

**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
Bridge Package 29**

RFP for Industry Review #2

Date Received: 10/28/2024

Meeting Date: 10/30/2024

						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Agreement	26 of 92 / IV.A.1	In reviewing the RFP for Industry Review #2, we noticed that the substantial completion date has been moved up by one month for US278 and by three weeks for US76. Question 2 of the Non-Confidential Questions previously referenced an additional three months for each site, rather than a reduction in time. With the current adjustments, completing these projects within the newly required timeframe appears challenging if not impossible. We respectfully request that you reconsider these substantial completion dates, ideally extending them into the summer of 2025, to ensure constructability.	Construction	No_Revision	We have included incentive language as we recognize that these are aggressive construction times. We have been able to construct similar structures in similar time frames both with and without incentives in the past.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	44 / Section 108	Does the incentive/disincentive and wavier of contractor claims special provision apply to the in contract utility work at US-76?	Construction	No_Revision	Yes.
3	Attach_A	Agreement	26 of 92 / IV.A.2	Under what condition does the in contract utility work have to be in to be considered substantially complete?	Construction	No_Revision	The utility work will need to be completed such that any other work items do not necessitate a lane closure.
4	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	pdf page 130	There is currently a large amount of debris against the US 76 bridge piers. Will the contractor be responsible for the removal of this debris or will SCDOT be removing it prior to construction?	Construction	Revision	Contractor is responsible for removing debris necessary to demo and construct the bridge within the channel within the R/W. Contractor will also clear debris within the project limits.
5	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	pdf page 130	At the US 76 site, what is the department's intent for embankment on the west end of the 1928 bridge? Does the contractor need to tie approach embankment back to bridge providing access? If access is provided, who is responsible for the structural stability of the bridge?	Construction	No_Revision	No. No work on the 1920's bridge is required. However, the 2:1 fill slope for the new bridge may wrap around and under the 1920's abandoned bridge.
6	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	Section 104 pdf page 202 Section 401: H. pdf page 283	Both Sections 104 and 401 list full depth patching quantities to be carried in the Contractors bid of 300 SY for US 76, and 1200 SY for US 178 for a total of 1500 SY. Does the department intend for teams to carry 1500 SY for Detours and 1500 SY for Consturction for a total of 3000 SY, or is the 1500 SY total in Section 401 intended for the detours?	Construction	Revision	Will revise section 401 to have approach FDP and will clarify its use.



7	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	Section 806 pdf page 306	Please clarify which site (if any) the Control of Access Fence is intended for.	Construction	Revision	C/A specification removed.
8	Attach_A	Exhibit 7		Are materials for waterline installation required to meet Buy America requirements?	Construction	No_Revision	Yes. Buy America is required for any in-contract work.
9	Attach_A	Agreement	10 of 91/II.D.5	Please remove the five day waiting period between submittal packages of the same type. Due to the aggressive completion dates we will be designing the bridges simultaneously and we need the ability to submit both final bridge packages as soon as they are complete.	DM	No_Revision	This provision will remain.
10	Attach_A	Agreement		Answers to non-confidential questions from the First Industry Draft indicated that SCDOT was obtaining a Nationwide 3 Permit and not a General Permit. Article IX of the Agreement indicates that a USACE Regional General Permit for SCDOT Projects is being obtained for US-278. Please clarify the permit type that is being obtained for each site.	Environmental	Revision	Agreement will be revised to indicate a Nationwide 3 permit.
11	Attach_B	Geotechnical		The field testing data indicates fairly consistent rock quality between the two interior bent borings. In order to meet the demands of a compressed schedule will the Department allow borings B-3 and B-4 to be used to design the interior bents for the US-76 bridge with the requirement that one verification boring be performed at each bent prior to drilled shaft excavation starting?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	Yes.
12	Attach_B	Geotechnical		Based on the provided geotechnical data, it appears that the Hawthorne Formation is a consistent elevation across the US-278 site. Due to the accelerated schedule and difficult drill rig access, will Department accept the field testing data as being sufficient for interior bent foundation design and not require additional borings at the US-278 site?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	No.
13	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	10	Special Provision 8 says to use the current detour route for US-76 and not the route listed in Attachment B. Please provide a list of the roads on this route	Roadway	Revision	The US-76 detour is being revised. The current detour shown in Attachment B will remain but for non-commercial traffic only. A separate truck detour route will be added to Attachment B for US-76.
14	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b		Section 2.1.5 requires that 2:1 slopes be provided at the bridge end slopes. It is difficult to tell exactly how the new bridge end slope beneath the proposed new US-76 bridge will tie in with the existing adjacent slopes beyond the washed out area. It is likely that slopes other than 2:1 will be necessary to avoid abrupt changes at the tie-ins to existing slopes and provide a stable transition. Please revise language for the US-76 site to allow for variable slopes along the eastern bank to facilitate the tie in to existing slopes.	Roadway	Revision	Use 2:1 or flatter slopes. If steeper slopes are desired, please clarify the need. Exhibit 4b revised to clarify 2:1 or flatter slopes.



15	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2 / 2.1.5	The span lengths listed for the US-76 bridge add up to 270' however 280' is listed as the total bridge length. Which length is correct?	Structures	Revision	270' is correct.
16	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2 / 2.1.22	In the second paragraph "proposed" is misspelled.	Structures	Revision	Spelling will be corrected.
17	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	Section 2 pdf page 345	At the US 76 site, who is responsible for moving the City of Westminster temporary waterline should it be in conflict with construction activities or embankments?	Utilities	Revision	Temporary adjustment is included in Westminster's relocation work.
18	Attach_A	Exhibit 7		Does the City of Westminster have a list of Prequalified Contractors and/or designers to perform the waterline relocation?	Utilities	Revision	This will be included in the RFP
19	Attach_B	Utilities		Please provide design and construction criteria and construction specifications for the City of Westminster waterline that, per Exhibit 7, is in-contract work.	Utilities	Revision	This will be included in the RFP
20	Attach_A	Exhibit_3		The relocation of the City of Westminster waterline is indicated in Exhibit 7 to be "in contract" but the Scope of Work only mentions the removal and/or salvaging of the existing waterlines and makes no mention of construction of a new waterline. Please clarify.	Utilities	Revision	Scope will be revised to include utility coordination requirements.

