

NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS

Bridge Package 22

Contract ID 8876710 - Berkeley, Colleton, Dorchester, Darlington, Florence, Georgetown, Horry, Marion, Williamsburg Counties

FINAL REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS - ROUND 3

TEAMS						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	152	Exhibit 4a, Section 2.1: Would SCDOT consider revising the design speed displayed in Table 2.1 for S-26-65 (over Maple Swamp) to match the posted curve advisory speed showing 45 MPH located after the bridge near address 4842 Hwy 65, Conway, SC.	Roadway	No_Revision	No. The sign is after the bridge and no advisory speed before the bridge in either direction.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	160	Exhibit 4b, Section 2.1.2 permits plastic hinging for prestressed concrete piles below grade. Will plastic hinging below grade for drilled shafts be permitted as well?	Structures	Revision	Yes.
3	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	160	It is our understanding that Table 6.1 of the SDS is intended to be specifically for drilled shafts and prestressed concrete piles. We therefore intend to allow plastic hinging in steel end bent piles due to their ductility capacity. Does SCDOT concur with this interpretation and approach?	Structures	Revision	Yes.



NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS

Bridge Package 22

Contract ID 8876710 - Berkeley, Colleton, Dorchester, Darlington, Florence, Georgetown, Horry, Marion, Williamsburg Counties

FINAL REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS - ROUND 2

TEAMS						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	152 - 159 & 168-176	It appears that Exhibit 4a and Exhibit 4b are included more than once in the RFP following Addendum 2. Can SCDOT confirm which versions of these Exhibits are to be utilized?	Other	Revision	RFP will be updated to clarify.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	1	Exhibit 4a, Section 2.1: For LIB sites, would SCDOT consider revising the Design Speed in the Functional Classification & Design Speed table to match the posted speed limit or curve advisory speed for the following sites: S-21-26/S-16-495 (over Back Swamp) - posted 45 mph curve advisory speed, S-22-31 (over Lane Creek) - posted speed limit 55 mph, S-22-24 (over Pole Swamp) - posted speed limit 45 mph, S-34-32 (over Reedy Creek) - posted speed limit 35 mph, S-45-30 (over Black River) - posted 45 mph curve advisory speed.	Roadway	Revision	RFP will be updated to clarify.



NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS

Bridge Package 22

Contract ID 8876710 - Berkeley, Colleton, Dorchester, Darlington, Florence, Georgetown, Horry, Marion, Williamsburg Counties

FINAL REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS - ROUND 1

TEAMS						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	PIP	Hydraulics		Please provide the unedited FEMA models for each site.	Hydrology	Revision	Unedited FEMA Models have been provided in PIP.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f	5	RFP states Simplified Newmark method shall be used to analyze seismic ground displacements. Will the use of foundation elements to restrain soil movements ("Superpile" Method) be permitted?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	Yes, there is no prohibition from using the "Superpile" method for analyzing the use of structural mitigation. The Simplified Newmark is just for evaluating the magnitude of movement for slope stability and whether some form of mitigation (structural or geotechnical) will be required.
3	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	6	Exhibit 4a, Section 2.9: For LIB sites, is it permissible to use the curve advisory speed in lieu of the posted speed for determining clear zone and guardrail length of need?	Roadway	No_Revision	The design speed is the advisory speed when present. Are there locations where the design speed in the RFP does not match the advisory speed?
4	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	5	Can the lower value of the range of clear zone be used for LIB sites?	Roadway	No_Revision	A blanket approval will not be allowed. May look at allowing on specific sites.
5	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f		What percent reduction of skin friction is allowed to mitigate negative skin friction through the use of pile coatings such as bitumen, or proprietary pile sleeves such as Yellow Jackets, or proprietary pile coatings such as Slickcoat?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	The Department does not have a specific allowance for skin friction reduction. We would rely on the designer to provide documented design references for specific materials. Note that Yellow Jackets only mitigate skin friction within fill and not below the fill.
6	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f	5	From the last paragraph of RFP Exhibit 4f Section 2.3 Seismic - Full Design Criteria Sites, does the last sentence in this paragraph apply to the methods discussed in the first sentence (discrete element/rigid inclusion methods), second sentence (methods that include densification or excess pore pressure reduction), or both the first and second sentence?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	The last sentence primarily refers to the specific methods described in the first sentence, but also non-specific methods discussed in the second sentence. The intent of the language is to limit proposed ground improvement methods for keeping liquefaction from occurring to methods that densify the soil or provide rapid excess pore pressure dissipation. There's no real limitation for methods used to resist movement from slope instability or lateral spreading as a result from liquefaction occurring, though the design must still proven and approved by the Department.



7	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a		Based on my review of previous design bid build bridge replacement (BR) project lettings, it does not appear to have been the Department's standard practice to install rumble strips as part of standalone BR projects. Additionally, a review of ED-53 suggests that the policy may not be intended to apply to these projects, particularly where the project scope already provides compliant clear zones or protective barriers in locations where clear zone requirements cannot be met. Has the OAD coordinated with Traffic Engineering to determine whether the installation of rumble strips is appropriate or beneficial on bridge replacement projects where the roadway segments that would otherwise warrant rumble strips are outside of the BR project limits? From a safety and operational standpoint, installing isolated sections of rumble strips only within the limited bridge replacement project extents provides little to no meaningful safety benefit. Rumble strip installations are typically implemented as part of a continuous corridor treatment to provide consistent driver expectation and behavior. For that reason, projects that include rumble strips generally do not begin and end the treatment at bridge approaches or other short isolated segments. Additionally, even in locations where the existing roadway currently includes rumble strips, the geometric and safety improvements incorporated into the BR project would address the conditions that originally warranted their installation. As a result, replacement of the rumble strips within the limited project extents would not appear to be justified or provide a measurable safety benefit.	Roadway	Revision	The intent is to not install new rumble strips on roadways where they currently do not exist. The intent would be to replace any existing damaged rumble strips.
8	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	4	HDB 2019-4 Section 1.1.2.2 indicates that for Zone A, SCDOT requires no backwater increase for a project to be considered as meeting their requirements for a "No Impact" finding. Please consider revising the RFP language to clarify and confirm SCDOT's position that backwater may be increased in ANY Zone A and still meet their requirements for a "No Impact" finding if the total backwater is less than 1 ft. A change to the RFP was made for Reedy Creek but not for Back Swamp.	Hydrology	Revision	A revision will be made.
9	PIP	Roadway		Can SCDOT confirm what level of SUE was performed on the project	Utilities	No_Revision	The majority was level B. The levels for each utility are indicated in the SUE cadd files in Attachment B.
10	PIP	Utilities		Can the SUE roll plot for S-29 over Jeffries Creek be provided. It appears to be missing from the utility report.	Utilities	No_Revision	In our deliverable the roll plot is shown as page 30 of 59. Check the file again and respond if still not showing.
11	Attach_A	Agreement	78 of 301	For the S-29 site, the closure time has a note that states "due to proximity of schools and bus usage on this route, scheduling care should be taken to perform a majority of this closure duration during the summer months". Can SCDOT define what a "majority of the closure" means?	Construction	No_Revision	The intent of this asterisk is to bring this site's location near schools to the teams' attention. While not a contractual requirement, SCDOT would find value in minimizing the impacts to school traffic by the bridge 90-day closure occurring predominately within the summer months when school is not in session. We understand that the typical summer break is less than 90 days, but would encourage contractors to reduce the amount of time the closure is in place during the days that school is not in session.



12	Attach_A	Agreement	53 of 87	Would SCDOT be amenable to revised warranty periods on bridges that utilize Low Impact Criteria due to concerns with performance limits and the interaction between the roadway and bridge. If not, how would the DB team address performance issues if settlement occurs, since this isn't part of Low Impact Design analysis?	Construction	No_Revision	At this point, SCDOT will continue to require warranties on all design-build projects regardless of criteria. While the DB team is not required to perform slope stability or settlement analyses for Low Impcat Bridge sites, the DB team may choose to perform these analyses if deemed necessary due to potential for instability or settlement occurring.
13	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	5 of 8	"Bridge end drainage shall consist of a single standard concrete flume at each corner receiving deck discharge. Limit flume bypass flow to 0.20 cubic feet per second." - bypass flow may exceed 0.20 cfs, if this occurs, will additional flumes in series be allowed until bypass reaches 0.20 cfs?	Structures	Revision	Language will be revised to allow additional flumes in series in situations where the single-flume 0.2 CFS bypass-flow requirement cannot be met in conjunction with deck drains spaced at 5-feet or less. 5-feet will be introduced as minimum deck drain spacing, for structural integrity of the barrier and/or deck.
14	Attach_A	Exhibit_4	3 of 4	Project Design Criteria - SCDOT Hydraulic Design Bulletins, there is no limit to the effective date. Other references typically state "effective as of the Final RFP release date". There is risk that any HDB introduced post RFP could be enforced, is the intent to introduce this risk?	Hydrology	Revision	A revision will be made.
15	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	3 of 6	Given that this is a bridge replacement and site constraints are expected, meeting standard ditch freeboard requirements may require unnecessary amounts of new right-of-way. Can modified or reduced ditch freeboard criteria be considered acceptable?	Hydrology	No_Revision	No change in ditch criteria.
16	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	5 of 8	"Closed drainage systems are not allowed on this project." - Section 2.1.4 of Exhibit 4b states that "Bridge width may be increased up to 3-feet maximum to accommodate intersection sight distance for driveways or intersections in close proximity to the bridge." The bridge width (shoulders in particular) may need to be widened to accomodate large gutter spreads in order to eliminate the need for a closed drainage system. Can the bridge width be widened more than 3-feet if necessary to accomodate large gutter spreads or can water be dropped from the deck into the waterway below if necessary to reduce gutter spread?	Structures	No_Revision	State NPDES permitting and water quality standards would dictate whether or not scuppers can discharge directly over jurisdictional waters. State water quality requirements encourage scuppers to be minimized over open water. The need to meet spread requirements is typically sufficient justification for locating scuppers over the channel (in addition to the overbank areas) instead of widening the bridge.
17	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	6 of 11	Section 4.2 states "SCDOT will purchase the parcel located adjacent to the bridge along the northeast quadrant and will commit to passing ownership of the parcel that is not required for the new bridge right-of-way". Based on figures locate din the PCE document it appears Parcels 9, 10, and 11 will require ROW acquisition. Can SCDOT confirm the DB teams are to include ROW acquisition services associated with what appears to be total takes for Tracts 9, 10, and 11?	ROW	No_Revision	No total takes for parcels 10 and 11 are anticipated or proposed. The contractor is responsible for acquiring all of tract 9, in accordance with APPENDIX B of the PCE Appendices found in Attachment B Environmental documentation, PDF pages 5-28.



NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS

Bridge Package 22

Contract ID 8876710 - Berkeley, Colleton, Dorchester, Darlington, Florence, Georgetown, Horry, Marion, Williamsburg Counties

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW

Date Received: 4/10/2026

TEAMS						SCDOT
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Exhibit 5		Special Provision (9) under Section 104 (Detour Routes) references a Special Provision for full-depth pavement patching; however, no such Special Provision appears to be included in the contract documents.	Construction	Will revise to incorporate an additional 300 sy per site.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	2	Special provisions for full depth patching is listed in the Exhibit 5 table of contents but the special provision language/quantities does not show up in the document. Typically SCDOT provides an estimated quantity for FDP on detour routes. Will this be provided in a future RFP update or will the contractor be required to estimate FDP for detour routes?	Construction	Will revise to incorporate an additional 300 sy per site.
3	Attach_A	Agreement	25 of 87	With the individual bridge duration requirements now published, would the DOT consider extending the construction completion from 9/19/2029 to 3/19/2030.	Construction	No.
4	Attach_A	Agreement	25 of 87	Can the S-8-791 bridge closures be concurrent of must each site be closed on an independent schedule?	Construction	This will be clarified in a revision to the RFP.
5	Attach_A	Exhibit_4	4	Project design criteria references the 2025 specs but 2007 specs are listed elsewhere in the document (Supplemental specs reference, Exhibit 4z Foundation Installation plan, etc). Please clarify which Standard Specification Documents will control.	Construction	2025 Specifications will control.
6	Attach_A	Agreement	28 of 98/IV.A	Will the Department allow a travel lane in one direction to be closed prior to the Notice of Closure if all traffic movements are accommodated under a two-way, one lane operation?	Construction	Yes, but will be based on lane closure guidance in SCDOT Engineering Directive 32.
7	Attach_A	Exhibit 5		Special Provision (9) under Section 104 (Detour Routes) references a Special Provision for full-depth pavement patching; however, no such Special Provision appears to be included in the contract documents.	Construction	Will revise to incorporate an additional 300 sy per site.
8	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z		Is it the intent of the RFP to require preliminary roadway plans for all sites, or may the Contractor determine on a site-by-site basis which roadway submittal package (e.g., preliminary, ROW, or final) is appropriate to initiate design and review?	DM	For the technical proposals, concept plans are required only for the sites specified in the RFP. After award, all sites require preliminary plans.
9	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z		May the contractor omit Preliminary Bridge plan package submittals at their own risk and advance to directly to Final Bridge plan package submittals?	DM	With new criteria being implemented in this contract, SCDOT desires to see preliminary plans.
10	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	n/a	S-41 over ashapoo contains a USACE Icon and label "Fishpond Bridge". Is this bridge historic or are any additional permitting issues expected?	Environmental	SCDOT is still working to finalize the S-41 over Ashepoo NEPA document.
11	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	2	Will SCDOT release the site specific environmental commitments before the Confidential Risk Register Meeting with Proposers?	Environmental	Exhibit 6 will be updated and the signed NEPA documents will become available. However, the S-41 over Ashepoo NEPA document is not finalized yet, so the commitments for that site may or may not be available by then. This will be uploaded to the PIP before the Confidential Risk Register Meeting with Proposers. These documents will be added to Attachment B with the issue of the Final RFP.
12	PIP	Survey		Will wetland and stream lines be made available to the teams? They are shown in the roadway plans.	Environmental	Yes, they will be uploaded to the PIP.



13	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	4	The last bullet of Exhibit 4e Section 2.2.1.4 states that a design variance is allowed for S-57 over Willow Creek. Has SCDOT obtained this design variance or are the DB teams expected to submit documentation and obtain this design variance? Is the variance to a total design variance depth limited to 0.3 feet or 0.3 feet above the existing overtopping elevation?	Hydrology	Section 2.2.1.4 of Exhibit 4e will be revised.
14	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	4	The last bullet of Exhibit 4e Section 2.2.1.4 allows the backwater depth to be greater than the existing with a design variance. Would this increase in backwater depth meet the criteria for a "No Impact" finding per HDB_2019-4 and if not will DB teams be required to develop a CLOMR and LOMR?	Hydrology	Will meet a finding of no impact because backwater is less than 1 foot over natural condition. Refined design may create no increase in backwater but preliminary design showed a slight increase.
15	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	n/a	As indicated by the Hydro Memos in the PIP, several sites are tidally influenced, coastal flooding influenced or influenced by other downstream waterways. Please consider adding language in the RFP to more clearly specify which sites are influenced by these items and how SCDOT desires the sites to be analyzed and designed as there is limited guidance in SCDOT design specifications for these scenarios creating ambiguity in the RFP.	Hydrology	No revision to exhibit 4e.
16	PIP	Hydraulics	n/a	The PIP hydro memo for S-105 over Stanley Creek is located within the Waccamaw River 1% AEP floodplain and functions as a relief opening during such events. Will additional design and modeling requirements need to be met or only those pertaining to Stanley Creek?	Hydrology	Design requirements for Stanley Creek with no adverse impacts to other structure crossings within the floodplain.
17	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	n/a	The PIP hydro memo for S-32 over Reedy Creek indicates that the backwater depth will be increased and design variance will be required. Will the backwater depth at this site be allowed to be increased and if so will SCDOT obtain the design variance or will the DB team be required to submit documentation and obtain this design variance? Additionally since the backwater depth will be increased does this site meet the requirements for a "No Impact" finding per HDB_2019-4?	Hydrology	S-32 qualifies for Low Impact Criteria. Follow PCDM-11 for LIC design criteria. Memo was developed using Low Volume Criteria and is for information only. LIC was implemented during our prep phase of procurement as stated and explained in the RFP.
18	PIP	Hydraulics	n/a	In the specific PIP hydro memos for S-105 over Stanley Creek and S-30 over Black River, Michael Baker recommended 2-D hydraulic modeling. Will the SCDOT require 2-D hydraulic modeling for these bridges?	Hydrology	2-D models were encouraged because of site conditions but will not be required.
19	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	5	The RFP states that USGS regression equations be used to generate discharges for the SCDOT runs. Preliminary modeling for S-57 over Willow Creek, S-105 over Stanley Creek, and S-30 over Black River did not use regression equations. S-105 over Stanley Creek (Waccamaw River) used observed gage data. Flows for S-57 over Willow Creek were calibrated based on Hurricane Florence (2018) and observed high water marks. Flows for S-30 over Black River were also based on observed gage data. Can the SCDOT confirm which flow data shall be used?	Hydrology	Memos are for information only. Design according to RFP criteria.
20	PIP	Hydraulics	n/a	Several hydro memos reference being unable to meet convergence criterion of the Hydraulic Design Manual (S-41 over Ashpoo River, S-791 over Wapoola Creek, S-791 over Canterhill Swamp, and S-30 over Black Swamp). Were the sites where convergence was unable to be met deemed to be modeled sufficiently downstream such that convergence requirements will not need to be met for final design?	Hydrology	Memos are for information only. Design according to RFP criteria. RHDS 2009 states what the limits of the profile computation should do to converge, however this is up to the EOR and not a requirement.
21	PIP	Hydraulics		Does SCDOT HQ or the District Office have any information they can share of flooding issues at the bridge sites?	Hydrology	No flooding on any bridge sites except for major rain events. S-57 and S-105 have been closed in the past 5 years for rain events.
22	PIP	Survey	n/a	The survey files for S-19 and S-495 appear to be missing some linework and other information including but not limited to bridge limits, channel top of bank, WSE at time of survey etc. Does SCDOT have this information that they can provide the design teams?	Other	Survey files will be reviewed and updated with missing information. As notified on 4/6, upon receipt of additional survey files, those survey files will be finalized and moved to Attachment B.
23	RFP	3	15	Due to several bridges requiring redesign to meet low impact bridge criteria, please consider increasing the stipend.	Other	No.
24	RFP	3	TOC	Please verify that Highway Safety Analysis, Temporary Pavement Design, and a Complex Bridge Independent Peer Review Package listed in the Table of Contents is not required for this project.	PM	The Highway Safety Analysis, Temporary Pavement Design, and Complex Bridge Independent Peer Review Package are not required, and are no longer present in the table of contents.
25	RFP	8	36 of 44	Please verify the date for Submittal of NCQ between SCDOT's Response to Formal ATCs with Initial Determination (6/24/26) and the Confidential One-on-One Formal ATC Meetings (7/1/26).	PM	Milestone Schedule will be updated to clarify. Submittal of NCQ will be June 2nd 2026.
26	RFP	4	20 of 44	Please confirm that the reference to "sites specified above" in Section 4.1.4 (Appendix A.2) is referring to the sites listed in Section 4.1.3 (Appendix A.1).	PM	Confirmed. Will add section number to reference.



27	RFP	4	20 of 44	Please clarify that technical proposal conceptual bridge plans are to be submitted on 22"x34" sheets per BDM0724 and will be different size sheets from the roadway technical proposal plans (22" x 36").	PM	Section 4.1 will be updated to indicate 22" X 34", not 22" X 24".
28	RFP	4	19 of 44	Please verify/clarify that if a roadway or bridge design is planned to be modified from conceptual designs provided in the PIP that technical proposal conceptual roadway and bridge plans are not to be submitted unless it is one of the sites listed in Section 4.1.3.	PM	Confirmed.
29	RFP	4	19 of 44	Please verify if S-26-65 over Maple Swamp is a Full Criteria Site or a Low Impact Site. Section 4.1.3 is not consistent with Exhibit 3 or the Minimum Bridge Length document in Attachment B.	PM	Maple Swamp is a low impact site.
30	RFP	2	Page 7 of 87/ II.B.2	Section II.B.2 states the contractor may rely on survey information provided in Attachment B. The survey files that are on the project website listed under the PIP.	PM	As notified on 4/6, upon receipt of additional survey files, those survey files will be finalized and moved to Attachment B.
31	RFP	4	Page 19 of 44	Please confirm that Conceptual Roadway and Bridge plans are NOT needed for the other 8 sites (S-31 over Lane Creek, S-24 over Pole Swamp, S-134 over Jenkins Swamp, S-569 over Lousing Swamp, S-32 over Reedy Creek, S-791 over Molly Branch, S-791 over Canterhill Swamp, and S-791 over Wapoola Creek)	PM	Confirmed.
32	RFP	8	Page 36 of 44	Please clarify multiple Milestone Schedule dates that appear out of order and potentially in the wrong month. Dates include but are not limited to Submittal of Non-Confidential Questions Tuesday, June 2, SCDOT Responds to Preliminary ATCs Monday, June 1, Submittal of Non-Confidential Questions Tuesday, June 2.	PM	Milestone Schedule will be updated to clarify.
33	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a		Are rumble strips required to be installed at any of the sites?	Roadway	Install rumble strip according to Standard Drawing 632-205-00.
34	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	3	Is it the intent of Section 2.3 to include in the table the shoulder widths that comply with Section 2.12?	Roadway	The shoulder width in Section 2.3 table include the bike/ped accomodations needed for those sites in section 2.12. Section 2.12 added to provide an explantion for the shoulder widths in table.
35	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a		Berkeley County is advancing a project to add a two-way left-turn lane along S-791, which terminates at the southern end of the S-791 bridge over Canterhill Swamp. Will the RFP be modified to accommodate or coordinate with the County's planned improvements?	Roadway	SCDOT is aware of the intersection improvement at US Highway 52 at Southern Teminus of Old Highway 52 but the bridge replacement termini is outside the limits of the instersection improvements.
36	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Page 4 / 2.4	The proposed improvements for S-495 over Back Swamp approach the limits of an existing broken back curve condition. To fully accommodate the proposed work, minor geometric revisions within this existing broken back curve may be required. Given that the RFP states broken back curves are not permitted, please clarify whether: The prohibition applies strictly to newly introduced broken back curves only, or Modifications within an existing broken back curve condition may be considered acceptable where avoidance is not practical and no additional adverse operational impacts are introduced.	Roadway	Revised language to clarify



37	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	169 of 292	The RFP states "Tie down driveways with HMA matching mainline type to the back of the Right of Way or as directed by RCE. Tie down intersecting routes with HMA matching mainline type ." Does this apply if existing driveways are concrete and if not, what concrete driveway specifications should the DB team assume?	ROW	Will revise 4c to address concrete driveways.
38	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	6 / 2.10	Based on our review of Section 2.10, it appears that a 75-foot offset for ROW is not required at the bridge crossing. Please confirm.	ROW	The 75' block out width is not required.
39	Attach_B	Structures	n/a	The minimum bridge length specified (400') for S-30 over the Black River is less than the existing bridge (435'). Please verify that this bridge can be replaced with a shorter bridge than the existing assuming the 100yr. flow backwater depth is not increased.	Structures	Confirmed. 400' is less than the existing bridge length and the minimum proposed bridge length required. This length should meet Low Impact hydraulic criteria.
40	Attach_B			The minimum bridge length for S-30 over Black River is 400 feet while the existing bridge length is 435 feet. Please confirm the minimum bridge length is correct.	Structures	Confirmed. 400' is less than the existing bridge length and the minimum proposed bridge length required. This length should meet Low Impact hydraulic criteria.
41	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Page 2 / 2.1.6	Exhibit 4b Section 2.1.6 states "All bents shall be parallel to each other." On curved alignments, will radial bents be allowed?	Structures	Radial bents will be allowed for flat slab bridges only. The intent is to use uniform precast beam/slab lengths in each span.
42	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Page 5 / 2.1.16	Will the use of micropiles be permitted at end bents in order to avoid utility impacts?	Structures	Micropiles are currently not allowed as a foundation type. They will be considered on a case by case basis, if proposed by a team through an ATC, depending on utility conflict and bridge type.
43	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Page 1 / 2.1.1	Will utility loads be required at any of the proposed bridge sites?	Structures	Loads for specific utility attachment are currently not required or anticipated based on preliminary coordination thus far.
44	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Page 6 / 2.1.17	In section 2.2.17 the RFP states "Extend the reinforced concrete infill inside the pipe pile, as a minimum depth, to the point where the moment demand is less than half of the maximum moment demand (i.e. below ground plastic hinge moment)." The "below ground plastic hinge moment" does not appear needed, should that be removed?	Structures	Yes, will remove parenthetical.
45	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Page 4 / 2.1.8	Will higher than 4000psi concrete strength be allowed in some cast-in-place elements?	Structures	Request is too vague.
46	Attach_B	Traffic	N/A	Will SCDOT provide approved detour routes?	Traffic	Detour routes will be provided by the Final RFP.
47	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 1	1	Will the department require 6" White edge lane markings for the sites required wider shoulders in Exhibit 4a section 2.12 or is that left to the engineers judgement?	Traffic	Provide lane markings in accordance with Exhibit 4a section 2.12.
48	PIP	Traffic		Are there approved detour routes for each site, and if so can these be provided?	Traffic	Detour routes will be provided by the Final RFP.
49	RFP			Will the utility report be provided? Will utility information be provided in the RFP document Exhibits?	Utilities	Preliminary utility reports will be provided to the short-listed teams via Projectwise.
50	Attach_B	Survey		We received utility contact information on 10 of the sites but the following sites (S-356,S-29, S-57, S-569, Both S-65 sites, S-134, and S-105) were missing this information, will we receive the contact information on these?	Utilities	All preliminary utility reports will be provided.
51	Attach_A	Exhibit_1		Does the Department anticipate any utility relocation work to be included within the contract? If so, will that work be addressed through a supplemental agreement negotiated after execution of the contract?	Utilities	Yes there are several wet utilities SCDOT is working with for in-contract work. This will be addressed when available.



Additional Questions

52	RFP	3	8,9 of 44	Section 3.8 where it discussed "if environmental determinations have been determined" and specficially in Bullets A&B it mentions "the environmental impacts". Can additional informatoin be provided to descrive what is an "environmental impact"? Would this be additional wetland and stream impacts, impacts to the 4(f) property, more ROW on 4(f) parcels, or some specific item?	Environmental	Environmental impacts are defined as those resources (i.e. wetlands, cultural resources, 4f properties, etc) evaluated in the NEPA document.
53	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	4	The response to NCQ 14 indicates that the finding of "No Impact" is correct. We concur as it relates to FEMA however, HDB 2019-4 Section 1.1.2.2 indicates that for Zone A, SCDOT requires no backwater increase for a project to be considered as meeting their requiriements for a "No Impact" finding. Please consider revising the RFP language to clarify and confirm SCDOT's postion that backwater may be increased in a Zone A and still meet their requiriements for a "no Impact" finding if the total backwater is less than 1 ft.	Hydrology	Revised exhibit 4e to clarify.
54	Attach_B			Please provide a point list and description for each site's survey.	Other	The point list and description will be requested and provided when available.
55	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	18 of 83	Please consider reducing the number of Roadway Trainees for this bridge replacement project to 2 (1 per year). 14 roadway trainees appears to be too many for this type of project due to the limited roadway work.	PM	This requirement will be updated to 3 Bridge Trainees and 0 Roadway Trainees.
56	PIP	Roadway	N/A	Can the SCDOT provide the CAD files for the S-791/Orions Way Intersection project?	Roadway	No.
57	RFP	2	2.6 (page 3 of 44)	Would SCDOT reconsider providing the necessary mitigation for NEPA impacts? This will likely save both on cost and schedule relating to the necessary USACE permits.	Environmental	Yes, SCDOT will provide up to a certain amount of wetland mitigation credits in each service area. Exhibit 6 will be updated to reflect this change.

