

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

FINAL RFP - ROUND 1

Date Received: **25-Sep**

6-Oct

CONTRACTOR						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Agreement	28	Please add a statement at the end of paragraph C that if the road is closed this time will not count against the maximum site specific construction days listed in the table for each site.	Construction	Revision	Revision to "C." will be made and provided in an addendum. Clearing and grubbing under a single lane closure is acceptable and will not count against the bridge closure duration.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	1	It appears that the update regarding preliminary plans conflict with the Department's answer to non-confidential question #9. Please clarify that preliminary Roadway and Bridge plan package submittals can be eliminated at the Team's risk noted in section 1.2 (Submittal Exceptions).	DM	Revision	Language will be revised to clearly indicate Preliminary submittal may be omitted at Contractor's risk.
3	Attach_A	Exhibit 6		S-37-133 states: Commercial stream credits are available and wetland credits may be available from a SCDOT bank if the CONTRACTOR determines no other option is available. For budgeting and planning purposes, please clarify 'may be available...if CONTRACTOR determines no other option is available'. i.e. to what extent does CONTRACTOR have to demonstrate that no other option is available?	Environmental	No_Revision	"If the CONTRACTOR determines no other option is available" would generally be understood that the Contractor would investigate to see if a commercial bank selling wetland credits with a service area covering the project site existed or not. If it did, then they would purchase credits from that bank. If a bank did not exist, they would notify the SCDOT of this situation and the SCDOT would work with the Contractor to secure appropriate credits from a SCDOT wetland bank. In regards to extent, a commercial mitigation bank servicing the area either exists or it does not. The Contractor is expected to take measures to make this determination. Teams may utilize publicly available websites and contact either mitigation banks or the US Army Corps of Engineers directly to obtain this information.
4	Attach_A	Exhibit 6		Will SCDOT charge for wetlands credits?	Environmental	No_Revision	No.
5	Attach_A	Exhibit 6		Please resolve the discrepancy between Exhibit 6 and the response to NCQ 11. Exhibit 6 says that the Department may provide credits and the NCQ answer says the Department will not provide credits.	Environmental	No_Revision	Exhibit 6 overrides the response. Credits would be provided for S-133 as stated in Exhibit 6.
6	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	4	Would the Department allow the design build team to use a non-reporting nationwide 3 permit if wetland impacts are less than 0.1 acres? This has been done on previous bridge replacement projects.	Environmental	No_Revision	Yes.
7				Can the slope stability analyses for the 100-yr scour condition be evaluated at a resistance factor of 0.90?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	No.



8	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	1	Please add this statement to the first paragraph of section 2.2.1.8 Abutments: The "minimum 10-foot distance from any point on the channel to the abutment toe at riprap face" (i.e. the projected slope) as shown in Figure 3 of HDB 2019-4 does not apply to these sites.	Hydrology	Revision	Statement added to 4th bullet of section 2.2.1.8 of exhibit 4e.
9	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	4	Can the minimum allowable clearzone widths be used instead of desirable?	Roadway	No_Revision	No.
10	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	4	Can trailing end treatment be used instead of leading end treatment for trailing end of bridge if clearzone requirements are met for opposing traffic?	Roadway	Revision	Will revise to allow if clearzone requirements are met.
11	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	3	The existing K value for the profile at S-168 over Little Choestoea Creek is 67.9. The K-values used in the conceptual roadway profile are 59 and 53. Exhibit 4a section 2.6 states that "K-values shall not be less than the existing conditions, except when the existing K value exceeds the design speed (not 15 mph allowable range) minimum requirements." Can we use the conceptual design roadway profile?	Roadway	No_Revision	No. Use 4a 2.6 section: For the low volume bridge replacement sites, if the existing K value is within 15 mph of the design speed retain or improve the K value. If the existing K value is not within 15 mph of the design speed, use a K value that is within 15 mph of the design speed. K values shall not be less than the existing conditions, except when the existing K value exceeds the design speed (not 15 mph allowable range) minimum requirements.
12	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	5	Under Section 2.11 (Right-of-Way) it appears the first two paragraphs conflict on the required right-of-way. The first paragraph states no additional right-of-way is necessary where a 75-foot width is at least 45-feet from each end. The second paragraph states "or where the length of 75-foot wide right-of-way is not present at least 75-feet from each end". Please clarify 45-foot or 75-foot from each end of the bridge.	Roadway	No_Revision	Where 75' ROW exist and the proposed bridge ends are $\geq 45'$ from exiting ROW; no ROW is needed. If the proposed bridge ends are $< 45'$ from the existing ROW, 75' will be required. Sites where ROW is $< 75'$ will require 75' all around the proposed bridge location including 75' from proposed bridge ends. Construction limits are to be within the existing ROW or new ROW.
13	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 2		Contractor is required to install, maintain and improve signs for detour. Are there any additional requirements for improvements? Paving, striping, intersection improvements, clear zone issues, or other?	Traffic	No_Revision	No other improvements are required from a traffic standpoint however FDP still may be required.
14				Can utilities (waterline) be reattached to bridges at S-197 over Tyger River, S-51 over Snow Creek?	Utilities	No_Revision	SCDOT has not approved any new attachments or reattachments at this time.



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

RFP FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW

Date Received: 9/17/2025

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	No_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. Addtional dicussion 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.
32	Attach_B	Environmental		Please provide the WOTUS boundaries noted in the PCE and NRTM in CAD or shape file format.	Environmental	Revision	Files provided and uploaded in PIP section on website. Note: These files are not formal delineations or approved by any regulatory agency and teams are expected to conduct site specific delineations as needed.
33	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	4	Does the triple profile apply to low volume road sites?	Hydrology	No_Revision	No. The tripple profile does not define LVB abutment riprap protection slopes. PCDM-11 page 10 states that the projection of the abutment riprap protection slope shall not intersect any point on the channel bank or bottom.
34				Tyger River - curved roadway approaches meet tangent bridge. Can guardrail be curved leading up to structure? or must it be a straight line from end of barrier through the stiffness transition? What is maximum kink allowable at connection? What is minimum length of tangent guardrail at bridge connection and guardrail termini?	Roadway	Revision	The stiffness transitions and end terminals cannot be curved, but standard MASH guardrail in between end terminals may follow roadway curvature. The maximum "kink" angle between bridge barrier and stiffness transitions is 5-degrees. Exhibit 4b



35				Tyger River - will SCDOT provide the existing low chord elevation so teams can confirm the proposed low chord meets required criteria?	Hydrology	No_Revision	FEMA has the LC at 575 according to the FIS profile. The 100 year WSE will be the controlling criteria and not the existing LC elevation.
36				What is the minimum curve length for S-138 bridges (PCDM-11 criteria) 150 ft for 50 mph or 105 ft for 35 mph?	Roadway	No_Revision	The PCDM 11 allows the 15 MPH reduction of DS therefore the curve length would also be based on the reduced DS.
37				Will SCDOT increase the number of FATCs from 10 to 15?	PM	No_Revision	No additional ATCs will be allowed on this project.
38	Attach_B	Roadway		Can the 4" HMA surface course for the Standard Guardrail Detail with Asphalt Non-Mow Strip be a 4 inch combination of intermediate and surface?	Construction	Revision	RFP will be revised to allow a combination of intermediate and surface for the non-mow strip.
39	PIP	Hydraulics	S-42-197 Conceptual Bridge Plans	The conceptual bridge plans for S-197 show fill being placed in the floodplain at end bent 1. We realize that these plans are for information only, however, we assume this design was used in establishing the Minimum Bridge Lengths shown in Attachment B. Is SCDOT going to allow teams to add fill in the flood plain at this site provided all other hydraulic design requirements are met? Unless fill will be allowed in the floodplain, using the minimum bridge length provided violates RFP Exhibit 4e, Section 2.2.1.8, First Bullet.	Hydrology	Revision	4e will be revised for S-197 proposed abutment toe limits.



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

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

Date Received: **7/9/2025**

N/A

CONTRACTOR						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	RFP		N/A	We understand that non-FEMA models were used by HNTB for their hydraulic study will those models be available for the design build team to review?	Hydrology	No_Revision	Yes, models will be provided no later than the release of the Final RFP.
2	RFP	2	5	2.7 Deadline for qualification submittal is July 22, 2025 but does not have a time similar to previous proposals, i.e. 9AM. Please clarify if there is a time the RFQ should be submitted.	Other	Revision	Time for RFQ submittal added.
3	RFP	2	2	Section 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 - Can you please confirm that Construction Engineering and Inspection and Quality Acceptance and Independent Assurance Testing will be performed by SCDOT or through a separate procurement? In Section 2.2.2 it states that Construction engineering and management, including quality control inspection and testing, will be the responsibility of the successful Proposer but 2.2.3 states that construction engineering will be handled by SCDOT so we would like some clarification on CEI services.	Other	No_Revision	This is the standard QA/QC process. More information will be provided in the RFP.
4	RFP	3	16	Section 3.8 Prequalification Requirements of Short-listed Proposers - Can you please confirm that the SCDOT Prequalification Certificate for the Lead Contractor is to be submitted with the RFP response for short-listed firms and not to be submitted with this RFQ?	Other	No_Revision	Confirmed. Section 3.8 states "Submittal of all construction firm prequalification certificates shall be submitted with the response to the RFP in order to be responsive."
5	RFP	2	3 of 26	Section 2.2.7. When will SCDOT post the addendum with the DBE goal requirements?	Other	Revision	The DBE goal will be provided in Addendum 1.
6		3.4.4	10 of 26	Please confirm that an Assistant Project Manager is NOT required and if so that the full 20 points will be applied to the Project Manager.	PM	No_Revision	An APM is not required. If a PM is used all 20 points will go towards that individual and the PM will be solely dedicated to the project.
7		3.5.2	14 of 26	Please confirm that the additional Work History and Quality Forms needed for Appendix C only applies to "yes" answers for the questions noted on page 14 of the RFQ.	PM	No_Revision	Yes. If additional Work History and Quality Forms are required to satisfy the requirements of this section, they shall be included in the Appendix C and will not be counted against the specified page limit in Section 5.2.2.
8	RFP	3	11	3.4.5 References Lead Structural Engineer. Please clarify if this role is to be included.	PM	Revision	No structural key individual required. Information removed.
9	RFP		N/A	Are the bridge lengths and span arrangement SCDOT provided final or can the design build team shorten the provided bridge length or span arrangements to provide SCDOT some cost savings?	Structures	No_Revision	Minimum bridge lengths and minimum channel span lengths will be specified in the RFP. Proposed reductions to either will be evaluated through the ATC process.



10	RFP		N/A	Is SCDOT committed to the proposed bridge materials, or can varying industry standard bridge components be considered if a cost savings can be shown ?	Structures	No_Revision	Allowable bridge types will be provided in the RFP. Deviations to standard SCDOT bridge types and materials will be evaluated with the ATC process.
11			5 of 26	Are there any time restrictions for the deadline of the Submittal of Qualifications on July 22, 2025?	PM	Revision	Time for RFQ submittal added.

