South Carolina Department of Transportation

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

### FINAL RFP - ROUND 3

Date Received: 6/11/2025 Meeting Date:

| | | | | | | SCDOT | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Question No. | Category | Section | Page / Doc No. | Question/Comment | Discipline | Response | Explanation |
| 1 | Attach_A | Agreement | 49 of 92 | Exhibit 6 - 2.1-d was revised to state wetland credits will be provided by an SCDOT bank. Section X-5 states the Contractor is responsbile for any mitigation required by permits. We understand, based on the Q&A, DOT is covering the migitation, however these two statements appear contradictory. | Environmental | Revision | Add a clause where mentioned in the Agreement to say "Unless specified otherwise in Exhibit 6" |

Post Office Box 191
Columbia, South Carolina 29202-0191

Phone: (803) 737-2314
TTY: (803) 737-3870

South Carolina Department of Transportation

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

### FINAL RFP - ROUND 2

Date Received: 6/5/2025 leeting Date: N/A

| | | | | | | SCDOT | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Question No. | Category | Section | Page / Doc No. | Question/Comment | Discipline | Response | Explanation |
| 1 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4c | 2.1pdf pag | 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. |

Post Office Box 191
Columbia, South Carolina 29202-0191

Phone: (803) 737-2314
TTY: (803) 737-3870

South Carolina Department of Transportation

# 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

| | | | | | | SCDOT | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Question No. | Category | Section | Page / Doc No. | Question/Comment | Discipline | 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 alloable 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. |

Post Office Box 191
Columbia, South Carolina 29202-0191

Phone: (803) 737-2314
TTY: (803) 737-3870

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 reivsed 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. |

Post Office Box 191
Columbia, South Carolina 29202-0191

Phone: (803) 737-2314
TTY: (803) 737-3870