

**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
P042942 - US 17A/21 over CSX Emergency Bridge Replacement**

FINAL RFP - ROUND 3

Date Received: 12/11/2023

Non-Confidential Meeting Date: 12/13/2023

						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	Page 111 / Section 815 (pdf Page 301)	Section 815 discusses the application of Anionic Polyacrylamide for Erosion Control. Can SCDOT specify where, if anywhere, the contractor will be required to use this product on the project?	Construction	No_Revision	The use of Anionic Polyacrylamide is at the sole discretion of the Teams if deemed necessary or feasible. This product is one of many BMPs that may be used for erosion control to reduce offsite sediment loss.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	Page 112 / Section 815 (pdf Page 302-303)	Under Erosion Control Measures, Paragraph C refers to the SCDHEC General Permit dated January 1, 2013. That permit has been replaced by a new General Permit with an effective date of August 5, 2022. The new permit provides the ability to submit a NOI within 30 calendar days after commencing construction for Emergency Projects. Please revise Section 815 to reflect the new permit, and please confirm if this project falls under the Emergency category qualifying it for NOI after construction activities start.	Construction	Revision	The statement is accurate for the new General Permit with an effective date of August 5, 2022.
3	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	2	Section 2.1 Environmental Commitments 2.1b says 4 weeks notice to the RCE is required prior to demolition. Proposer anticipates demolition occurring sooner than 4 weeks pending approvals. Will 4 week notice hold up demolition if all other approvals are in place?	Environmental	No_Revision	Since demolition will begin outside of nesting season, the successful Proposer will be free to begin. Nesting seasons begins in March.
4	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f	General	The GDM requires borings to be performed at the end bent locations with an additional boring at a point 100 feet from the bridge end. The geotechnical data provided as part of the RFP information has borings at the end bent locations and additional borings performed at a distance on the order of 50 feet from the bridge ends. Given the condensed schedule for this project, will the geotechnical information provided in the RFP be sufficient for this project or will SCDOT require an additional boring to be performed at a point 100 feet from the bridge ends?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	The borings and soundings conducted approximately 50 feet back from the proposed end bents will suffice if in the opinion of the Geotechnical Engineer of Record additional testing is not needed.
5	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f	General	The GDM requires a boring every 500 feet along the alignment for embankment heights over 10 feet with side slopes of 2 Horizontal to 1 Vertical. The geotechnical information provided as part of the RFP provides borings along the roadway alignment. However, the concept plans indicate embankment fill on the order of 11 feet a distance of 500 feet to the west of Boring RW-2. Given the condensed schedule for this project, will the geotechnical information provided as part of the RFP be sufficient for this project, or will SCDOT require an additional boring to be performed 500 feet to the west of boring RW-2?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	Additional borings will be required as necessary to meet the requirements of the GDM for the embankments. However, these additional borings and any associated analysis could be provided as revisions to the RFC Geotechnical Reports to help expedite schedule if in the opinion of the Geotechnical Engineer of Record there will not be a major impact to the design and roadway plans.



6	Attach_A	Agreement	26	IV Contract Time Section A, paragraph 1 has been modified moving substantial completion from 5/21/24 to 6/28/24. Given that US 21 is an evacuation route and hurricane season commences in early June, SCDOT should consider offering an Early Completion Incentive. Please confirm.	Other	No_Revision	SCDOT will not offer an Early Completion Incentive for this project.
7	RFP	8	8.9 (p20 of 26)	Per the RFP, "Because of their prior work or services currently being provided that relate to this Project, the following firm(s) have been identified as having conflicts of interest: Civil Engineering Consulting Services, Inc. (CECS), Brockington & Associates, Inc., and F&ME Consultants". Is STV not also identified as having a conflict of interest due to their involvement as CSX's owners representative/consultant?	Other	Revision	STV will be added to the conflict of interest. In addition, WSP, who is involved with CSX environmental review will be included.
8	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 39 / Section VII.B (pdf Page 71)	<p>Due to the expedited schedule for this project, and to minimize the initial cost proposal for the project for SCDOT.</p> <p>Since the R/R company's reviewing and providing agreements and/or reviewing construction submittal(s) will be on the critical path of the project, and the R/R company has not been able to confirm review durations.</p> <p>Will SCDOT provide a quantifiable time frame to base these items on from the R/R company to include in the Contractor's schedule?</p> <p>And further, will SCDOT provide relief to the Contractors for time and additional compensation if/when the project is delayed by the R/R company or companies?</p>	Structures	No_Revision	<p>CSX and SCDOT have committed to a 10 business day review timeline for design submittals. Construction submittals do not fall within this commitment but will be expedited as much as is possible or feasible. The quality of submittals is paramount to meeting these expeditious goals.</p> <p>Approaches to project delays will be handled per standard SCDOT process and specifications.</p>
9	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b		Section 2.1.17 requires 6" clear cover to the hoop reinforcing in the uncased portion of the drilled shaft. Typical SCDOT practice is to use 4" clear cover on uncased drilled shafts per DM0111. The Baseline Geotechnical Report indicates low resistivity and low pH as a potential concern for steel piles. Subsurface sulfate attack of the concrete is not anticipated. AASHTO LRFD 8th Ed. Table 5.10.1-1 only requires 3" minimum cover on Cast-in-place piles in corrosive environments. Will SCDOT consider eliminating the extra clear cover? If not, will SCDOT consider allowing water/cement ratios less than or equal to 0.40 to enhance the durability of the drilled shaft concrete as an alternative?	Structures	Revision	6" cover is recommended by the AASHTO Guide Specification for Service Life Design, 1st Edition (which is an Exhibit 4 design reference) - Section 6.2.4. After further consideration however, the drilled shaft casing will provide sufficient sacrificial protection against corrosion of drilled shaft rebar at the depths where corrosion could occur. This requirement is being removed in Addendum 3.
10	Attach_A	Exhibit 5		Will SCDOT change the DBE submittal/approval timeframe in paragraph 2a on page 34 from 15 days to 5 days?	Other	Revision	We received feedback from SCDOT's DBE Office and they are amenable to the adjustment from 15 to 5. This will be updated in Addendum #3.



11	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 9 / II.B.D.1 & 2. (pdf Page 56)	Submittal 000 is to include a Design Review Sumittal Schedule and a Design QC Plan and it must be approved prior to any other design deliverables. Would SCDOT consider allowing Submittal 000 to be included with Submittal 001 for simultaneous review due to the tight schedule?	PM	No_Revision	For this project only SCDOT will allow submittal 000 to occur for review after Notice of Award and prior to execution of the contract and NTP at the teams sole risk.
12	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 10 / II.B.D.6. (pdf Page 57)	SCDOT typically finishes all design reviews in Bluebeam prior to releasing the session to the team for comment review and responses. Given the accelerated schedule for this project and the capability of Bluebeam to allow simultaneous review, would SCDOT consider inviting teams to the Bluebeam sessions while the SCDOT review is in progress? This would allow designers to see comments in real time and make revisions as the session progresses. When the session is complete, the teams could be given permission to then provide responses. This could greatly reduce the period of time needed for revisions prior to resubmittal of designs.	PM	No_Revision	<p>SCDOT will consider opening the review sessions to the teams as reviews are performed. It is noted that SCDOT has 10 business days to perform reviews and not all reviews begin the day plans are received. Design review comments may be entered, deleted or changed by SCDOT during the 10 business day window. Any changes the design team enacts prior to the final review period is at their sole risk. The design team shall not respond to comments until the review period has ended or as authorized by SCDOT. If complications occur due to access to the review session, SCDOT will revert to closed sessions for review.</p> <p>It should also be noted that STV, sub-consultant for CSX, will not be using Bluebeam for reviews but will be marking plans and entering comments into an excel form for the design team to use for responses. In addition, STV requires verification plans and responses to comments to close reviews.</p>

