

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

RFP FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW

Date Received: 5/14/2025

Meeting Date: 5/16/2025

Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	SCDOT	
						Response	Explanation
1	RFP	3	6	Can a question that asks if a proposer's design meets the intent of the RFP be answered confidentially?	PM	No_Revision	SCDOT may accept and respond to Confidential Questions prior to Final RFP.
2	RFP	5	21 of 35	The Example for Determining the Weighted Criteria Score uses the wrong x values for the Quality Credit Score and Technical Scores. They are swapped. Please update to reflect the scoring described in RFP Section 5.8.	PM	Revision	Will revise in Final RFP
3	RFP	8	28 of 35	When will Non-Confidential and Confidential Questions submitted on Monday, June 02, 2025 by 7:30 am ET be answered? Will there be an open forum to review answers to these questions?	PM	Revision	Will Revise to state that SCDOT will respond to NC and Confidential questions on Wednesday June 4.
4	RFP	8	28 of 35	In order to achieve the technical proposal submittal date, please consider allowing teams to submit confidential questions by May 23rd followed by a 1 hour confidential meeting to discuss submitted questions and review confidential concepts some time during the last week of May.	PM	No_Revision	SCDOT may accept and respond to Confidential Questions Prior to Final RFP. If Time allows a confidential meeting may be allowed.
5	RFP	4	14 of 306	The technical proposal requirements list A.2 as a submittal, however no information is listed on following sheets and bridges are proposed to be close and detour. Is A.2 required as part of the tech. proposal?	PM	Revision	A.2 will be revised (deleted) as detour is prescriptive for SC-83 and no marked detour is required for S-58. Detour for SC-83 will be added to attachment B.
6	Attach_A	Agreement	7 of 92	In Section II - A. Scope of Work, the next to last line states Exhibits 5 "Choose an Item,.". Can this be item be reviewed?	PM	Revision	Will Revise Final RFP to include Exhibits 6 and 7
7	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	pdf page 139	RFP states "The work also includes repairing any deficient roadway embankments within the roadway approach limits of each bridge." Please define areas considered deficient so proper quantities may be developed, or include a bid quantity for all teams to carry for this item.	PM	No_Revision	No specific areas will be defined. Complete all needed repairs within the limits of construction for the final design.
8	RFP	4	pdf pages 31, 223, & 224	Article IV D.1. Liquidated Damages identifies LD's associated with substantial completion as \$2,500 per day. Exhibit 5, SP 27 Section 108 identifies incentive/disincentive for SC-83 bridge as \$4,000 per day. Are the	Construction	No_Revision	Yes. If the SC 83 is not complete by Project Substantial Completion, the Contractor will be assessed both LDs and the Disincentive cumulatively.
9	Attach_A		pdf pages 196, 203, 223-8	Multiple references to SCDOT 2007 Edition of Standard Specifications. Please confirm or revise to 2025 Edition.	Construction	Revision	Will be revised to 2025 Edition
10	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	69	What depth should be used for the full depth patching?	Construction	No_Revision	Depth of patching is dictated by site conditions at each individual project site and no depth will be specified.



11	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	69	Will quantities be given for the patching of detour route for SC 83?	Construction	Revision	Quantities will be provided.
12	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	25	Do utility relocations that do not affect the opening of the road have to be completed in order to receive the incentive payment? Will the contractor be charged the disincentive for utilities that do not relocate by 1/8/2027?	Construction	No_Revision	Site must meet the definition of Substantial Completion and utility delays will not extend the incentive date.
13	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 2	5	When will the detour route be provided for SC-83?	Traffic	Revision	This will be provided.
14	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 2	2	Will the contractor be required to install a posted detour for S-58 prior to closure?	Traffic	No_Revision	Posted detour route is not required for S-58
15	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 2	Section 2.4 pdf page 170	RFP states "A posted detour is not required for S-58." Please confirm a detour plan sheet and signing quantities will not be required for S-58.	Traffic	No_Revision	Confirmed - No posted detour will be required for S-58. Use standard drawing for road closure.
16	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	Section 2.2 pdf page 161	Please confirm Surface Type E for leveling / buildup thickness is 1.8 inches. The SCDOT Guidelines for Asphalt Mixture Selection limit thickness for Type E for leveling / buildup to 1.5 inches.	Pavement	No_Revision	Use Surface E for build up/leveling between 0-1.8 inches .
17	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	1	Has the DOT discussed relocation options with the utility owners? If so please provide this information.	Utilities	Revision	The preliminary utility report will be provided.
18	PIP	Roadway		Is the 105' New ROW at SC-83 set so that the relocated overhead power lines do not have to get easements for clearing and maintenance access?	Utilities	No_Revision	The conceptual ROW lines depicted in the PIP plans are for information only.
19	PIP	Utilities		Can the preliminary utility report be provided?	Utilities	Revision	This will be provided.
20	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	1	Will plastic hinging be allowed in drilled shafts supporting interior bents?	Structures	Revision	Yes. Plastic deformation should be "limited" as referenced in SDS 3.1.
21	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2	Per RFP Exhibit 4a Section 2.5 the minimum shoulder width for S-58/Gaddys Mill Road is 6'-0", however the concept plans show 5'-11" due to cored slab superstructure geometric constraints. Please verify a 5'-11" shoulder on the	Structures	No_Revision	5'-11" is allowed on the bridge, per Exhibit 4b 2.1.4 and Bridge Memo DM0120.
22	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2	Can the skew angle be reduced or eliminated at the SC-83 bridge if it prevents the use of flat slab spans?	Structures	Revision	Yes. 10-degree skew requirement will be deleted.
23	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	5	The corrosion results at both sites indicate aggressive site conditions however RFP section 2.1.16 indicates sacrificial steel thickness for end bent corrosion is not required. Can you please confirm that sacrificial steel thickness is not required?	Structures	No_Revision	Confirmed. Ph was slightly lower than 5.5 but Resistivity was high and this was considered.



24	Attach_B	Hydraulics		Is it the intent for the 10 foot measurement for the toe ditch detail to be from the shoulder break point?	Hydrology	No_Revision	It is intended to be measured from the break of the shoulder down to the toe of the fill slope in height, not length of the slope as shown in Attachment B.
25	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	2	Are the freeboard requirements applicable to spans in the new overbank areas of the proposed bridges?	Hydrology	No_Revision	Freeboard requirements are applicable for the length of the proposed bridge.
26	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2	The RFP states that the SC-83 bridge shall be designed so that there is no more than 1.5' of backwater for the 100-year storm event. This contradicts the SCDOT's Requirements for Hydraulic Design Studies that states there can be no more than 1.0' of backwater for the 100-year storm event. Will the design build team need to go through a design variance process for this?	Hydrology	No_Revision	The RFP Criteria overrides the Requirements for Hydraulic Design Studies.
27	Attach_A		1	For the new driveway on S-58, what design vehicle do we need to accommodate?	Roadway	No_Revision	Passenger car will be sufficient.
28	Attach_A		1	At SC-83, what width do we need to make the asphalt apron onto Bluff Cemetery Road? The dirt road is currently 11' wide, the preliminary design and typical shows a 30' width, while the RFP lists a 9' lanes for this local road.	Roadway	No_Revision	Typical shows a variable width. Exhibit 4a overrides Attachment B typical. Construct an entrance that would accommodate 2 - 9' lanes. Ensure appropriate turning movements are accommodated to and from this local roadway based on guidance in ARMS. Construction should stop at the existing ROW line.
29	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	2	Are preliminary and final bridge and roadway geotechnical reports the required deliverables for S-58 or will the deliverable be a Geotechnical Summary Report in accordance with PCDM-11?	Geotechnical	Revision	Deliverable will be a Geotechnical Summary Report in accordance PCDM-11.
30	Attach_B	Geotechnical		Are any additional geotechnical lab testing results planned to be released?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	No.
31	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	3	Will wetland/stream delineation files be provided pre-bid?	Environmental	No_Revision	No. There are none to be provided.
32	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	Section 2.2.1.7 pdf page 176	Specified span arrangement for S-58 does not meet 5-foot setback criteria in Section 2.2.1.7 on northwest and northeast corners.	Hydrology	Revision	Exhibit 4e will be revised.
33	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	Section 2.2.1.8 pdf page 176	Specified span arrangement for S-58 does not meet toe projection criteria in Section 2.2.1.8 on northeast corner.	Hydrology	Revision	2.2.1.8 projection of new abutment slope criteria pertains to sites that do not qualify for low volume bridge criteria. A revision to exhibit 4e will be made to clarify.
34	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Section 2.11 pdf page 148	Acquiring the 75-foot required right of way on the east end of the S-58 bridge will impact the potential historic property on Tracts 4 & 6. Will SCDOT allow teams to maintain existing right of way on the east end provided limits of construction remain within existing right of way?	Roadway	Revision	The question mentions the east end of the bridge. However, the historical property is on the west end and only on Tract 6. Exhibit 4a will be amended to exclude acquiring R/W on this tract as well as tract 4 on the west end of the bridge to avoid an existing structure.
35	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?	PM	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.
36	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?	PM	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.



37	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?	PM	No_Revision	No
38	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?	PM	No_Revision	No

