

NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
Emergency Bridge Replacement 2020-2 - Project ID P040306 - Aiken County

RFP FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW

Date Received: 2/2/2021

Non-Confidential Meeting Date:

						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Agreement	7 of 87	Agreement II. B. 2. States: CONTRACTOR may rely on geotechnical and survey information provided in Attachment B – Supplemental Design Criteria. The CONTRACTOR shall incorporate the information into the final project documents. There is no Survey in Attachment B. Please clarify if there is new survey available to rely on and please add to Attachment B if so.	Construction	Revision	New survey "2021 Survey.zip" has been added to Attachment B.
2	Attach_A	Agreement	29	\$10,000 / day liquidated damages for opening travel lanes is high. This is the number used on I-77 and I-85 / I-385 Interchange DB Projects. Would SCDOT consider \$5000 / day?	Construction	No_Revision	No. Liquidated damages have been developed based on user costs for the facility.
3	Attach_A	Agreement	25	Has consideration been given to the potential conflict between the project completion date (March 5) and the seasonal restrictions for asphalt surface? Given this very short window, the time allowed for placement of asphalt surface, 7 days of curing and placement of thermoplastic and RPM's appears to be inadequate. Will permissions be granted to allow for placement of these items outside of temperature and seasonal restrictions?	Construction	No_Revision	Yes, with an approved cold weather paving plan, permission will be given for placement outside seasonal restrictions. Temperature restrictions will remain.
4	RFP	2	Section 2.5/Page 3 of 32	Can SCDOT please provide the wetland impacts the Department has estimated for the project?	Environmental	Revision	Will provide as soon as it is available later this week.
5	RFP	3	Section 3.7.1/ Page 98 of 32 Impacts	Can SCDOT please provide the digital wetland line?	Environmental	Revision	New survey "2021 Survey.zip" has been added to Attachment B. Wetland lines have NOT been verified by USACE.
6	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	Page 4	Please provide and identify the horizontal locations of 'River' as expected in Commitment 8.	Environmental	No_Revision	Shown as top of bank line (RD_EX_H20) in the updated survey file.
7	Attach_B	Environmental	13	"AP8.2 From January to May and/or August to November, installation of piles and sheet piles in rivers where sturgeon are known to use for migration and spawning are limited to drilled-shafts or those activities labeled "A" in section 5.2 ("Noise"). Appropriate/specific timeframes for individual sturgeon migration and spawning rivers are found in Appendix H of the FHWA/NMFS-SERO BMP Manual." Can SCDOT provide Appendix H above? or specify moratorium dates in the RFP for this location?	Environmental	Revision	Document provided in Attachment B.
8	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	3	Will General Permit limits be exceeded? Who is responsible for additional permitting requirements.	Environmental	No_Revision	SCDOT is working to secure appropriate permits. See Exhibit 6 Commitment 7 and Article IX for Contractor responsibilities.



9	Attach_B	Environmental	13	Does the moratorium apply to work "outside the channel"? During high water events - is it everything in the water? Or just the channel. Or is it everything in the wetlands?	Environmental	No_Revision	Channel only.
10	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	2	Are there any draft permit drawings and or supporting cad files that would be available in order to determine design compliance with the general permit? Also, please provide the IP even though not yet approved.	Environmental	Revision	Delineation files can be provided. (It should be noted that lines have NOT been verified by ACE.) A copy of submittals can be provided when available.
11	Attach_A	Exhibit 6		With the limited contract time for this project and since SCDOT is acquiring the permit, would SCDOT consider providing the required mitigation for this project?	Environmental	No_Revision	If SCDOT acquires the permit, as in this case, SCDOT will provide mitigation.
12	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Structures 2.1.5/Page 1	States: "Provide low chord and/or freeboard requirements in accordance with Exhibit 4e." 4e States "The proposed bridge low chord elevation shall not be less than the existing bridge low chord elevation." Please clarify it is SCDOT's intent to match the existing low chord elevation.	Hydrology	No_Revision	The RFP does not prohibit raising the low chord if warranted by design. The low chord shall not be lowered.
13	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	hydraulics Section 2.2 and 2.3/ Page 1 & 2	Can SCDOT provide the detailed FEMA Study, including FEMA model, for the project area for use during design development prior to submittal of Cost Proposal?	Hydrology	Revision	The teams should acquire the model on their own. SCDOT will also pursue and will post when/if received. Exhibit 4e will be revised to indicate SCDOT intent for the teams to achieve a "no-impact" certification for this project.
14	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	3	Section 2.4 Sediment and Erosion Control and Water Quality states that additional water quality treatment shall be provided when outfalls discharge to 303(d) listed, TMDL, and other sensitive waters. The SCDHEC Water Quality Data Portal indicates that the South Fork Edisto is in an approved TMDL watershed. Does this requirement apply to direct discharges to the river, or does this also apply to the floodplain and wetland areas? Can SCDOT confirm the presence of sensitive waters or other environmental resources on the project?	Hydrology	No Revision	Direct discharge applies to the river channel only and not floodplain or wetland areas. SCDOT is not a contributor to fecal coliform.
15	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2	Section 2.2 Bridge Hydraulics states the proposed bridge low chord elevation shall not be less than the existing bridge low chord elevation. Can SCDOT confirm that the minimum freeboard requirements listed in the Requirements for Hydraulic Design Studies Section 1.1.5.1 and Hydraulic Design Bulletin 2019-1, Section 1.1.5.1 will apply? Is the South Fork Edisto River considered a "larger river" requiring a minimum 7.0 foot design flood freeboard across the main channel?	Hydrology	No Revision	Yes, Requirements for Hydraulic Design Studies Section 1.1.5.1 and Hydraulic Design Bulletin 2019-4 (not 2019-1 in original question) will apply for this project. No, 7.0 feet of freeboard is not required as the South Edisto River at this location is not considered a "larger river". Do not lower the low chord. Span the channel.
16	PIP	Hydraulics		Is there an effective FEMA model available? If so, will SCDOT be providing it during the pursuit phase?	Hydrology	No Revision	The teams should acquire the model on their own. SCDOT will also pursue and will post when/if received.
17	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2.2	Is the effective model (if available) meant to be the basis of study for the existing, proposed, and natural conditions HECRAS models described in this section?	Hydrology	No Revision	Yes the effective model is the FEMA model.
18	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2.3	Has SCDOT had discussions with the Aiken County Floodplain Administrator about whether this project can be administered locally or does it need to go to FEMA for approval?	Hydrology	No Revision	Discussions were not had with the flood plain coordinator. If determined a No-Impact then send the county a certification letter for concurrence. If a CLOMR is required, then county and FEMA coordination is required.

19	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2.2	No survey DTM provided for project but multiple tin files were provided. Can SCDOT provide an up to date DTM or specify which tin file is to be used for design?	Hydrology	Revision	New survey "2021 Survey.zip" has been added to Attachment B.
20	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2.2	If SCDOT is allowing the proposed low chord to be just above the existing low chord, does SCDOT intend to waive or adjust freeboard and backwater requirements if hydraulic modeling WSEL results differ significantly from effective WSEL's?	Hydrology	No Revision	The RFP does not prohibit raising the low chord if warranted by design. The low chord may not be lowered.
21	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2.3	If an effective FEMA model exists, but cannot be provided to proposers as part of the pursuit, there is a higher risk that a technical proposal design could result in a CLOMR if the design build team is required to utilize the effective model as the study basis to achieve FEMA compliance post award. Please reconsider the completion date since CLOMR risk is present or provide the effective model as soon as possible.	Hydrology	Revision	The teams should acquire the model on their own. SCDOT will also pursue and will post when/if received. Exhibit 4e will be revised to indicate SCDOT intent for the teams to achieve a "no-impact" certification for this project.
22	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2	"The proposed bridge low chord elevation shall not be less than the existing bridge low chord elevation." Can SCDOT provide the minimum low chord elevation with respect to the provided survey?	Hydrology	Revision	Yes. Exhibit 4e will be revised to establish the existing low chord elevation at 267.02'. This was calculated by using the most recent (2021) survey shots of finished grade and subtracting existing superstructure depth (from the as-built bridge widening plans).
23	Attach_A	Agreement	29	Has SCDOT considered the affect of LDs (and risk of payment) on the contract price of the Project?	Other	No_Revision	Yes.
24	PIP	Survey		Survey information seems to be based on a survey in 2001. Can SCDOT confirm this is the most update information available and represents current conditions in field?	Other	Revision	New survey "2021 Survey.zip" has been added to Attachment B.
25	PIP	Survey		No horizontal datum information given for the provided survey, only the vertical datum (NGVD 29) seems to be referenced. What is the correct horizontal datum to use with the provided survey files?	Other	Revision	New survey "2021 Survey.zip" has been added to Attachment B.
26	RFP	3	6 of 32	Section 3.6: States: "SCDOT will provide written responses to the submitted confidential questions prior to the Confidential Preliminary ATC Meeting and/or any Confidential One-on-One Formal ATC Meetings." No place else are preliminary ATC's mentioned and is not reflected in the schedule. Please clarify. If possible would SCDOT consider a confidential Q&A to explore preliminary ATC ideas before submitting final?	PM	No_Revision	No preliminary ATCs will be allowed. Only one Formal ATC per team may be submitted for evaluation.



27	RFP	3	7 of 32	Section 3.7 states: "Concepts which violate environmental commitments require submittal and approval of an ATC to be eligible for implementation." but Section 3.7 also states that "For this project, requests for contract modifications that may qualify as ATC's are limited to bridge superstructure types other than those allowed by Exhibit 4b such as prestressed concrete box beams with a concrete overlay." Please clarify if only a bridge superstructure type change is eligible for an ATC submission.	PM	No_Revision	Only one formal ATC will be allowed and only related to a change in superstructure type.
28	RFP	3	7 of 32	Section 3.7.1: Will SCDOT allow Preliminary ATC's to be submitted before requiring the Single Final ATC submission. Also, would SCDOT consider more than just one Final ATC and consider ATC's related to areas other than just the superstructure as stated?	PM	No_Revision	No.
29	RFP	3	9 of 32	Section 3.7.1: Would SCDOT consider a confidential Q&A prior to submission of the one allowable ATC?	PM	No_Revision	No.
30	RFP	3	12 of 32	Section 3.8: Would SCDOT consider a modest stipend?	PM	No_Revision	No.
31	Attach_A	Agreement	Section D-6/ Page 9 of 87	Due to stated construction schedule, will SCDOT consider reducing design review time as stated?	PM	Revision	Design review timeframes will be revised to allow 7 day initial review, 5 day for contractor response then 3 day for subsequent reviews.
32	RFP	2	10	Due to the short project duration, would SCDOT commit to a 5-day initial review period? Based on the number of submittal packages, there will be a minimum of 9 weeks of review time.	PM	Revision	Design review timeframes will be revised to allow 7 day initial review, 5 day for contractor response then 3 day for subsequent reviews.
33	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z		Would SCDOT permit the DBT to skip Preliminary Plans and go directly to Final Plans Submittal at risk? Would this require an ATC?	PM	No_Revision	The contractor may, at their own risk, go directly to Final Plans submittal. No ATC is required or allowed for this.
34	RFP		3.7	Would SCDOT consider permitting 3 ATCs?	PM	No_Revision	No.
35	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Page 1 Section 2.6	States "Develop vertical curves, grades, and clearances in compliance with SCDOT Roadway Design Manual." Will grade adjusted vertical curves for stopping site distance be required on this project?	Roadway	No_Revision	Yes, adjusted stopping sight distances will be required for this project. This would apply to grades where downgrades are 3 percent or greater.
36	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a		Do all power poles not protected by existing or proposed guardrail need to be outside the clear zone if within the project limits? RFP states Aiken Electric will be relocating their pole line to the farthest distance from the roadway/bridge centerline feasible (just inside the proposed ROW). Do the existing poles need to be outside the clear zone? If not, do we need to get a design exception to allow them to stay within the clear zone? They appear from Google Earth to be 12-15 feet from the edge of lane. With a 60 mph design speed, that doesn't meet clear zone requirements.	Roadway	No_Revision	Generally, power poles may be considered an isolated hazard. Thus it may not be practical to protect each pole. Clearzone is not a design exception qualifier and thus, no design exception would be needed if poles were within the clearzone. However, designers should make every effort to locate all hazards outside the clearzone (or protect). If poles remain in the clearzone, they shall be located as far back as practical using engineering judgement.
37	Attach_A	Agreement	7 of 87	Agreement II.A.: Scope States: CONTRACTOR shall furnish all services, right of way services.....as defined in the Project Scope of Work made a part hereof as Exhibit 3, Project Design Criteria made a part hereof as Exhibit 4 and Exhibits 5 Choose an item., and Attachment B. RFP further states SCDOT is responsible for ROW services. Please clarify what the Contractor is responsible for.	ROW	No_Revision	SCDOT is responsible for all ROW shown in Attachment B. The contractor will be responsible as outlined in Article VIII of the Agreement should any ROW be required beyond the New ROW limits shown in Attachment B.
38	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	3	Clear all Right Of Way within the project limits. - Is it SCDOT's intent to clear all existing and newly acquired ROW?	ROW	Revision	Clear the entirety of the 75' ROW on the south side of SC-4/302. For the north side of the bridge, clear the 75' ROW for the full length of the bridge and a minimum of 75' from each end of the bridge, or as needed to complete the project. Exhibit 4a will be revised to indicate this information.

39	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	3	Are project limits defined by the length of construction?	ROW	No_Revision	Yes. Project limits shall be defined as the limits required to complete the bridge replacement and tie into the existing facility.
40	Attach_A	Agreement	Section 4/Page 25 of 87	Due to stated Time for Construction of Project, will SCDOT allow partial package submittals for the bridge?	Structures	Revision	Yes, Superstructure and Substructure plans will be allowed as separate submittals on this project. They must be combined into one plan set once they have both been released for construction.
41	RFP	2	Section 2.2/Page 2 of 32	When will SCDOT provide existing bridge plans?	Structures	No_Revision	Files of existing road and bridge-widening plans uploaded to each team individually through Projectwise. Original (1932) existing bridge plans could not be found.
42	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	4	Section 2.1.15 Bridge Drainage and Low Point states that deck drains may not be placed on the main span over the South Edisto River channel and that closed drainage systems are not permitted on this project. Given the presence of sensitive waters on this project, will deck drainage be allowed to discharge to the floodplain and wetlands outside of the main channel, or must runoff be contained on the bridge deck until it may be discharged beyond the end bents, with additional bridge width as required to satisfy spread requirements?	Structures	No_Revision	Deck drainage will be allowed to discharge to the floodplain and wetlands outside of the main channel.
43	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2.1.20	Would SCDOT consider removing the 27.5' column spacing limit for multi-column interior bents?	Structures	Revision	Yes, the 27.5' column spacing limit will be removed for this project.
44	Attach_A	Agreement	36	"In the event that the Aiken Electric Cooperative facilities remain in place but are de-energized during construction activities, the CONTRACTOR shall avoid impacts to these facilities" - Who's decision is it to move or not move? Can Contractor request the move?	Utilities	No_Revision	The clearances from the electric lines control bridge construction activities. In the event Aiken Electric Co-op is able to relocate the live wires but a delay occurs with removing the remaining electric or communication lines, the contractor, in coordination with said utilities, may proceed with construction activities that do not impact the remaining facilities. At this time SCDOT is anticipating that all utilities will be able to relocate within the utility window.





Date Received: 2/10/2021

Non-Confidential Meeting Date:

						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	RFP	2	J	The response to NCQ 11 states that SCDOT will provide mitigation and that no revision would be made to the RFP; however, "Wetland and Stream Mitigation" is listed as a Contract Deliverable in the Agreement, Chapter 2, Section J(11). It's found on sheet 53 of 282 in the PDF. We believe the Final RFP should clarify or remove this deliverable in the Final RFP.	Environmental	No Revision	SCDOT is acquiring a permit and providing mitigation for that permit. Article IX requires the CONTRACTOR to provide mitigation for any permit modifications. The CONTRACTOR will coordinate with ESO regarding wetland mitigation but there are no available stream mitigation options for this area. Therefore, any stream impacts proposed by the DBT will have to be mitigated by the CONTRACTOR.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Page 2/ Page 143 of RFP	Section 2.1.7: Allowable superstructure types include superstructures outlined in 12.3.2.4 of the BDM. 12.3.2.4 is Steel rolled beams. For a 60ft continuous span a W21 beam would meet the minimum span to depth requirements in AASHTO 2.5.2.6.3. with a beam depth of +/- 21 inches. Section 12.2.5.5 of the BDM requires that the maximum deck overhang is equal to the depth of beam for structural steel less than 36". This would be a maximum overhang of 21". However, the same section requires a minimum overhang of 27". In a case where the maximum overhang is less than the minimum overhang, would SCDOT prefer the minimum overhang of 21", the maximum overhang of 27" or is this section of the BDM limiting the minimum steel beam depth to 27"?	Structures	No Revision	Maximum overhang equal to the depth of beam governs in this case. Minimum overhang is dependent on method and means of construction.
3	Attach_B	Hydraulics	Abutment and Pier Setbacks/Page 2	Does the 5-foot minimum setback for pile bent refer to the face of pile or face of cap? Also, the vertical line in figure 2 appears to have been shifted slightly from the front face of the substructure.	Hydrology	No Revision	The 5-foot setback for pile bents is measured to the center of the piles. The 10' setback for piers is measured to the face of the column (not the cap).
4	Attach_B	Geotechnical	Geotechnical Subsurface Data Report	Does SCDOT consider the provided geotechnical investigation data sufficient to meet the requirements of Chapter 4 of GDM, and that no additional investigations will be required unless deemed necessary by Design-Builder's Geotechnical Engineer?	Geotechnical	No Revision	The geotechnical subsurface data provided is not intended to be all inclusive. The Design-Build Team must verify that the requirements of the GDM are met based on their specific design.





						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	Page 1	At guardrail approaches to the bridge ends, shoulder improvements for approaches to guardrail are required to meet guardrail standards according to Std. Dwg. 805-115-10. These improvements may extend further than the actual tie down for the proposed roadway (i.e. the project limits). Will SCDOT require full overlay/ milling /replacement of pavement per Exhibit 3-Project Scope when only shoulder improvements are required to meet guardrail standards	Construction	No Revision	No paving is required to appropriately tie to existing conditions. Work to tie the shoulders to the existing facilities may extend past the paving limits.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Page 7 - Section 2.1.22 Slope Protection	Will SCDOT allow re-use of the existing rip rap in its "as-is" condition by allowing contractor to remove it from the existing bridge abutments and place it at the new bridge abutments. If additional quantity is needed to meet SCDOT standard rip rap details, it will be provided, but we would like to re-use what is available.	Construction	No Revision	Yes as long as it meets SCDOT specifications and is free from wood, trash, foreign debris, and deleterious material. It must also meet hydraulic requirements found in Hydraulic Design Bulletin 2019-4.
3	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	Page 4	After a visit to the site during a rain event, the low-lying overflow areas on each side of the main channel were completely covered in water by as much as 2' from abutment to abutment, and it appears using crane mats for access may be susceptible to flood risk. Please confirm the SCDOT is including use of a stone riprap causeway approximately 2 ft. in height, on either side of the 90' channel without encroaching on the channel, for construction access in the USACE permit and that this method is permissible for construction access.	Environmental	Revision	No, we are not including stone rip rap causeway in the permit . A draft copy will be provided in the PIP.
4	Attach_B	Environmental		Are there any draft permit drawings and or supporting cad files that would be available in order to determine design compliance with the general permit? Also, please provide the IP even though not yet approved. It is imperative for the DBT to determine at construction activities are within the permitted area and if additional mitigation will be required.	Environmental	Revision	A draft copy will be provided in the PIP. The wetlands file from the survey folder in Attachment B is being moved to the Project Information Package as the final jurisdictional determination has not been made.
5	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2	Section 2.2 Last Paragraph: Per USGS SIR 2016-5121 documentation, Live Bed Contraction Scour data is available for this crossing (SC Bridge Scour Envelope Curves). Can SCDOT make this data and any other scour study data available for DB team use prior to bid?	Hydrology	Revision	The scour study data has been posted to the project webpage.
6	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 29 of 87- Liquidated Damages	Since the SCDOT has stated a \$10,000 per day LD for not having travel lanes open to the public, would SCDOT consider an equal Incentive for early opening of the roadway for every day in advance of the Feb 6, 2022 date? If not the same amount, another amount?	PM	No Revision	No.

