

NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
Bridge Package 19 - Contract ID 5362310 - Greenville & Pickens Counties

RFP FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW

Date Received: 1/3/2025

Non-Confidential Meeting Date: 1/13/2025

				SCDOT		
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Exhibit_4	150	The RFP lists the 2007 Standard Specifications manual, however it is our understanding the 2025 manual now takes precedence. Can SCDOT confirm which manual to use?	Revision	Will provide updated Exhibits to comply with 2025 Spec book. Multiple changes made throughout to refer to 2025 Standard Specifications.
2	RFP	Agreement Section IV	27 of 92	Construction time is defined as calendar days from Notice of Demolition, which is to be submitted 30 days prior to beginning demolition. Does that mean that the actual construction time, starting after the demolition notice period, is 30 days less than the number of calendar days listed in the table on page 28?	Revision	Revised.
3	RFP	Agreement Section IV	28 of 92	The DB Team understands the urgency of re-opening closed bridges, but if additional engineering and construction capacity is available, would SCDOT allow additional bridges to be designed and constructed concurrently if they did not affect the direct path for the S-23 bridges to construction?	No_Revision	Yes. Prioritizing closed bridges to reopen first does NOT preclude concurrent work on other bridges.
4	RFP			If construction timelines overlap with the summer occupancy season for northern long-eared bats and tricolored bats (April 1 – July 15), does SCDOT have a protocol for addressing this with the US Fish & Wildlife Service? Or should all clearing activities wait until after July 15?	No_Revision	Construction activities are allowed. Clearing will need to occur outside restriction times.
5	PIP	Hydraulics		Hydraulic computer models provided in the Project Information Package appear to be independently developed models. Will SCDOT provide the official FEMA hydraulic computer models for bridge sites within Zone AE Special Flood Hazard Areas – e.g., S-40, S-310, S-94, and S-26?	No_Revision	SCDOT requested all models from FEMA and have provided all that were available from the engineering library.
6	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	155 of 301	Section 2.10 states trailing end GR is required for all sites except S-94 and S-102. Conceptual plans for S-32 currently show no trailing GR. Can SCDOT provide clarification on whether or not trailing GR is required for this site?	Revision	Exhibit 4a will be updated to clarify.
7	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	155 of 301	Section 2.6 of the RFP states to utilize the existing horizontal centerlines for LV sites. S-41 is noted as a LV site, however the plan design files utilize a relocated centerline. Can SCDOT provide information on which horizontal CL to utilize at this site?	Revision	Will revise language to allow for relocated centerlines.



8	Attach_B	Roadway		The proposed plans show a relocated centerline alignment for the S-94 site. The public meeting displays discussed that a relocated alignment would utilize traffic staging to keep S-94 open to traffic during construction. However, the RFP mentions an 80 day closure window. Can SCDOT confirm if the site is to be stage constructed or close and detoured. If the site is to be staged constructed, can SCDOT provide design requirements for lane, shoulder, and offset width requirements?	No_Revision	PIP plans are for information only. Site S-94 shall be closed and detoured under an 80 day closure window per the Agreement, Section IV.A.
9	PIP	Roadway		At the S-102 site, guardrail is currently cutting off access to Parcel 18. How does SCDOT wish to proceed with this area?	No_Revision	PIP plans are for information only. A relocated driveway will be required at Parcel 18 to accommodate the guardrail design requirements.
10	PIP	Roadway		Can the proposed CADD files along with the proposed plan and profile view PDFs for the S-310 site be provided?	Revision	Yes.
11	Attach_B	Structures	149, 159	Under Design References, page 149, AASHTO LRFD Design Specifications, 2017, 8th Edition is cited, but on page 159 Section 2.1.1 AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 9th Edition is cited as the design requirement. Can you confirm which LRFD version is required.	Revision	9th Edition is correct. Design Reference list will be revised.
12	Attach_B	Roadway		At the S-94 site, can SCDOT provide the design requirements for the turn lane into Tract 22, required length of storage?	No_Revision	150 ft of storage for the right turn lane into the school (Tract 22), Figure A-9 in ARMS Manual.
13	PIP	Traffic		Can the proposed detour routes be provided?	Revision	Proposed detour routes will be provided.
14	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	145 of 301	The scope of work states the sites will be constructed on the existing roadway alignment on the existing centerline. There are multiple sites utilizing relocated centerlines. Can clarification or removal of this statement be made?	Revision	Exhibit 3 will be revised to address off-alignment replacements.
15	PIP	Utilities		Can SCDOT provide the preliminary utility package report and SUE CADD files and associated SUE sheets?	No_Revision	SCDOT files will be sent to the short-listed teams.

