

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

RFP for Industry Review #2

Date Received: 11/14/2024

Meeting Date: 11/19/2024

						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f	2.2	Would data obtained from a Borehole Shear Test device be allowable in design, even if it exceeds the maximum allowable values presented in Table 7-17 of the GDM?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	Yes, assuming this refers to a Field Vane Shear Test or other widely accepted test method. Note that PCDM-11 states that global slope stability analysis of embankments is not required for Low Volume Bridge Replacements.
2	RFP	13	24	The Bid Bond Form was struck through, however language in section 4.2 references Bid Bond with the Cost Proposal. Please confirm a Bid Bond will not be required with the Cost Proposal submission.	PM	No_Revision	The struck through form is an old Bid Bond form. Section 4.2 provides the correct link to the new form. A Bid Bond will be required.
3	PIP	Roadway	Conceptual Roadway Plans	Please provide the roadway profiles that were used to set the project limits on the conceptual plan views .pdfs.	Roadway	Revision	Will provide Microstation files in the PIP for information only. We expect the teams to meet all requirements of the RFP & RDM.
4	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2.12	At the S-115 site, what sight distance requirements will be required for the existing driveway for Parcel 3.	Roadway	No_Revision	Every effort should be made to meet the standard requirements for sight distance per the RDM. Please clarify if that is not feasible for this project.
5	Attach_A	Agreement	40	Section VIII - Right of Way Acquisition State" Right of entry exhibits will be included in Attachment B when available." Can SCDOT confirm Right of Entry forms will be executed by all property owners prior to the Agreement signature date?	ROW	No_Revision	SCDOT's intent is to secure all right of entries prior to construction.
6	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2.12	At the S-115 site, there is an existing driveway for Tract 4. which appears to lose access based on new guardrail requirements. What accommodations need to be made for this Tract?	ROW	No_Revision	This will be addressed in the Final RFP
7	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Section 2.1.6 pdf page 134	Is there a minimum skew angle for Greenville S-115?	Structures	Revision	Yes. It is 15 degrees and will be specified.
8	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Section 2.1.4 pdf page 133	RFP states "Remove and dispose of the existing structures and appurtenances, including non-attached piles and remnants from previous structures, in accordance with the SCDOT Standard Specifications." Greenville S-115 has an old existing stone abutment in the southeast quadrant that sits right on the channel bank. Removal of this structure may affect hydraulic modeling and could impact top of bank offsets. Does SCDOT want this abutment removed?	Structures	Revision	No. Previous bridge abutment remnant on south side of the river may remain. See subsequent question #6 below (response is revised).



9	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Section 2.1.20 pdf page 139	The Greenville S-115 existing channel banks are steeper than 2:1. How far upstream and downstream are teams required to carry the 2:1 spill through abutment slope before tying back to the existing slope?	Structures	No_Revision	We expect Exhibit 4e Section 2.2.1.8, projection of 2:1 slope staying out of channel, to control bridge length.
10	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Section 2.1.20 pdf page 139	The required bridge span configuration listed for York S-59 in Exhibit 4e, 2.2.1.7, will produce a minimum average span length of 80 feet requiring the used of drilled shafts. Would SCDOT consider raising average span length for adjacent spans to 80 feet at this site to allow for pile foundations? This change would save the department money and expedite the construction of the bridge.	Structures	No_Revision	Yes we have considered it. Based on the loads for 80-foot tributary span lengths in a 3-span configuration, the number and size of piles expected, and the preliminary boring information, a concrete pile interior bent foundation may not be feasible from a lateral stability design standpoint. Drilled shafts may be the only option that meets all structural design requirements in final design and should be bid accordingly. Shafts with rock sockets are also preferred hydraulically.
11	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2.1.4	At the S-115 site, will the existing bridge foundations from 1957 be required to be removed as part of this project?	Structures	Revision	No. Previous bridge abutment remnant on south side of the river may remain. See subsequent question #6 below (response is revised).
12	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2.1.16	Based on the GSDR for S-24-166, the pH of the sampled soil is below the 5.5 threshold specified in the GDM. Will the Department be providing a minimum corrosion rate for steel piles?	Structures	Revision	At S-166, the Department will require steel H-piles at end bents to be upsized one size from the size that is designed for. For example, if structurally HP14x73 piles are designed, HP14x89 piles will be required.
ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FROM NOVEMBER 19 & 20 OPEN-FORUM							
1	Attach_B	Environmental	S-115 PCE	In the PCE, the environmental commitments only prohibit tree felling between April 1st and September 30th. In the Biological Assessment, SCDOT agrees to avoid blasting, drilling, or tree clearing during this period. Please clarify which activities are prohibited.	Environmental	No_Revision	Activities not applicable to the project construction do not apply. Drilling for shafts is not prohibited.
2	Attach_B	Environmental		Will the contractor be responsible for coordination/consultation with USFWS and the NEPA re-evaluation if tri-colored bat is listed following award?	Environmental	No_Revision	No. SCDOT will address.
3	Attach_B	Environmental		Is the contractor responsible for preparing Jurisdictional Determination packages and/or permit drawings for sites impacting greater than 1/10 acre of WOTUS?	Environmental	No_Revision	No. Teams shall proceed with Nationwide 3 coverage as provided.
4	RFP	13	24	Section 4.2 (Cost Proposal) of the RFP states the cost proposal and bid bond forms shall be sealed in a separate envelope and delivered as part of the cost proposal. Section 4.3 states proposers are to e-mail one electronic copy. Please clarify the cost proposal submittal method.	PM	Revision	You may submit the bid bond forms electronically alongside your cost proposals.



5	RFP		130/313	Exhibit 4a Section 2.11, states “No new right-of-way is anticipated to be acquired or required for the S-166 bridge site”, but the existing right-of-way does not extend a minimum 75-ft from the end of the bridge as stipulated in the 3rd paragraph of Exhibit 4a Section 2.11. Is the S-166 site exempt from this criteria?	ROW	No_Revision	Based on conceptual proposed alignments and design, no ROW will be required at this site.
6	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Section 2.1.4 pdf page 133	Based on responses to questions 8 and 11 from NCQ IR2, there are concerns with leaving the previous bridge abutments in place, post award and during construction. Is it the responsibility of the Design-Build Team to verify the structural integrity of the wall both during construction and post construction? Concerns deal with drilled shaft conflicts during construction as well as hydraulic, environmental and structural impacts should the structural integrity of the wall become compromised. We would ask SCDOT to add language which requires removal of the existing wall due to the mentioned risks, unknowns, and liability.	Structures	Revision	Language is being added requiring complete removal of previous bridge abutment remnant. Regrading the area to reestablish the stream bank with riprap and tie in to existing bank is also required.
7	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2.2.1.7	Our team has determined an estimated top of bank based on a site visit investigation and LiDAR data. Placing Interior Bent 2 at the required set back from this top of bank and setting End Bent 1 based on a 70-ft span with 2:1 fill slope, we estimate the toe of fill being at the top or into the river. Will SCDOT consider revising the RFP minimum bridge length at S-115 based on these findings?	Structures	Revision	Minimum total bridge length is being increased by 10 feet, with the expectation of an 80-ft span at beginning of bridge and beginning of bridge station in the vicinity of 35+08.
8	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2.1.16	(Similar to the NCQ #12 regarding Bridge S-24-166), the GSDR for Bridge S-23-115 indicates the pH of the sampled soil is slightly below the 5.5 threshold specified in the GDM. Will the Department be providing a minimum corrosion rate for the steel piles at S-23-115 (or does the relatively higher Resistivity value offset the marginally low pH, resulting in the overall corrosion potential as "non-aggressive")?	Structures	Revision	Specific requirements for increasing steel pile size at end bents are being added for both S-24-166 and S-23-115. Per the GDM and low pH, both sites are considered aggressive.

