

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

RFP FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW

Date Received: 11/14/2023

Meeting Date: 11/16/2023

					SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	46	In reference to Item 32, will Fuel Adjustment Indexes apply to this project?	No_Revision	Yes.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	48	In reference to Item 38, if any material within the existing embankment from the original ground line (before US 17A/21 was built) to the current ground surface does not meet Item 37, will it have to be removed and replaced with no additional time or compensation?	No_Revision	No. The material may remain in place.
3	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 26 of 92; IV.A.1. (pdf 58)	During the site visit on 10/27/23, a completion date of May 31, 2024 was indicated ahead of Hurricane Season which begins June 1, 2024. The RFP states "The new bridge shall be opened to traffic prior to May 1, 2024. The Project shall be Substantially Complete prior to May 31, 2024." We understand that the main intent is to have this route open for critical evacuations in the event of a hurricane. With that goal in mind, would SCDOT consider revising the agreement to state that the bridge will be opened to traffic prior to May 31, 2024?	Revision	The intent was for the bridge to be open to traffic prior to or on May 31, 2024. Substantial completion should be complete prior to or on June 21, 2024. This language will be added/adjusted.
4	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 10 of 92 Paragraph 6 (pdf 42)	Given the accelerated nature of the project, will SCDOT consider expedited submittal review times in addition to what they are already doing?	Revision	Review times have been compressed to the extent practical and have been coordinated and concurred with by CSX RR. However, 4z will be revised to allow for teams to submit at a minimum, Preliminary and Final Bridge plans and Final Roadway plans. Teams may elect to skip Preliminary and R/W Roadway submittals at their own risk.
5	RFP	2	3	When will SCDOT provide the full archeological survey showing area that is unavailable till 1/31/2024? Should this condition be added to the Agreement?	Revision	Information will be added to website. Agreement will be updated when NPCE is signed by FHWA. Language will be clarified.
6	RFP	2	3	Has SCDOT started the Nationwide 3(a) permit preparation based on the Concept Roadway Plans included in the PIP?	No_Revision	Yes. In light of design developments, SCDOT will be obtaining a GP for impacts. A copy of the application will be provided to teams as well as the approved permit.
7	Attach_A	Agreement	49	Since the existing road, culverts, bridge, etc. are more than 50 years old, can the reference to 50 years in paragraph 3 be changed to 100 years so that these assets are not consider archeological remains or historical structures?	No_Revision	No. SHPO has concurred with qualifying historic archeological remains. A copy of the 106 report and concurrence letter will be provided. Items in question were not of concern to SHPO.
8	Attach_B	Environmental		When does SCDOT anticipate providing the NEPA document?	No_Revision	When it is signed by FHWA.
9	Attach_B	Environmental		Has SCDOT completed a jurisdictional determination or an initial draft stream and wetland delineation that can be shared immediately?	No_Revision	Delineation files will be shared once provided to the USACE. No streams identified onsite, only wetlands.
10	RFP	2	3 of 26	Section 2.5 - Please consider providing draft environmental commitments prior to the completion of the NPCE as they may have an impact on the Teams' designs.	No_Revision	FHWA will not allow sharing of draft commitments prior to a NEPA decision.
11	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	1	Long eared bats are assumed to be listed as endangered by the time of construction, will SCDOT make an a determination on the long eared bats? Has any coordination with the US Fish & Wildlife been done to date and can that be shared with the design build teams?	No_Revision	Determinations made. Section 7 coordination is complete. Information will be provided to teams.



12	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	1	Is SCDOT requiring clearing/grinding the entire proposed ROW width or only within toe of fill slopes? Will clearing/grinding be required with wetlands/ditches?	Revision	Clearing and grubbing will be within construction limits and clearing only out to right of way.
13	RFP	2	Page 3 of 26; Paragraph 3 (pdf 8)	With regard to the archeological data recovery, the RFP states that the "the selected Proposer shall cooperate during these efforts." Can SCDOT expand on the cooperation efforts anticipated? Should the selected Proposer have archeological staff on the team to assist with this cooperation?	No_Revision	SCDOT will oversee data recovery activity. Contractor will need to coordinate with SCDOT consultant for safe access and providing safe work area for them to complete the recovery effort.
14	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	Page 1; Section 2.0 (pdf 170)	Given the short schedule of the project, would SCDOT consider eliminating the Preliminary Road Geotechnical Report and only require the Final Road Geotechnical Report?	Revision	Yes, though this would be at the DB team's risk.
15	Attach_B	Geotechnical	1. Draft Geotechnical Information	Based on the geotechnical information provided with the RFP, it appears that no Seismic Cone Penetration Tests were performed. Given the seismic requirements of the site, will Seismic CPT's be performed and the results provided as an addendum to the RFP?	No_Revision	No. Shear wave and compression wave velocities were measured using downhole geophysical test methods in a cased soil testing boring and this data was provided with the Draft Geotechnical Information and will also be provided with the final reports.
16	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f	Page 5; Response Spectrum data (pdf 168)	The lower limit value for TNH, shown in the provided ADRS curve in Exhibit 4f, is not consistent with the formula written above it ($4 \cdot H/V \cdot s, H$). Can you confirm if it's a typo or if the formula needs to be changed.	No_Revision	The lower limit value for TNH and the equation are correct. However, the TNH value is based on the 2-successive layer method, and not on the equation in this case.
17	Attach_B	Geotechnical	1. Draft Geotechnical Information	When does SCDOT anticipate providing the complete Geotechnical Baseline Report?	No_Revision	The Geotechnical Baseline Report and Subsurface Data Report should be available by the end of this week if not sooner.
18	Attach_B	Geotechnical	1. Draft Geotechnical Information	Please clarify how the coordinates for geotechnical boring locations (CPT and SPT) were obtained. Were they determined by survey, or handheld GPS, or some other method?	No_Revision	Test locations were surveyed.
19	Attach_B	Geotechnical		Is the performance based method (utilized in SPTLIQ that is provided in SCDOT Website) acceptable in identifying the liquefied zones?	No_Revision	Yes, though note both SPT borings and CPT soundings were performed and the GEOR should be evaluating the data for both. Is there any reason to think that SPLIQ would not be allowed?
20	Attach_A	Agreement	50	In relation to Section XI, Will SCDOT complete and provide all HAZMAT surveys for all structures (bridge, walls, culvert) by December 4, 2023?	No_Revision	Yes, this information will be provided as soon as it is available, but no later than release of the Final RFP. Sampling of the walls and culvert were not performed.
21	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	1	Per the RFP, the existing 4'x6' RCBC is to be "analyzed, designed, and extended to meet all criteria". It is assumed that this culvert is an abandoned cattle crossing. Per pre-RFP meeting, SCDOT indicated this culvert was likely a "cattle crossing" and could be demolished. Please clarify.	Revision	Scope has been updated to keep and extend culvert.
22	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	4	"2.5 NPDES Permitting" does not reference coordination with OCRM. Attachment for DHEC's More Common Permits highlights "Non-Coastal." Confirm if SCDOT has established this to be a "Non-Coastal" review with DHEC or if OCRM coordination is anticipated since a portion of the project is in Beaufort County. Is it possible for OCRM to waive a Coastal Zone Consistency Review given the very aggressive schedule?	No_Revision	No Coastal Zone Consistency waiver to SCDOT's knowledge. Full reviews have been streamlined on small projects recently.
23	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2	Section 2.1.19 - Can SCDOT please confirm that the existing 30" RCP at approximately Sta. 1095+00 is structurally sufficient and can be retained?	Revision	SCDOT can not confirm. Initial analysis is that the culvert is undersized and will need to be replaced. Teams should analyze and design accordingly. Project Scope will be revised accordingly.
24	Attach_B	Hydraulics	1. Toe-Ditch Detail	Would SCDOT consider the removal of the Toe-Ditch Detail from Attachment B to minimize additional right-of-way, environmental and utility impacts?	No_Revision	R/W should be set. SCDOT will not remove Toe-Ditch Detail from Attachment B.



25	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	Page 4; Section 2.5 (pdf 162)	Has SCDOT started early coordination with OCRM in regards to obtaining a NOI and CZC permit to minimize potential delays in schedule impacts?	No_Revision	SCDOT has not started early coordination. See question 22 question above.
26	Attach_A	Agreement	10	Will SCDOT change all references to number of days in paragraph 6 to one (1) day? Most of the references say five business days, which is the equivalent of 7 calendar days, and this is about 6% of the contract time allowed to complete the roadway and bridge sufficiently to open to traffic. Exhibit 4z includes numerous submittal packages. Just 4 end-on-end submittal packages will burn about 25% of the allowed time.	No_Revision	Review times have been compressed to the extent practical and have been coordinated and concurred with by CSX RR. However, 4z will be revised to allow for teams to submit at a minimum, Preliminary and Final Bridge plans and Final Roadway plans. Teams may elect to skip Preliminary and R/W Roadway submittals at their own risk.
27	Attach_A	Agreement	15-16	Will SCDOT change the time limits in Table 5a for Levels 4, 5, and 6 to 24 hours to accommodate the very aggressive delivery schedule?	Revision	SCDOT is open to a minor compression of levels 4, 5, and 6. Additional internal discussion is needed.
28	Attach_A	Agreement	53	Will SCDOT remove Section XIII.A.2 from the Agreement?	No_Revision	This section will remain unchanged within the agreement.
29	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	36	Is the DBE Committal Sheet or DBE Utilization Commitment Plan required with the Cost Proposal?	No_Revision	Requirements are explained in the DBE special provision.
30	RFP	3	6	Due to the extensive amount of pre-bid work required by a proposer to be in a position to meet SCDOT's delivery schedule, will SCDOT please consider adding a Stipend of at least \$100,000?	No_Revision	SCDOT will discuss internally and consider the addition of a stipend.
31	RFP	3	6	If the project is cancelled, will SCDOT provide a Stipend of at least \$300,000?	No_Revision	SCDOT will discuss internally and consider the addition of a stipend in the event of project cancelation. However, this is a very low risk and the amount would be determined and listed in the agreement and not the amount requested.
32	RFP	3	6 of 26	Section 3.6 - Confidential Questions - Typically confidential 1 on 1 meetings are for ATC discussions. Since ATC's are not allowed for this project will SCDOT consider removal of confidential questions and 1 on 1 meetings?	Revision	Due to the accelerated schedule, the intent was to offer teams the opportunity for a confidential meeting if needed; they are not mandatory. We will clarify the language accordingly.
33	RFP	8	20 of 26	Section 8.9 - Conflict of Interest - Can SCDOT please confirm there are no consultant firms that are precluded from this pursuit due to a conflicts of interest? Should the geotechnical engineer who provided the drilling for this project be precluded (F&ME)?	Revision	There are three firms that are precluded from pursuit: F&ME, Brockington, and CECS. These firms will be added to the list.
34	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	1	Can SCDOT please clarify whether or not the 4x6 RCB will need to be extended or flowable filled? Based on our teams preliminary evaluation the culvert is not required to be extended and can be flowable filled as the culvert is outside of the FEMA 500-year flood plain.	Revision	Culvert is to be retained and extended. Scope will be revised to require this.
35	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	1	Can SCDOT please confirm it will be allowable to forego Preliminary Roadway Plans Package submittal?	Revision	CSX requires submittal of Preliminary and Final Bridge plans. Will revise 4z to allow teams to omit preliminary and R/W Roadway plans at their own risk.



36	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	1	Can SCDOT please confirm it is acceptable to skip both the Preliminary Submittal Package and Right-of-Way Submittal Package at the contractor's own risk?	Revision	CSX requires submittal of Preliminary and Final Bridge plans. Will revise 4z to allow teams to omit preliminary and R/W Roadway plans at their own risk.
37	Attach_A	Agreement	10 of 92	Per the RFP on page 26 of 92 - Section IV Contract Time Project Schedule: "Time is of the essence". Per the RFP Section D.6 (Design Review) on page 10 of 92, "The initial review period for each submittal package shall be 10 business days following the date SCDOT receives an accurate and complete submittal in conformity with the contract. SCDOT review comments will be sent to the CONTRACTOR, who shall respond within five business days and prior to subsequent phase submittals. SCDOT will then status CONTRACTOR'S responses and will provide additional comments, if any, within five business days. If any open comments remain after the initial 10 day review and subsequent five day review and comment periods, there will be no time constraint for the CONTRACTOR to respond. For all subsequent rounds of CONTRACTOR responses, SCDOT will status CONTRACTOR'S responses and will provide additional comments, if any, within five business days." Due to the time of essence required for this project, will SCDOT consider a 5 business day initial review period in lieu of the aforementioned 10 business day initial review period?	No_Revision	Review times have been compressed to the extent practical and have been coordinated and concurred with by CSX RR. 10 days is the minimum.
38	RFP	4	7 of 26	Section 4.1 - Is a schedule required to be included in the Technical Proposal Narrative?	No_Revision	We do not intend to require a schedule as a part of the Technical Proposal. However, teams will not be penalized for providing one.
39	Attach_B	Survey		The current survey does not show jurisdictional streams/wetlands, can SCDOT please provide this information?	No_Revision	Final survey was received and uploaded to the website earlier this week. Additional wetlands information, if not available will be provided when GP application is submitted.
40	Attach_B	Survey	1. US 17A Preliminary Surveys	When does SCDOT anticipate providing the Final Survey files?	No_Revision	Final survey was received and uploaded to the website earlier this week.
41	Attach_A	Agreement	10	Referencing paragraph 6, will CSX and SCDOT review the plans concurrently? If we have to satisfy all SCDOT comments before CSX gets the plans, the delivery schedule will be compromised.	Revision	SCDOT and CSXT will review the plans concurrently within 10 business days maximum.
42	Attach_A	Agreement	40	Can the 15-day reference in paragraph 7 be changed to 5 days?	Revision	Will be adjusted to 10 days to match intent.



43	Attach_A	Agreement	40	Can the 14-day reference in paragraph 8 be changed to 5 days? Time is of the essence as 14 business days will be almost three calendar weeks.	Revision	It is anticipated that the Construction Agreement will be in place prior to NTP. As such, the referenced 14 days will not likely be relevant. Language to be adjusted as necessary.
44	Attach_A	Agreement	40	Will SCDOT coordinate with CSX and prepare/provide the separate right-of-entry agreement that will be required between the Contractor and the Railroad as described in paragraph 9 of the Agreement so that such can be executed with the Agreement?	No_Revision	The Contractor will acquire their own right of entry agreement with CSXT.
45	Attach_B			Will the executed Railroad Agreement be provided by December 4, 2023? If not, when?	Revision	Please clarify if the intent was December 4 or January 4? It is not anticipated that the finalized agreement will be executed by the referenced December date. Pertinent information will be provided within Exhibit 8 when available.
46	Attach_A	Exhibit 8	1	Will SCDOT please provide the frequency of trains through the project site and the construction time frame windows that CSX is allowing? Additionally, what is the average number of trains per day, max speed (mph) of trains, and if there are any passenger trains on these lines for railroad insurance purposes?	No_Revision	This information is publically available on the FRA database. The milepoint is 444.1 and crossing number is 632440L.
47	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 39 of 92; VII.B.4. (pdf 71) Page 46 of 92; VIII.C.9. (pdf 78)	VII. Railroad Coordination states "This includes all expenses such as railroad flagging operations except as defined above in Section VII.B.1.", while VIII. Right of Way Acquisition states "This includes all expenses such as railroad flagging operations." leaving off the exception as defined. VIII. Right of Way also includes the following additional language that is not part of the Railroad section; "The CONTRACTOR shall include all costs associated with these requirements in the final bid price. Once a contract is executed, SCDOT shall administer invoicing for costs to the Railroad Company or Companies. Monies will be deducted from the CONTRACTOR's progress payments after payments are made to the Railroad Company." Please clarify which section takes precedence.	Revision	This language will be clarified and adjusted to reflect intent of SCDOT's railroad coverages.
48	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 40 of 92; VII.B.7. (pdf 72) Page 47 of 92; VIII.C.12. (pdf 78)	VII. Railroad Coordination states " The CONTRACTOR shall attend a mandatory meeting with the SCDOT's Utilities Office and Railroad Projects Office within 15 days after the Notice to Proceed." VIII. Right of Way states "The CONTRACTOR shall attend a mandatory meeting with the SCDOT's Utilities Office and Railroad Projects Office within 30 days after the Notice to Proceed." Please clarify.	Revision	Will be adjusted to 10 days to match intent.



49	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 40 of 92; VII.B.9. (pdf 72) Page 47 of 92; VIII.C.14. (pdf 79)	VII. Railroad Coordination states "The required PE Agreement, between SCDOT and Railroad, has been executed to allow the Railroad to review or comment on any design questions or submittals from the CONTRACTOR. The Construction Agreement, between SCDOT and Railroad, must be executed before any demolition or construction activities can begin at the railroads." VIII. Right of Way states " The required PE Agreement, between SCDOT and Railroad, must be executed before Railroad will review or comment on any design questions or submittals from the CONTRACTOR. The Construction Agreement, between SCDOT and Railroad, must be executed before any construction activities can begin at the railroads. " Please clarify.	Revision	SCDOT has an existing PE agreement. It is anticipated that the Construction Agreement will be in place prior to NTP. As such, the referenced 14 days will not likely be relevant. Language to be adjusted as necessary.
50	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 39 of 92; VII.B.1 (pdf 71)	RFP states SCDOT will be responsible for procuring up to 100 days of flagging. Is this 24 hours a day, 7 days a week?	Revision	Requests for Flagging options for 24 hours a day, 7 days a week would have to be made from SCDOT. It may not be possible or practical and would likely require (4) flagman and significant overtime charges. SCDOT's intent is to provide flagging services for one standard daytime shift per day. Additional discussions with CSX are necessary and we will clarify the definition of or intent of a "flagging day" in Exhibit 8.
51	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 40 of 92; VII.B.1 (pdf 71)	Will the Railroad be able to provide flagging 24 hours a day, 7 days a week? What is the cost of flagging per day if exceeds the provided 100 days?	Revision	Requests for Flagging options for 24 hours a day, 7 days a week would have to be made from SCDOT. It may not be possible or practical and would likely require (4) flagman and significant overtime charges. SCDOT's intent is to provide flagging services for one standard daytime shift per day. Additional discussions with CSX are necessary and we will clarify the definition of or intent of a "flagging day" in Exhibit 8. We have requested cost clarifications from CSX.
52	Attach_A	Agreement	Pages 39 & 40 of 92; VII.B.3 & 4 (pdf 71-72)	Paragraph 3 states "CONTRACTOR shall be responsible for assisting SCDOT in the development of the railroad agreement by providing requested information", Paragraph 4 states "The CONTRACTOR shall be responsible for all costs to the Railroad Company or Companies for services provided by the Railroad or the Railroad's Agent, as detailed in the executed Railroad Agreement between the SCDOT and the Railroad". If the Railroad Agreement will not be finalized until after a contractor is selected, how does SCDOT intend for these costs to be captured as part of the contractor's price proposal?	Revision	SCDOT will furnish all railroad agreement costs and up to 100 days of flagging operations as clarified above. Anything outside of the construction agreement and above and beyond the 100 days of flagging will be the responsibility of the Contractor. Language will be further clarified.
53	Attach_A	Agreement	Pages 39 of 92; VII.B.4. (pdf 71)	RFP states "The CONTRACTOR shall be responsible for all costs to the Railroad Company or Companies for services provided by the Railroad or the Railroad's Agent, as detailed in the executed Railroad Agreement between the SCDOT and the Railroad". If the Railroad Agreement has been executed, can a copy be provided for review?	No_Revision	The existing railroad PE agreement will not be shared at this time. All pertinent information will be provided in Exhibit 8.
54	Attach_A	Exhibit 8	Page 1 (pdf 326)	Please provide the number of trains per day and what type, freight and/or passenger.	No_Revision	This information is publically available on the FRA database. The milepoint is 444.1 and crossing number is 632440L.
55	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 39 of 92; VII.B. (pdf 71)	Please confirm that the Railroad will not require crash walls for this project.	No_Revision	CSX Public Projects Manual requires crash walls when piers are located within 25-feet of a track. Given the clearances required in the RFP, crash walls will not be required. CSX has reviewed the clearance envelope diagram and did not request crash walls.



56	PIP	Roadway		Based on the Conceptual Roadway Plans, will SCDOT require grade adjustments for the 4% grades on the bridge approaches since greater than 3%?	No_Revision	No.
57	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	1	Section 2.6 - Can SCDOT please confirm grade adjusted K values are not required for this project?	No_Revision	Confirmed.
58	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	1	What is the criteria for the driveway at the south approach? What is the maximum allowable raise of grade? What are the driveway pavement requirements?	No_Revision	Property owner does not want any grade changes to the driveway. Tie to existing pavement as closely as possible & minimize impacts. If driveway should need to be reconstructed, utilize US 17A roadway pavement design & meet ARMS requirements.
59	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	1	Section 2.3 shows 7% truck, while PIP conceptual bridge plans title sheet shows 11% truck, can SCDOT please confirm 7% trucks is correct?	Revision	Official percentage is 14% trucks. Will revise accordingly.
60	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	1	Section 2.0 - Can SCDOT please confirm that terrain should be classified as rolling? Rolling terrain allows for 5% max grades, but conceptual plans reflect a maximum grade of 4%. Surrounding terrain at project site more closely reflects level terrain.	No_Revision	Conceptual plans are for information only. No change necessary.
61	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2	Section 2.9 (Clear Zones) - In the third paragraph, consider revising to explicitly allow for guardrail in areas of new right of way and wetland impacts. Removing statement requiring "SCDOT advanced approval" reduces risk for DB Teams.	Revision	Will revise language.
62	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	1	There appears to be jurisdictional wetlands on the south approach. Will SCDOT consider allowing 1.5:1 side slopes to avoid these jurisdictional wetland impacts?	No_Revision	No.
63	RFP	Exhibit_4a	Sec. 2.9, 3rd Paragraph	RFP States: "For those areas where no guardrail currently exists, design fill and cut slopes to obtain clear zones and to avoid the need for protection." Will SCDOT consider relaxing guardrail requirements as portions of the existing roadway fill slopes warrant guardrail, but do not have guardrail. With proposed raises in grade, additional length of guardrail will greatly reduce project footprints and amount of fill.	Revision	Will revise language.
64	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Page 1; Section 2.3 (pdf 132)	Roadway Design Criteria lists the truck percentage on US 17A/US 21 as 7%. The SCDOT Traffic count website, the bridge SI&A and the conceptual bridge plan cover sheet all show a truck percentage of 11%. Please confirm the truck percentage to be used.	Revision	Official percentage is 14% trucks. Will revise accordingly.
65	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Page 1; Section 2.2 (pdf 132)	The RFP lists the design speed for the bridge at 55 mph. The posted speed at this location is 45 mph and the design speeds for the vertical curves that we are tying into on either side of the bridge both below 50 mph. Would SCDOT consider lowering the DS from 55 mph to 50 mph to allow for K Values more in line with the rest of the US 17A/US 21 corridor in this area? Doing so would significantly reduce the project length, fill heights, utility impacts and ultimately the total project cost.	No_Revision	Posted speed is 55 mph per SCDOT sign inventory & Google Earth street view. Design speed will remain 55 mph as this is a US Route & a Hurricane Evacuation Route.
66	Attach_A	Agreement	8	Paragraph 4 states that Right of Way services shall be the responsibility of the Contractor. In the pre-RFP meeting, SCDOT stated SCDOT would be responsible for all right of way scope elements based on the Conceptual Roadway Plans. Given the very aggressive nature of the project, SCDOT needs to retain all scope elements related to right of way acquisition to be able to meet SCDOT's delivery schedule.	Revision	SCDOT will acquire all ROW and perform all ROW services for this project with the exception of any ROW or services necessary as dictated by the Contractor's plans if outside of SCDOT conceptual footprint.



67	Attach_A	Agreement	41	Please clarify if SCDOT or Contractor is acquiring right of way including right of way acquisition services. In pre RFP meetings SCDOT indicated it would be responsible for all right of way acquisition activities.	Revision	SCDOT will acquire all ROW and perform all ROW services for this project with the exception of any ROW or services necessary as dictated by the Contractor's plans if outside of SCDOT conceptual footprint.
68	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	1	Section 2.1.3 - Are the entirety of the existing soil nails on the End Bent 1 side to be removed?	No_Revision	The excavation required to create the bridge opening will likely result in complete removal of nails. If portions of nails extend into in-situ soil below the limits of required concrete slope protection, they may be left in place provided they do not conflict with slope protection installation.
69	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	1	Section 2.1.3 - "Heavy equipment will not be allowed to bear directly on top of the existing concrete crib retaining walls supporting each existing end bent. One of the existing walls was damaged in a train collision and repaired with soil-nails and shotcrete facing." Can SCDOT please specify the minimum offset that "heavy equipment" will be allowed in vicinity of the existing crib walls?	No_Revision	Offset is subject to demolition plan review by CSX. Per CSX, their preferred offset is one that is determined by way of engineered signed and sealed calculations and creates a safe slope, eliminates the possibility of the slope collapsing, and/or becoming unstable at any time during construction/demolition activities.
70	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2	Section 2.1.5 - Can SCDOT please provide Stations for Begin Bridge and End Bridge along CL US 17A / US 21 that all teams will have to abide by as the stations in the conceptual bridge plans are located in the PIP?	Revision	Yes.
71	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2	Section 2.1.6 - Does DM0108 revisions to BDM Sections 15.5.3.1 and 15.5.3.3 indicating "severe corrosion conditions" apply for prestressed concrete girder stress limits for this project?	No_Revision	Yes. Project is located in Beaufort county (being partially located in Hampton county does not change the requirement).
72	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2	Section 2.1.6 - Can SCDOT please remove reference to structural steel plate girders regarding maximum allowable beam spacing as structural steel girders are not allowed for this project?	Revision	Yes.
73	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	5	Section 2.1.15 - Can SCDOT please provide geotechnical base line report recommendations for the soil corrosion characteristics since the baseline report has yet to be provided?	Revision	To be included once baseline report is received.
74	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	5	Section 2.1.15 - Can SCDOT please confirm steel H-piles and steel pipe piles are not allowed at interior bents, including for columns supported by pile footings?	Revision	GBLR recommendations have been reviewed and indicate a corrosive soil environment. A steel pile corrosion rate will be specified in the RFP.
75	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	5	Section 2.1.15 - Can SCDOT please clarify that drilled piles with steel H-piles placed within a bore hole are not allowed at interior bents?	Revision	Pile footings will not be allowed at interior bents.
76	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	6	Section 2.1.19 - Can SCDOT please clarify that the 2:1 spill through abutment slopes are to be sloped 2:1 perpendicular to the end bents?	Revision	Yes, will clarify.
77	PIP	Structures		Conceptual Bridge Plans show the top of railroad clearance envelope at Elevation 44.0. With the proposed 23'-0" minimum vertical clearance this would equate to a top of rail Elev. 21.0. Is the minimum vertical clearance envelope to be developed based on the PIP's conceptual bridge plans top of rail elevation of 21.0 or the surveyed top of rail within Attachment B?	No_Revision	The minimum vertical clearance is to be developed based on the surveyed top of rail elevations. Elevation 44.0 was a conservative assumption to ensure the conceptual grade and conceptual project limits achieve 23'-0" minimum clearance.
78	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2	Regarding 2.1.5 - Will the 62' approach spans be required to be the same material type and beam depth as the 122' main span?	Revision	Yes



79	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2	Regarding 2.1.5 - "Use 62'-0" approach span length (both) and 122'-0" main span length." Is the prescribed 122'-0" main span considered a minimum length?	No_Revision	No. Exact span arrangement is prescribed.
80	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2	If a FIB is utilized, will the design need to abide by FDOT Index 20010 Series Prestressed Florida-I Beams (Rev. 01/16) table showing the maximum bonded prestress force for different FIB sizes?	No_Revision	No. SCDOT and AASHTO prestressed concrete design requirements apply with respect to concrete stress limits.
81	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	Page 1; Paragraph 3 (pdf 130)	During the site visit on 10/27/23, SCDOT indicated that the box culvert near station 1115+00 should be analyzed for conveyance, and if not needed, it should be filled with flowable fill. The RFP states the culvert "appears to not continuously convey water but may act as a relief. Analyze, design and extend culvert to meet all criteria." Does SCDOT still intend for the box culvert to be filled if hydraulic analysis indicates it is not needed?	Revision	No. Retain and extend box culvert.
82	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Page 6; Section 2.1.19 (pdf 141)	RFP states "Design Interior Single and Multi-Column Bents using cast-in-place reinforced concrete bent caps and columns supported on cast-in-place reinforced concrete drilled shafts." Would SCDOT consider allowing pile footings to support interior bents?	Revision	SCDOT has considered pile footings, but will allow only drilled shafts at interior bents for this project. Concerns with pile footings (which may not be realized until final design) include steel pile corrosion, undesirable plastic hinging below ground at interior bents in the seismic model, and the possible need for structural mitigation for seismic liquefaction.
83	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	Page 5; Section 2.1.15 (pdf 140)	If pile footings are allowed for interior bents, can Steel H Piles and Steel Pipe Piles be used for the footings?	Revision	Pile footings will not be allowed at interior bents. H Piles and pipe piles are options at end bents.
84	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	1	Since US 17A/21 is closed and detoured, is a TMP necessary along with a Community and Public Relations Plan? Can these components be eliminated from the Agreement so the Contractor can focus on more important components of the project?	No_Revision	TMP is required for all jobs, this is currently closed and detoured. A simple but detailed TMP mimicking the currently available detour schematic (see below) is acceptable. The Community/Public Relations Plan has been relaxed from standard language, however, we are open to additional discussion.
85	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 2	6	When will SCDOT provide the detour plan?	No_Revision	There is a detour schematic available on our public website here: https://www.scdot.org/us17a-21-over-csx-rr/default.aspx
86	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 2	Page 6; Section 2.4 (pdf 155)	It is noted that the Contractor is to install and maintain road closure and detour signing and devices. The department has already closed the road. Is it the intent for the contractor to replace the department's devices and signs?	No_Revision	Yes. The contractor will be responsible for replacing and maintaining the detour.
87	Attach_A	Agreement	38	In pre-RFP meetings, SCDOT indicated it would be responsible for all utility coordination responsibilities. Exhibit 3 indicates utility coordination is responsibility of the contractor. Since extensive utility coordination must be done immediately and prior to NTP, and since SCDOT has already begun such work, will SCDOT retain all utility coordination services required as described in Section VII.A on pages 37-39 of the Agreement? Given the very aggressive nature of the schedule, the project would be better served if SCDOT retained all scope elements related to Utility Coordination services.	Revision	At this time, SCDOT is anticipating that all utility impacts will be mitigated prior to NTP. If the Contractor's plan necessitates additional changes to the utilities, they will be responsible for this coordination and associated work.
88	Attach_A	Agreement	40	Will SCDOT provide a complete and detailed report the Contractor can rely on for each Utility requiring relocation within the Railroad's ROW, along with the time each Utility will require to complete their Agreement and Work per paragraph 10?	Revision	At this time, SCDOT is anticipating that all utility impacts will be mitigated prior to NTP. If the Contractor's plan necessitates additional changes to the utilities, they will be responsible for this coordination and associated work.



89	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	1	Will SCDOT please provide complete all pertinent contact information for all utilities located within the project limits (Exhibit 7) by November 17,2023?	Revision	At this time, SCDOT Is anticipating that all utility impacts will be mitigated prior to NTP. If the Contractor's plan necessitates additional changes to the utilities, they will be responsible for this coordination and associated work.
90	Attach_B			Will SCDOT provide copies of the final agreements and/or understandings with all utility companies by December 4, 2023? If not, when?	No_Revision	December 4 or January 4? Utility information will be provided to each team when finalized.
91	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	1	Can SCDOT please provide utility contact information?	Revision	SCDOT will revise Exhibit 7 once this information is available.
92	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	2	Can SCDOT please provide clarification if utility companies will be allowed to use the conduits within the barrier parapets?	No_Revision	SCDOT has notified utilities that three conduits will be available.
93	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	2	"The Department has provided all meeting notes and information received from the utilities in the Project Information Package." Can SCDOT please verify this has been provided?	Revision	This will be forthcoming as available.
94	Attach_B	Utilities		Will signed and sealed SUE plans be provided?	No_Revision	SUE has not been obtained for this project.
95	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 37 of 92; VII.A.1 (pdf 69)	RFP states "The DEPARTMENT has initiated utility coordination with the following known utility conflicts". What is the current status of the relocation efforts?	Revision	At this time, SCDOT Is anticipating that all utility impacts will be mitigated prior to NTP. If the Contractor's plan necessitates additional changes to the utilities, they will be responsible for this coordination and associated work.
96	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 40 of 92; VII.B.8. (pdf 72) Page 47 of 92; VIII.C.13. (pdf 79)	The RFP indicates a minimum 14-day approval time-frame for all railroad agreements. Does this include utility permits for utilities crossing the railroad right of way? Will SCDOT assist in expediting the utility permits with CSX?	No_Revision	With SCDOT assistance, Utilities will pursue their own agreements for relocations.
97	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 37 of 92; VII.A.1 (pdf 69)	If SCDOT is expediting utility relocation efforts, will as-built plans for any completed relocations be provided to the contractor for inclusion in the final deliverable?	No_Revision	As-builts of relocated utilities will not be available prior to award. When available, Information showing proposed relocations will be provided to teams through ProjectWise.
98	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	Page 1; Section 2. (pdf 323)	Please provide contact information for the listed utility companies.	Revision	SCDOT will revise Exhibit 7 once this information is available.
99	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 37 of 92; VII.A. (pdf 69)	Has SCDOT coordinated with the utility company on the type of poles they plan to utilize? If they are planning to use self supporting engineered poles in this location, the time required for ordering materials for the UT company would be extensive.	No_Revision	SCDOT has coordinated with Dominion, at this time they intend to install wooden poles for the relocated portions.

