

**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS**  
**Bridge Package 27 - Contract ID 5570770 - Dillon and Marlboro Counties**

**FINAL RFP - ROUND 2**

Date Received: 6/5/2025

Meeting Date: N/A

						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	2.1pdf page	Please verify New Construction Pavement Design for SC 83. RFP has two lifts of HMA Surface Type C. Should second lift be an Intermediate Course?	Pavement	No_Revision	Exhibit 4c in the RFP is correct. Due to the relatively small amount of paving on the project, we intentionally specified two lifts of Surface C to limit it to only two asphalt mixes for the project.



**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS**  
**Bridge Package 27 - Contract ID 5570770 - Dillon and Marlboro Counties**

**FINAL RFP - ROUND 1**

Date Received: 6/2/2025

Meeting Date: 6/4/2025

Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	SCDOT	
						Response	Explanation
1	PIP	Structures		Please provide the load rating files for the SC-83 bridge.	Structures	No_Revision	SC 83 existing load rating files will be provided.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	3 & 4	Does the Department want the teams to estimate what the impacts to WOTUS could be and include the cost of the mitigation in their proposals or is this going to be handled with a supplemental agreement to the selected team after delineations are performed?	Environmental	Revision	See Exhibit 6, SCDOT will cover the cost for wetland mitigation. Contractor will be responsible for stream mitigation.
3	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2	At S-58, can the span arrangement be adjusted if overall bridge length remains consistent with the RFP and the main channel span is equal to or greater than 50 feet? We would utilize a 30 foot minimum length for any end spans.	Structures	No_Revision	No.
4	PIP	Geotechnical		At SC-83, can the shear wave data from boring B-4 be used with the MERV method to calculate an age correction factor for the Holocene age deposits identified in the baseline borings?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	Yes, however the calculation must still be reasonable for a deposit of that age
5	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	1	Can teams elect to eliminate Preliminary and Right-of-way Roadway and Bridge plan package submittals at their own risk for this project? If we're allowed to begin submittals with Final submittal packages, we will include any appropriate information shown under Preliminary Submittal Packages and Right-of-way Submittal Packages with the Final Submittal Packages.	DM	No_Revision	No. Exhibit 4b addresses allowable submittals. If teams elect to begin submittals with Right-of-way submittal packages, include any appropriate information shown under Preliminary Submittal Packages with the right-of-way submittal packages.
6	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a		What are the paving limits and pavement design for Bluff Cemetery Road?	Roadway	No_Revision	Construction should stop at the existing ROW line. Refer to 4c for tying down intersecting routes.
7	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	3	At SC-83 the RFP requires purchasing an additional 50 foot of ROW from the existing 75 foot based on section 12.1.14 (Figure 12.1-D) of the RDM. Since this additional ROW will be almost entirely within WOTUS we want to confirm that the Department wants this area shown in the plans as new ROW.	Roadway	No_Revision	Conceptual Plans in the PIP are for information only. Follow the requirements of Exhibit 4a.
8	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	3	For areas where the NPDES line is outside of the proposed ROW, requiring the grubbing operations to be extended to the limits of the BMPs can the contractor show permissions for this work?	Roadway	Revision	Conceptual Plans in the PIP are for information only. Follow the requirements of Exhibit 4a. NPDES limits shall be covered by ROW.
9	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	69	I do not see where quantities have been added to the RFP for patching of the detour route for SC-83. Is this no longer required?	Construction	Revision	Use SY from District.



10	Attach_B	Utilities		Please confirm that the contractor does not need to include the cost of the Trico water line relocation at S-58 in his cost proposal.	Utilities	No_Revision	Confirmed
11	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	3	The last paragraph in Section 2.11 states the contractor shall clear and grub the entirety of the new ROW, clear only and not grub in the wetlands, and to extend grubbing for the area between the NPDES line and outside construction limits. In wetlands between the NPDES line and construction limits, is the contractor required to grub?	Roadway	Revision	No, 4a will be revised to clarify.
12	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	Section 2.0 pdf page 186	Will SCDOT allow teams to proceed at their own risk straight to final bridge plan submittals provided any information required for the preliminary submittals is included in the final package?	DM	No_Revision	Exhibit 4z allows this. Teams may elect to eliminate Preliminary Roadway and Bridge plan package submittals at their own risk for this project.
13	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	Section 2.0 pdf page 186	Will SCDOT allow teams to proceed at their own risk straight to Right of Way plan submittals provided any information required for the preliminary submittals is included in the Right of Way package?	DM	No_Revision	Exhibit 4z allows this. If teams elect to begin submittals with Right-of-way submittal packages, include any appropriate information shown under Preliminary Submittal Packages with the right-of-way submittal packages.
14	Attach_A	Agreement	Section II.D.3 pdg page 50	Will SCDOT allow roadway plan for both sites to be combined into one submittal for review?	DM	No_Revision	No.
15	Attach_A	Agreement	Section II.D.3 pdg page 50	Will SCDOT allow bridge plans for both sites to be combined into one submittal for review?	DM	No_Revision	No.

