

NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
Bridge Package 16 - Contract ID 3962240 - Pickens County

RFP FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW

Date Received: 2/24/2023

Meeting Date: 3/6/2023

						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	Page 30 (240)	High Strength Geotextile for Embankment Reinforcement Table 1 specifies Long-Term Design Strength in the machine direction of 22,800 lb/ft. This strength requirement is extremely high and it would be very difficult to obtain from most manufacturers. Is this a typo? .What application is this spec for? Section 4 states that geogrids must meet the Table 1 properties as well, but there are no geogrids that would come close to this strength. Shouldn't geosynthetic strength be determined by the designer for the specific application it is used for? Are there situations where SC-M-203-2 can be used instead?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	There is no requirement to use this Special Provision. This special provision is specific to a high-strength geotextile if needed for the project. Yes, geosynthetic strength is determined by the designer and specified in the plans. SC-M-203-2 should be used for typical geogrid applications and SC-M-203-3 should be used for typical geotextile applications. The Special Provision is for a material that falls outside of the maximum design strength ranges for those two Supplemental Technical Specifications.
3	PIP	Hydraulics		Can the HEC RAS Ras Mapper Terrain and Feature files be provided for US 123, SC 183 (Gregory Creek), & SC 124 as were provided for SC 183 (Twelve Mile Creek)?	Hydrology	No_Revision	All files have been provided that SCDOT has obtained.
4	Attach_A			Will the abutments on the existing bridges be removed (laid back) to the extent of the natural conditions.	Hydrology	Revision	Yes, existing embankments are expected to be removed to natural conditions for the length of the proposed bridge. This will be clarified in Exhibit 4b for all off-alignment replacements.
5	PIP	Hydraulics	Hydro Memos / Section 2.2 of RFP	Based on the most recent FEMA Flood Maps, the bridges to be replaced are all in designated FEMA Flood Zones. Constructing the bridges on new alignment will require new cut or fill sections in the designated flood zone and may extend outside the existing Right of Way. The PIP indicates "No-Impact" Certificates for all locations. 1. Does SCDOT expect that a CLOMR/LOMR will need to be issued due to the new alignments differing from current FEMA maps and models? 2. If so, has any coordination already taken place?	Hydrology	No_Revision	SCDOT doesn't expect a CLOMR/LOMR process on these bridges. No coordination has taken place since the Department does not expect to go through that process. CLOMR only needed if no impact is not obtainable.
6	PIP	Roadway		Are any roadway design files available for US 123 SB?	Roadway	Revision	Microstation files provided were mislabeled, US 123 SB design files were provided & file names will be revised accordingly in PIP. A conceptual design was developed for SB replacement only and then NB bridge was subsequently added to the project. A conceptual design for both NB and SB replacement has not been developed.
7	PIP	Survey		Will SCDOT provide the the existing surveyed centerlines for US 123?	Roadway	Revision	Attachment B survey files will be updated and released with the Final RFP.
8	PIP	Roadway	Conceptual Roadway Plans	Will conceptual roadway plan and profiles be provided for the US 123 over Georges Creek location?	Roadway	No_Revision	A conceptual design was developed for SB replacement only and then NB bridge was subsequently added to the project. A conceptual design for both NB and SB replacement has not been developed.



9	PIP	Survey		Will SCDOT be providing the existing property and ROW for SC 124? There is no existing ROW east of the bridge.	ROW	Revision	Attachment B survey files will be updated and released with the Final RFP.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	3	Please clarify the minimum span length requirements in Exhibit 4b.2.1.8 in contrast to Attachment B/Hydrology Package 16_BridgeInfo.pdf for SC 183 over Gregory Creek	Structures	Revision	Attachment B/Hydrology Bridge Info table specifies minimum channel span and minimum total bridge length. Minimum span lengths specified in Exhibit 4b 2.1.8 (second paragraph) apply to approach spans (not the channel/main span). This will be clarified.
10	PIP	Structures		Are any structural design files available for US 123 NB and SB?	Structures	No_Revision	Not for both NB and SB. A conceptual design was being developed for SB replacement only and then NB bridge was subsequently added to the project. A conceptual design for both NB and SB replacement has not been developed.
11	PIP	Structures		Are the conceptual bridge plan and profile .pdf files available for US 123	Structures	No_Revision	No. A conceptual design was being developed for SB replacement only and then NB bridge was subsequently added to the project. A conceptual design for both NB and SB replacement has not been developed.
12	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	1	Please confirm that Exhibit 4b 2.1.2 – Seismic Design and Detailing controls over Exhibit 4f 2.3 Seismic Design Page 5 last paragraph. A Category A seismic design does not require the SEOR to calculate the fundamental period of the structure. Is this required for this project?	Structures	No_Revision	Confirmed. Exhibit 4f 2.3 requires checking the fundamental periods if the structure is "seismically designed". Since SDC A does not require a detailed seismic analysis, then the fundamental period of the structure does not need to be checked.
13	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	5	Section 2.1.17 of Structures Design Criteria states to provide a minimum of one (1) deck drain per span. If spread calculations confirm that deck drains are unnecessary are deck drains still mandatory per span?	Structures	No_Revision	Yes.
14	PIP	Structures	Conceptual Bridge Plans	Will conceptual bridge plans be provided for the US 123 over Georges Creek location?	Structures	No_Revision	No. A conceptual design was being developed for SB replacement only and then NB bridge was subsequently added to the project. A conceptual design for both NB and SB replacement has not been developed.
15	PIP	Utilities		When will the utility information be made available on Projectwise?	Utilities	Revision	Information will be provided to the short-listed teams ahead of the Industry Review Open Forum.
16	PIP	Survey		Will the SUE CADD files be made available?	Utilities	Revision	Information will be provided in Attachment B for the release of the Final RFP.

