

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

FINAL RFP - ROUND 1 - UPDATE

Date Received: 11/27/2023

I Meeting Date: 11/30/2023

Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	SCDOT	
						Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Agreement	10	Paragraph 6 appears to reference submittals covered by Exhibit 4z. Will SCDOT and CSXT construction submittals and subsequent reviews also be limited to 10 business days?	DM	No_Revision	Construction submittals will be expedited per discussions with CSX. However, the review duration is based on the quality of the submittal and no firm duration will be provided.
2	Attach_A	Agreement	17	Referencing Paragraph J, what constitutes the Contract Deliverable for Clearing and Grubbing Plan? Is this a different submittal than the NPDES and construction limits shown on the Roadway Plans? Or do the Roadway RFC plans constitute the Clearing and Grubbing Plan submittal? Please describe the Contract Deliverable for Clearing and Grubbing plan.	Roadway	No_Revision	The NPDES limits may suffice for the clearing and grubbing plan provided they clearly show the limits of clearing and of clearing and grubbing. A narrative to support the clearing and grubbing operation should be provided to address items such as MOT needs, protection of RR property, etc.
3	Attach_A	Agreement	26	Jurisdictional Agency approval guidelines in the PIP allow 128 days for SCDHEC Construction Coastal permit (also includes 35 days for CZC), which is 85% of the time allowed to substantially complete the project. What is SCDOT's approach to expedite Agency approvals and what are SCDOT's expectations from SCDHEC/OCRM and the Contractor in this process? What amount of time should the Proposers use for Agency approvals as the Proposer develops their schedule and cost associated with the Project Delivery & Approach?	Environmental	No_Revision	SCDOT has begun early coordination, and will continue to coordinate, with all involved agencies to ensure minimization of reviews and delays on necessary approvals.
4	Attach_A	Agreement	40	Please provide Right of Way - Right of Entry dates for each parcel	ROW	No_Revision	Right of Entry for the non-CSXT properties was granted November 20, 2023.
5	Attach_A	Agreement	47	Section IX Permits states the SCDOT will obtain a General Permit and SCDOT will provide the approved permit to the awarded design team. Can SCDOT provide the assumed wetland impact shapes or limits and/or a copy of the GP application to proposers so we can know whether or not our design is covered by the SCDOT prepared GP?	Environmental	Revision	Feature boundaries have not been approved by USACE. Impacts are accounted for out to proposed new RW shown in conceptual design. We can share a figure showing impacts.
6	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	1	Will SCDOT consider allowing the existing 6x4 box culvert @ Sta 1115+00 to be replaced/extended with a round pipe culvert?	Hydrology	Revision	Yes. The RFP will be revised to allow for adequately sized pipe to be provided for drainage and the existing culvert remaining annular space will be filled with flowable fill.
7	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	1	Referencing Section 2.1.3, will temporary shoring be required for demolition of the two existing bent crash walls due to the depth of removal required and their proximity to the Railroad tracks?	Railroad	No_Revision	The demo must be completed in accordance with the CSX Public Projects Manual. Shoring requirements are defined in the Temporary Excavation and Shoring section of the CSXT Public Project Information Manual under the Construction Submission Criteria section.
8	Attach_B	Structures		Will SCDOT request a new Asset ID number from the Bridge Maintenance Office during project procurement ? This new number will need to be in all the load rating documentation and on the plans. There is usually a lag of several weeks from the request to the new number being issued.	Structures	Revision	Yes. SCDOT will provide the new Asset ID.



9	PIP	Geotechnical		During the most recent open forum discussing questions, SCDOT stated that soil borings were taken at the proposed culvert extension. From review of the Baseline Geotechnical Report it doesn't appear borings were taken near the existing 6x4 box culvert around station 1114+35. The nearest borings appear to be 200-300' away from the culvert location. Will SCDOT provide borings per the GDM to be utilized for the design of the box culvert extension or confirm expectations for any required field exploration at the culvert extension given the aggressive schedule?	Geotechnical	Revision	The RFP will be revised to allow for adequately sized pipe to be provided for drainage and the existing culvert remaining annular space will be filled with flowable fill. We do not have borings at the box culvert location and will not be providing them at this point in the procurement. The GDM only requires exploration of pipes greater than or equal to 48 inches in diameter, so if the pipe is less than 48 inches, no geotechnical exploration of this location will be required.
10	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2.12	The RFP states the project is "not part of any South Carolina bicycle tour routes or pedestrian plans and additional bicycle/pedestrian accommodations are not required." According to sctrails.net, US 17A / US 21 is listed as "Local Bike Route - Other". Can SCDOT verify that no bicycle accommodations are required for this project?	Roadway	No_Revision	No revision. Full width shoulders will allow for any future bike lane.
11	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 1	1	"The white edge lines may be 6 inches in width if sufficient shoulder width is present to allow for bicycle traffic." What is the purpose of this statement if exhibit 4a, Section 2.12, states "additional bicycle/pedestrian accommodations are not required."?	Traffic	Revision	2' shoulders do not constitute as "sufficient shoulder width" for bicycle lane traffic. Standard width edge lines are acceptable where applicable. Statement will be adjusted/removed.
12	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2.10	RFP Exhibit 4a Section 2.10 states "Non-mow strips shall be constructed of asphalt." Exhibit 5 Section 805 B. Materials states "Construct the non-mow strip using a minimum 4" HMA Surface Course or a 4" Class 2500 Portland Cement Concrete." Can SCDOT please clarify the desired pavement type for non-mow strips?	Roadway	No_Revision	Exhibit 4 takes precedence over Exhibit 5 per the RFP agreement. Asphalt non-mow strips are required.
13	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2.4 & 2.10	RFP Exhibit 4a Section 2.4 states "Develop traffic lane and shoulder widths in compliance with SCDOT Roadway Design Manual." The Roadway Design Manual states on Figure 16.3-A Footnote 2 "Where guardrail is required, increase the shoulder width an additional 3.75 feet." No where in the Roadway Design Manual is a compressed guardrail shoulder break discussed, thusly 3.75 feet is required behind the face of guardrail, which would preclude the use of the compressed guardrail shoulder. Can SCDOT clarify the language in Section 2.4 to allow compressed guardrail shoulder break in areas where right of way or environmental impacts dictate that standard guardrail shoulder break cannot be built?	Roadway	No_Revision	Section 2.10 states additional length guardrail posts may be utilized & therefore standard drawing 805-215-00 applies. No revision.
14	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2.0	The RFP states to "classify the terrain as rolling." The Roadway Design Manual defines rolling terrain as "Locations where the natural slopes consistently rise above and fall below the roadway grade line and, occasionally, steep grades present some restriction to the desirable horizontal and vertical alignment." The project location does not seem to support this, but rather level terrain. Can SCDOT verify which terrain classification best fits this project?	Roadway	No_Revision	Rolling. See IR Question 60 response.



15	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2.4	RFP Exhibit 4a Section 2.4 states "Develop traffic lane and shoulder widths in compliance with SCDOT Roadway Design Manual." The Roadway Design Manual states on Figure 16.3-A Footnote 2 "Where guardrail is required, increase the shoulder width an additional 3.75 feet." RFP Section 2.10 states "Provide non-mow strip under guardrail in accordance with the guidance found in the Exhibit 5, Special Provisions Section 805." In RFP Special Provisions Section 805 states "Provide non-mow strip under guardrail as shown in the plans, in accordance with plan details, standard drawings 805-525-01 & 805-525-02, and these special provisions." The guardrail shoulder widths dictated by the Roadway Design Manual (widen shoulder 3.75 feet) do not match with widths in standard drawing 805-525-01 which show a 5.0 feet shoulder behind the face of guardrail. Can SCDOT please clarify the required shoulder widths for guardrail and required widths and dimensions of the non-mow strip?	Roadway	No_Revision	Section 2.10 states additional length guardrail posts may be utilized & therefore standard drawing 805-215-00 applies. Non-mow strip shall end at the shoulder break for additional length guardrail application. Exhibits have been added to Attachment B to clarify non-mow strip paving dimensions.
16	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2.6	RFP Exhibit 4a Section 2.6 states "Develop vertical curves, grades, and clearances in compliance with SCDOT Roadway Design Manual." The Roadway Design Manual states in Section 4.1.3 "Where practical, the designer should attempt to meet downgrade-adjusted SSD values." and again in Figure 6.5-A Note 2 "For crest vertical curves, consider grade adjustments where the downgrade is 3 percent or greater." Can SCDOT consider adding language to the RFP to explicitly state that grade adjustments for downgrades will not be required to reduce risks to the teams?	Roadway	Revision	It is not practical at this project location & this question was answered in the IR Question 57 response. Will add language to Exhibit 4a to further clarify grade adjusted SSD is not a requirement for this project.
17	Attach_A	Exhibit 8	p1	Will a preliminary geotechnical report also be required for CSX's review of the preliminary bridge plans?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	Per CSX: We need to review all bridge, roadway, drainage, utility, construction phasing etc., just send us everything from a plan standpoint. Geotech logs as part of the plans are fine, but they are generally just for our information and we do not "approve" Geotech reports.
18	Attach_A	Exhibit 8	p1	Will the Preliminary and /or Final Geotechnical Report be reviewed by CSX? Will the Preliminary and/or Final Seismic Report be reviewed by CSX?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	Per CSX: Geotech logs as part of the plans are fine, but they are generally just for our information and we do not "approve" Geotech or Seismic reports.
19	Attach_A	Exhibit 8	p1	Can SCDOT and/or CSX please provide allowable construction windows for work within CSX ROW?	Railroad	No_Revision	Per CSX: Contractor shall plan to perform work under the natural windows of operation (i.e. in between trains) and under flagman control (i.e. no planned outages or rerouting of train traffic).
20	RFP	4	p26 of 92	Per the RFP, " Time is of the essence. The Project shall be substantially complete on or prior to June 21, 2024. As US 17A/21 is an official hurricane evacuation route, the new bridge shall be open to traffic on or prior to May 31, 2024. " Can SCDOT please define what "Open to Traffic" means?	Construction	No_Revision	"Open to traffic" means roadway is operational for two way traffic.
21	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	p6	Will SCDOT and/or CSX require the construction casings for the drilled shafts to be drilled/screwed versus vibrated due to the vicinity of the railroad tracks to the casing locations?	Structures	Revision	Per CSX: We would request that an SC Licensed Geotechnical engineer provide their engineering recommendation on this question. Will vibrating the casings into place cause settlement of the track(s)? SCDOT will not preclude vibrating in casing. However, Contractor will need to provide analysis/information to CSX for review and approval prior to implementation. Exhibit 4f will be revised to note this CSX requirement.



22	Attach_A	Exhibit 8	p1	Per the RFP a minimum of 10 days is required for CSX reviews. What is CSX's maximum review period? At how many days past their required 10 day minimum will SCDOT agree that CSX's review has impacted the schedule?	Railroad	No_Revision	The 10 day minimum establishes the design review period to plan for when developing schedules. The intent is for reviews to be complete within 10 business days.
23	Attach_A	Exhibit 8	p1	Is utilizing two cranes for picking/erection of beams considered "dynamic"? If so will this require an exception from CSX? Per their Public Projects Manual, on p131, "4. Dynamic hoisting operations are prohibited when carrying a load with the Potential to Foul. Cranes or other lifting equipment shall remain stationary during lifting. (i.e., no moving picks)." If this operation is considered dynamic then we would request that the CSX design variance/exception be started as soon as possible so as to not delay the schedule.	Railroad	No_Revision	Per CSX: Dual cranes are common and allowable provided the cranes remain stable when performing hoisting operations (i.e. can't pick and walk crane).
24	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	p2	Please confirm end bridge stations - should the Begin Bridge station be 1105+03.38?	Structures	Revision	Yes. Will revise Exhibit 4b.
25	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	p1	Per the RFP, "There is an existing 4 by 6 concrete box culvert at Sta. 1115. Analyze, design and extend the box culvert to meet all criteria." If the RC box culvert is determined to be oversized, would it be allowed to place a smooth wall pipe within the culvert as the extension and flowable fill the RC box culvert?	Hydrology	Revision	Yes. The RFP will be revised to allow for adequately sized pipe to be provided for drainage and the existing culvert remaining annular space will be filled with flowable fill.
26	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f	Page 2 / Section 2.1.2 (pdf 165)	SCDOT's response to Question 100 from the Non-Confidential Question responses for the RFP for Industry Review dated 11/16/23 stated, "A quantity of spoil and a location maps showing the locations of soil removal will need to be provided." Please clarify who needs to provide this information.	Construction	No_Revision	SCDOT has attempted to provide a preliminary estimate for spoil amounts and locations to get preliminary feedback from CSX. This information will be provided when available. However, this is merely for information only and it will be each Team's responsibility to provide this information to CSX for review and approval.
27	Attach_A	Agreement	Pages 47-49 of 92 / Section IX.B / Section X.A.5 (pdf 79-81)	Section IX.B states "All permits necessary for completion of this project shall be procured by the contractor." (pg 47 of 92). Section X.A.5 states "The Contractor is responsible for any mitigation required by the permits." (pg 49 of 92). Since SCDOT will be obtaining the GP, please confirm that SCDOT will provide mitigation for impacts resulting from the preliminary construction limits. Also, please confirm that in the event a permit modification is needed, the Contractor will be responsible for the modification, including any additional mitigation costs required.	Environmental	No_Revision	SCDOT will provide mitigation for the approved GP based on SCDOT's conceptual design. It will be the Contractor's responsibility to modify the permit or any environmental documents as necessary based on the Contractor's design changes beyond what is approved.

