADD files for each site be provided as part of Attachment B? If so, please provide date when information will be posted.	PM	No_Revision	Survey information will be provided as received but no later than 2/27. Geotechnical information will be provided 2/18 within Attachment B. CADD files would be provided in PIP.
42	Attach_A	Exhibit_3		Should the DOT website list match Pg 126 regarding S-38-634 over Cooper Swamp instead of Snake Swamp?	PM	Revision	Yes, this will be corrected.
43	RFP			Please update date for RFP IR2 in milestone schedule.	PM	Revision	This will be updated.
44	Attach_B			When does SCDOT anticipate providing survey, geotechnical, and other information?	PM	No_Revision	Survey information will be provided as received but no later than 2/27. Geotechnical information will be provided 2/18. Other information will be provided as it becomes available.
45	PIP	Roadway	N/A	Is SCDOT expecting to post conceptual roadway plans and or conceptual bridge plans for any of the 6 sites?	Roadway	No_Revision	No.
46	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	3	Section 2.10 - It does not appear that the Non-Mow Strip Detail is provided within Attachment B, will this detail be provided?	Roadway	Revision	Yes.
47	Attach_B	Roadway	N/A	Traffic Projections - Can SCDOT also provide truck % for all 6 sites?	Roadway	Revision	Yes.
48	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2	Section 2.6 - Can SCDOT please confirm grade adjusted K values are not required for this project?	Roadway	Revision	Confirmed. Will update Exhibit 4a to clarify.
49	PIP	Roadway	N/A	Are there any existing roadway plans for S-39 over Cooper Swamp? We cannot locate on SCDOT's Plans Online.	Roadway	No_Revision	If existing plans are found during procurement, they will be provided to the teams.
50	RFP			If existing causeway is unprotected, is guardrail required to the length it is no longer necessary, or simply protect the ends of the structure?	Roadway	No_Revision	Guardrail is required to the extent practical for each site. Each team should use their best engineering judgement on the design of guardrail. The expectation is not to chase existing deficiencies outside of the bridge replacement project.



51	RFP		134 of 302	Can minimum grade of 5% be reduced at tie-in to existing roadway if existing is flatter?	Roadway	No_Revision	Yes, at tie-ins to an existing grade less than 0.5% is acceptable and standard practice.
52	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a		Please confirm 11 ft lanes are acceptable with Rural - Major Collector and 60 mph design speed for S-39	Roadway	No_Revision	Confirmed, that design criteria is based on the existing conditions and the limited information available at this time.
53	PIP	Survey		Due to the significant washout locations and erosion of banks, will SCDOT provide approximate top of bank lines?	Hydrology	Revision	No. Abutment setback will not be based on top of bank lines for this project. New 2:1 abutment slopes shall be set based on a projection of the natural channel bottom. A revision in the Exhibit 4b will be made. Minimum bridge opening will be set based off keeping proposed abutment slope toes outside of existing out-to-out culvert limits.
54	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	3	Section 2.11 - Are permissions/temporary ROW allowed at any sites?	ROW	No_Revision	Rights of Entry and Acquisitions will be based on successful Contractor's plans. If temporary construction easements (TCEs) are necessary, this should be conveyed in ROW or Final Plan submittal and will be secured accordingly.
55	Attach_B	Structures	3	Revisions to SDS Section 5.1.8 - Can SCDOT please verify that 50% of Live Load is needed for seismic design?	Structures	Revision	The live loading requirement will be removed for this project
56	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2	Section 2.1.6 - Recommend to remove "All adjacent cored slab or box beam bridges on this project shall consist of a single span". If the intent of this statement is to prevent small spans/interior bents in the channel then we recommend to provide a minimum channel span for each site (except S-22).	Structures	No_Revision	The intent is to receive a single span bridge at every cored slab or box beam bridge site (every bridge site except S-22). We believe this will be feasible hydraulically. Is there a concern with needing more than a 100' box beam at any particular site? Concur. Instead of prescribed minimum channel spans, the minimum opening will be set by keeping the proposed 2:1 abutment toe of slope outside of the existing culvert limits.
57	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2	Section 2.1.6 - Do any of the sites require a skew?	Structures	No_Revision	No
58	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	4	Section 3.1 states "Plans shall be submitted electronically as a landscape 22"x36" pdf file." Can SCDOT confirm that bridge plans are to submitted as 22x34" pdf file? For a potential culvert, is 22x36 or 22x34 required?	Structures	Revision	Confirmed - bridge plans need to conform to the new 22"x34" sheet size. Culvert plans should be sized to fit in the roadway plan set , so 22"x36" sheet size is required.
59	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	4	Section 2.0 - For potential culverts, can SCDOT confirm that bridge plans are not required, and only roadway structures sheets are sufficient?	Structures	No_Revision	Confirmed - culvert plans shall be included in the final roadway plan set, in accordance with the "Roadway Structure Plan Preparation Requirements" in Attachment B.
60	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	7	Section 3 - Are new asset IDs and load ratings required for non-bridge sized culverts (< 20')?	Structures	No_Revision	No. If the structure does not meet the LRGD definition of bridge, asset ID is not assigned and load rating is not required.
61	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	1	Can SCDOT please provide what materials are allowed for potential pipe alternatives used as the main crossing for the sites? Only reinforced concrete?	Hydrology	Revision	Yes. RCP is required. Changes to exhibit 4e will be made.
62	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	4	Section 2.1.15 - Can SCDOT please verify that sheet piles are not allowed as foundation elements?	Structures	No_Revision	Confirmed. Sheet piles are not listed as an acceptable pile type.



63	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	7	Section 2.2- Can SCDOT please verify that any type of retention systems (sheet piles, concrete walls, etc) are not allowed to be placed in front of end bents?	Structures	No_Revision	Confirmed. RFP states that spill-through abutment slopes are required and retaining walls are not allowed.
64	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	7	Section 3 - For a potential triple 108' RC pipe system crossing (bridge sized), can SCDOT please verify a load rating is required?	Structures	No_Revision	Confirmed. The pipe system mentioned would qualify as a bridge per LRGD technical note 10.
65	RFP			Section 2.1.6 - Can pipes be used in lieu of RCBC assuming hydraulic criteria is met? Say maximum 2 pipes?	Structures	Revision	Pipe culverts will be allowed at the low-volume sites, the two existing sites where dual pipes are being replaced: S-634 & S-458 , provided hydraulic criteria is met. 3 pipes maximum will be allowed.
66	RFP			Will SCDOT consider using a cored slab or box beam bridge with concrete overlay as an alternate bridge type for S-22?	Structures	No_Revision	No. A flat slab bridge is required at S-22.
67	Attach_B	Structures	2.1.6	Can the DB Team select a superstructure of their choosing per the BDM instead of being required to utilize a flat slab bridge on S-22? This would allow each team to design and build said site using their best and preferred methods.	Structures	No_Revision	No. A flat slab bridge is required at S-22.
68	Attach_B	Structures	2.1.14	Based on the span configuration of S-22 and the requirements of one drain per span, deck drainage may be required to spill into the waterway. Will SCDOT allow this?	Structures	No_Revision	Yes. There are no environmental restrictions preventing scupper discharge over water on S-22.
69	Attach_B	Traffic	N/A	Is SCDOT expecting to provide the other 4 site detour routes?	Traffic	No_Revision	No. Only S-22 and S-39 require posted detour routes. The four remaining bridges only require road closure signs per standard drawing
70	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	4	Can SCDOT verify that Williston Telephone has facilities within project limits and verify contact information?	Utilities	Revision	Yes, SCDOT is still in active coordination with all utilities
71	Attach_B	Utilities		How does SCDOT intend to handle ACT 36 utility relocations. Due to the expedited schedule and recent issues with approvals for paperwork, there are concerns with having the waterline information finalized and incorporated into the schedules.	Utilities	Revision	SCDOT is in active coordination with both wet utilities (Orangeburg DPU on S-39 and Silver Springs Rural Water on S-191).
72	Attach_B	Utilities		Will SCDOT provide a utility package?	Utilities	Revision	SCDOT will provide all documents received from the utilities.



NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
Bridge Package 32 - Contract ID 5772040 - Bamberg, Calhoun, and Orangeburg Counties

RFP for Industry Review #2

Date Received: 2/24/2025

Meeting Date: 2/26/2025

						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	PIP	Survey		Follow up question to #53: Can SCDOT provide a minimum channel width for bidding purposes? Perhaps define the minimum required channel width as the previous culvert width?	DM	No_Revision	Revision was included in RFP IR2. However, criteria will be further reviewed prior to Final RFP and ammended as necessary. (Elimination of pipe/box culverts as an option at several sites)
2	PIP	Hydraulics		Package 32 Info: Can SCDOT Clarify the two sites where pipe culverts are allowed are the S-1210 in Orangeburg County, and S-458 in Bamberg County?	DM	Revision	Given the difficulties of meeting hydraulic criteria at several sites, revisions will be made to require bridge structures at all sites except S-1210 where pipe/box culvert criteria will be provided.
3	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	1	Section 1.2 - "Teams may elect to proceed from Conceptual Plans submitted with their Technical Proposals to Final Bridge Plans at their own risk for all sites." This seems to contradict the paragraph beforehand that states that ROW Submittals are required for all sites which require new ROW (which appears to be all sites). Can SCDOT please clarify?	DM	Revision	Since all sites appears to require R/W, the sentence will be reviewed to require R/W submittals with a caveat that if no R/W is required, the teams may elect to go straight to Final submittal at their risk.
4	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f	3	Section 2.3 - "Seismic design of the bridge structures, roadway structures, and bridge embankments shall be required in accordance with the SCDOT Geotechnical Design Manual and SCDOT Seismic Design Specifications for Highway Bridges." Can SCDOT please also add/clarify the new seismic requirements for the S-39 bridge structure here to include reference to Exhibit 4b?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	No, because the requirements are not the same. While a detailed seismic analysis of the bridge structure may not be required, geotechnical seismic analysis is still required. Geotechnical seismic analysis is not required for box culverts.
5	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	1	2.0 Submittal Packages - Can SCDOT verify that Preliminary Roadway/Bridge Geotechnical Reports are not required for the Low Volume Criteria sites (S-1210, S-634, S-458 & S-191)?	Geotechnical	Revision	Preliminary summary reports are not required for low volume criteria sites.
6	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	1	2.0 Submittal Packages - Can SCDOT verify that Geotechnical Roadway/Bridge Summary Reports for Low Volume Bridges are required instead of "Final/RFC Roadway/Bridge Geotechnical Reports" for the Low Volume Criteria sites (S-1210, S-634, S-458 & S-191)?	Geotechnical	Revision	Yes, only summary reports are required for low volume criteria sites.
7	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	1	2.0 Submittal Packages - Can the Geotechnical Roadway Summary Report for Low Volume Bridges and Geotechnical Bridge Summary Report for Low Volume Bridges be combined into one report for the Low Volume Criteria sites (S-1210, S-634, S-458 & S-191)?	Geotechnical	Revision	Yes, if the roadway plans and bridge plans are submitted concurrently. Note a revision has also been made to the Agreement to allow for roadway and bridge to be submitted for a single site as one submittal package.
8	Attach_B	Hazmat	N/A	S-22 Asbestos Report cover states ACM was found, but Section 5 Recommendations of the report states no suspect materials were found, can SCDOT please verify if there are no suspected asbestos materials at S-22 site?	HazMaterial	Revision	No asbestos was found for S-22. The report will be revised and provided.



9	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	3	<p>Follow up question to #33 and #34: Existing backwater at S-39 over Cooper Swamp is approximately 2.4 ft. The bridge length required to reduce the backwater to 1 ft or less as compared to natural conditions is considerably more than 100 ft.</p> <p>Will SCDOT consider a design exception to allow a backwater elevation up to the existing condition? Limit the bridge to 100 ft single span box beam, or set other criteria to control the length of this structure?</p>	Hydrology	No_Revision	Backwater requirement is to remain at 1.5 feet as stated in IR2.
10				<p>LVBRC uses a 25 yr Design Storm for freeboard requirements, with an allowance that roadways that currently overtop can continue to overtop (50 ft from bridge ends).</p> <p>For the two sites where pipes are allowed, is the roadway allowed to continue to overtop? Is there an offset requirement?</p>	Hydrology	Revision	Exhibit 4e will be revised to specifically address the S-1210 project site. Bridges shall be required at all other sites.
11				<p>What design storm should be used to set the hydraulic capacity of the pipe? Or is it just an improvement over existing?</p>	Hydrology	Revision	The design event for roadway drainage is discussed in Part 2 of the Requirement for Hydraulic Design Studies section 2.2.2 of the requirement for roadway drainage. A revision will be made to exhibit 4e for any exceptions.
12				<p>If the roadway profile is elevated (for upsized pipes and adequate cover) for a roadway that is currently overtopping, the backwater will be increased unless the hydraulic opening is sized to accommodate the 100 yr storm. Will SCDOT consider a design variance for backwater at the two sites allowing pipes? Or maintain the existing profile such that the overtopping is maintained as currently exists.</p>	Hydrology	Revision	Bridges are required at all sites except S-1210. Pipe culvert design at S-1210 shall have no negative impact on existing hydraulic condition. Existing WSE's shall not increase for any design event up to and including the 1% AEP (100-year).
13	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e		<p>At all sites where box culverts or pipes are allowed, we are seeing a rise in the 500-yr storm due to the increase in embankment. Can SCDOT confirm having a rise in the 500-yr storm is acceptable if all other criteria is met?</p>	Hydrology	Revision	All sites with the exception of S-1210 will require bridge structures. Criteria will be provided for S-1210
14	PIP	Hydraulics		<p>Based on the available information, the S-39 site cannot meet the requirements for the 100' bridge hydraulically. Can SCDOT provide a new estimated bridge length?</p>	Hydrology	No_Revision	A 100' bridge is not required. The length of the bridge is an estimated length based on minimal information.
15	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	1	<p>Exhibit 4b and Exhibit 4e do not mention usage of headwalls. Are headwalls required for all pipes? Or is there a minimum pipe size that would not require a headwall? Are headwalls required for pipe systems (such as the estimated triple 108" Pipes for S-634 over Cooper Swamp)?</p>	Hydrology	Revision	All sites with the exception of S-1210 will require bridge structures. Criteria will be provided for S-1210 which will include headwall, bank stabilization and riprap requirements.



16	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	4	Section 2.2.1.5 Low Chord - There appears to be a contradiction; where bullet 2 states "Low Chord elevations shall meet HDB 2019-4 criteria for S-22 and S-39 and shall not be below the low chord of the existing bridge" however bullet 3 states "Existing bridge low chords for S-22 and S-39 will not be considered for design of new structures since the existing structures were not bridges". Can SCDOT please confirm that the existing low chord does not need to be matched for the S-22 and S-39 sites?	Hydrology	Revision	Exhibit 4e will be revised.
17	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	5	Section 2.2.2 states to use the USGS regression equations to generate discharges for the SCDOT runs. Are these SCDOT runs and USGS discharges required to be run as steady state or unsteady state analyses?	Hydrology	Revision	Steady state analyses shall be used.
18	Attach_B	Survey	N/A	Is SCDOT still expecting to provide the remaining 4 surveys (S-458, S-1210, S-191 & S-S-634) by 2/27?	PM	No_Revision	Yes these will be provided no later than Thursday, 2/27.
19	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2	Section 2.6 Vertical Alignment - Can minimum grades be changed to 0.3%?	Roadway	Revision	Sure.
20	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	4	Section 2.1.13 - Can SCDOT please verify that vertical face barriers with moment slab are required on each side of roadway above proposed pipe and/or box culverts?	Structures	No_Revision	At proposed pipe or box culvert sites, concrete moment-slab barrier is required when standard guardrail-post-installation conflicts with the pipe or box culvert. This is stated in the box culvert design criteria in Attachment B. Proposed pipe sites shall follow SCDOT standard drawings for pipes and guardrail. Section 2.1.13 in Exhibit 4b is criteria for new bridges.
21	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2	Section 2.1.7 states "For S-39 over Cooper Swamp, allowable structure types are outlined in Sections 12.3.2.1, 12.3.2.2, 12.3.2.3, 12.3.2.4, and 12.2.3.5 of the BDM as well as design memo DM0424 and DM0524. For the flat slab option, utilize the standard span lengths and continuous unit configurations available on the SCDOT Structural Drawings and Details website." For the flat slab option, are D/B teams only limited to using the latest standard drawing span configurations? For examples, a 40'-40'-40'-40'-40' single continuous unit or 40'-30' single continuous unit span configurations would not be allowed since it is not within the latest standard drawing configurations?	Structures	No_Revision	Yes. The intent is to use the latest standard drawing span configurations.
22	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2 & 3	Section 2.1.7 states DM0424 and DM0524 are to be used for cored slab and box beam bridges. DM0424 states "Cored slab bridges shall be limited to tangent vertical grades of 4% or less or on slight crest vertical curves." DM0524 states "Box beam bridges shall be limited to tangent vertical grades of 4% or less or on slight crest vertical curves". Slight crest vertical curves language is vague. Can SCDOT please define a maximum crest vertical curve K-value to be used on cored slab/box beam structures?	Structures	No_Revision	For this project, slight crest vertical curvature is defined as any crest vertical curve that meets the roadway criteria in Exhibit 4a and RDM. Sag vertical curves on the bridge are disallowed by DM0424 & DM0524.
23	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	4	Section 2.1.14 states "Bridge end drainage shall consist of a single standard concrete flume at each corner receiving deck discharge. Limit flume bypass flow to 0.20 cubic feet per second". Can SCDOT modify the first sentence to state "Bridge end drainage shall consist of a single standard concrete flume (minimum) at each corner receiving deck drainage" to allow for additional flumes to be incorporated if bypass flow exceeds 0.20 cubic feet per second (or similar language to allow for multiple flumes at each corner)?	Structures	No_Revision	No. The intent to use a sufficient number of deck drains in combination with a single flume.



24	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	4	S-634 over Cooper Swamp - Is there any additional information SCDOT can provide for the waterline on the south side?	Utilities	No_Revision	This is currently thought to be an irrigation line and will be handled as a ROW item.
25	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	4	S-634 over Cooper Swamp - The AT&T (phone) was not observed on our team's site visit; can SCDOT provide any additional information or verify this utility is going to be potentially impacted?	Utilities	No_Revision	AT&T has indicated their line ends outside of the project limits.
26	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	2	S-22 over Caw Caw Swamp - Alltel/Verizon utility boxes/pedestals were observed on our team's site visit. Can SCDOT verify that these lines are abandoned and/or potentially add information?	Utilities	No_Revision	We will verify with Verizon the status of these facilities.
27	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	1	Is SCDOT expecting to provide any additional utility information prior to the March 12 Technical Proposal Submittal?	Utilities	No_Revision	Yes, and this information will be provided as it is received
28	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	3	S-191 over Roberts Swamp - Does the Silver Springs Rural Water relocation, which is expected to go in-contract under ACT 36 per Exhibit 7, need to be included in the contractor's bid? Or will this relocation be paid for by SCDOT outside of the contractor's bid?	Utilities	No_Revision	The Act 36 relocation costs will not be part of the cost proposal and is expected to be handled via change order post-award.
29	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	3	S-191 over Roberts Swamp - Can SCDOT please provide Silver Springs Rural Water's preferred contractor list?	Utilities	No_Revision	Silver springs is in process of providing this information to SCDOT
30	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	1	Can SCDOT provide all utility coordination (emails/meeting minutes/etc) that has been performed to date to teams through SCDOT's ProjectWise?	Utilities	No_Revision	Yes, this will be provided
31	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	1	Several waterlines may need relocations; will SCDOT allow a relocated waterline to be attached/mounted to any of the new bridges?	Utilities	No_Revision	No attachments have been approved at this time.



NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
Bridge Package 32 - Contract ID 5772040 - Bamberg, Calhoun, and Orangeburg Counties

Final RFP

Date Received: 3/3/2025

Meeting Date: 3/5/2025

						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A			Would SCDOT allow borings at the proposed end bents of S-22 be used for all bent design, or will borings be required at the interior bents as prescribed. Access to the interior bent borings will be difficult. In this region, it is anticipated the geology and soil profile will be uniform across the entire bridge length.	Geotechnical	No_Revision	Boring frequency is required to meet the SCDOT Geotechnical Design Manual. The design may progress at the discretion and risk of the DB Team prior to obtaining the additional borings. The additional borings may be obtained once the Contractor has mobilized and is able to provide access for the additional borings with reports and plans revised to include the additional borings and any design revisions needed based on findings of the additional borings.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	1	Section 2.1.6 - Has debris potential been evaluated at the S-1210 site? Is it safe to assume that debris potential will not need to be evaluated if a pipe system is chosen? Or will the design-build team need to still evaluate the debris potential post-award?	Hydrology	No_Revision	Debris potential has not been evaluated at the S-1210 site. DB team will need to evaluate debris potential as they would in any other culvert crossing project.
3	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	3	Section 2.1.9 - Should "Existing WSEs" be instead "Proposed WSEs"?	Hydrology	Revision	Yes. A revision will be made.
4	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2	Section 2.1.6 states to use the design event for the S-1210 system. RHDS Section 2.3.D states "Base of headwater must be at least 1' below the subgrade of the roadway" and "design head should be limited to 1.2*the height of the culvert barrel" - are these criteria to be used for the design of the S-1210 system if it is considered non-bridge sized?	Hydrology	Revision	Yes. If the combined opening is less than 20 feet then roadway drainage criteria will be met except otherwise stated in exhibit 4e.
5	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2	Section 2.1.6 - Does a bridge sized pipe system for S-1210 need to free flow for the 100-year event?	Hydrology	Revision	Yes. If the combined opening is more than 20 feet then low volume bridge criteria will have to be met.
6	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2	Section 2.1.6 - Does a bridge sized pipe system for S-1210 need to provide a 1' freeboard to the design event?	Hydrology	Revision	Yes. If the combined opening is more than 20 feet then low volume bridge criteria will have to be met.
7	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c		At Contractor's decision, is it acceptable to use intermediate in lieu of base for the full depth of the base and intermediate levels?	Pavement	Revision	We can allow the intermediate substitution for HMA Base on the gab options with both intermediate and base requirements so S-191 in Orangeburg and S-22 in Calhoun.



8				S-1210 current AWS is approx. 2 inches. Considering construction traffic and anticipation that roadway will need repair, will SCDOT require Contractor to repave entire roadway with surface repair to match existing condition, full depth patching (2 inches), or full depth asphalt as required by design?	Pavement	Revision	Patching quantity will be increased to account for potential construction traffic repairs within the project limits of this location.
9	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2	Section 2.8 - Is AASHTO Method 2 superelevation development allowed for sites with 35 mph design speed?	Roadway	No_Revision	No the RDM specifies to only use for urban streets & this project has no urban roadways, but utilize the supplemental design criteria for Low Volume Bridge Replacement Project where applicable which leaves room for engineering judgement.
10	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2	Section 2.9 - Does the department consider riprap pads at the ends of flumes to be considered a hazard that needs to be analyzed for guardrail length of need?	Roadway	No_Revision	Yes.
11	Attach_B	Structures	6	The response to Question #6 from the Additional Questions from 2/26/2025 Open-Forum states "Ignore the washed-out ground conditions when applying this criteria. In plan view, the proposed abutment toes shall not encroach on the existing culvert limits", which appears to be contradictory. The proposed toe of slope would need to tie into the washed out condition. Can SCDOT please verify that the proposed toe of slopes in plan view cannot exceed the existing culvert limits?	Structures	No_Revision	Confirmed - proposed toe of slopes in plan view cannot exceed the existing culvert limits. This is the current RFP language. We understand that with the washed-out conditions, this will result in longer bridges.
12	Attach_A			Since S-458 is on a curve, can SCDOT confirm the bridge width will not be allowed to follow DM 0120?	Structures	No_Revision	We believe the intent of DM0120 language is consistent with the RFP requirements. For S-458, the minimum shoulder width (4-feet) shall be provided when a horizontal curve is located on a cored-slab bridge. This typically results in the addition of one slab unit on low-volume projects.
13	Attach_B	Roadway	N/A	Can SCDOT please provide the truck % for each site?	Traffic	Revision	Yes.
14	Attach_A	Exhibit 7		The contact information for Robert Yongue with Norway Telephone is not active. Can SCDOT provide an alternative name, number, and email address?	Utilities	Revision	This will be provided/updated when available.
15	Attach_A	Exhibit 7		The contact information for Robert Yongue with Williston Telephone is not active. Can SCDOT provide an alternative name, number, and email address?	Utilities	Revision	This will be provided/updated when available.
16	Attach_A	Exhibit 7		Does SCDOT have a timeline on negotiation and relocation or requirements regarding the private waterline on S-634? For example, is the line allowed to be touched if it is a ROW negotiated item, can the line be cut and capped during construction, etc	Utilities	No_Revision	The intent is to handle this particular private waterline as a right of way item during acquisition negotiations. Additional information or direction will be provided when available.



Additional Questions from 3/05/2025 Open-Forum

1				Is a bid bond required to be attached to the bid form?	Other	No_Revision	Yes a bid bond is required to be attached. The form us linked in the RFP Instructions and available on our website.
2				Can SCDOT elaborate on where to show DBE participation for required sites? And how to show requirements are met within the contract?	Other	No_Revision	There is a 5% requirement for two sites, S-22 & S-39 due to federal funding appropriations. The remaining sites do not have a 5% DBE requirement and any DBE commitals for these sites will not count towards DBE commitments on the two sites referenced above.

