

**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
I-20 over Wateree River - Project ID P029450 - Kershaw County**

RFP FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW

Date Received: 8/8/2022

Non-Confidential Meeting Date: 8/16/2022

| | | | | | | SCDOT | |
|--------------|----------|---------------|--|--|---------------|-------------|---|
| Question No. | Category | Section | Page / Doc No. | Question/Comment | Discipline | Response | Explanation |
| 1 | Attach_A | Exhibit 5 | 7 | Section 104 - Please confirm the 500 SY of partial depth patching and the 500 SY of full depth patching required to be included in the bid is the complete maintenance scope for the Wateree River bridges, that no other repairs items are to be included. | Construction | No_Revision | Due to the condition of the existing bridge decks, SCDOT considered this work to be above and beyond what would be considered normal maintenance. |
| 2 | Attach_A | Exhibit 5 | 7 | Section 104 - Due to the significant lane closure prohibitions shown in section 2.2.2 of Exhibit 4d, Part 2, would SCDOT consider increasing the repair completion time from 24 to 48 hours? | Construction | Revision | Will be updated to say "repair completion time to be determined by RCE based on significance of the repair needed not to exceed 48 hours". |
| 3 | PIP | Forms | 1 | The "Complete List of SOV Items" includes item 9210612 - Independent Quality Assurance. Section V. B. 2. of the Agreement (page 31 of 91) states SCDOT will be providing Independent Assurance Testing. Please clarify. | Construction | No_Revision | The Complete List of SOV Items provides a list of all available SOV items in SCDOT's system and is not project specific. SCDOT will provide an SOV worksheet of all items in which SCDOT desires cost insight to be completed as part of contract execution. Additional items from the Complete List of SOV Items may be added as appropriate by the successful proposer. SCDOT will provide Quality Acceptance and Independent Assurance Testing as stated in the Section V.B.2. |
| 4 | Attach_A | Agreement | II.D.6 Page 10 of 91 Page 61 | The section states, "No more than one new submittal package shall be uploaded to ProjectWise within a five business day period." Suggest change to "No more than one submittal package PER DISCIPLINE shall be..." This change would allow submittal of specific discipline submittals to follow separate schedules, i.e. Roadway could be submitted on Monday and Structures on Thursday. | DM | No_Revision | The 5-day rule applies. It is allowable to submit a roadway and bridge package simultaneously or 5 days apart. |
| 5 | Attach_B | Environmental | I-20 Bridges Replacement PCE Page 139 of 201 | Confirm that the following wording contained in the USFWS No Effect Guidance Letter is not a requirement for this project. "As a conservation measure for all projects it is recommended that all tree clearing activities be conducted during NLEB inactive season of November 15th to March 31st of any given year." | Environmental | No_Revision | Guidance letter is a generic letter provided by USFWS. No NLEB identified so it does not apply. |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------|---------------|--|--|---------------|-------------|---|
| 6 | PIP | Environmental | I-20_Wateree_Rehab_JD_Shapefiles, I-20_Wateree_Replacement_JD_Shapefiles | The two Shapefile data sets only contain the Project Study Area Boundary and does not contain any boundaries for the JD areas. Provide revised files with JD information included. | Environmental | Revision | SCDOT will provide shapefiles |
| 7 | Attach_A | Agreement | 46 | Section X.A.1. "...included in Exhibit 4" Please confirm Exhibit 6 includes the Environmental Commitments. | Environmental | Revision | Contract will be revised to correct reference. |
| 8 | Attach_A | Exhibit 6 | 4 | The fifth bullet point on page 4 of the Exhibit 6 notes that "In-water work will occur only during daylight hours." Please define "in-water work." In other words, is working on the bridge superstructure from a floating barge considered in-water? Is placing concrete into a previously driven drilled shaft casing considered in-water? Would bridge demolition activities from a barge be considered in-water? | Environmental | No_Revision | In water work includes activities (excavation, filling, pile driving, drilled shaft casing installation, etc.) that could result in the physical destruction or alteration of important aquatic habitat. Work inside a placed casing would not be considered in-water work. Work outside the water column would not be considered in-water. |
| 9 | Attach_A | Exhibit 6 | 2.1 and 2.2, page 1 and page 2 | Regarding Waters of the US, the RFP says "The required mitigation for this project will be determined through consultation with the USACE and other resource agencies." Will CONTRACTOR be responsible for cost or design of mitigation? | Environmental | No_Revision | Yes. |
| 10 | Attach_B | Environmental | | Would SCDOT consider providing shape files of the environmental resources in the CEs and their technical documentation, to assist in design, impact avoidance and minimization, and impact calculation? | Environmental | Revision | SCDOT will provide shapefiles |
| 11 | Attach_A | Exhibit 6 | Environmental Design Criteria Page 6 | Items 6 and 7 are identical. One should be deleted | Environmental | Revision | Will be updated to remove one of them. |
| 12 | Attach_A | Exhibit 5 | 28 | Scope of work in Exhibit 3, page 1, states that rehabilitation work for the two pairs of overflow bridges over the Wateree Swamp will include substructure elements. For any temporary shoring installed to protect the rehabilitated bridges, are any special provisions needed to also establish temporary shoring monitoring requirements? | Geotechnical | Revision | Temporary shoring in general is addressed in the Section 204: Structure Excavation Supplemental Specification posted on SCDOT's website. For temporary support of flat slab superstructure during bridge rehab repair work, Exhibit 4b will be revised to require instrumentation and monitoring of shoring structures. |
| 13 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4f | 1 | Section 2.0, Please provide the gINT files used to create the boring logs in the Geotechnical Subsurface Data Report | Geotechnical | No_Revision | These are already on the website in Attachment B. |
| 14 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4z | 2 | Final Road Submittal Package: Please clarify if more than one Roadway Geotech Report is needed. (Table shows "Reports") | Geotechnical | No_Revision | Only one roadway report is required. |
| 15 | Attach_A | Agreement | XIII.B.1 | Section XIII.B.1 states Type 1 Differing site conditions are limited to a 5-ft radius drawn from the center of test hole. This is unreasonably small and conflicts with Section II.B.2 which states the CONTRACTOR may rely on the geotechnical data provided. Please clarify that the geotechnical data can be relied upon. | Geotechnical | No_Revision | Reliance on geotechnical data is as described in the Agreement. |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------|------------|------------------------|---|-----------|-------------|---|
| 16 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4b | 4 & 5 | Regarding drainage spread in travel lanes: Is there a similar requirement for temporary spread in the travel lanes on both the structure and on the roadway approach during construction? | Hydrology | Revision | Temporary drainage spread shall be restricted to the shoulder width and this will be clarified in Exhibit 4b for bridge drainage. Roadway approach spread will also be restricted to the shoulder for temporary drainage and this will be clarified in Exhibit 4e. For temporary rainfall intensities, use AASHTO Appendix 17A to determine the appropriate design frequency, as specified in Exhibit 4e. |
| 17 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4z | 5 | The Preliminary Hydraulic Report notes the inclusion of Field Investigation and Pipe Inspection Report. What is the criteria for performing Video Pipe Inspection on existing pipes? There are existing pipes within the projects which may not be disturbed as part of the project. | Hydrology | Revision | Pipes within the project limits are generally inspected. If pipe is in good condition and has capacity for new design, no work is required. If design changes capacity, new design for ppe is necessary. SCDOT Pipe and Culvert field inventory and inspection guidelines will be added to Attachment B. Exhibit 4e will be updated to reference the Attachment. |
| 18 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4e | 2 | Section 2.1 states that spread criteria for replacement and rehab bridges shall follow the BDM, Exhibit 4b, and RHDS. There is a requirement in 2.1.14 of Exhibit 4b that conflicts with the BDM. Also, please clarify requirements for rehab bridges - the "Proposed Repair Details & Quantities for Overflow Bridges..." document in Attachment B presents very prescriptive requirements regarding additional drains for the rehab bridges which is very limited (and appears to be based on observed conditions as opposed to any analysis) as compared to this requirement regarding spread management by analysis. Clarify if more drains are anticipated to be added to the rehab bridges than what is required and adjust the language in the documents accordingly." | Hydrology | Revision | Will update Section 2.1 to remove the "and rehab bridges" from that section. The prescriptive requirements in Attachment B are all that is required for overflow bridges. |
| 19 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4e | 3 | Clarify the applicability of second sentence on the page about setting bench elevation in light of requirement to retain the existing end slopes as stated in the last paragraph of section 2.1.21 | Hydrology | No_Revision | Existing embankment will need to be cut to provide proper bench elevation and toe will be need to be maintained. |
| 20 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4b | 5 | 2.1.14 - Provides criteria for scupper design. H&H Report analyzed existing scuppers with 30% blockage. Should new scuppers be designed with a percentage of blockage? If so, how much? | Hydrology | No_Revision | There is no requirement for a percent blockage as it relates to meeting spread requirements in scupper design. Considering blockage to provide a conservative design is at the engineer's discretion. |
| 21 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4e | 2 | 2.2 - If "No-Rise" is achievable, who is responsible for FEMA payment? RFP does not address if CLOMR/LOMR is needed. | Hydrology | No_Revision | Should not be applicable to this project. |
| 22 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4e | 3 | 2.2 - States Min. freeboard is 7' above design WSEL, but H&H Report states they were told by SCDOT to pass the historical peak discharge (1916 Event). Are we to set the low chord to pass the historical high water or to pass the 100-year event? | Hydrology | Revision | Pass the Historical High Water. Will revise 4e to clarify. |
| 23 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4e | Section 2.2, pages 2-3 | Exhibit 4e, Section 2.2: Is HEC-RAS 2D considered an approved 2D model? | Hydrology | Revision | Will revise to clarify that we only accept SMS:SRH 2D and ADH |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------|-----------|--|---|-------|-------------|---|
| 24 | Attach_A | Agreement | 33 | Consider reducing the "extended discovery period" from eight (8) years to five (5) years which is more common as an industry standard. | Legal | No_Revision | Eight year time period is extent of the statute of repose deadline for the discovery of latent defects. |
| 25 | Attach_A | Agreement | III.B.1.d, page 22 of 91 | For reasons for allowable price adjustments, Section III.B.1.d includes Intentional or bad faith acts or omissions by SCDOT that unreasonably interfere with CONTRACTOR's performance and cause delay of work on the critical path of the Project. Please consider including "any breach" along with "Intentional or bad faith acts or omissions" as well as not limiting this item to only delays which affect the critical path as non-critical delays and impacts may still have a cost impact to the CONTRACTOR. | Legal | No_Revision | We will be dealing with claims for price adjustments for trivial breaches (i.e. "any" breach) on non-critical path delays. |
| 26 | Attach_A | Agreement | IV.A.3.j, page 27 of 91 | Section IV.A.3.j states "The CONTRACTOR may plan for early completion; however, the schedule shall never reflect a completion date earlier than the original Substantial Completion date. SCDOT will not be liable in any way for CONTRACTOR's failure to complete the Project prior to the original Substantial Completion date. Any additional costs, including extended overhead incurred between CONTRACTOR's scheduled early completion date and the original Substantial Completion date, shall be the responsibility of the CONTRACTOR". The CONTRACTOR's schedule should reflect their plan, and the contractor should be compensated for delays beyond CONTRACTOR's control whether or not it pushes the CONTRACTOR's planed Substantial Completion past the original substantial completion date or not. | Legal | No_Revision | SCDOT does not pay a bonus or reward for early completion. Delay claims are determined and compensated through force majeure and owner directed changes. |
| 27 | Attach_A | Agreement | XIII.C.2.d, page 51 of 91 | For concurrent delays, a fortuitous force majeure event should not relieve the Owner for liability when they are also delaying the Project. Please consider revising the language for this section. | Legal | No_Revision | Prevents Contractor from being rewarded twice for same delay. |
| 28 | Attach_A | Agreement | VII.A.3, page 37 of 91 | Section VII.A.3 states CONTRACTOR is only entitled to a time extension for utility owner delays. CONTRACTOR should also be entitled to additional compensation as well if a utility owner interferes or fails to relocate conflicting utilities in a timely manner, provided CONTRACTOR can demonstrate that appropriate coordination efforts have been made. Please consider changing language to address. | Legal | No_Revision | Contractor may have remedies outside the contract against the utility for delay. |
| 29 | Attach_A | Agreement | VI Insurance and Bonding, A.3, Pg 35 of 91 | VI. Insurance and Bonding, A.8., requires the CONTRACTOR to obtain Delay in Start Up coverage. In order to quote coverage for Delay in Start Up Coverage, the underwriters will need a breakdown of the \$1,000,000 sublimit by types of fees on a monthly basis. Please provide required monthly breakdown of fees / costs by type and amount and the number of months the coverage limit shall provide coverage for. | Legal | No_Revision | There is no list or breakdown of charges, but the failure to promptly begin work after the issuance of NTP is a default/material breach of the agreement. |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------|-----------|---|---|----------|-------------|--|
| 30 | Attach_A | Agreement | XVI Indemnity, B. Defense and Indemnification Procedures, Pgs 62-64 of 91 | XVI. Indemnity, B. Defense and Indemnification Procedures. This article makes several references to Section II but, Section II is missing from the documents provided. Please provide Section II. | Legal | Revision | Updated Agreement from Section II to be Section B. |
| 31 | Attach_A | Agreement | VI. Insurance and Bonding, A., 3., Pg 34, of 91 | VI. Insurance and Bonding, A., 3., requires the CONTRACTOR to obtain a notarized letter showing financial availability to cover deductibles. This is an onerous and unnecessary burden. Deductibles are the sole responsibility of the first named insured on the policy and not the responsibility of the owner or any other additional insureds on the policy. Because there is no financial exposure to the Owner, CONTRACTOR's deductibles should be at the sole discretion of the CONTRACTOR. Please consider striking this paragraph in its entirety. | Legal | No_Revision | This provision ensures a Contractor has sufficient cash flow to cover a deductible. Otherwise, a Contractor will select the highest deductible available without SCDOT knowing whether Contractor could actually pay the deductible if a claim arises. |
| 32 | RFP | | | In numerous places the contract says SCDOT makes a decision that is final or similar wording. We assume that all those decisions are still subject to the Disputes procedures. Please confirm. | Legal | No_Revision | SCDOT cannot control or prevent Contractor from filing a dispute. But, ultimately one party has to be the decisionmaker on the job site and that is SCDOT. |
| 33 | Attach_A | Agreement | Section I, Page 7 of 91 | Is it reasonable to rely on the Project Information? In particular, can we assume that the scope and results of the geotechnical information were performed based on using standard industry practices? | Legal | No_Revision | Project Information Package is preliminary and should be treated as such. The preliminary geotechnical work in Attachment B was completed using industry standards practices. |
| 34 | Attach_A | Agreement | II. D.6, page 10 of 91 | Please consider deleting the last sentence in Section II.D.6, or, consider excluding "disputed comments" from those comments required to be closed prior to the issuance of RFC plans as delays to the RFC plans and subsequently starting work caused by disputed comments is a significant risk that could add cost to the project. | Legal | No_Revision | Our comments are made based on the requirements of the RFP. We have been successful working though comment disputes in the past. |
| 35 | Attach_A | Agreement | II.K.1 | ATCs provide a benefit to the Project and SCDOT, however section II.K.1 pushes all the risk of ATCs to the CONTRACTOR. At a minimum, please consider applying the list of events that entitle the CONTRACTOR to a time extension as given in Section IV.B to ATCs. | Legal | No_Revision | The risk of an ATC should always be on Contractor. Otherwise, Contractor would get benefit of ATC proposal in procurement without the risk of the ATC in construction. ATC should be "all or nothing" for risk/reward. |
| 36 | Attach_A | Agreement | XIV.A | Please consider adding " A delay outside the CONTRACTOR's control" to the list of causes of a Force Majeure. | Legal | No_Revision | The force majeure clause contains all of the "outside the contractor's control" risks that SCDOT is willing to accept. |
| 37 | Attach_A | Agreement | XIII.A.3 | Please consider deleting the last sentence in Section XIII.A.3 as it conflicts with the rest of the differing site conditions clause in Section XIII. | Legal | No_Revision | We don't see a conflict so no change. |
| 38 | RFP | 4 | Exhibit 4c Page 1 | Section 2.2 and 2.3 refer to milling 2" of pavement and replacing with 200 psy Surface Type A. 200 psy of Surface Type A equates to less than 2" of milling. Please advise if we are to use 200psy or 2"? | Pavement | No_Revision | Place 200 psy of Surface Type A as stated in the RFP. |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------|-----------------|-----|---|----------|-------------|--|
| 39 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4c | 1 | 2.3 and 2.4 - What are the limits for full depth patching? Exhibit 5, Section 401, page 73 includes required bid quantities but no limits. | Pavement | No_Revision | Full depth patching is at the direction of the RCE per the Special Provision. |
| 40 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4z | 10 | 3.4.6 - If the team uses one of the pavement design options presented in Exhibit 4c, is there a deliverable for pavement design? | Pavement | No_Revision | No, just a typical section shown in the roadway plans. |
| 41 | RFP | 3 | 8 | In the first paragraph on page 8 of 45, it is stated that "Concepts that simply delete or reduce scope, require or are premised upon an additional of a separate SCDOT project...,or conflicts with environmental commitments, are not eligible for consideration as ATCs. Then the first bullet below the next paragraph states that "Concepts which violate environmental commitments require submittal and approval of an ATC to be eligible for implementation." Please clarify the intent of these statements | PM | Revision | We will provide clarification on these two statement. You can not just simply delete a enviornmental commitment. It has been committed to as a part of the project. However, If you chose a new alternative design and because of that a commitment changes, we could give a conditional apporval pending a re-evaluation of NEPA. |
| 42 | RFP | 3 | 4 | Under Section 3.1 there is a reference to the MILESTONE SCHEDULE Being in Section 8. Section 8 is on page 39 of 45 defined as the NON_COLLUSION CERTIFICATION. MILESTONE SCHEDULE is in Section 7.2 on page 37 of 45. Please clarify. | PM | Revision | Milestone schedule is in Section 8. Section added back to coincide with the wording in this Section. |
| 43 | RFP | 3 | 6 | From Section 3.5, "...Preliminary ATCs (See Section 3.7 for discussion on ATCs)." Please clarify if this reference should be to Section 3.8 and/or 3.9. | PM | Revision | Updated the reference to Section 3.8 and 3.9 |
| 44 | RFP | 3 | 8,9 | There are 2 references in Section 3.8..1 to "... in Section 3.8.1." Please cofirm that these references should be to Section 3.9.1 for definitions. | PM | Revision | Updated the references to Section 3.9.1 |
| 45 | RFP | 3 | 15 | 3.11 Stipends "...Stipend Agreement set forth in Section 13." The STIPEND AGREEMENT is Section 11 on page 42 of 45. Please clarify. | PM | Revision | Updated when adding back in Section 8 and 9 the Stipend Agreement is in Section 13. |
| 46 | RFP | 3 | 9 | 3.8.2 - No deadline is provided for requesting a Confidential Preliminary ATC Meeting in either the narrative or Milestone Schedule. Please clarify. | PM | Revision | Updated the milestone schedule with date to request meeting by. |
| 47 | RFP | 3 | 10 | 3.9.1 - Are Formal ATCs to be submitted in priority order? | PM | Revision | Language added in Section 3.9.1 to have Formal ATC's also submitted in priority order. |
| 48 | RFP | 4 | 21 | 4.1 - The time commitments of Key Individuals from the RFQ do not match the commitment contained here under Item 7.f, second bullet. Please clarify. | PM | No_Revision | Section references RFQ time periods. |
| 49 | RFP | 4 | 18 | 4.1 - Please confirm that the Quality Commitment Matrix Form on the SCDOT Design-Build site, under Standard Forms, is the Quality Credit Matrix referenced in section 4.1. | PM | Revision | Yes, Form name will be updated on the Web Site to Quality Credit Matrix. |
| 50 | RFP | 4 | 23 | 4.3 - This section states that a redacted proposal will be accepted if the stipend is waived. Section 4.4 on page 24 states that a redacted proposal "must" be submitted even in the absense of confidential information. Please clarify this requirement in regards to the stipend. | PM | Revision | Will be updated to say that there is no need for a redacted proposal if no confidential information is included. |
| 51 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4d_Pt 2 | 0 | Title page for this Exhibit reads "Part 3. Should this be Part 2?" | PM | Revision | Yes, This has been updated to Part 2. |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------|------------|-----------------------------------|--|---------|-------------|---|
| 52 | RFP | 3 | 3.6, Pg 6 of 45 | Various sections of the RFP for Industry Review say, "Written questions submitted outside of these dates may not be accepted." When looking at the Milestone Schedule provided in the RFP, the given dates are very specific and usually by 7:30 am ET. Please confirm that RFIs and Questions can be submitted up to the date and time presented in the Milestone Schedule and will not be accepted after that date. | PM | No_Revision | It is SCDOT's intent to have all questions submitted by the timeframes listed in the Milestone schedule. However, we reserve the right to consider other questions submitted outside of these timeframes as well. All non-confidential questions will be responded to so that all proposers receive the same response to the question and that will be included on the website. |
| 53 | RFP | 3 | 3.8.2 Page 9 of 45 | 3.8.2, second sentence states, "Proposers shall request a meeting in writing (email is acceptable) addressed to the SCDOT POC with a copy to the alternate POC by the date specified in the Milestones Schedule." The Milestones Schedule does not state the date by which a request for a meeting should be made. Please provide deadlines for meeting requests. | PM | Revision | Updated the milestone schedule with date to request meeting by. |
| 54 | RFP | 2 | 2.4 Page 2 of 45 | RFP mentions prohibited communications, please define what are prohibited communications outside of SCDOT staff | PM | No_Revision | No direct or indirect communication with SCDOT staff or anyone under contract with the SCDOT on this project other than the POC's |
| 55 | RFP | 7 | Milestone Schedule, page 37 of 45 | The ATC Meeting and Submittal Cycle shown in the Milestone Schedule prohibits collaboration and innovative cycles of design development. 1. A single ATC meeting held 5 days after RFP release, 2. Submittal of (presumed to be ALL ideas) Preliminary ATCs 2 weeks after RFP Release. A preferred ATC cycle is to have multiple 1on1 meetings over first 3 months, allow ATCs to be submitted (preliminary or final) up through 3rd month with 2 week review cycles. Set date for Final ATC submittal and Design-Builder manages cycle to meet acceptable submittal by date listed. Would SCDOT be open to a modification to their ATC Process? | PM | No_Revision | No, This will be the ATC schedule for this procurement. |
| 56 | Attach_B | Survey | P029450-Wateree_survey points.dgn | This file does not contain any data. Please provide file with survey point data in it. | Roadway | Revision | File will be provided with survey point data in it. |
| 57 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4a | 2 | Section 2.9 - Provide limits where we are to extend/provide new MASH guardrail installation. | Roadway | No_Revision | Limits of guardrail will be based on actual design. All new guardrail shall be MASH compliant. It is acceptable to tie to existing and/or extend NCHRP 350 rail in good condition. Guardrail shall be provided in all areas where clearzone is not met (within project limits) and be in compliance with the AASHTO Roadside Design Guide. |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------|------------|---|--|------------|-------------|--|
| 58 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4a | 2 | Section 2.8 (also Exhibit 5, Section 105, page 10) - Define the limits of required cross slope verification and any necessary cross slope corrections on the existing pavement. | Roadway | No_Revision | Entire paving limits will require cross slope verification and cross slope corrections on the existing pavement. Limits of paving will be based on actual design. |
| 59 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4z | 4 | 2.0 - First asterisk note after table. Does this mean that combining Preliminary and ROW roadway submittals is permissible and does not require an ATC? | Roadway | No_Revision | Combining the preliminary and ROW roadway submittals will not require an ATC. The DB Team can elect to submit ROW plans and skip preliminary plans at their risk. |
| 60 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4z | 3.4.1, page 8 | Subsection 3.4.1 Final Road plans specifies submitting Geopak (gpk) files for horizontal and vertical alignments. In the same paragraph it states "If other Civil Engineering software packages were utilized for project development then all binary or ASCII files that are software dependent for that package shall be submitted". Does this indicate GEOPAK has to be used as the design platform or could Inroads be used? | Roadway | No_Revision | No. GEOPAK does not have to be used as the design platform. Inroads can be used. If software other than GEOPAK is used, all design files shall be provided to allow conversion via LandXML or similar format |
| 61 | Attach_B | Survey | | An existing ground surface was provided but it seems that the bridge decks were removed. Are the bridge deck surfaces available and can they be provided? | Roadway | Revision | Bridge deck surface will be provided in Attachment B |
| 62 | Attach_A | Agreement | VIII.A.3, page (40 to 46) of 91 | Section VIII has extensive language of ROW services expected to completed by the contractor. One item not in control of contractor is the time and expense to acquire a property through condemnation. Knowing if this situation may occur after award is very difficult and contractor should be compensated for time and cost should a required parcel impact the critical path of the project. | ROW | No_Revision | The expense of the property for just compensation and premium payments is the responsibility of the SCDOT. Contractor is responsible for cost of acquisition services. Contractor is responsible for accounting for time to achieve right of entry for a parcel. |
| 63 | PIP | Structures | Conceptual Bridge plans P. 2 (both dual and single structure) | The Design data lists the Seismic Design Category as "B", however based on the OC of "I" as well as the the SD1-SEE value of 0.35g, Table 3.5 of the Seismic Design Specification would classify this as a Seismic Design Category "C" Bridge. Are we designing for a Category B or C? | Structures | Revision | Design for Category C per the Seismic Design Specifications. Conceptual Bridge Plans are for information only and will be revised. |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------|------------|--|---|------------|-------------|--|
| 64 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4b | 8 | Statement is made to perform repairs in accordance with Attachment B document entitled "Proposed Repair Details & Quantities for Overflow Bridges - Asset ID: 5780,5785, 5781, & 5786." The document referenced then presents rehabilitation options that are based on field conditions with quantities. Please provide confirmation and clarify in the documents that the quantities and extent of all rehabilitation and repair items are fixed and are not subject to further interpretation based on field conditions at the time of NTP or initiation of work. If these quantities and extents are not fixed, please provide mechanism for payment of rehab work outside of what is required/documented in the report. | Structures | No_Revision | The quantities shown in Attachment B are intended to be fixed. There are no "options" contained in the repair details. There are specific repair types called for at specific locations. Any changes in rehab work during construction will be handled through a change order. |
| 65 | RFP | 4 | 4b p. 9 | Clarify who is to perform "initial inspection prior to opening the bridge to traffic." | Structures | Revision | SCDOT inspectors or representatives of SCDOT Bridge Maintenance will provide the inspections. Contractor is responsible for coordination prior to opening bridge to traffic. |
| 66 | RFP | 4 | 4b p. 1 | Clarify if the maximum galvanized length applies to all bar sizes. | Structures | Revision | Sentence revising the maximum length to 60-feet will be deleted. 40-foot maximum required by BDM 17.3.1 will apply. Maximum length of galvanized rebar is subject to rebar supplier capabilities. |
| 67 | Attach_B | Structures | Repair Details & Quantities for Overflow Bridges | RS&H Report Section 3 indicates five different types of joint repair. Confirm that Type 1 and Type 2 repairs only extend to the gutterline since those are not noted as requiring curb/railing replacement. | Structures | No_Revision | Per the Expansion Joint Replacement details and notes on pdf page 18 of the repair details, replacement joint seal material extends to the outside edge of the curb/railing. |
| 68 | Attach_B | Structures | Repair Details & Quantities for Overflow Bridges | RS&H Report Section 8 indicates the approach slabs are to be constructed in "general conformance" with SCDOT drawings and details. Please clarify allowable deviations from normal SCDOT practice | Structures | Revision | The word "general" will be deleted. The rebar design intent of the SCDOT Drawings and Details shall be retained/provided. Geometry modifications as necessary to conform to the existing bridge field conditions are allowable. |
| 69 | Attach_B | Structures | Repair details starting on p. 8 (multiple incidents) | Deck repair details specify square feet for each repair and appear to show rectangular area for repair work, but do not specify boundaries for the deck repair. Please clarify how the extents for the repair areas are to be determined. | Structures | No_Revision | RCE will provide rectangular limits in the field based on the area provided, to cover each spot repair. |
| 70 | Attach_B | Structures | Wateree River Deck Patching Details | Does SCDOT have locations and dimensions of full and partial depth patching on the Wateree bridges similar to the Overflow Swamp bridges? | Structures | No_Revision | No. Areas will be determined as defects are observed. This is intended to be a maintenance function during construction. |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------|-----------------|--|--|------------|-------------|---|
| 71 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4b | 8 | 3.0 - Load rating overflow bridges. Not addressed here but see Exhibit 4z, 3.15, last bullet, page 13 - Please clarify if overflow bridges are to be load rated. | Structures | Revision | Will update RFP to include updating existing Load Ratings to include rehab repairs for the Overflow Bridges. Existing Load ratings will be provided. |
| 72 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4b | 9 | 4.0 - Who performs the bridge inspections? | Structures | Revision | SCDOT inspectors or representatives of SCDOT Bridge Maintenance will provide the inspections. Contractor is responsible for coordination prior to opening bridge to traffic. |
| 73 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4b | Structures Design Criteria Section 3, Page 8 | Is submittal of bridge load capacity ratings required for the overflow dual bridges? | Structures | Revision | Will update RFP to include updating existing Load Ratings to include rehab repairs for the Overflow Bridges. Existing Load ratings will be provided. |
| 74 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4d_Pt 2 | 9 | 2.6 , last sentence of 3rd paragraph. Does this statement - "SCDOT will accept designs for the transition meeting AASHTO Method 2" - apply only to the west end of the river bridges or to both the east and west ends? | Traffic | Revision | Method 2 criteria is deleted. |
| 75 | RFP | | | Will SCDOT be providing a list of utility owners and utility reference information? | Utilities | Revision | SUE information gathered during prep work will be provided to the teams via projectwise. |
| 76 | Attach_A | Agreement | VII.A.3, page 37 of 91 | Section reads "If said utility companies interfere or fail to relocate conflicting utilities in a timely manner" Will SCDOT define what duration will meet the definition of "timely manner"? | Utilities | No_Revision | The magnitude and relocation time of any utility relocation are specific to a Proposer's project design and construction sequencing. Timely manner could best be defined as the duration needed to properly and completely relocate the utility in accordance with Utility requirements into its final position or a position where it no longer conflicts with the Contractors construction sequencing. This is duration is determined as result of coordination efforts between the Contractor and Utility. |
| 77 | Attach_A | Agreement | VII.A.3, page 36 of 91 | Section reads "If applicable, all temporary relocation costs as well as any other conflict avoidance measures shall be the responsibility of the CONTRACTOR." Will SCDOT agree that should a temporary relocation be required to keep an existing utility in service during construction of the permanent relocation that any cost related to the temporary relocation should be borne by the utility owner if it was determined the utility owner does not have prior rights? | Utilities | No_Revision | Yes, within context of the CONTRACTOR conforming to all requirements of Article VII. |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |



**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
I-20 over Wateree River - Project ID P029450 - Kershaw County**

FINAL RFP - ROUND 1

Date Received: 10/19/2022

Non-Confidential Meeting Date: 11/3/2022

| | | | | | | SCDOT | |
|--------------|----------|---------------|------------------------------|--|---------------|-------------|---|
| Question No. | Category | Section | Page / Doc No. | Question/Comment | Discipline | Response | Explanation |
| 1 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4b | Section 2.2, pg 8 | On the rehabilitation of the existing overflow bridges scope, will SCDOT consider issuing separate substantial completion milestone dates for each bridge to start the warranty period? | Construction | No_Revision | Rehabbed structures are within the project limits and the DB warranty should not begin until all staging is completed and traffic is in final configuration. |
| 2 | RFP | 4 | Section 4.1.4, page 20 of 45 | MOT plans can be provided at 1" = 200' on 36" width x 8' length sheets. At least one layout be less than 1.5 feet in length when printed at 200 scale. Proposer requests permission to submit Appendix A.2 roll plots on ANSI D 22" x 36" paper at 1" = 100' full-size scale instead of 3'x8' format. | DM | Revision | Will revise to allow D 22"x36" sheets at 1":100' scale as an option. |
| 3 | Attach_B | Environmental | SHPO Consultation | Will Contractor be responsible for additional archaeological investigations at site 38KE1191/1192 if avoidance is not feasible? | Environmental | No_Revision | Yes. Per the cultural report, if avoidance is not possible, additional studies would need to be conducted to determine if graves are located within the work area. |
| 4 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4f | 2 & 3 | Sections 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 require that the Geotechnical Engineer of Record include a certification statement that all criteria have been met in the As-Installed Driven Pile or As-Installed Drilled Shaft Foundation Packages. We understand that SCDOT's intent is for the GEOR to review the information provided by the Contractor and certify that the information as provided meets the foundation design criteria. We also understand that SCDOT's intent is NOT for the GEOR (or their representative) to be present during the foundation construction to certify that the production logs accurately reflect the installed foundation elements. Is our understanding of SCDOT's intent correct? | Geotechnical | No_Revision | Yes. |
| 5 | PIP | Survey | | Can SCDOT please provide any survey information (point files, DTM/TIN, etc.) for the bottom of the river? | Hydrology | Revision | The raster used for the surface is embedded within the model. When the model is opened it is located under GIS Data. That is the raster that combines the Lidar data, bathymetry data and the SCDOT provided survey. That raster was combined with coverages in the model to create the model mesh. It is in the model when it is opened in SMS and in the SMS folder it is also located in the "terrain" folder as a .tif file. However, we are going to have a .tin file created and provided to the teams. |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------|------------|-----------------------------------|--|-----------|-------------|---|
| 6 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4e | Section 2.1, pg 2 | Section 2.1 states to "Design temporary drainage systems in accordance with AASHTO Drainage Manual Appendix 17A". However, Appendix 17A states that the methodology is intended for use in development of design frequency criteria for temporary roadway/hydraulic crossings (ex. channels, bridges, culverts) and does not make mention of an applicability to roadway drainage and/or bridge deck drainage. To ensure an equality in the interpretation of the hydraulic design criteria for all proposing teams, SCDOT should consider revising Appendix 4E of the RFP to adopt a constant rainfall intensity for spread design during temporary MOT phases. For additional context, recent SCDOT interstate projects (design build and design bid build) have adopted constant rainfall intensities of 2"/hr. for temporary hydraulic spread in upland regions and between 2-3"/hr. in coastal/lowland regions. | Hydrology | No_Revision | Design temporary drainage systems in accordance with AASHTO Drainage Manual Appendix 17A |
| 7 | PIP | Hydraulics | SRH-2D Model | The electronic files provided for the SRH-2D model appear to have been exported incorrectly and do not allow the model to open or run. Specifically the boundary conditions and material files appear to contain no data. Can the SRH-D model files be exported and provided? | Hydrology | No_Revision | Files are working |
| 8 | Attach_B | Survey | P029450-Wateree_survey_points.dgn | This is a follow up question to the response to Q56 from Round 1 NCQs. When will the bathymetric survey data be made available? | Hydrology | Revision | The raster used for the surface is embedded within the model. When the model is opened it is located under GIS Data. That is the raster that combines the Lidar data, bathymetry data and the SCDOT provided survey. That raster was combined with coverages in the model to create the model mesh. It is in the model when it is opened in SMS and in the SMS folder it is also located in the "terrain" folder as a .tif file. However, we are going to have a .tin file created and provided to the teams. |
| 9 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4e | 2 | This is a follow up question for clarification to the response to Q18 from Round 1 NCQs. Section 2.1 of Exhibit 4e states to follow the spread criteria from the BDM, Exhibit 4b, and RHDS for the replacement bridges. However, Section 2.1.14 of Exhibit 4b states that the BDM Subsection 18.2.2 does not apply to this project. Please clarify this apparent conflict. | Hydrology | Revision | BDM Section 12.2.3 (Figure 18.2-1 specifically) provides the allowable spread criteria for bridge deck drainage, except as amended by RFP Exhibit 4b Section 2.1.14. Per Exhibit 4b, BDM Section 12.2.2, which is an equation that would allow no scuppers to be used for a certain maximum bridge length, is not allowed to be used on this project. Will clarify by referring only to Exhibit 4b for bridge drainage requirements. |
| 10 | Attach_A | Agreement | 19 | Section II, L. Subcontracts, Item s. requires that all subcontracts "be consistent in all other respects with the terms and conditions of this Agreement to the extent such terms and conditions are applicable to the scope of work of such subcontractors, and include all provisions required by this Agreement." It is our interpretation that this clause requires all design subconsultants/subcontractors to carry the same level of professional liability insurance (i.e. \$10 million). With the required DBE participation, these limits may not be feasible for such firms. We request SCDOT consider a revision to the professional liability limits and/or a revision to the flowdown clause. | Legal | No_Revision | No, Liability coverage is designed to protect more than the monetary value of a particular contractor's scope of work. |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------|------------|--|--|------------|-------------|---|
| 11 | Attach_A | Agreement | 57 | Section XVI - Indemnity, the indemnification obligation is not tied to negligence and could result in indemnification for SCDOT's own negligence. It is requested that a clause be added stating that this indemnification obligation does not require the CONTRACTOR to indemnify SCDOT for its own negligence and that the indemnification obligation in XVI.A.2.d be modified to require indemnification for "the actual or alleged CONTRACTOR negligent performance of the work." | Legal | No_Revision | Statement regarding indemnification for SCDOT's negligence is incorrect. Additionally, Proposer's indemnity obligation is not limited to negligence or negligently performed work. |
| 12 | Attach_A | Agreement | VI Insurance and Bonding, A.3, Pg 35 of 92 | Given the response to question number 29 from the Industry Review Comments, please confirm that the Delay in Start-Up Coverage requested is to cover the Contractor's delay costs with no coverage for the Owner. | Legal | No_Revision | All coverages are required to name SCDOT as an additional insured per Article VI.A.3. |
| 13 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4c | Section 2.3, page 1 | The SCDOT uses a terminal serviceability of 2.5 for high-speed limited-access facilities and 2.0 for all other situations. Is 2.0 acceptable for terminal serviceability for temporary pavement? | Pavement | No_Revision | The use of a pt= 2.0 could likely be acceptable in temporary pavement designs. Would be determined on a case by case basis and dependent on assumptions made on other inputs and if pavement would be incorporated into final pavement. |
| 14 | RFP | 3 | 12 | The last sentence of Section 3.9.1 states that "All information being exchanged between Proposers and SCDOT shall occur only on the specific dates shown, unless otherwise directed by SCDOT POC." Since the FATC submittal is due by 7:30 AM, can SCDOT allow for submission of FACTs the day prior? | PM | No_Revision | The due date says by 7:30am so that allows for the early submittal of the item as long as it is by the date and time in the chart. |
| 15 | RFP | 4 | 23, 24 | Consider revising the language as stated in 4.3 Page 23 (pdf page 28), "Two completed submittals per team will be accepted, one original and one redacted (if the Proposer elects to waive payment of the Stipend), and shall be uploaded..." to add the word 'EVEN' in the parentheses. E.g. Two completed submittals per team will be accepted, one original and one redacted (even if the Proposer elects to waive payment of the Stipend), and shall be uploaded... 4.4 Page 24 (pdf page 29) states nothing about the stipend but stipulates that a redacted copy is required (regardless stipend payment waiver), "The Proposer must submit one complete copy of its Proposal from which it concealed such "Confidential" information, i.e. the redacted copy. Even in the absence of "Confidential" information, the Proposer must submit a redacted copy of its Proposal." | PM | No_Revision | The proposer must submit one copy of its Proposal without redactions. We also need a redacted one if the proposer does not accept the stipends and/or if the proposer has confidential information they want redacted. Section 4.4 does not require a redacted copy. It states that the proposer "may" also submit a redacted copy. |
| 16 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4b | 8 | Please confirm that no seismic retrofit is required for the rehabilitation bridges. | Structures | No_Revision | Confirmed. RFP is prescriptive on rehab repairs to be performed. |
| 17 | PIP | Structures | | Can SCDOT please provide the Microstation files used for development of the conceptual bridge plans? | Structures | Revision | DGN files will be provided in Project Information Package. |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------|---------|-----------------------|--|------------|----------|---|
| 18 | Attach_B | Survey | Combined Survey Files | During the Open-Forum Meeting with Proposers, it was mentioned that SCDOT would provide additional information on river soundings and survey / point cloud data on the existing bridges. When does SCDOT anticipate providing these documents? | Structures | Revision | Existing bridge shots have been provided in updated survey files currently on website. There is no additional point cloud data for existing bridge structures. Will provide the bathymetric survey data, for the river channel, on the website as a .tin file. |
| 19 | PIP | Traffic | | Can SCDOT provide traffic data on US 521 and US 601? | Traffic | Revision | General volume, class, k-factors, and d-factors are available on SCDOT website for count stations. https://scdottrafficdata.drakewell.com/publicmultinodemap.asp Will also provide traffic volumes gathered for project in PIP. |



**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
I-20 over Wateree River - Project ID P029450 - Kershaw County**

FINAL RFP - ROUND 2

Date Received: 11/03 - 11/17/2022

Non-Confidential Meeting Date: 12/1/2022

| | | | | | | SCDOT | |
|--------------|----------|-----------------|--|--|--------------|-------------|---|
| Question No. | Category | Section | Page / Doc No. | Question/Comment | Discipline | Response | Explanation |
| 1 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4b | 1 | Please clarify SCDOT's intentions regarding the combination of scour with seismic modeling and design. SCDOT Seismic Design Specification section 5.1.8 states that "The effect of long term scour should be considered" which implies that seismic modeling should consider the effects of scour. This is consistent with previous versions of SCDOT's GDM section 14.6 which articulates this combination. However, recent updates to the GDM have removed this language and it can be interpreted that scour is not intended to be considered in seismic design. Please clarify if SCDOT intends scour to be considered in seismic modeling and design, and if so, the amount of scour to be considered in each seismic design event. | Structures | Revision | Exhibit 4b will be revised to require modelling of one-half of the 500-year scour depth for both the SEE and FEE earthquakes. This is in addition to modelling zero scour. Seismic performance objectives shall be met for both situations (half-scour and zero scour). |
| 2 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4d_Pt 2 | 9 | It is stated that SCDOT will accept a 60mph design speed "for the transition from the existing I-20 mainline travel lanes to the temporary bridge structure" on the west end of the Wateree River bridge. Please confirm that the stage 1 portion of a single bridge alternative qualifies as a "temporary bridge structure" as it relates to this requirement. | Traffic | No_Revision | No, the 60 mph design speed was intended exclusively for the temporary bridge design. |
| 3 | Attach_B | Structures | Proposed Repair Details & Quantities for Overflow Bridges, Pg 45 of 49 | Section 8 of the mentioned section of Attachment B states, "A new approach slab will be constructed after all undermining and voids have been filled and will re-establish the deflection joint between the superstructure and approach slab." For these repairs, will a liquefaction analysis be required, and if needed will the installation of earthquake drains be required? | Geotechnical | No_Revision | No. Seismic design is not required for rehabs unless specifically stated in the design criteria in the RFP. |
| 4 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4b | Section 2, 2.1.5 | RFP section 2.1.19 requires to offset the proposed piers away from the existing piers. However section 2.1.5 states to remove entirely Piers F & G. This water not being navigational and not in conflict with the proposed structure (as per 2.1.19) can the removal be limited to 2 ft below mudline and reduce the need of deeper cofferdam systems. | Structures | No_Revision | The offset requirement in 2.1.19 does not apply to the existing footings for Piers F & G, as stated in the first bullet point. Proposed piers may be placed in the area of existing Piers F & G, as the conceptual plans show. Additionally, the existing footings for Piers F & G are currently partially exposed and removal to 2-feet below the mud line will cover the majority of the footing. As such, the requirement to entirely remove them will remain. |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------|------------|--|---|--------------|-------------|---|
| 5 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4b | Section 2.1.19 | Exhibit 4b, section 2.1.19 Substructures states that there should be "10-foot minimum between centerline of proposed bent and centerline of existing pile bents". On the east end of the existing structures, the spacing of the existing bents is approximately 30 feet from each other. To better facilitate structurally efficient layouts for the new structure, can the above requirement be removed for the shorter span existing bents from approximately station 1813+00 to the existing east abutment? | Structures | No_Revision | No. |
| 6 | Attach_B | Structures | Proposed Repair Details & Quantities for Overflow Bridges, Page 43 of 49 | The bent cap retrofit shown for Bridges 5780 & 5785 Bents 2, 24 & 25, and Bridges 5781 & 5786 Bents 2 & 25 show the use of #16 adhesively bonded dowels for the repair. Is the Contractor responsible for evaluating the structural adequacy of the proposed repair or simply constructing the repair as detailed? | Structures | Revision | Minimum sizes of adhesive anchors are represented on the repair details. EOR is to verify structural adequacy of the bent cap retrofit detail and design new reinforcing that is consistent with the existing bridge design. Adhesive anchor design is to be in accordance with bridge design memo DM0408. This will be clarified in the RFP. |
| 7 | Attach_B | Structures | Proposed Repair Details & Quantities for Overflow Bridges, page 11 of 49 | The provided quantities for joint repair equals the total lineal feet of joints over the intermediate bents. Please confirm that all joints shall receive at least a Type 1 repair. | Structures | No_Revision | Confirmed, all joints shall receive at least a Type 1 repair to clean and reseal the joints. |
| 8 | Attach_B | Structures | Proposed Repair Details & Quantities for Overflow Bridges, Pg 46 of 49 | The detail for the approach slab replacement does not address if any repair is needed on the deck side over the abutment. Please confirm if the entire length of the deck edge needs to be repaired and it will be paid using the joint repair types already established in the contract. | Structures | No_Revision | No repairs to the edge of deck at the end bents are required. New approach slab is to be cast against the existing flat slab and deflection joint installed, per the SCDOT approach slab Drawing No. 702-30a. |
| 9 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4f | 2.3, Page 3; GDM, Chapter 12, Section 12.9 | Since the site has the potential for liquefiable soils, will a Site Specific Response Spectra (SSRA) be required. | Geotechnical | No_Revision | No. The seismic design curves presented in the RFP shall be used. |
| 10 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4f | 2.3, Page 3; GDM, Chapter 12, Section 12.9 | Was shallow bedrock accounted for in the development of the ADRS Curve | Geotechnical | No_Revision | Data obtained from the geotechnical subsurface exploration was used in developing the ADRS curve. |
| 11 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4e | Section 2.2 Bridge Hydraulics, Page 3 | When we ran the hydraulic model presented by SCDOT the results of the model do not match those presented in the RFP design and in final design the overall low chord elevation of the structure and profile of the roadway may need to be raised to meet a higher low chord elevation. Should we proceed with the elevations as provided in the RFP. | Hydrology | Revision | RFP conceptual design was based on 1D model with scour potential utilizing a 2D model for analysis. Exhibit 4e will be revised to allow TEAMS to use 1D model but still require 2D for scour analysis. |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------|------------|-------------|--|-----------|-------------|--|
| 12 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4e | Section 2.2 | Exhibit 4e, Section 2.2: Will backwater of greater than 1.0 foot for the proposed bridge be acceptable as long as there is a reduction in proposed backwater compared to existing bridge conditions? | Hydrology | No_Revision | Yes, HDB 2019-4 requires that SFHA's with floodways have no increase in the 1% AEP flood and floodway profiles and that there is no increase in floodway width at published and unpublished cross sections to meet "No Impact" requirements. |
|----|----------|------------|-------------|--|-----------|-------------|--|



**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
I-20 over Wateree River - Project ID P029450 - Kershaw County**

FINAL RFP - ROUND 3

Date Received: 1/6/2023

Non-Confidential Meeting Date: 1/25/2023

| | | | | | | | SCDOT | |
|--------------|----------|--------------------------------|---------------------|---|--------------|-------------|---|--|
| Question No. | Category | Section | Page / Doc No. | Question/Comment | Discipline | Response | Explanation | |
| 1 | RFP | SCDOT Geotechnical Manual 2022 | Chapter 21, pg 21-1 | Will we be allowed by the GOER to prepare a single bridge/roadway PGER and GER since there is very little road work, or will separate reports be required. | Geotechnical | No_Revision | A single combined roadway and bridge report may be submitted if roadway and bridge plans are submitted together at the same time. Otherwise, separate reports are required to be submitted with the corresponding plan sets. | |
| 2 | RFP | 4 | 4.1, Page 17 of 45 | The RFP states "The Technical Proposal Narrative shall contain no more than 10 pages, excluding the required appendices. Charts, tables, and schedules used to explain or expand on the Technical Proposal are to be included within the page limit and shall not be inserted into the appendices." Will SCDOT allow 11x17 page size for a chart, table, and/or schedule to explain or expand on the Technical Proposal? If so, will one single sided 11x17 page count as one page or two within the 10 page maximum? | PM | No_Revision | No, the page size will remain 8.5"x11" and the page count will be 10 pages. | |
| 3 | RFP | 4 | 4.1, Page 17 of 45 | In Section 5.2 on Page 22 of 27 of the RFQ document stated that "Text contained on the Key Individual Resume Forms, Work History Forms, charts, exhibits, or other illustrative information shall be no smaller than 10-point Time New Roman." There is no mention in Section 4.1 of the RFP document in regards to the font size allotments for charts, exhibits or other illustrative information. Will a smaller font size be allowed for charts, exhibits, graphics, etc. within the 10-page Technical Proposal? | PM | Revision | Will add that charts, tables, schedules, exhibits, or other illustrative information may be single spaced and shall be no smaller than 10 point font. | |
| 4 | RFP | 5 | 5.4, Page 26 of 45 | In regards to the Technical Proposal Presentations, would SCDOT consider allowing Proposers to prepare a separate presentation with material and excerpts from their Technical Proposal and Proposal Plans? | PM | No_Revision | Only what is provided in the Technical Proposal will be used at the meeting. | |
| 5 | RFP | 4 | 20 | Scale for Conceptual MOT roll plots is shown as 1"=200'. For this project drawings using larger scale (1" = 100') will still fit on 36" x 8' long rolls and will be much easier to read. Please confirm that the MOT roll plots can be prepared using a scale no smaller than 1"=200' and that 1" = 100' scale may be used. | Traffic | Revision | Revising RFP to state no smaller than 1"=200'. | |
| 6 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4b | 5 | Section 2.1.14 states that a single concrete flume be provided in each bridge corner and also limits the bypass flow onto erodable surfaces to 0.2 cfs. For a bridge of this length, there will be a large volume of runoff leaving the bridge that would be incompatible with a single flume and the bypass flow limitations. Is it SCDOT's intention to provide a potentially atypically large number of bridge deck drains in order to limit the bypass flow beyond a single flume? Alternately, a more typical deck drain spacing could be used with multiple flumes or more efficient and higher capacity drainage structure(s). | Structures | No_Revision | The intent is to provide a typical number of deck drains and control the runoff such that a single flume can handle it. Prep work indicated 15-foot maximum scupper spacing to achieve this, which we believe is "typical". If teams are concerned a spacing much tighter than 15-feet will be necessary to meet the RFP requirements, then please let us know. | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------|------------|----|---|------------|-------------|--|
| 7 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4b | 5 | Please verify the 0.2 cfs bypass flow limitation for erodable surfaces. This flowrate is typically specified as the limit for bypass flows at superelvation rollover locations, not for shoulder slopes. | Structures | No_Revision | Verified. Please see response to previous question. Erosion of fill slopes at bridge ends due to flume bypass flow is a common SCDOT maintenance concern. |
| 8 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4b | 8 | Section 2.1.21 states that the "limit of riprap on the approach embankments is 30-foot minimum back from the beginning/end of bridge as shown on Standard Drawing 804-105-00." Please clarify how the 30-foot minimum is interpreted on the upstream side of the bridge where the existing guide banks are present and are to be retained. | Structures | No_Revision | New riprap is required to the 30-foot limit regardless of presence of existing guide banks. |
| 9 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4c | 1 | Section 2.2 requires surface planing 2 inches prior to overlay. The latest rehabilitation plans indicate that the last pavement treatment was 200 PSY of Surface and 110 PSY of OGFC. Please confirm that it is SCDOT's intent to leave less than one inch of the old surface course in place beneath the proposed overlay. | Pavement | No_Revision | Yes, our intent is to only remove two inches total. |
| 10 | Attach_A | Agreement | | Please confirm that design subcontractors/subconsultants of every tier are not required to carry \$10,000,000 in professional liability insurance, as could be interpreted from Section VI A of the Agreement. | Legal | No_Revision | Section VI.A applies, by its plain terms, only to the Contractor. SCDOT only requires subcontracts to be consistent with its Agreement with Contractor (Section II.L.3.s) Issues like insurance limits, coverage amounts, and risk sharing between the Contractor, consultants, subcontractors, and subconsultants are a matter of contract between those parties. |
| 11 | Attach_A | Agreement | 78 | During the RFQ phase, the DBE section initially listed the professional services DBE requirement as 0.8% of the contract value. After the initial round of questions during the RFQ phase, SCDOT changed the professional services DBE percentage to 0.3%. However, it appears that Section XVIII of the Agreement was not updated to reflect the change the professional services DBE goal from 0.8% to 0.3%. Please update Section XVIII of the Agreement to reflect the same DBE goals that were included in the RFQ, since our team was assembled based on the goals stated in the RFQ. | PM | Revision | Revised to match .3% shown in the RFQ. |