

**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
Bridge Package 30**

RFP for Industry Review #1

Date Received: 11/7/2024

Meeting Date: 11/8/2024

						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	RFP			Can the contractor access the sites prior to any plan approvals to demo and remove structures?	Construction	No_Revision	Contractor may access the site, but will need necessary permits to do so. (NOI, Right of Entry, demo permit, approved demo plan, approved MOT/detour plans, etc)
2	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	68	Section 49 indicates the Contractor shall provide XXXX square yard of FDP, a unit price of \$XX per square yard, and removed to a depth of XX inches as directed by RCE. Can SCDOT please provide amounts for these.	Construction	Revision	Will revise.
3	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	249	Section 51 indicates the Contractor shall provide XXXX square yard of full depth concrete pavement patching, a unit price of \$XX per square yard, and removed to a depth of XX inches as directed by RCE. Can SCDOT please provide amounts for these.	Construction	Revision	Will revise.
4	Attach_A	Exhibit 5		Will there be any incentives for early completion?	Construction	No_Revision	We do not intend to have incentives on this project.
5	Attach_A	Agreement	9	Will SCDOT allow multiple concurrent design submittal packages for review?	DM	Revision	Yes. Please refer to accommodations made and limitations in Exhibit 4z. Agreement will be revised.
6	Attach_A	Agreement	Section II.D.3 pdg page 39	Would SCDOT allow final roadway and final bridge submittals to be combined for one location at a time?	DM	Revision	Yes. Please refer to accommodations made and limitations in Exhibit 4z. Agreement will be revised.
7	Attach_A	Agreement	Section II.D.3 pdg page 40	Would SCDOT allow preliminary roadway plans for all four sites to be combined into one submittal package for review?	DM	No_Revision	No
8	Attach_A	Agreement	Section II.D.3 pdg page 40	Would SCDOT allow right of way plans for all four sites to be combined into one submittal package for review?	DM	No_Revision	No.
9	RFP		10 of 85	Section II.D.6 of the Agreement states that no more than one new submittal package shall be uploaded to ProjectWise within a five business day period. Based on this constraint, it will take several weeks to complete preliminary submittals for one bridge site. Given the accelerated nature of this project, will SCDOT consider allowing more than one submittal package per five day period?	DM	No_Revision	Refer to Exhibit 4z for plan submittal accommodations and limitations.



10	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	Section 2.0 pdf page 165	Will SCDOT allow the Technical Proposal Conceptual Plans to be submitted as Preliminary Plans post award for the purpose of expediting utility relocation?	DM	No_Revision	Yes refer to Exhibit 4z
11	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	Section 2.0 pdf page 165	Will SCDOT allow teams to proceed at their own risk straight to final bridge and final roadway plan submittals provided any information required for the preliminary and right of way submittals is included in the final package?	DM	No_Revision	Yes refer to Exhibit 4z
12	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	2	Can the draft NEPA document be provided so teams can anticipate what sort of commitments may be necessary?	Environmental	No_Revision	No. Teams may expect typical commitments similar to previous packages. Will be specific conditions related to bats per US Fish and Wildlife guidelines regarding clearing restrictions.
13	RFP	2	4	Per Section 2.6 a NW3 permit will be utilized for applicable projects. Based on review of existing wetlands at the S-166 and S-59 sites there appear to be over 0.10 acres of wetland impacts which would require a PCN. Can SCDOT confirm an RPG4 permit would not be more applicable for these sites?	Environmental	No_Revision	Under agreement with the USACE, emergency projects are all authorized to proceed under NW3 for all on alignment replacements. Projects should be designed to minimize impacts while meeting current design criteria.
14	Attach_B	Hazmat		Can SCDOT provide the asbestos and lead based paint reports?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	Reports were just submitted and will be uploaded to the website on 11/8/24.
15	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f	Section 2.0 pdf page 161	RFP states the Geotechnical Subsurface Data Report and field testing files have been provided in Attachment B. When can we expect that information to be provided?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	Reports were just submitted and will be uploaded to the website on 11/8/24.
16	Attach_B	Hydraulics		Will the HEC-RAS model for the S-115 site in Greenville be provided?	Hydrology	No_Revision	There is no available model that we have access to. Zone A locations frequently do not have FEMA models.
17	Attach_B	Hydraulics		On S-166, the model begins approximately 500 feet downstream of the bridge and no bridge model is included within the HEC-RAS geometry. Is this correct, or does an updated model need to be provided?	Hydrology	No_Revision	This is a limited detail study. SCDOT has provided what the Department has access to. Zone A locations frequently do not have FEMA models.
18	PIP	Hydraulics		Two of the 3 HEC-RAS models do not model the existing bridge or provide data at their locations. Will SCDOT provide that modeling information?	Hydrology	No_Revision	SCDOT has provided what the Department has access to. Zone A locations frequently do not have FEMA models.
19	PIP	Hydraulics		Will a HEC-RAS model be provided for S-115?	Hydrology	No_Revision	SCDOT has provided what the Department has access to. Zone A locations frequently do not have FEMA models.
20	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2.2.1.7 pdg page 158	RFP states bridge lengths and bridge span configurations are to be set based on existing topography and setback requirements listed in subsequent sections. Please provide the existing topography information, primarily the top of channel banks, so that teams can proceed with conceptual designs.	Hydrology	No_Revision	Limited surveys have been performed at the sites. It will be the contractor's responsibility to provide full topographical surveys.



21	RFP		18 of 85	Section II.K of the Agreement states there are no ATC's for this project. Does this mean there is no opportunity to shorten the bridges via an ATC to provide a reduction to the minimum bridge lengths provided in Section 2.2.1.7 fo Exhibit 4e - Hydraulic Design Criteria.	Hydrology	No_Revision	Yes there is no opportunity to shorten the bridges. through ATC's. Bridges must meet RFP criteria.
22	PIP			Will the hydro model for the S-115 site be provided?	Hydrology	No_Revision	There is no available model that we have access to. Zone A locations frequently do not have FEMA models.
23	Attach_B	Survey		Will survey files for each site be provided as part of Attachment B? If so, please provide date when information will be posted.	Roadway	No_Revision	Limited surveys have been performed at the sites and provided on 11/4. It will be the contractor's responsibility to provide full topographical surveys.
24				Can SCDOT provide the existing road plans for the S-230 site be provided? These are not available online.	Roadway	No_Revision	File No. 24.335 in Greenwood County contains the plans & they are available through Plans Online.
25	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Setion 2.10 pdf page 130	Will SCDOT allow Pre-MASH guardrail to be used on the northwest corner of the Greenville S-115 bridge to minimize impacts to the driveway?	Roadway	Revision	Yes. Will revise RFP to allow at this single location.
26	RFP	2	7	Section 2.3 states "The Proposer shall obtain permission from any landowner prior to entering private property", however Section VIII Right of way Services states SCDOT is handling all ROW services. Can you confirm SCDOT is providing ROW services and if so clarify section 2.3 language?	ROW	No_Revision	This language is intended to inform the contractor if they want/intend to access the site before right of entries or acquisitions are provided by SCDOT, it is their responsibility to obtain the appropriate permissions and permits.
27	Attach_A	Agreement	Section II.B.4 pdf page 38 & Section VIII.A pdf page 70	Section II (page 38) states Right of Way services shall be the respnsibility of the Contractor. Section VIII (page 70) states "Contractor is not responsible for acquiring right of way or providing right of way services...". Please clarify Contractor's responsibility as it pertains to right of way services.	ROW	No_Revision	SCDOT is responsible for all right of way services for this project.
28				Can the existing bridge inspection reports be provided, not just the SIA sheets?	Structures	No_Revision	Yes, they will be provided directly to each team via SharePoint.
29	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	Section 703 pdf page 262	Exhibit 5 provides specifications for Galvanized Reinforcing Bars. However, Exhibit4b structures section does not mention any requirements of Galvanized Reinforcing Bars. Please clarify if galvanized bar are required at any of these locations.	Structures	No_Revision	Galvanized bridge deck rebar is not required, per Ehibit 4b. The special provision was left in Exhibit 5 in case it is needed for an unforeseen reason at some point in the project.



30	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2.2.1.8 pdf page 158	RFP states new abutment toes shall not exceed limits of existing abutment toes and that teams are to provide a minimum 5 foot abutment toe setback from any point along the channel bank to the face of the abutment's rip rap protection. Please provide locations of existing abutment toes and top of channel banks.	Structures	No_Revision	Limited surveys have been performed at the sites. It will be the contractor's responsibility to provide full topographical surveys.
31	PIP			Are existing bridge plans available?	Structures	No_Revision	Two sites have plan sets. All four were built from maintaince standards. All plans from SCDOT bridge inventory files will be provided to teams via SharePoint.
32	PIP			Are the latest bridge inspection reports available?	Structures	No_Revision	Inspection Reports will be provided to teams via SharePoint.
33	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	2	Will the water line on the S-115 be allowed to re-attach to new bridge?	Utilities	Revision	SCDOT is in coordination efforts with the utility owner and this information will be provided in the RFP at the earliest opportunity.
34	Attach_A	Exhibit_3		There is no mention of relocation of the existing waterline in the scope of work. Please clarify language to state if contractor is required to construct the new line as well.	Utilities	Revision	SCDOT is in coordination efforts with the utility owner and this information will be provided in the RFP at the earliest opportunity.
35	Attach_A	Exhibit 7		Is the Blue Ridge waterline required to go in-contract, there is no mention of relocation in Exhibit 7 or the scope of work. If so, can a list of prequalified designers and contractors be provided?	Utilities	Revision	Blue Ridge is classified as a large utility and can elect to self-perform. SCDOT is seeking a final decision from them and will provide this information at the earliest opportunity.

