

**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS**  
**Bridge Package 21**  
**Contract ID 5368980 - Oconee and Spartanburg Counties**

**RFP FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW**

Date Received: 8/27/2025

9/8/2025

CONTRACTOR						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	PIP	Hydraulics		There is substantial overbank scour downstream of S-51 bridge over Snow Creek. The scour location extends beyond the proposed right of way. Will SCDOT require channel overbank protection within and beyond right of way? If so, can a distance be provided?	Hydrology	Revision	Ditch will need to be improved on that downstream side and protection will be required within SCDOT ROW. Changes will be made to Exhibit 4e in the Final RFP.
2	Attach_B	Survey		Please provide the survey TIN file.	Roadway	Revision	Files will be uploaded to the website under Attachment B Survey.
3	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a		What design vehicle should be used when designing the S-37-51 driveway for Tract 9?	Roadway	No_Revision	Refer to 3.7 of the RDM. Use the vehicle type that is used for most geometric design or noted otherwise in the RFP.
4	Attach_A	Agreement	28 of 98	Agreement Section IV.A.1c states that the "Contractor may perform clearing and grubbing and utility relocations in advance of the Notice of Closure/Demolition provided detour/construction signage is in place." If the contractor elects to do this work with the detour in place will this time count towards the maximum site specific construction time?	Construction	No_Revision	The intent is to minimize disruption to the traveling public as much as possible. For open bridges, any temporary detours prior to bridge construction will require District approval. The RFP allows for temporary lane closures leading up to the bridge construction detour however; Any approved detour for utility relocations will not count against construction time.
5	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	4	The conceptual roadway plan for S-168 over Little Choestoea Creek references pre-mash guardrail standard drawing 805-730-01 at one driveway. Does the Department approve of its use at this location?	Roadway	Revision	Language will be added to Final RFP Exhibit 4a to specify for locations that deviate from standards.
6	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	5	Exhibit 4a Section 2.14 Design File: Will the Department allow the use of OpenRoads Designer?	Roadway	Revision	Language will be added to Final RFP Exhibit 4a to allow for open roads as well.
7	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	4	It appears that the roadway profile at two of the sites is being raised over 8 feet in order to meet the criteria in section 2.1.14 of Exhibit 4b. Would the Department accept an ATC that moved the low point closer to the end of bridge if adequate drainage structures were provided within the limits of the roadway to maintain the spread within the shoulder?	Structures	No_Revision	Profile low points will not be allowed on cored slab / box beam bridges or approach slabs on this project. Modifying post spacing in guardrail stiffness transition standard drawings will not be allowed. Standard concrete flumes are located as close to the bridge ends as possible with standard post spacings. We do not envision an ATC being able to improve this situation.
8	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	4	The pier setbacks for S-133 may not be 10 feet (the distance to the cap is 9 feet on north side and 9.5' on the south side). Would a setback less than 10 feet be allowed at this site?	Hydrology	No_Revision	Measurement shall be taken from centerline of pier or pile bent. Refer to HDB 2019-4.
9	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	1	Can Teams elect to eliminate Preliminary Roadway and Bridge plan package submittals at their own risk for this project.	DM	Revision	Final RFP Exhibit 4z will be revised to reflect this change.
10	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	27	Please confirm the quantity of 400 square yards for full depth asphalt pavement patching is for the detour routes and the bridge approaches.	Construction	No_Revision	Patching quantities intended for bridge approaches and detour routes as directed by RCE.



11	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	4	If delineations for WOTUS will not be provided in the RFP please state that wetland credits will be provided by SCDOT as was done in Bridge Package 27	Environmental	No_Revision	SCDOT will not provide credits for these sites. SCDOT identified commercial mitigation banks providing credits for the applicable site in the PCE documentation. Refer to the appropriate site PCE Permit Determination form for the mitigation bank.
12	RFP	8	32	Can Teams submit confidential questions prior to the confidential/conceptual ATC meeting to make this meeting more productive? Questions could be submitted by 9:00 AM on 9/9 with responses given at the meeting.	DM	Revision	Teams can submit Confidential Questions including those related to conceptual ATCs prior to the meetings on September 10th.
13	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	1	Please verify the design speed for both bridges on S-37-168. The design speeds for the three other sites appear to match the posted speed limits, however the posted speed limit for S-37-168 appears to be 45 mph while the design speed is 50 mph.	Roadway	No_Revision	Verified. S-168 design speed is 50mph, and is a site that meets low volume bridge criteria.
14	Attach_B			When can we expect to have the detour routes posted in Attachment B?	Traffic	Revision	Detour routes will be provided in Attachment B.
15	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	3	Please verify the maximum grade on S-37-51. The RFP states the maximum grade of 10%, however the conceptual profile shows a proposed grade greater than 10%.	Roadway	Revision	Language will be added to Final RFP Exhibit 4a to specify locations.
16	RFP	3	12	Will SCDOT consider increasing the Stipend amount with the known utilities at each site, considerable resources are needed for preliminary utility coordination pre-bid? ( 0.2% of the STIP value has been the standard)	PM	No_Revision	Several considerations determine the stipend amount, independent of the STIP value.
17	Attach_B	Hydraulics		The models provided in Attachment B for S-37-168 (Trib to Choestoea), S-37-133 ( Little Cane Creek), and S-42-197 (South Tyger River) are not the correct models. These models do not match the ones referenced in the Hydro memos that were provided for each bridge.	Hydrology	Revision	Files will be revised in the PIP.
18	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	4	Does the criteria for checking the projection of the new abutment slope (2:1 ground line) apply to the Low Volume Criteria sites?	Hydrology	No_Revision	Yes and can be referenced in PCDM-11 page 10.
19	Attach_B	Hydraulics	Toe-Ditch - Detail	Please clarify the toe ditch detail. Is the intent to require a 5-foot berm at the bottom of all 2:1 slopes greater than 10-feet in height?	Hydrology	No_Revision	Yes.
20	Attach_B	Roadway		The MicroStation CAD file titled "S-37-168 over Trib to Choestoea Creek Roadway Profile.dgn" contains the profile for S-197 over South Tyger River profile. Please provide the missing profile.	Roadway	Revision	File will be added to PIP.
21	Attach_A	Agreement	28 of 98	Contract is to be complete 792 days after NTP (26 months). Relocation of the utility at S-37-133 over Little Cane Creek could take as much as 24 months to move. Can SCDOT add additional time for utility relocation at this site, or define a utility window such that additional delays can be added to the contract time at this site?	Construction	No_Revision	At this time, Department has not received feedback that utility relocation is required for the nearby transmission lines on S-133.
22	Attach_A	Agreement	28 of 98	Is the time (120 days and 150 days) for the S-37-168 bridge closure required to be concurrent? Or can each site be replaced on an independent schedule?	Construction	Revision	The S-168 sites have independent schedules and shall be constructed as such. Detours for S-168 over Trib to Choestoea Creek and S-168 over Little Choestoea Creek shall not be placed concurrently with one another.
23	Attach_B	Survey		Can survey files be provided?	Roadway	Revision	Files will be uploaded to website under Attachment B.



24	Attach_B	Survey		There is a gate at S-37-51 near station 113+50 left - plans indicate to coordinate with landowner. Landowner has indicated a strong desire to keep this access to bottom fields (separate access from the house uphill). Would SCDOT consider a break in approach guardrail at this location to maintain existing access?	Roadway	No_Revision	No guardrail break. Gate and fence to be moved to new location outside ROW with discussion and direction from owner and RME.
25	Attach_B	Survey		There is a gate at S-37-133 near station 37+00 left. Would SCDOT consider a break in approach guardrail at this location to maintain existing access?	Roadway	No_Revision	No guardrail break. Gate and fence to be moved to new location outside ROW with discussion and direction from owner and RME.
26	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a		S-197 over South Tyger River: The Design Speed is 45 mph, with allowable reductions to 35 and 40 mph for horizontal and vertical curves. Is the guardrail type required to be set for 45 mph? And should the resulting low point of the roadway be shifted to 50 ft from end of bridge? or is the 35 ft as shown acceptable?	Roadway	No_Revision	The 35ft is acceptable as 45mph meets the STD drawing 805-001-01 and PCDM-14 requirements.
27	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a		S-51 over Snow Creek: NPDES line for private drive (EB1 right) is shown outside ROW. Is the NPDES line for private driveway excluded from the requirement to cover NPDES with new ROW?	DM	No_Revision	Please see response to Question 28. No R/W will be required as the need for the driveway has been eliminated.
28	PIP	Roadway		S-51 over Snow Creek: Private drive (EB1 right) cut line extends into Parcel 10. Is it acceptable to have damages to parcel 10 to provide access to parcel 9? Is a break in the guardrail permissible to avoid this situation?	Roadway	No_Revision	The Driveway proposed on tract 9 is not required; therefore no guardrail break needed. Driveway could not be verified. Additional discussion may occur after ROW negotiations with owner.
29	Attach_B	Traffic		Can detour routes be provided?	Traffic	Revision	Detour routes will be provided in Attachment B.
30	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	3	S-37-51 over Snow Creek lists a maximum grade of 10%. Existing profile grade exceeds 10%. Is an exception allowed for the 10% maximum grade at this site?	Roadway	Revision	Final RFP Exhibit 4a language will be revised to address this location.
31	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	5	Section 2.11 requires 75 ft ROW from each end of the bridge. Past RFPs have allowed existing ROW to remain if 75 ft of ROW was present for at least 45 ft from the bridge. Will SCDOT allow the existing ROW to remain as is if a minimum length (45 ft, 50 ft, 60 ft) is provided? Or is 75 ft minimum required at all locations?	DM	Revision	Maintain existing ROW if it extends at least 45' from each end of the bridge.

