

NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS

CLRB 2021-1 - Contract ID 5456570 - Cherokee, Chester, Fairfield, and Union Counties

Final RFP Round 1

Date Received: 9/14/2021

					SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	5	30 of 88	Is contractor required to have QC (CEI) staff on site daily? Or will SCDOT provide CEI. Can SCDOT clarify expectation of Contractor QC?	No Revision	Per the RFP, the contractor shall provide dedicated QC personnel for the project. SCDOT will provide QA.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	18	Do any sites require vibration monitoring?	No Revision	Contractor should follow vibration monitoring specification per the RFP and assess each site to whether or not vibration monitoring is required.
3	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	pg. 25	Section 109 states "SECTION 401: HOT MIX ASPHALT (HMA) QUALITY ASSURANCE". Is this applicable and if so should it be SC-M-400?	Revision	This is an editing error. The referenced section was inadvertently removed and will be added to Exhibit 5.
4	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	pg. 35	Asphalt binder adjustments; What is the reason for the supplemental information if nothing is going to be adjusted?	Revision	This is an editing error. Only the first sentence should have included. The same issue is present in Section 109: Fuel Adjustment Indexes.
5	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	pg. 2	Under Section 1 General - Can the contractor rely on the wetlands lines identified by the Dept to accomplish bullet points 1 & 2.	No Revision	Files may be used for guidance but teams should field verify and perform delineations of features as needed per site.
6	Attach_B	Environmental	various	Please provide digital files for streams/wetlands identified for projects (S-58, S-300, S-214 were the ones that it appears you have data for).	Revision	Files will be provided in the Project Information Package.
7	Attach_B	Environmental		Would the SCDOT secure the JDs and provide the digital wetland lines?	Revision	No, the line files that will be provided in Project Information Package should only be used for guidance, not final line location. Teams will be responsible for obtaining JDs and permits as necessitated by final design.
8	Attach_B	Environmental		Is the contractor responsible for USACE permits and mitigation for unavoidable impacts to streams/wetlands, resulting from the bridge replacement accomplishing SCDOT RFP design criteria, even if the ESO did not anticipate a permit? If so, how would the contractor now make a reliable determination of the limits of streams/wetlands with the information provided by SCDOT?	No Revision	Yes. It is anticipated the SCDOT would provide needed wetland mitigation but the teams would be responsible for stream mitigation. Teams should be prepared to verify/delineate each site regardless of SCDOT determination to ensure their design does not result in unforeseen impacts.
9	Attach_B	Geotechnical		Are soil samples and rock cores for each bridge available for inspection and where are they kept?	No Revision	Yes, samples are available for review at S&ME's Columbia, SC office. If requested, a single day can be scheduled for the teams to review available samples not expended in laboratory testing. Samples can also be handed over to the successful team at contract award.
10	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2.2.1.2	The criteria states "Design for the 25-year storm event or existing Level of Service, whichever is greater." The current SCDOT design standard for secondary road bridges is the 25-year storm event. According to the RFP, if the existing level of service is the 50-year storm event, which is greater than the 25-year storm event, this will result in a larger bridge than necessary for the bridge hydraulic design requirements. Please clarify.	Revision	"or existing Level of Service, whichever is greater" will be deleted to clarify. The intent of "or existing level of service" was to avoid reducing the existing hydraulic opening, if the existing bridge passed an event larger than the 25 year. This is effectively accomplished by other criteria in 4e: bridge length, freeboard, and low chord.



11	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2	2.2.1.2 - Strike "or existing Level of Service, whichever is greater"? Following sections require maintaining low chord and maintaining existing bridge ends.	Revision	Will revise as suggested to clarify. See response to Question 8.
12	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2	2.2.1.3 - Add Shall not be less than 2 feet ABOVE THE 25-YEAR STORM EVENT unless the...	Revision	Will revise as suggested to clarify. See response to Question 8.
13	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	3	2.2.1.7 requires 5 ft setback to face of pier, Attachment B requires 7.5 ft to 10 ft. What controls?	Revision	Attachment B setback diagrams will be removed. Revised Exhibit 4e will clarify setback requirements. 5' setback will control.
14	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	3	2.2.1.7.2 requires a 5-ft setback. Attachment B requires 10 ft setback. What controls?	Revision	Attachment B setback diagrams will be removed. Revised Exhibit 4e will clarify setback requirements. 5' setback will control.
15	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	3	2.2.1.8 requires no intersection of channel bank / bottom. Attachment B requires 10 ft setback. What controls?	Revision	Attachment B setback diagrams will be removed. Revised Exhibit 4e will clarify setback requirements. 5' setback will control.
16	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	3	2.2.1.8 requires 5 ft abutment toe setback. Attachment B requires 10 ft setback. What controls?	Revision	Attachment B setback diagrams will be removed. Revised Exhibit 4e will clarify setback requirements. 5' setback will control.
17	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	pg. 3	On Page 3, section 2.1.7 - Please confirm that the channel span lengths provided in Attachment B Hydrology attachment 4 do not need to be extended to account for the minimum 5-foot setback from the top of the channel bank. Please confirm whether the 5ft set back is included in the stated channel span lengths.	No Revision	The minimum channel span lengths and minimum bridge lengths were set considering the 5-foot setback requirements. A hydraulic study has not been performed by SCDOT, however, and the minimum span or bridge lengths may need to be increased to meet freeboard or backwater requirements.
18	Attach_B	Survey		Within Attachment B Survey Files, are the RD_EX_H20 lines representing the top of bank?	Revision	Yes. See response to Question 17.
19	Attach_B	Survey		Within Attachment B Survey Files, RD_EX_H20 lines are not continuous and have segments which appear to be missing for all bridges. Please provide.	Revision	Additional dgn files for each bridge, containing RD_EX_H20 lines only, will be provided in Attachment B - Survey to fill in the missing top of bank lines.
20	Attach_B	Survey		Please provide the high water elevation for S-214 bridge over Little Creek.	Revision	See response to Question 19.
21	Attach_B	Survey		Please confirm the ODW elevation for S-214 bridge over Little Creek.	Revision	We coordinated with the survey office and determined shot #1025 ("ODW" shot dated 3-29-18) was actually a high water mark on a bridge support. It was not a time-of-survey water elevation of the creek. ODW stands for on-date-water and replaces the older NW / normal-water survey code. New survey files for S-214 will be provided with an updated ODW shot (#1319) and shot #1025 will change to a high water code.
22	RFP	4	4.3 and 4.4, p.21-22	The statement below in 4.4 seems to indicate that a redacted submittal is required even without any confidential information (which would require a waiver of stipend), in contradiction to section 4.3. Please clarify. "Even in the absence of "Confidential" information, the Proposer must submit a redacted copy of its Proposal."	Revision	Revised language makes a distinction between proprietary information and work product disclosure. Proprietary information (as defined herein) may be redacted without waiving the stipend. Work product information redaction still waives the stipend.
23	RFP	4	16 of 43	Since discrepancies must be resolved at contractor's expense during project execution, should minor discrepancies in plans submitted be counted negatively during proposal scoring?	No Revision	Yes, the TP is your opportunity to demonstrate your ability to comprehend the criteria and perform the work. Minor discrepancies are evaluated and scored consistently.



24	Attach_A	Agreement	pg. 9	Would SCDOT consider adding the following language to Section C, Design Criteria, on page 9 of 88 in the Agreement as was used in a prior design build project? "The standard care for all design professional services performed by the designer of record and its sub-consultants pursuant to this Agreement shall be the care and skill ordinarily used by members of the design profession practicing under similar conditions at the same time and locality of the Project. Further, notwithstanding anything contained herein, the indemnity related to design services shall be limited to the extent of any negligence (acts, errors, or omissions) of the design of the Project or otherwise negligently failing to adhere to the standard of care as defined herein."	Revision	Language will be added to the Agreement.
25	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2	2.2.1.3 - Can SCDOT provide maintenance records associated with debris for each bridge?	Revision	Yes, information will be provided in the Project Information Package on the website.
26	RFP	8	35 of 43	Would SCDOT remove the beginning of the window for submittal of Cost Proposals? Instead have only a final delivery time of 10:00 am Thursday February 10, 2022? We would like the ability to submit early to ensure delivery!	No Revision	No.
27	Attach_A	Agreement	pg. 76	DBE goal - The section states "The DBE goal on this Project is 10 percent of the Contract Price. As a portion of the overall DBE goal, the DBE goal for Professional Services on this Project is 0 percent. The remaining 0 percent must be met in any trade in support of Professional Services and/or constructing the Project." Will SCDOT please clarify the DBE goal.	Revision	The DBE goal is 10%. Future design build procurements will have a Professional Services DBE goal as a part of the overall goal. For this project there is no Professional Services goal.
28	RFP	5	5.3	This section states Conceptual Plans will be scored at 20 pts (page 23). Should this be 60 pts? States later in the same section (page 24) that Conceptual Roadway Plans are worth 20 pts and Conceptual Bridge Plans are worth 40 pts for a total of 60.	Revision	RFP will be updated to reflect a total of twenty plus forty points totaling sixty points for conceptual plans.
29	RFP	5	5.7	Section 2.3.1 of the RFQ discusses that "Proposers are advised that the evaluation of the SOQ's and selection process is a competition and not simply a prequalification for the RFP stage." The Industry Draft RFP mentions the SOQ score. How will the SOQ score be weighted within the technical and cost proposal analysis?	Revision	RFP has been revised. SOQ score will not be used in the scoring formula.
30	RFP	5	5.7 / Page 26	Can shortlisted teams be provided a debrief of their SOQs prior to submittal of the technical proposal?	No Revision	No.
31	RFP	3	pg. 8	Section 3.7.1 Submittal of Prelim ATC's, page 8 of 43, will SCDOT consider allowing up to 10 Prelim ATC's since 5 Final ATC's are permitted?	Revision	Yes. 10 Preliminary ATCs will be allowed.



32	RFP	3	pg. 8	Section 3.7.1 SUBMITTAL OF PRELIMINARY ATCs - If a PATC/ATC can apply across multiple bridge sites, will we be required to submit a PATC/ATC separately for each site, or can we lump all applicable sites into a singular PATC/ATC?	No Revision	No. Single ATC can cover multiple sites however if criteria for one site is not allowed or doesn't meet, ATC must be revised.
33	RFP	3	pg. 11	Section 3.8.1 SUBMITTAL OF FORMAL ATCs - Can the # of ATC's be increased from 5 to 10?	No Revision	No. Formal ATC total to remain at 5.
34	Attach_A	Agreement	pg. 5	Under the List of Exhibits on Page 5 of 88 in the Agreement -Utilities is listed as an exhibit, but was not included in the RFP. Environmental, shown as exhibit 7 is incorporated as exhibit 6.	Revision	Utilities removed from list of exhibits.
35	Attach_A	Agreement	pg. 20	On Page 20 of 88 in the Agreement -Item 6. under L. Contracts appears to be a header or incomplete sentence.	Revision	"7." is removed under Item 6.
36	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Page 2; 2.6/2.7	Section 2.6 dictates retaining existing centerline which is consistent with PCDM 2017-11 (Rev. 7/1/19). Section 2.12 then states that "reconstruction of substandard horizontal curves to larger radii may be feasible in lieu of increasing superelevation." By changing the radii of horizontal curves, thereby changing the centerline, would the bridge then no longer be allowed to be constructed using LVBC?	No Revision	As a part of CLRB 2021, it is SCDOT's intent to retain the existing centerline at all bridge sites. We believe all horizontal curves within the required limits of construction fall at or above the design speeds listed in exhibit 4a. Designers shall tie into existing cross slopes/superelevation with the appropriate longitudinal grades.
37	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2	Do sections 2.6, 2.7 and 2.12 conflict?	No Revision	As a part of CLRB 2021, it is SCDOT's intent to retain the existing centerline at all bridge sites. We believe all horizontal curves within the required limits of construction fall at or above the design speeds listed in exhibit 4a. Designers shall tie into existing cross slopes/superelevation with the appropriate longitudinal grades.
38	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	pg2-3	Section 2.12- Superelevation contains ambiguous language regarding superelevation of existing curves. Please clarify the correction of existing curves. Please describe what criteria SCDOT will use to determine whether using larger curves is "feasible" or required.	No Revision	As a part of CLRB 2021, it is SCDOT's intent to retain the existing centerline at all bridge sites. We believe all horizontal curves within the required limits of construction fall at or above the design speeds listed in exhibit 4a. Designers shall tie into existing cross slopes/superelevation with the appropriate longitudinal grades.
39	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	pg 3	Section 2.14- Roadside Safety refers to the Roadway Design Manual 3R Guidance. This guidance references engineers judgement on application of clear zone and roadway safety, especially as it relates to being cost effective. Please consider additional guidance (ie. use guardrail where currently shown, maintain existing clearzone or alternate clearzone criteria)	No Revision	To some degree, clearzone always includes engineering judgement. The expectation is to provide a clearzone based on final design that meets the Roadside Design Guide, which is reiterated in RDM Section 18.2.12. Where clearzone cannot be obtained, protection is warranted unless it necessitates severe environmental impacts or can be shown otherwise to be impractical.
40	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	pg2	Section 2.8 Vertical alignment- Please clarify whether the Longitudinal Gradient requirement of 0.3% applies to crest vertical curves that would have instantaneous grades less than 0.3% if placed on the bridge.	No Revision	Crest vertical curves on the bridge are acceptable as long as the gradients for the vertical curves are no less than 0.3%.
41	Attach_A	Agreement	pg. 43	If the Contractor wishes to acquire additional ROW beyond what SCDOT has defined, will ROW Services performed by SCDOT be accomplished at set hourly rates, or at a lump sum per parcel rate? If hourly, is there a maximum rate per parcel SCDOT will assign for Contractor to use in budgeting for this?	No Revision	No, this will be handled by Contractor's ROW sub and cost of services part of bid.



42	Attach_A	Agreement	pg. 43	Page 43 of 88 in the Agreement, Section E. Contractor Cost contains several bullets defining Contractor and SCDOT cost sharing associated to any additional ROW defined to be obtained by the Contractor on hold-off properties. Will SCDOT please provide a list of all such properties and regular updates on status throughout the RFP phase so Contractors can better estimate their portion of associated costs?	Revision	All Right of Way acquisitions will be part of the RFP and Contractor's responsibilities. Page 41 Section B 1 a-c & 2 will be removed from RFP.
43				Question number 41; should this be a revision to the Contract Page 43, Section E. Part 1.a.i.? This part specifically references the SCDOT to perform ROW services and have the Contractor responsible for the cost, but the answer specifies ROW services to be performed and paid for by the Contractor.	Revision	The right of way section in the agreement is being revised to reflect the overall answers of Question 41 and 42.
44	RFP	2	pg. 2	Section 2.3 -Please provide the Project Wide Link to the available existing bridge plans.	No Revision	No existing bridge plans are available. At some of the sites, there are bridge standard plan sheets included in the existing roadway plans, which can be found at the SCDOT Plans Online website.
45	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Page 5	Section 2.1.18 states acceptance of drilled shafts will be based on separate SCDOT-conducted CSL testing. Yet Exhibit 4f Section 2.1.2 on page 3 states the contractor is responsible for CSL of mass concrete for drilled shafts. Do these criteria mean that all CSL testing for non-mass concrete drilled shafts will be performed by SCDOT?	Revision	Exhibit 4b will be revised. Exhibit 4f is correct. The contractor will be responsible for CSL testing of all drilled shafts.
46	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Page 7; 2.2	Is a scour analysis required for roadway retaining walls? If so, does the bottom of wall need to be below scour or can scour counter measures be used?	Revision	A scour analysis is required for the bridge opening. A separate scour analysis is not required for roadway retaining walls. Riprap shall be used as scour counter measures at the toe of roadway retaining walls per the RFP. The bottom of retaining wall may not need to be below the bridge contraction scour elevation, provided riprap will effectively protect the toe of slope and toe of wall in the design scour event, as determined by the engineer of record. A requirement will be added to discuss riprap protection of the retaining walls as part of the bridge scour study.
47	RFP	2	2.3	RFP states available bridge plans will be provided. Are there any available bridge plans, and if so, when will they be provided and where?	No Revision	No existing bridge plans are available. At some of the sites, there are bridge standard plan sheets included in the existing roadway plans, which can be found at the SCDOT Plans Online website.
48	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	3	2.1.10 - Can exclusion be made for cored slabs and/or box beams?	No Revision	Post tensioning with strands is not permitted for this project. Transverse tie rods are required on cored slab spans per the SCDOT Bridge Drawings and Details.
49	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	pg. 4	On Page 4, Section 2.1.14 - If deck drains are not required per calculations, will the requirement of 2 drains per span still be needed?	No Revision	Yes
50	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	pg. 6	On Page 6, Section 2.1.19 - Please confirm that the bottom of end bent caps will need to be at least 1'-0" below the bottom of the soil fill on the front face of cap, and not 1'-0" below top of the riprap if the riprap is applicable (as shown within the SCDOT BDM Figure 20.2-2)?	No Revision	Confirmed. RFP and BDM Figure 20.2-2 both indicate "embankment fill" and not riprap. Compacted soil is required up to 1'-0" above the bottom of bent cap to help prevent erosion underneath the cap. Additionally, riprap is not required to be placed on the level berm (on top of the sloping portion of end fill slope), against the face of cap.
51	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	pg. 6	On Page 6, Section 2.1.21 states "Provide approach slabs for all bridges on this project.", however, the stated ADT would not normally require approach slabs. Please confirm that the SCDOT is requiring approach slabs at every bridge.	No Revision	SCDOT is requiring approach slabs at every bridge on this project.



52	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 2	pg.5	Section 2.4 - Will the contractor be required to make any improvements to define detour routes prior to their acceptance by the SCDOT and their use for detour traffic?	Revision	Yes, only if needed. SCDOT will provide quantities for full-depth patching for detour routes to cap the risk.
53	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 2	pg. 6	SCDOT has defined detour routes for 2 bridges and required the contractor to define the route for the other bridges and stated that "Pavement on detour routes will be maintained by SCDOT." Will SCDOT be providing pavement maintenance on contractor defined detours as well as SCDOT defined detours? If not, what would be the contractor's requirements for the detour routes defined by the contractor?	Revision	No. SCDOT will provide quantities for full-depth patching for detour routes to cap the risk, should pavement maintenance be needed. SCDOT will provide detour routes for the other bridges that did not have a detour route defined.
54				Question 16 – Is the minimum 5' abutment toe setback to the face of the rip rap or to the slope line?	Revision	This is measured from the top of bank to the Abutment toe at riprap face.
55				Question 52 – When will the additional detour routes be provided?	Revision	The additional detour routes are provided in Attachment B.
56	Attach_A	Agreement	46 of 88	Please confirm that the SCDOT wetland credits will be provided at no cost to the Contractor.	No Revision	Confirmed.
57	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	pg. 2	Does the Department believe that the projects fit RGP 4?	No Revision	Yes.
58	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	pg. 4	Please provide the State Certification of the current USACE General Permit.	No Revision	SCDOT was not provided this certification.
59	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	pg. 4	Can the Contractor rely that the Department's NEPA documents will completely address SCDOT GP, III PCN Requirements 3. g. h. i. & k.?	No Revision	Yes.
60	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	pg. 4	Will post-construction water quality treatment be required on bridges or can deck drains empty directly in to the streams for all bridges?	No Revision	SCDOT allows the use of open drainage when the water body is not impaired, however, scuppers over the channel should be minimized. DHEC will make the final decision on this use of scuppers.
61	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	pg. 2	Is it SCDOT intent that the design year traffic volume is the current year traffic volumes?	No Revision	Guidance on this is not directly provided in RFP. Per the Supplemental Design Criteria for Low Volume Bridges, the design year traffic volume may be used as current year traffic volumes (minimum).
62	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	pg. 2	Are grade adjustment K values required for this project?	No Revision	No. Grade adjustment K values are not required for this project. Per RDM Section 4.1.3, "Where practical, the designer should attempt to meet downgrade-adjusted SSD values."
63	RFP	3	6 of 43	Section 3.6, page 6 of 43, "Will SCDOT allow submittal of a Foundation RFC package in advance of the full bridge RFC package including Superstructure sheets?"	No Revision	This is a deviation from the RFP that would require approval as an ATC. As an ATC, it is not favorable for a bridge package of this size and schedule.
64	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	pg. 2	On Page 2, Section 2.1.6 - Is Future Wearing Surface dead load required in the bridge design as well as the load rating performance for these projects?	No Revision	Yes. The Load Rating Guidance Document policy refers to BDM Section 13.2.2 for future wearing surface application. 13.2.2 does not distinguish between superstructure types or make an exception for bridges with an as-built asphalt wearing surface.
65	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	pg.6	Can approach slabs be removed for bridges with a future ADT (2042) less than 400 vehicles per day?	No Revision	No. District 4 is requiring approach slabs at all sites regardless of ADT. The RFP governs over the BDM.
66	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	pg. 2	Does the SCDOT have a maximum acceptable length for the 2ft deep hollow core beams?	Revision	Yes: It is 70 feet per the longest 24" deep cored slab span in the current SCDOT Bridge Drawings and Details. The RFP will be revised to clarify this.
67	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	pg. 4	Section 2.1.14 Will SCDOT allow a low point within 50' at the beginning or end of the bridge?	No Revision	Yes, Section 2.1.14 of the RFP governs the low point location. When the MTBBC2 stiffness transition is used, the low point may be coordinated with the standard flume location and placed a minimum of 15 feet beyond the approach slab.

