

**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS  
Bridge Package 30**

**RFP for Industry Review #1**

Date Received: 11/7/2024

Meeting Date: 11/8/2024

|              |          |           |                            |  |              | SCDOT       |  |
|--------------|----------|-----------|----------------------------|--|--------------|-------------|--|
| Question No. | Category | Section   | Page / Doc No.             | Question/Comment   | Discipline   | Response    | Explanation  |
| 1            | RFP      |           |                            | Can the contractor access the sites prior to any plan approvals to demo and remove structures?   | Construction | No_Revision | Contractor may access the site, but will need necessary permits to do so. (NOI, Right of Entry, demo permit, approved demo plan, approved MOT/detour plans, etc) |
| 2            | Attach_A | Exhibit 5 | 68                         | Section 49 indicates the Contractor shall provide XXXX square yard of FDP, a unit price of \$XX per square yard, and removed to a depth of XX inches as directed by RCE. Can SCDOT please provide amounts for these.                                   | Construction | Revision    | Will revise.   |
| 3            | Attach_A | Exhibit 5 | 249                        | Section 51 indicates the Contractor shall provide XXXX square yard of full depth concrete pavement patching, a unit price of \$XX per square yard, and removed to a depth of XX inches as directed by RCE. Can SCDOT please provide amounts for these. | Construction | Revision    | Will revise.   |
| 4            | Attach_A | Exhibit 5 |                            | Will there be any incentives for early completion?   | Construction | No_Revision | We do not intend to have incentives on this project.   |
| 5            | Attach_A | Agreement | 9                          | Will SCDOT allow multiple concurrent design submittal packages for review?   | DM           | Revision    | Yes. Please refer to accommodations made and limitations in Exhibit 4z. Agreement will be revised.   |
| 6            | Attach_A | Agreement | Section II.D.3 pdg page 39 | Would SCDOT allow final roadway and final bridge submittals to be combined for one location at a time?   | DM           | Revision    | Yes. Please refer to accommodations made and limitations in Exhibit 4z. Agreement will be revised.   |
| 7            | Attach_A | Agreement | Section II.D.3 pdg page 40 | Would SCDOT allow preliminary roadway plans for all four sites to be combined into one submittal package for review?   | DM           | No_Revision | No   |



|    |          |            |                            |   |               |             |   |
|----|----------|------------|----------------------------|---|---------------|-------------|---|
| 8  | Attach_A | Agreement  | Section II.D.3 pdg page 40 | Would SCDOT allow right of way plans for all four sites to be combined into one submittal package for review?   | DM            | No_Revision | No.   |
| 9  | RFP      |            | 10 of 85                   | Section II.D.6 of the Agreement states that no more than one new submittal package shall be uploaded to ProjectWise within a five business day period. Based on this constraint, it will take several weeks to complete preliminary submittals for one bridge site. Given the accelerated nature of this project, will SCDOT consider allowing more than one submittal package per five day period? | DM            | No_Revision | Refer to Exhibit 4z for plan submittal accomodations and limitations.   |
| 10 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4z | Section 2.0 pdf page 165   | 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 refer to Exhibit 4z   |
| 11 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4z | Section 2.0 pdf page 165   | Will SCDOT allow teams to proceed at their own risk straight to final bridge and final roadway plan submittals provided any information required for the preliminary and right of way submittals is included in the final package?  | DM            | No_Revision | Yes refer to Exhibit 4z   |
| 12 | Attach_A | Exhibit 6  | 2                          | Can the draft NEPA document be provided so teams can anticipate what sort of commitments may be necessary?  | Environmental | No_Revision | No. Teams may expect typical commitments similar to previous packages. Will be specific conditions related to bats per US Fish and Wildlife guidelines regarding clearing restrictions.                             |
| 13 | RFP      | 2          | 4                          | Per Section 2.6 a NW3 permit will be utilized for applicable projects. Based on review of existing wetlands at the S-166 and S-59 sites there appear to be over 0.10 acres of wetland impacts which would require a PCN. Can SCDOT confirm an RPG4 permit would not be more applicable for these sites?   | Environmental | No_Revision | Under agreement with the USACE, emergency projects are all authorized to proceed under NW3 for all on alignment replacments. Projects should be designed to minimize impacts while meeting current design criteria. |
| 14 | Attach_B | Hazmat     |                            | Can SCDOT provide the asbestos and lead based paint reports?  | Geotechnical  | No_Revision | Reports were just submitted and will be uploaded to the website on 11/8/24.   |
| 15 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4f | Section 2.0 pdf page 161   | RFP states the Geotechnical Subsurface Data Report and field testing files have been provided in Attachment B. When can we expect that information to be provided?  | Geotechnical  | No_Revision | Reports were just submitted and will be uploaded to the website on 11/8/24.   |
| 16 | Attach_B | Hydraulics |                            | Will the HEC-RAS model for the S-115 site in Greenville be provided?  | Hydrology     | No_Revision | There is no available model that we have access to. Zone A locations frequently do not have FEMA models.  |



|    |          |            |                                   |  |           |             |  |
|----|----------|------------|-----------------------------------|--|-----------|-------------|--|
| 17 | Attach_B | Hydraulics |                                   | On S-166, the model begins approximately 500 feet downstream of the bridge and no bridge model is included within the HEC-RAS geometry. Is this correct, or does an updated model need to be provided?   | Hydrology | No_Revision | This is a limited detail study. SCDOT has provided what the Department has access to. Zone A locations frequently do not have FEMA models.   |
| 18 | PIP      | Hydraulics |                                   | Two of the 3 HEC-RAS models do not model the existing bridge or provide data at their locations. Will SCDOT provide that modeling information?   | Hydrology | No_Revision | SCDOT has provided what the Department has access to. Zone A locations frequently do not have FEMA models.   |
| 19 | PIP      | Hydraulics |                                   | Will a HEC-RAS model be provided for S-115?  | Hydrology | No_Revision | SCDOT has provided what the Department has access to. Zone A locations frequently do not have FEMA models.   |
| 20 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4e | 2.2.1.7<br>pdg page<br>158        | RFP states bridge lengths and bridge span configurations are to be set based on existing topography and setback requirements listed in subsequent sections. Please provide the existing topography information, primarily the top of channel banks, so that teams can proceed with conceptual designs. | Hydrology | No_Revision | Limited surveys have been performed at the sites. It will be the contractor's responsibility to provide full topographical surveys.  |
| 21 | RFP      |            | 18 of 85                          | Section II.K of the Agreement states there are no ATC's for this project. Does this mean there is no opportunity to shorten the bridges via an ATC to provide a reduction to the minimum bridge lengths provided in Section 2.2.1.7 fo Exhibit 4e - Hydraulic Design Criteria.                         | Hydrology | No_Revision | Yes there is no opportunity to shorten the bridges through ATC's. Bridges must meet RFP criteria.  |
| 22 | PIP      |            |                                   | Will the hydro model for the S-115 site be provided?   | Hydrology | No_Revision | There is no available model that we have access to. Zone A locations frequently do not have FEMA models.   |
| 23 | Attach_B | Survey     |                                   | Will survey files for each site be provided as part of Attachment B? If so, please provide date when information will be posted.   | Roadway   | No_Revision | Limited surveys have been performed at the sites and provided on 11/4. It will be the contractor's responsibility to provide full topographical surveys.   |
| 24 |          |            |                                   | Can SCDOT provide the existing road plans for the S-230 site be provided? These are not available online.  | Roadway   | No_Revision | File No. 24.335 in Greenwood County contains the plans & they are available through Plans Online.  |
| 25 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4a | Setion<br>2.10<br>pdf page<br>130 | Will SCDOT allow Pre-MASH guardrail to be used on the northwest corner of the Greenville S-115 bridge to minimize impacts to the driveway?   | Roadway   | Revision    | Yes. Will revise RFP to allow at this single location.   |
| 26 | RFP      | 2          | 7                                 | Section 2.3 states "The Proposer shall obtain permission from any landowner prior to entering private property", however Section VIII Right of way Services states SCDOT is handling all ROW services. Can you confirm SCDOT is providing ROW services and if so clarify section 2.3 language?         | ROW       | No_Revision | This language is intended to inform the contractor if they want/intend to access the site before right of entries or acquisitions are provided by SCDOT, it is their responsibility to obtain the appropriate permissions and permits. |



|  |          |            |  |   |               |             |   |
|--|----------|------------|--|---|---------------|-------------|---|
| 27   | Attach_A | Agreement  | Section II.B.4 pdf page 38 & Section VIII.A pdf page | Section II (page 38) states Right of Way services shall be the responsibility of the Contractor. Section VIII (page 70) states "Contractor is not responsible for acquiring right of way or providing right of way services...". Please clarify Contractor's responsibility as it pertains to right of way services.    | ROW           | No_Revision | SCDOT is responsible for all right of way services for this project.  |
| 28   |          |            |  | Can the existing bridge inspection reports be provided, not just the SIA sheets?  | Structures    | No_Revision | Yes, they will be provided directly to each team via Projectwise.   |
| 29   | Attach_A | Exhibit 5  | Section 703 pdf page 262                             | Exhibit 5 provides specifications for Galvanized Reinforcing Bars. However, Exhibit 4b structures section does not mention any requirements of Galvanized Reinforcing Bars. Please clarify if galvanized bar are required at any of these locations.  | Structures    | No_Revision | Galvanized bridge deck rebar is not required, per Exhibit 4b. The special provision was left in Exhibit 5 in case it is needed for an unforeseen reason at some point in the project. |
| 30   | Attach_A | Exhibit 4e | 2.2.1.8 pdf page 158                                 | RFP states new abutment toes shall not exceed limits of existing abutment toes and that teams are to provide a minimum 5 foot abutment toe setback from any point along the channel bank to the face of the abutment's rip rap protection. Please provide locations of existing abutment toes and top of channel banks. | Structures    | No_Revision | Limited surveys have been performed at the sites. It will be the contractor's responsibility to provide full topographical surveys.   |
| 31   | PIP      |            |  | Are existing bridge plans available?  | Structures    | No_Revision | Two sites have plan sets. All four were built from maintenance standards. All plans from SCDOT bridge inventory files will be provided to teams via SharePoint.                       |
| 32   | PIP      |            |  | Are the latest bridge inspection reports available?   | Structures    | No_Revision | Inspection Reports will be provided to teams via Projectwise.   |
| 33   | Attach_A | Exhibit 7  | 2  | Will the water line on the S-115 be allowed to re-attach to new bridge?   | Utilities     | Revision    | SCDOT is in coordination efforts with the utility owner and this information will be provided in the RFP at the earliest opportunity.   |
| 34   | Attach_A | Exhibit_3  |  | There is no mention of relocation of the existing waterline in the scope of work. Please clarify language to state if contractor is required to construct the new line as well.   | Utilities     | Revision    | SCDOT is in coordination efforts with the utility owner and this information will be provided in the RFP at the earliest opportunity.   |
| 35   | Attach_A | Exhibit 7  |  | Is the Blue Ridge waterline required to go in-contract, there is no mention of relocation in Exhibit 7 or the scope of work. If so, can a list of prequalified designers and contractors be provided?   | Utilities     | Revision    | Blue Ridge is classified as a large utility and can elect to self-perform. SCDOT is seeking a final decision from them and will provide this information at the earliest opportunity. |
| <b>ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FROM NOVEMBER 8 OPEN-FORUM</b> |          |            |  |   |               |             |   |
| 1  | RFP      | 1          | 36 / 66  | Does SCDOT anticipate that tree clearing restrictions will be required at any sites?  | Environmental | No_Revision | Yes. S-115 will have them.  |



|   |          |           |         |   |               |             |   |
|---|----------|-----------|---------|---|---------------|-------------|---|
| 2 | Attach_A | Exhibit 6 | 4       | Has SCDOT coordinated with USFWS for projects that are unable to avoid tree clearing restrictions? If so, can guidance be provided due to anticipated impacts with tree clearing moratoriums for the project? | Environmental | No_Revision | Yes, did coordinate with USFWS but not for avoiding restrictions. Current restriction will be no clearing from April 1 - Sept 30 for S-115. Teams should clarify if they cannot clear this site before April.                     |
| 3 | RFP      | 4         | 1 / 165 | Due to the accelerated schedule, will the Department allow us to forgo a preliminary geotechnical submittal and only submit final geotechnical reports?   | Geotechnical  | Revision    | Since all project sites meet the criteria for Low Volume Bridge Replacement Projects, only Geotechnical Summary Reports are required and preliminary and final reports are not required. Exhibit 4z has been revised.             |
| 4 | RFP      | 4         | 1 / 165 | Due to the accelerated schedule, will the Department allow a combined geotechnical roadway and bridge report?   | Geotechnical  | No_Revision | If roadway plans and bridge plans are submitted concurrently, then the geotechnical reports may be combined.  |
| 5 | RFP      | 4         | 2 / 134 | Given the minimum bridge length requirements in Exhibit 4e, will any deviations be allowed for the 10 foot span length increment requirement in Exhibit 4b?   | Structures    | No_Revision | No. The New SCDOT Structural Drawings and Details for cored slab and box beam bridges provide standard designs in 10-foot length increments. This was taken into account in the minimum span and bridge lengths prescribed in 4e. |

