South Carolina Department of Transportation

NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
I-95 over Lake Marion - Project ID P041130 - Clarendon and Orangeburg Counties

RFP for Industry Review Rev. 1

Date Received: 1/23/2025 Non-Confidential Meeting Date: 2/11/2025

Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Agreement	Section XII pdf 104 of 341	Please clarify the extent of demolition for the substructures. Do teams remove to the waterline, the mudline, or tip of piles?	Construction	Revision	Specification with clarification will be provided in Exhibit 5.
2	Attach_A	Agreement	Section XII pdf 104 of 341	Are teams required to remove the existing bridge foundations west of the old US 301 bridge?	Construction	Revision	Language will be added to Exhibit 3 to remove all old bridge foundations as a part of this project. ~~Specification with clarification will be provided in Exhibit 5.~~
3	Attach_A	Agreement	23/24 of 92	The Design Build Agreement references Exhibit 5 for Extended Job Site Overhead Rates. These rates cannot be found within Exhibit 5, please provide these rates and or a specific section reference within Exhibit 5.	Construction	Revision	*Section 105: Exteded Job Site Overhead* will be added to Exhibit 5
4	Attach_A	Agreement	78 of 92	After a thorough review of the DBE Contracting Opportunities on the project, we request that SCDOT consider setting the DBE goal be reduced to 9.2%, with a Professional Services goal of 0.2%.	Construction	No_Revision	DBE goal will remain as initially set. Teams will be required to follow good faith efforts and coordinate with the DBE Office.
5	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	Section 3.3 pdf 209 of 341	Can the ROW submittal packages be eliminated?	DM	Revision	Will revise to allow omission of ROW plans if ROW is not required on the project.
6	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Section 2.1.5 pdf 165 of 341	The RFP states that teams are to "Construct the new bridges with bridge roadway widths that are equal to or greater than the approach roadway widths that are specified in Exhibit 4a". Exhibit 4a, Section 2.4 indicates 12-ft inside shoulders, however, Attachment B, Structures, Item 1, Bridge Typical Sections, shows a 10-ft inside shoulder for both the Main Bridge and Relief Bridges. The additional 4-ft of shoulder will cause the Main Bridge to be over 150-ft wide which is the maximum superstructure width for a single bridge deck. Please clarify inside shoulder widths for the bridges, and if we are required to use 12-ft, please update Bridge Typical Section in Attachment B to match RFP requirements or remove maximum single deck width of 150-ft.	DM	Revision	10-ft inside shoulder is the requirement on the bridges. This will be clarified in Exhibit 4a.
7	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	4	Section 2.1.5 of Exhibit 4b requires the new bridge roadway widths to be equal or greater than the approach roadway widths. Section 2.4 of Exhibit 4a requires 12 ft. total inside shoulder widths. The Bridge Typical Sections document located in Attachment B - Structures shows 10 ft. inside shoulders. Additionally, if 12 ft. inside shoulders are required, the bridge will be required to be split into dual bridges as it would violate the max. superstructure width of 150 ft. Please confirm 10 ft. minimum inside shoulders are required for the bridge decks.	DM	Revision	10-ft inside shoulder is the requirement on the bridges. This will be clarified in Exhibit 4a.

Post Office Box 191
Columbia, South Carolina 29202-0191

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

8	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Section 2.13 pdf 160 of 341	Will fishing be allowed from the shared use path?	Environmental	No_Revision	Fishing will not be signed as prohibited.
9				Per GDM Section 10.10.2.1, ERSs not located beyond the bridge embankments shall be designed to not collapse. Recommend SCDOT define "collapse" for roadway ERSs during the seismic event.	Geotechnical	No_Revision	Collapse means no adverse impact to safety or property in the immediate vicinity.
10	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	Section 2.2 pdf 195 of 341	What design standards dictate downstream dam failure? What loads should teams consider when doing this analysis?	Hydrology	No_Revision	SCDOT wants conservative bridge design with dam failure. No loads to be considered from hydraulic design. Model without downstream dam and perform both HEC-18 and USGS scour computations. Use most conservative scour for design.
11	Attach_A	Agreement	36 of 92	Builder's Risk insurance is required in "the amount of the Contract Price", which is incongruent with typical application of Builder's Risk insurance coverage. This amount of coverage would only be necessary if there was an event, or events, causing loss of practically the entire project. The exceptional unlikelihood of such occurrence(s) make this Builder's Risk limit impractical and adds significant cost to the project for no reason. Please consider revising the requirement to $100 million.	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make this revision.
12	Attach_A	Agreement	36 of 92	Pollution Liability coverage in the amount of $1 million per occurrence and $2 million aggregate is insufficient for the scope and volume of work being performed in open water. Please consider increasing the Pollution limits to $2 million and $4 million.	Legal	Revision	We will make this change.
13	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f	Section 1 pdf 198 of 341	Can SCDOT provide the Soil Support Value (SSV) for the project area?	Pavement	Revision	A suplementary pavement investigation will be completed in the near future and this information will be included in an updated pavement information package.
14	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f	Section 1 pdf 198 of 341	Can SCDOT provide the I-95 northbound and southbound outside shoulder pavement structure for the approaches, or if that is not available, obtain the necessary borings in the shoulders and provide the data to the teams?	Pavement	Revision	A suplementary pavement investigation will be completed in the near future and this information will be included in an updated pavement information package.
15	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	Section 2.3 pdf 179 of 341	Please clarify which is required for Mainline Interstate Temporary Pavement. Do teams to use the IRI Performance Requirement, or the prescriptive pavement listed in Option 1?	Pavement	Revision	The provided temporary pavement design will not include performance requirements but initial ride requirements will need to be met.
16	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	1	Project limits for new location, widening, and rehabilitation are not clearly defined for the roadway leading up to, between, and beyond the bridges. Is any part of the roadway outside the bridge limits required to be widened to account for the future 3rd lane in each direction?	Pavement	Revision	A clarification will be provided for paving limits and requirements.
17	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	2	Section 2.3 - Temporary Pavement list Option 1. Is there an Option 2?	Pavement	Revision	A suplementary pavement investigation will be completed in the near future and this information will be included in an updated pavement information package. Based off of the results of that information a revision may be completed to include an additional option.
18	Attach_A	Exhibit 5		Please provide direction on how to handle patching of composite pavements (asphalt over concrete) within the project limits. Additionally, please provide a unit rate and anticipate quantity for composite pavement patching.	Pavement	No_Revision	We do not anticipate any A suplementary pavement investigation will be completed in the near future and this information will be included in an updated pavement information package. Based off of the results of that information a revision may be completed to include an additional option.

19	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	2.4	The pedestrian pathway pavement (existing location) section states "Full Depth Patch as directed by RCE". Please provide information on the existing pavement structure and a unit rate and anticipated quantity for pedestrian pathway full depth patching.	Pavement	No_Revision	A suplementary pavement investigation will be completed in the near future and this information will be included in an updated pavement information package. Based off of the results of that information a revision may be completed to include a composite patching quantity.
20	RFP	3	Section 3.9 pdf 16 of 341	Could maximum number of formal ATCs be raised from 10 to 15?	PM	Revision	Will update to the 15 FATCs
21	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Section 2.1.5 pdf 165 of 341	Can the 8-ft utility window and 14-ft shared use path space be utililized for MOT staging during construction?	PM	No_Revision	Vehicular travel lanes are required a grooved surface finish. This area is to have a broomed finished in accordance with the RFP. Vehicular travel will not be allowed on a broomed surface finish.
22	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	Section 1 pdf 341 of 341	Will the waterline be installed by others? Will it be constructed after the bridge construction is complete?	PM	No_Revision	Waterline will be installed by others. It will be constructed after the bridge construction is complete.
23	RFP	3	15 of 46	Section 3.10 Highway Safety Analysis states that any permanent alignment shifts are required to be equal to or better than the existing alignment and the analysis be submitted with Preliminary ATCs. Please confirm that a shift in the existing alignment does not require an ATC. If teams determine that an alternate shift in alignment is more advantageous after the Preliminary ATC submittal date, can the teams submit the new analysis for review and approval? When will the approval or denial be provided?	PM	Revision	A revision will be made to require all changes to permanent alignment that a team is considering must be submitted as ATCs and follow the ATC process. They will be reviewed and approved when we respond to ATCs.
24	RFP	5	26,27 of 46	In Section 5.3, page 26 of 46, the technical score narrative states the technical proposal narrative will be scored at 40 points and conceptual plans will be scored at 70 points out of 100. The table on page 27 of 46 scores the concept plans to add to 60 points.	PM	Revision	Correct, it is 60 points.
25	RFP	3	9 of 46	Please consider increasing the number of Preliminary ATCs allowed to 25.	PM	Revision	Will update to the 25 PATCs
26	RFP	3	11 of 46	Please consider increasing the number of Formal ATCs allowed to 15.	PM	Revision	Will update to the 15 FATCs
27	RFP	3	8 of 46	Please refine RFP Section 3.8 based on this project not having an identified preferred alternative. The section outlining "If the environmental determination for the Project identified a preferred alternative:" should be removed to reduce confusion.	PM	Revision	Will revise this section to remove this language.
28	RFP	5	27 of 46	Please provide guidance for Quality Credit Points similar to other recent projects to define what items SCDOT values most and the quality points associated with these items.	PM	No_Revision	We provided the items that SCDOT values in Section 4.1, Item 2. Quality points will not be specified for each of the items.
29	Attach_B	Environmental	File 3	Can SCDOT provide the Sonar data that is represented in CE sheets 1170-1176?	PM	No_Revision	Need some additional clarification of what is needed. We have provied the images and report describing what was shown in those images.
30	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 2	2.2	Lane closure restrictions section of the RFP doesn't cover restrictions on existing pedestrian and bike trail. Please indicate if existing trail can be closed and or flagged for any period of time.	PM	Revision	Will make a revision to maintain access the the existing trail at all times.
31	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	1	Page 1 of the exhibit 3 discusses removal and disposal of the old US 301. Please provide horizontal and vertical demolition limits (station to station) for the existing mainline and relief US 301 bridge (trail).	PM	Revision	We will provide some aditional limit information in ~~Exhibit 5~~ Exhibit 3.
32	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	1	Please confirm that demolition of existing foundations adjacent to the US 301 bridge are not part of this contract.	PM	Revision	They are a part of the contract and we will ~~provide some aditional limit information in Exhibit 5.~~ clarify in the project scope.
33				Can either of the rest areas adjacent to the project be closed for any duration of time during construction?	PM	Revision	We are going to revise RFP requirements to say that they must remain open. If requesting a closure it needs to be done through an ATC and backup docuementation to justify the closure.

34	RFP	3	9 of 46	Section 3.8.2 Confidential Preliminary ATC Meeting, indicates that SCDOT will offer said meeting, "..at the request of the Proposer." This paragraph further indicates that the request shall be made by the date specified in the Milestone Schedule. However, the Milestone Schedule does not appear to list a deadline for the request. Is there a deadline by which Proposers must formally request this meeting? Or shall a Proposer's submission of a Preliminary ATC Package be considered a request for the meeting?	PM	Revision	Date will be specified in the Milestone Schedule.
35				Please provide details of the downstream lock repair and the impacts this may cause to the lake water level during the anticipated construction timeframe.	PM	No_Revision	SCDOT is not aware of any downstream lock repairs that will have an impact on the project.
36	RFP	8	38 of 46	In the milestone schedule, open forum meetings are not listed for response to non-confidential questions submitted on April 9, May 7, and June 19. Please provide dates for open forum meetings.	PM	No_Revision	For the rounds after Final RFP we do not set the dates for those meetings in the milestone schedule. We respond within 10 business days and hold and open forum meeting if we think one is necessary. Most likely we will have one, but generally they are quick and we can do in 30 to 45 minutes since you have reviewed our responses.
37	RFP	3	16 of 46	Please consider increasing the stipend amount to $900,000, in consideration of the overall anticipated value of the project and the decision to not select a preferred alternative. Extensive time and effort is necessary to explore alternative alignments and concepts, and analyze the potential need for ATCs to implement those alternatives, in addition to the typical ATC process for large projects.	PM	No_Revision	Stipend amount was set in accordance with SCDOT's process to account for the size and complexity of the project. Not adjustment will be made.
38	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Section 2.4 pdf 157 of 341	What are the median widths required for the relief and main bridges?	Roadway	Revision	Median widths shall accomodate future lanes described throughout Exhibits 3 and 4. Exhibit 4a revised to clarify median barrier extension off of bridge until full median width is achieved.
39	Attach_B	Structures	2. Revisions to SCDOT Seismic Design Specifications for Highway Bridges, Table 7.1	The note below table 7.1 says to delete the table to replace with "Note: Analysis for FEE not required for OC III bridges". This appears to be a mistake. Please clarify.	Structures	Revision	The sentence saying to delete the table should go before the table shown, which replaces the table in the SDS.
40	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Section 2.1.21 pdf 171 of 341	Are teams required to avoid existing foundations with their proposed substructures? If so, is there a minimum offset distance?	Structures	Revision	Yes, avoidance of existing foundations will be required, but a minimum offset distance will not be specified.
41	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Section 2.1.21 pdf 171 of 341	Please provide elevation for mean lake low water level.	Structures	Revision	Design low water elevation will be provided in Exhibit 4e.

42	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Section 2.1.3 pdf 163 of 341	Will teams be allowed to conduct their own vessel collision studies and revise the vessel collision loads?	Structures	No_Revision	No to conducting a separate collision study. If a team wants to select a different loading condition presented on page 5 of the vessel collision memo, based on a team's proposed span arrangement, this would be considered as an ATC.
43	Attach_B	Structures	2. Revisions to SCDOT Seismic Design Specifications for Highway Bridges, Section 6.4	DM0111 sets the top of drilled shafts at 5-ft above the waterline with elevations from bent to bent being at the same elevation. The vertical profile on the bridge will produce some bents where the distance between the top of shaft and the bottom of cap will leave short columns resulting in design being controlled by high seismic shear. Extending the drilled shaft to the bottom of cap in this situation, will result in plastic hinging in the drilled shafts to occur above ground. In these instances, will SCDOT allow plastic hinging to form below ground?	Structures	No_Revision	~~One design approach to avoid this situation is to design certain bents, including columns & shafts, to remain elastic so that plastic hinges do not form. If this is not possible during final seismic design, SCDOT will consider allowing a limited amount of drilled shaft plastic hinging below ground provided all other performance requirements are met. Above ground plastic hinging in drilled shafts, accounted for in the seismic design, is acceptable.~~ SCDOT will not allow below ground plastic hingting of drilled shafts on this project.
44	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Section 2.1.3 pdf 163 of 341	The 3rd bullet from the last in this section indicates a vessel collision force of 1,245 kip for the two closest bents on each side of the proposed clearance envelope. The vessel collision memo in the provided information indicate longer spans over the proposed channel would indicate lower force requirements. Is a vessel impact analysis required for any span arrangement which differs from the span arrangment in the information provided or are the 1,245 kip and 275kip loads required irregardless of the span length proposed over the navigation span and corresponding approach span lengths?	Structures	No_Revision	The 1,245 kip force for two bents on each side of the clearance envelope and 275 kip for everywhere else are required regardless of span length. This combination blankets all of the span arrangement scenarios presented in the memo. If a team wants to select a different loading condition presented on page 5 of the vessel collision memo, based on a team's proposed span arrangement, this would be considered as an ATC.
45	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Section 2.1.5 pdf 165 of 341	RFP states "For the relief bridge(s), provide sufficient width on the bridge for four thru-lanes in each direction on I-95...", however Attachment B, structures, Item 1, Bridge Typical Sections, shows only three lanes. Please clarify.	Structures	Revision	The requirement for four lanes will be revised to three lanes for the relief bridges. The requirement to maintain the current thru-lanes at their existing horizontal location will remain. Additional deck width for maintenance of traffic is anticipated at the relief bridge(s).
46	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	4	Section 2.1.5 of Exhibit 4b requires the relief bridge to provide sufficient width on the bridge for four thru-lanes in each direction on I-95. The Bridge Typical Sections document located in Attachment B - Structures reflects bridge widths for the relief bridge that do not meet this criteria. Please confirm which is correct.	Structures	Revision	The requirement for four lanes will be revised to three lanes for the relief bridges. The requirement to maintain the current thru-lanes at their existing horizontal location will remain. Additional deck width for maintenance of traffic is anticipated at the relief bridge(s).
47	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2	Please identify the direction(s) that the vessel collision force should be applied.	Structures	No_Revision	The application of the collision force is dictated by AASHTO LRFD BDS article 3.14.14.
48	PIP	Structures	SIA	SIA report included with project information package indicates that there are existing navigational controls on the existing bridges. What navigational aids will be required for the new structure(s)? Has USCG provided input on this?	Structures	No_Revision	Yes - we requested an exemption from navigational lighting from USCG for this bridge and received concurrence that lighting is not required at this time. The existing navigational lights are not functional. Nightime traffic on the lake is minimal.
49	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2.1.10	Additional barriers were added by addition of Utility Window, please clarify which concrete barriers receive Final Finish coatings.	Structures	Revision	Per 2.1.10, all concrete "median" barriers require final finish coating. The two barriers adjacent to the utility window are defined as median barriers in 2.1.14.
50	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2.1.10	Concrete barrier extends off the bridge along the shared use path, dose the barrier get Final Finish Coating? On both sides or one side?	Structures	Revision	Yes. All exposed concrete surfaces of median barriers extending off of the bridge shall be coated. This will be clarified in Exhbit 4b Section 2.3
51	Attach_A	Agreement	XII	Standard Specifications 202.3.2 state: "Remove the substructures of existing structures within the stream down to the natural stream bottom." Does department have USGC concurrence for the limits of substructure removal for all existing bridges on the project?	Structures	Revision	We have coordinated with USCG and will require removal of footings and foundation seals from the existing bridges in their entirety. Piles shall be cut off 2-feet below the mudline.

52	PIP			Please provide load rating reports for all structures to be demolished within the project limits.	Structures	No_Revision	The existing I-95 bridges over Lake Marion are critical security bridges. Consultants must submit Engineering Directive 18 information request forms to obtain existing bridge plans and load rating files for this project. Please submit ED-18 forms and a list of personell that will be using the information. Notify the OAD project point of contact when the form is submitted to SCDOT Bridge Management Office.
53	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2.2.21	What is mean lake low water level?	Structures	Revision	We will provide a design low water elevation in Exhibit 4e.
54	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 2	Section 2.6 pdf 187 of 341	Please provide Design Speed for Interstate Ramps.	Traffic	No_Revision	Maintain existing throughout project or as indicated by existing signage.
55	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 2	Section 2.6 pdf 187 of 341	What will the posted speed limit in the workzone be during construction?	Traffic	No_Revision	All workzone design elements must meet the posted speed limit prior to construction, in this case 70 mph.
56	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 2		Are teams required to keep Rest Area south of the Main Bridge open during construction?	Traffic	Revision	Requirement will be added to say that rest areas are required to be open. If requesting a closure it needs to be done through an ATC and backup documentation to justify the closure.
57	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	Section 1 pdf 341 of 341	Can SCDOT provide information on the electrical transmission line crossing Lake Marion, specifically the height of the lines above full pool?	Utilities	Revision	SCDOT will provide this information when recieved from Duke Energy.
58	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 3	1	Section 2 states a "ITS Fiber Sever Location" map is provided in Attachment B. Please provide the file in Attachment B.	Utilities	Revision	This will be provided.
59	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	1	Please provide a status update and estimate when in-contract utility information will be provided. Including but not limited to: design & construction criteria, specifications, pre-approved engineers/contractors, special provisions, studies, bridge attachment documentation, details, etc.	Utilities	Revision	This will be provided once complete.
60	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 2	2	Exhibit 4d.2 directs proposers to dispose of ITS components in accordance with Exhibit 5. The requirement is not in Exhibit 5.	Utilities	Revision	This will be added.
61	Attach_A	Agreement	VII	Please provide a status update, expected deliverables, and date when additional utility information will be provided (SUE, preliminary report, etc.)	Utilities	Revision	This will be provided.

South Carolina Department of Transportation

NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
I-95 over Lake Marion - Project ID P041130 - Clarendon and Orangeburg Counties

RFP for Industry Review Additional

Date Received: 02/12/2025 - 02/14/2025

Non-Confidential Meeting Date: 2/11/2025

Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a		Design criteria for ramps are not defined. What criteria is necessary for acceleration lengths and superelevation rates (speed, emax, etc.) necessary for the rest area ramp that may be impacted by design?	DM	Revision	Exhibit 4a will be expanded to include ramp criteria for the welcome center/rest area.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	Section 2.2 pdf 195 of 341	Please provide a DTM or similar application based on the bathymetric survey used and referenced in the scope and Hydro 2-D analysis.	Hydrology	No_Revision	DTM provided in the Survey file and 2D model for hydro analysis was provided in the 2D model file.
3	RFP	3	Section 3.8.1 pdf 14 of 341	The RFP only allows for a single 11" x 17" attachment for Preliminary ATCs. The response to Question 23 in Round 1 of Non-Confidential Questions indicated that all changes to permanent alignments must be submitted through the ATC process. Given the size of this project, will the department allow roll plots for any Preliminary ATC involving alignment shifts?	PM	Revision	Revised to allow Roll Plot if you are doing an alignment shift. This can be provided with the Preliminary ATC.
4	RFP	3	Section 3.14 pdf 21 of 341	As a follow up to the response to Question 37 in Round 1 of the Non-Confidential Questions, we request that SCDOT re-evaluate the project's size, complexity, and estimate in order to provide an increased stipend amount.	PM	Revision	Stipend calculation will be revisited and update to Stipend will be added to the next release of the RFP.

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
I-95 over Lake Marion - Project ID P041130 - Clarendon and Orangeburg Counties

RFP for Industry Review 2

Date Received: 3/21/2025

Non-Confidential Meeting Date: 04/02/2025

Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Page 3	Section 2.12 - Please provide project specific right or way requirements for bridge maintenance access.	PM	Revision	We will provided the required access for bridge maintenance. It will most likely be required to provide the 75' from the centerline of the NB and SB lanes and 75 from the birdge ends as a block out for access. This area shall be provided within the current ROW easement for the bridge.
2	PIP	Utilities	R2 Utility Report Page 25 of 26, PDF page 75 and 92	Secion 10.0 Special Provision in the Utility Report states "The Town of Santee owns and abandoned sewer outfall adjacent to the project. The exact location is unknown. The Contractor shall ensure that the integrity of this pipe is maintained during construction..." Is this a requirement of the contract and if so, please provide the location.	Utilities	No_Revision	What is required as a part of the contract is to coordinate with this utility company on this utility.
3	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	Page 80	Division 600: Removal Salvage and Disposal of ITS Equipment and Materials, Section 1.a. Removal and Salvage states "The items of major equipment to be salvaged are listed on the Plans." Have these "Plans" been provided?	Utilities	No_Revision	The items that would be salvaged will be identified on the plans that the teams would produce for the project.
4	Attach_A	Exhibit_4		Please confirm that lighting is not required along the new SUP on land or on bridges.	PM	No_Revision	Lighting is not required along the new SUP.
5	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 27	Section IV. A.1 states "The Proposer must identify the time required for the Construction Time of the Project on the Cost Proposal Bid Form. The Cost Proposal Bid Form does not have a line item to indicate the proposed Construction Time.	PM	Revision	Will remove the sentence that requires that on Bid Form.
6	Attach_A	Exhibit_4		Erosion of the current embankment adjacent to Lake Marion along the current Palmetto Trail causeway. Is rehabilitation of the existing causeway embankment included in the project scope of work? If so, please consider adding a quantity allowance and scope requirements in Exhibit 5.	Geotechnical	Revision	Will provide quidance for what to do on this embankment if used for the shared use path.
7	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	Section 202 Page 24	Section 202 requires demolition and removal of the existing seal slabs. Are these areas accounted for in the environmental open water impacts?	Environmental	No_Revision	No, it is not required to be accounted for in the impacts.
8	PIP	Geotechnical	1. Geotechnical Baseline Report	No SPT N-value measurements were taken after switching over to coring in the Limestone Formation. Based on adjacent borings, material may have been cored that would not result in spoon and tooling refusal. Please provide the decision process for when borings were cored vs. SPT within the limestone unit. Was there any discussion regarding SPTs between limestone core runs?	Geotechnical	Revision	During the field investigation, the goal was to core a significant amount of the limestone to perform unconfined compressive strength testing. This decision was made to try to define the potential variability in the limestone formation better than could be done with SPT testing alone. As such, materials that did not meet tooling refusal were cored and tested. To give the prospective design-build teams more data to evaluate their design options, roughly 25% of the borings drilled performed SPT testing through the limestone unit with no coring. The borings that did not have coring were spaced roughly evenly along the bridge alignment. Due to these specific exploration and testing decisions, no SPT sampling was conducted between sampling runs. The geotech reports will be revised to reflect the drilling and sampling approach.
9	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Page 11	Section2.2.23 Slope Protection - Should slope protection for the existing causeway near the begin bridge be extended the bottom of the causeway that is submerged under normal pool conditions? The bottom of the causeway ties in approximately 20 feet below normal pool elevation.	Structures	Revision	New bridge end slopes will be required to be graded down to design-low-water elevation (72.0) and riprapped, at all bridge ends.

Post Office Box 191
Columbia, South Carolina 29202-0191

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

10	PIP	Hydraulics	1. Hydraulic Report - Page 410	Risk Assessment form as well as the report states the proposed conditions will exceed 1 foot of backwater when compared to that of natural conditions. Will a design exception for backwater be granted for this crossing?	Hydrology	Revision	Backwater shall be maintained or improved and it shall be demonstrated that the proposed hydraulic design results in no increase in the 1% AEP flood profile for published and unpublished cross sections to achieve "No Impact" criteria.
11	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a		Do the two existing crossovers on I-95 need to be retained, removed, or reconstructed if impacted by a shift in roadway alignment?	PM	Revision	We will provide the requirement for the crossovers. The plan is to remove them and not reinstall them after the project is complete. However, while the existing bridges are still being used, we need to accomodate an emergency vehicle turnaround at both ends of the bridge.
12	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	Page 5	Exhibit 6, page 5, requires an 8-hour window halting "in-water work". Please clarify which specific activities are precluded and considered "in-water work".	Environmental	No_Revision	In short, work within the water column. Anticipated activities would include but not be limited to setting/driving spuds, pile driving, shaft casing driving/installation, demolition of substructure elements within the water column. The intention of this commitment was to create an 8hr period for sturgeon to pass through or be in the area generally during nighttime hours.
13	PIP	Utilities	R2 Utility Report - PDF Page 62	Are the (2) PROPOSED FTC 1.5" CONDUITS shown on pages 62-64 of the Utility report part of the contract?	Utilities	No_Revision	No. This information is included in the PUR as it is what FTC provided to SCDOT during early utility coordination. No specific accommodation has been identified.
14	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	Page 11	Exhibit 3 has been updated to include removal of existing spans along existing pedestrian bridge. Please provide direction to proposers on how to handle existing billboards.	PM	No_Revision	Information will be provided when we have clear direction on the removal of the sign structures. The intent is to remove and dispose of the signs or return to owner.
15	RFP	8	Page 40	Please consider revising the Milestone Schedule to provide a minimum of two full business days between "Issue Final RFP" and "Submittal of Formal ATCs for Initial Review and Submittal of Confidential Questions". The Final RFP could result in changes to FATCs and/or result in Confidential Questions.	PM	No_Revision	There will be no change in the schedule. Since this is the first submittal of the ATCs, we have an opportunity to make updates and resubmit them in the second round of Final ATCs. Also, in accordance with section 3.11.8.d of the RFP Instructions, it is the responsibility of the teams to request to add additional variances to ATCs based on any revisions SCDOT makes to the RFP Requirements for Addendums.
16	Attach_A	Agreement		It does not appear the contract contains a mutual waiver of consequential damages. Such a waiver would benefit both SCDOT and Contractor as each would not be entitled to seek consequential damages from the other. Further, including such a waiver may allow Contractor to provide more efficient and competitive pricing, which may result in a better value for SCDOT. Contractor requests such a waiver be added and proposes the following language (or similar language to the same effect) be added to the contract: NOTWITHSTANDING ANYTHING TO THE CONTRARY CONTAINED IN THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS, NEITHER SCDOT NOR CONTRACTOR SHALL BE LIABLE TO THE OTHER PARTY FOR ANY LOST PROFITS, ANY INDIRECT, INCIDENTAL, CONSEQUENTIAL, TREBLE, SPECIAL, PUNITIVE OR SIMILAR DAMAGES, HOWEVER CAUSED AND UNDER ANY THEORY OF LIABILITY, INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, NEGLIGENCE, STRICT LIABILITY, INDEMNITY, OR BREACH OF CONTRACT OR WARRANTY, EVEN IF SUCH PARTY IS ADVISED OF THEIR POSSIBILITY. Also, we would like to note that a waiver has previously been accepted on CCR Ph3 which states that neither party shall be liable to the other for punitive damages or indirect or incidental consequential damages, whether arising out of breach of this Agreement, tort or any theory of liability.	Legal	No_Revision	
17	Attach_A	Agreement		It does not appear the contract contains an overall limitation on Contractor's liability. Including such a limitation may allow Contractor to provide more efficient and competitive pricing, which may result in a better value for SCDOT. We note that there is a precedence for setting a Limit of Liability on previous SCDOT design building projects and Contractor requests such a limitation be added in a reasonable amount to be negotiated.	Legal	No_Revision	

18	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 30	It does not appear the contract contains a cap on liquidated damages. Including such a limitation may allow Contractor to provide more efficient and competitive pricing as it will know the outer limit of its delay-related exposure, which may result in a better value for SCDOT. Contractor requests such a limitation be added in a reasonable amount to be negotiated.	Legal	No_Revision	
19	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 58	Together Articles XV(A)(2 & 5) state… "CONTRACTOR further warrants the performance of all bridge components on all structures for three years from Final Completion of the Project. If a component fails to perform properly for any reason, including but not limited to normal wear and tear, the CONTRACTOR shall replace the failed component at no cost to SCDOT…These warranties are in addition to all warranties implied by law." Please delete the bridge components warranty set forth at Article XV(A)(2) as the other warranties that remain are sufficient to protect SCDOT's interests. Please also delete Article XV(A)(5) and replace it with language making clear that the only warranties given by Contractor are the express ones set forth in the contract.	Legal	No_Revision	
20	Attach_A	Agreement		Please modify the contract to allow for price and schedule relief for impacts/delays caused by permitting agencies, governmental action or inaction, utilities, railroads, and other third parties beyond Contractor's reasonable control. While in some instances, these same parties may also be beyond SCDOT's control, either Contractor or SCDOT must shoulder the risk of such parties impacting the project. If SCDOT takes this risk, SCDOT will only pay for these impacts if they happen (via equitable adjustments to the Contract Price), whereas if Contractor takes these risks, SCDOT will be paying for these impacts regardless of whether they materialize (via increased contingency pricing). Germaine to this specific issue, our team has become aware of a planned closure of the locks and a corresponding significant drawdown of Lake Marion, with both an unknown start date and scheduled duration that creates an unknowable level of risk to the project. Under the current provisions, both Contractors submitting a proposal are forced to attempt to account for this unknown risk, likely resulting in significant costs to SCDOT. Further to this specific issue, Section VII.A.3. states that, "The resolution of any conflicts between utility companies and the construction of the Project shall be the responsibility of the Contractor. If said utility companies interfere or fail to relocate conflicting utilities in a timely manner, SCDOT may, on an individual basis, consider a time extension for utility company delays when Contractor can demonstrate that appropriate coordination efforts have been made to expedite the utility relocation, and that the delay has a direct impact on the approved Critical Path. Contractor shall not be entitled to additional compensation for interference or delays in utility relocations. Contractor shall meet with the Department's Utilities Office within 30 days of the Notice to Proceed to gain a full understanding of what is required with each utility submittal." As written, only time is available in the event of non-cooperation by the utilities, and it is unclear as to what the Contractor can do if the Utility Company is not cooperating, even with SCDOT's assistance. Again, both Contractors submitting a proposal are forced to attempt to account for this unknown risk, likely resulting in significant costs to SCDOT.	Legal	No_Revision	Would like to know more about the information you have on the closure of the locks. SCDOTs coordinatio with Santee Cooper did not reveal a project that they were expecting to lower the water levels in Lake Marion below normal yearly levels.

21	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 3	Article III(B)(1)(d) states..."When expressly permitted hereunder, only to the extent so permitted, and except as otherwise expressly stated with respect to an aspect of the work (or basis for a change to the Contract Price), the Contract Price may be added to or deducted from as a result of any of the following…(d) Intentional or bad faith acts or omissions by SCDOT that unreasonably interfere with CONTRACTOR's performance and cause delay of work on the critical path of the Project…" Please delete the phrase "intentional or bad faith" as well as the term "unreasonable" from Article III(B)(1)(d). Please also change "and" to "or" in that same provision. These changes will more equitably define Contractor's entitlement to compensation in the event of a delay caused by SCDOT	Legal	No_Revision	
22	Attach_A	Agreement		To promote a more equitable balance of risk, please modify Contractor's indemnity obligations throughout to include only third-party claims to the extent such are caused by Contractor's negligence.	Legal	No_Revision	
23	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 52	To promote a more equitable balance of risk, please modify the differing site condition (DSC) regime as follows: • Delete the limitations on SCDOT's responsibility for Type 1 and Type 2 conditions in Article XIII(A) and (B) as Contractor should instead be afforded comprehensive DSC relief in accordance with industry standards; • Delete "unanticipated utilities" from Article XIII(A)(2) as Contractor should be entitled to cost and schedule relief in the event it encounters unknown or unanticipated utilities; • Delete the first and last sentences of Article XIII(A)(3); • Delete Article XIII(C)(2)(d) as concurrent delay should not foreclose schedule relief; and • Delete Article XIII(E)(6).	Legal	No_Revision	
24	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 57	Article XIV(14) states, "…..Any expense attributable to such occurrence of a Force Majeure Event shall not entitle CONTRACTOR to an adjustment in the Contract Price, as it is the Parties' intent that these events will be compensated under the Contractor's appropriate insurance policy. The duration of delay to the critical path identified in the current accepted CPM Schedule directly caused by a Force Majeure Event shall be added to the Contract Time." We note that in previous SCDOT DB contracts, SCDOT has allowed for adjustments to the Contract Price in the event that a FM event causes a "substantial price escalation of materials, commodities, or supplies." Contractor requests that such a similar avenue for adjustment be included in this contract.	Legal	No_Revision	
25	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 23	Article III.B states that the Contract Price may be added to or deducted from a as result of a "Change" of "Force Account Directive". At present, there is no provision requiring Notice to Surety of any changes above a certain threshold. We request that a the contract include a percentage cap on changes above which a notice to surety is required.	Legal	No_Revision	
26	Attach_B	Environmental	3. Approved CE Pages 16 and 827	Referenced pages show open water impact acreage. Please provide breakdown of how these impacts were calculated and where they are located. Also, were removal of existing foundations and installation of proposed foundations included in these calculations?	Environmental	Revision	We will provide what was used to calculate the impacts in the enviornmental docuement and this will be in the PIP. No, these impacts were not included in our calculations.
27	PIP	Hydraulics	1. Hydraulic Report - Page 33	Will SCDOT accept the USGS Scour Envelope Curves for this project even though the Drainage Areas are outside the applicable range? The results from the PIP for HEC-18 and USGS produce drastically different Scour depths. SCDOT please provide clarification on which scour methodologies should be used.	Hydrology	Revision	Yes. USGS Scour Envelope curves will be accepted. Exhibit 4e will be revised to clarify scour criteria. Bridge foundation shall be designed to withstand downstream dam failure as stated in Exhibit 4 e 2.2.

South Carolina Department of Transportation

NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
I-95 over Lake Marion - Project ID P041130 - Clarendon and Orangeburg Counties

RFP for Industry Review 2 Additional

Date Received: 4/3/2025-04/04/2025

Non-Confidential Meeting Date:04/02/2025

Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Section 2.15, Page 4	Is it SCDOT's intent to utilize RDM Figure 10.4-J to determine the sufficient acceleration length for the NB Rest Area entrance ramp?	Roadway	No_Revision	Follow criteria provided in 4a for development of acceleration lane length.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Section 2.15, Page 4	Can clarification be provided on where specifically the "stop condition/right turn" is located for the NB Rest Area entrance ramp, and it is SCDOT's intent to begin the acceleration length at that point?	Roadway	No_Revision	Begin acceleration at the yield sign where trucks enter the ramp movement proper.
3	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Section 2.6, Page 2	The existing causeway is on a 0% grade with drainage sheet flowing to Lake Marion and to median stormdrain. Increasing the grade to a minimum of 0.5% will require excessive asphalt build-up being performed during nightly lane closures. The RFP concepts reflect areas of asphalt build-up of 3.5 feet while maintaining traffic. Revision to the RFP is requested to allow the causeway to remain at 0% or reduced to 0.3% minimum as being constructed on other I-95 (MM 0-8).	Roadway	No_Revision	
4	Attach_A	Agreement	Section X.A.5, Page 48	Would SCDOT provide the appropriate mitigation credits to cover up to the maximum impact from the RFP alternatives identified in the NPCE?	Environmental	Revision	SCDOT is willing to provide mitigation credits to cover the maximum impact shown in the NPCE (2.1 acres).
5	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	Section 2.2	Can SCDOT confirm the Dam Failure scenario for analyzing scour is the scenario ran in the PIP "Lake Marion Hydraulic Report" for "Open Dam Scenario" which utilizes a crest elevation of 63 for the spillway.	Hydrology	No_Revision	Confirmed. This was identified as the higest velocity elevation to use for the dam failure scenario.
6	RFP	3	Page 12	Revision to the RFP is requested to increase the Formal ATC amount to 20.	PM	No_Revision	No changes.
7	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Section 2.6 pdf 160 of 347	The RFP requires a 0.5% minimum vertical grade on the mainline, however existing conditions at tie down locations are flatter than 0.5% and will require build up in excess of maximum amount allowable in some areas and potentially undercut existing pavement in others for cross overs with MOT phasing. Would SCDOT consider allowing less than 0.5% in the tie down and cross over areas to facilitate MOT phasing in these critical spots?	Roadway	No_Revision	Minimum grade is provided for new construction limits. It is typical and appropriate to adjust grades at tie-in locations to match existing without "chasing" grades.
8	Attach_B	Structures	Bridge Typical Section	The RFP requires a TL-5 56-inch high single-slope rigid barrier on both sides of the utility window. This barrier is typically reserved when traffic is approaching from each direction. Since there is no traffic on the west side of the southbound lanes, would SCDOT allow teams to use a 42-inch MASH Barrier Parapet on each side of the utility window? Per Design Memo DM0119, the 42-inch MASH Barrier Parapet between pedestrians and traffic is to be used when speeds are in excess of 50 mph.	Structures	Revision	The 56-inch TL-5 barrier will remain between interstate traffic and utility window. The second barrier, between the utility window and the SUP, will be revised to the 42-inch MASH Barrier Parapet.
9	Attach_B	Structures	Section 2.1.1 pdf 164 of 347	The RFP requires teams to "apply of composite dead load (DW line load) of 320 lb/ft, distributed equally to six girders in closest proximity to the utility window (see "Dimensions" section below) for future utility accommodation." Would the department allow teams to also distribute the weight of the parapet walls on each side of the utility window equally to the six closest girders as well?	Structures	No_Revision	For barrier loading, guidance in BDM 12.2.3 should be followed - each barrier needs to be distributed to the three girders immediately under and adjacent to it.

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
I-95 over Lake Marion - Project ID P041130 - Clarendon and Orangeburg Counties

FINAL RFP - ROUND 1

Date Received: 5/7/2025 **ial Meeting Date:** 5/21/2025

						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	PIP	Utilities	R2 Prelim. Utility Report Pg. 19 of 100	Reference SCDOT ITS (TF1) microwave signal pole station. Please advise: 1. Does this system need to stay operational throughout the life of the project? 2. Is the system part of WZITS? 3. Is it subject to the Liquidated damages listed in Exhibit 4d?	Utilities	Revision	Please refer to Exhibit 4d Part 3 and the Fiber Sever Locations document in Attachment B. Anything between the sever locations will not be considered in conflict with the project as long as all the criteria stated in the exhibit are met. SCDOT will fix the typo for the title page of 4d Part 3.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	Pg. 1	The RFP Scope states "The Contractor shall coordinate with all utility companies if their proposed design or construction requires the relocation of utilities either due to a physical conflict with the proposed work or due to crane safety clearances. The contractor shall provide utility coordination in accordance with the requirements of the Agreement for all project locations." Can the Department please clarify/define a "physical" conflict? If there is no direct/physical conflict and can be mitigated with other normally accepted protect-in-place measures, will the utility be allowed to remain as is. Or, is the expectation of the Department and/or utility, specifically related to the in-contract utilities, that regardless the utilities shall be relocated.	Utilities	No_Revision	Please refer to SCDOT's Utility Accommodation Manual. It is not SCDOT's intent to relocate utilities without an evaluation of all reasonable means of accommodation having been considered as part of the design. In regards to the in-contract referenced utility, while the process may appear to require relocation or a specific accommodation, please be cognizant that this is in reference to Act 36 and the accommodation for that process only. Final plans along with industry utility coordination practices will determine the actual accommodations or adjustments as warranted.
3	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	Pg. 1	Following up to Question 59 in the first round of NCQs. "Please provide a status update for project-specific specifications, requirements, design, and details regarding the in-contract utilities for this project."	Utilities	Revision	The Act 36 package for Town of Santee is in process of signatures. Once executed, the RFP will be ammended to include the information the Contractor will need to implement post-award. No other in-contract utility relocations are included.
4	PIP	Utilities	Pg. 91	The utility technical provisions and utility attachments are lacking important information related to the proposed 24" waterline. Of particular concern is the absence of construction and maintenance access requirements for the 24-inch waterline—which is highly likely to affect the proposers' selected horizontal alignment for both the interstate and the shared-use path. To support proposers in preparing their technical submissions, could you kindly provide a timeline for when these details will be made available before the technical proposal submission deadline on July 18? Ideally a conceptual plan, profile and section view of the bridge to underground transitions would be provided to Proposers. Additionally, please specify if a "utility window" would be required off the bridges and if the proposed utility could be under the shared use path.	Utilities	No_Revision	Proposers are only required to implement the means of accommodation of this proposed water line on the bridge as stated in the RFP. No further information will be provided in regards to this proposed utility as it will be a future installation by others under encroachment permit. Construction of this water line is not anticipated to occur until after this bridge replacement project is completed.
5	PIP	Structures	Existing Plans and Reports	After reaching out to the Office of Bridge Management (OBM), we still have some information missing that will help close the information gap regarding the existing bridges. In coordination with the OBM, can SCDOT please provide the following documents? 1. US 301 Original As-let plans and As-Built Plans (sub and superstructure). 2. I-95 Bridge No. 2 (Main Span) as-built plans for the substructure including pile driving records. Currently, only the substructure as-let plans is provided (document 1438.315). 3. Load rating and bridge inspection report for the existing 301 relief bridge. Currently, only the main bridge reports for the ex. 301 bridge is provided.	Structures	No_Revision	We have received the requested load rating files and as-built plans from OBM and will provide it to both teams.
6	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Pg. 7	Please clarify if the intent is to provide two (2) utility conduits in the MASH barrier between the utility window and SUP, since at least four full height access doors are required in this barrier which will prevent passage of the conduits. Also, please clarify if the last sentence of the 4th paragraph in Section 2.1.14 should be median barrier or MASH barrier in reference to pull-boxes. Also, clarify if the last sentence of the 1st paragraph should state "each barrier" or be limited to a single location.	Structures	Revision	Conduits are not required in the MASH barrier between the utility window and the SUP. Conduits are required in the median barrier between interstate shoulder and the utility window.

Post Office Box 191
Columbia, South Carolina 29202-0191

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

7	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Pg.4	Can clarification be provided as to what can and cannot be within the clear zone of the shared use path? Can fencing, such as C/A fencing, be located within the shared use path clear zone as the AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities Fourth Edition states that fences can be within 1' of the edge of a shared use path. Additionally, the shared use path must be relocated to regrade and armor plate the embankment slope along the causeway. Will the clear zone need to be maintained while this work is being performed or just in the final configuration after all work is complete?	Roadway	Revision	Comply with the referenced guide but provide distance greater than 1' where room is available. Provide clearzone for the SUP in all stages of construction.
8	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	Pg. 1	Please provide the longitudinal limits of the armor plating along the causeway. Specifically, provide direction in areas adjacent to existing I-95 SB main and relief bridges.	Structures	Revision	At bridge ends on the causeway, the longitudinal limit of bridge-end-riprap is defined as 30-feet back along the causeway from the beginning / end of bridge. Armoring of the causeway embankment per the SUP detail in Attachement B shall extend from bridge-end-riprap of the relief bridge to bridge-end-riprap of the main bridge. This will be clarified in 4b Section 2.1.23.
9	PIP	Roadway	Conceptual Roadway Plans	Can clarification be provided regarding any required work that needs to be done on Bass Drive where the shared-use path ties into the existing road? On Bass Drive, concept Alt B shows a relocated driveway, Alt C and C-2 show a cul-de-sac, and Alt A shows no additional work. Similarly, will any work be required at the end of St. Paul Road?	PM	Revision	Clarification will be provided if anything is to be done at these locations.
10	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Pg. 4	Currently there are bollards preventing motor vehicle traffic from accessing the old US 301 alignment. Will similar measures be required to prevent motor vehicle traffic from accessing the new shared-use path? Please provide termination detail requirements, including location, for the SUP to Bass Drive and St. Paul Road.	Roadway	Revision	A revision will be made to require bollards or other means to prevent vehicular traffic onto the shared use path portion of the bridge.
11	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	Pg. 2	Is the 10-year storm event appropriate for designing pipes crossing the SUP? Should they be designed to limit HW/D to 1.2 as well?	Hydrology	Revision	Pipes crossing SUP shall meet roadway drainage criteria.
12	PIP	Pavement	Additional Pavement Information	Follow-up regarding the response to question 19 from the first round of NCQs about the full depth patch pavement for the pedestrian pathway, we appreciate the supplementary pavement investigation provided. However, this investigation did not include details on the pedestrian pathway on the causeway. Additionally, the second part of our question remains unanswered. Could you please provide information on the existing pavement structure of the pedestrian pathway? We also need the unit rate and anticipated quantity for the full depth patching of the pedestrian pathway. Currently, Section 401 in Exhibit 5 specifies a pavement patching unit rate of $100 per SY beyond the 1000 SY of full depth pavement patching required in our proposal. Please confirm if this rate and quantity is inclusive of the pedestrian pathway full-depth patching.	Pavement	Revision	We do not plan to obtain any additional information for the pedestrian path since we are specifying the mill and overlay thicknesses. The pavement patching quantity and unit rate are inclusive of the pedestrian path and the total quantity will be increased to 1500 sy.
13	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	Pg. 11	Following up to Question 14 of the second round of NCQs. Please provide a status update on the direction for the removal of the sign structures on top of the existing spans along the Ex. 301 bridge.	PM	No_Revision	Currently we are coordinating with Santee Cooper Country and we will provide clarity on what happens with the sign. It will be the sign owner that will remove the sign if they wish to keep.
14	Attach_B	Environmental	CE Document	Following up to Question 29 asked in Round 1 of NCQs, can the SCDOT provide the raw data files of the sonar data from the firm that performed the survey? The figures provided in the Environmental Report are great information, but looking for a way to view and zoom into the figures with high resolution.	Environmental	No_Revision	We are inquiring with the underwater archaeological firm to see about transferring the files. We will keep the teams posted on availability.

15	Attach_A	Agreement	IV.A.(2) Pg. 27 of 96	Can bridge demolition be part of final completion if contractor meets all substantial completion criteria as mentioned in the Article IV.A.(2) paragraph? Please consider allowing bridge demolition as part of final completion.	Construction	Revision	Yes, we will revise to allow demo during final completion assuming all other elements of substaintial completion are met. For example, demo can have no impacts to traveling public and all construction on new bridge and roadway is completed in accordance with RFC plans.
16	Attach_A	Agreement	II.K.1 & 2 Pg. 18 of 96	Subject: Request for Re-Evaluation of Agreement Section II. K.1 and K.2 Regarding Alignment Considerations Background: Section 3.8 of the RFP indicates that, “Any design that modifies the permanent horizontal alignment is required to be an ATC….” However, the RFP does not include a specified baseline or preferred alignment for bidders. Consequently, every proposed alignment from each Design-Build Team is treated as an ATC (i.e., “universal ATC” status or treatment). Under Section K.1 of the Agreement, the Contractor is effectively precluded from obtaining additional time or compensation for any delays or cost impacts arising from the design or implementation of an alignment-related ATC. Furthermore, Section K.2 stipulates that, if an approved ATC cannot meet one or more of the conditions or restrictions set forth by SCDOT, the Contractor must revert to the baseline contractual requirements without relief for any associated impacts. Issue: Because all possible alignments must be submitted as an ATC, there is no practical “standard” alignment from which to deviate. This universal ATC condition places an extraordinary risk on the Design-Build Teams, requiring them to absorb any unforeseen issues, despite the absence of a baseline alignment. Request: We respectfully request that SCDOT re-evaluate Section K.1 and K.2 of the Agreement as applied to alignment-related ATCs. Specifically: 1. Potential for Equitable Adjustments – Consider providing a mechanism for equitable time or cost adjustments when legitimate, project-specific circumstances arise from the fact that, due to the absence of a baseline alignment, all proposed alignments must be submitted as an ATC. An example mechanism would be as follows: a. Reference Alignment: Define a notional or conceptual corridor that serves as a “reference” for scheduling and cost. If the Contractor’s alignment proposal stays within reference limits, any unexpected scope change, regulatory constraint, or project-specific event that materially alters the feasibility or cost of that alignment could be eligible for consideration under an equitable adjustment clause.	Legal	No_Revision	No changes are planned to this section.
Continuation of 16				b. Alignment Impact Review: When alignment-related issues arise (e.g., a newly discovered site condition, a late regulatory requirement, or a design change mandated by SCDOT), the Contractor would submit a written request detailing the impacts to cost and/or time. SCDOT would review whether this impact was genuinely unforeseeable or outside the Contractor’s control and whether it results from universal ATC treatment—rather than from the Contractor’s own actions. c. Process for Alignment Adjustments: Distinguish alignment-based adjustments (triggered by factors linked to the absence of a baseline alignment) from ordinary change orders. Include a clear submittal and review timeline, designating specific SCDOT personnel or panels to evaluate such requests expeditiously. d. Set Standard Criteria for Relief: Outline required justification (e.g., demonstration of good-faith design efforts, documentation of cost impacts tied to a newly discovered constraint). If SCDOT concurs that the impact flows from universal ATC status, the Agreement would authorize a time and/or cost adjustment. 2. Reversion to Contract Requirements – Consider revising the requirement that Contractors must revert to an unspecified “default alignment” without compensation if an approved ATC proves infeasible through no fault of the Contractor.	Legal		

ADDITIONAL QUESTION FROM 5/21 NCQ MEETING							
1	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Section 2.1.4, pdf 171 of 352	DM0108 mandates both fully continuous span and simple span designs; RFP states "...design concrete girders using the concrete tensile stress limts for "severe corrosive conditions" in accordance with AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications Table 5.9.2.3.2b-1." However, AASHTO LRFD BDS C5.12.3.3.6 states "Tensile stresses under service limit state loadings may occur at the top of the girder near interior supports. This region of the girder is not a precompressed tensile zone, so there is not an applicable tensile stress limit in Table 5.9.2.3.2b-1." Will SCDOT please provide a tensile stress limit for the top of girder near interior supports for continuous span designs?	Structures	Revision	Use the same concrete tensile stress limit as AASHTO specifies for the precompressed tensile zone, for the entire girder. This will be clarified. Better control of concrete cracking at the service limit was the desire with the respect to the AASHTO Guide Specification for service life design, under the assumption that girder ends may be exposed to deicing salts at leaking expansion joints, over the life of the structure. Requirement will be revised to use the moderate corrosion stress limit in Table 5.9.2.3.2b-1.

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
I-95 over Lake Marion - Project ID P041130 - Clarendon and Orangeburg Counties

FINAL RFP - ROUND 2 (Addendum #3)

Date Received: 6/19/2025 **Meeting Date:** 6/25/2025

						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	Pg. 65	Section 401: Full Depth Asphalt Pavement Patching requires 1500 square yards of full depth asphalt pavement patching to be performed. However, the uniform depth of patching is not provided. Please specify the depth of patching or consider changing the unit price to Ton.	Construction	Revision	Exhibit 5 will be updated to reflect 6" uniform depth for full depth patching.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	Paragraph (33) pdf page 244	RFP states, "For the existing bridges over Lake Marion, entirely remove and dispose of existing footings and foundation seals at interior bents / piers. Remove existing piles to a depth of 2-feet below the lakebed (mudline)." Please clarify. Is it the intent of the Department to have all interior bents removed entirely, or just the ones located in the main channel? Can the foundation seals and footers outside the main channel be removed to the same requirements set for the pile foundations?	Construction	Revision	Footings and Seals for existing I-95 bridge piers in the channel, Piers S & T, are required to be entirely removed. For all other piers in the lake, remove substructure to a depth of 2-feet below the lakebed. An existing plan sheet will be added to Attachment B to clarify.
3	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	Paragraph (33) pdf page 244	RFP states, "For the existing bridges over Lake Marion, entirely remove and dispose of existing footings and foundation seals at interior bents / piers. Remove existing piles to a depth of 2-feet below the lakebed (mudline)." The piles extend out of the foundation seals into the foundation above which is above the mudline on the piers. The top of the foundation seals are below the mudline in the areas outside of channel which could require sheeting to contain the concrete debris as the foundation seals are demolish under the water and below the mudline. This would add a significant amount of time and cost to the project.	Construction	Revision	Footings and Seals for existing I-95 bridge piers in the channel, Piers S & T, are required to be entirely removed. For all other piers in the lake, remove substructure to a depth of 2-feet below the lakebed. An existing plan sheet will be added to Attachement B to clarify.
4	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	Paragraph (33) pdf page 244	If foundation seals are required to be removed, please provide details on how they were constructed. For example, was wood sheeting used to the form seal foundations or some other type of sheeting such as steel or a steel box?	Construction	Revision	Foundation seals are required to be entirely removed at existing piers S & T (I-95 bridges) only. Elsewhere, removal limits are to a depth of 2-feet below the mudline. Seals were poured concrete and underwater inspection report states seals "typically exhibit medium to soft concrete hardness". No details of how they were constructed are available.
5	Attach_A	Agreement	Section IV.A.2 pdf page 78	Clarify if Agreement Section XII. Demolition, Removal & Disposal of Structures will be included in the "Project Close-out Activities". RFP states "Project Close-out Activities" may include this section. May is abgiguous language and clarification is requested for project scheduling purposes.	Construction	No_Revision	Some demolition may occur prior to Substantial Completion, however, the remainder of any demolition activities may/can occur after Substantial Completion. Demolition is not a requirement to achieve Substantial Completion.
6	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f	Geotechnical	The planned structures will be founded on drilled shafts within the Eocene Santee Limestone and underlying Undifferentiated Eocene. The primary path of earthquake energy transfer to the structure is expected to be from these Tertiary strata through the drilled shafts to the bridge structure. Has The Department considered whether H and V*sH values based on the profile condition at the structure may better characterize the seismic frequency content? The softer and scour-able overburden soils are not expected to meaningfully affect the earthquake energy or frequency content.	Geotechnical	No_Revision	Yes. Use the ADRS curves provided in the RFP.

Post Office Box 191
Columbia, South Carolina 29202-0191

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

7	PIP	Geotechnical	Geotechnical Baseline Report	The Geotechnical Baseline report states that the nearby 500-ft deep geophysical test from the I-95 and US301 interchange project was relied on for development of the project ADRS parameters, specifically the depth to B/C boundary (H) and the weighted average shear wave velocity to depth H. That test record shows upper the strata, about +85-ft to -25-ft, has a shear wave velocity above the B/C boundary value; below this to the test termination at 500-ft the Vs measured a generally consistent Vs between 1500 and 2000 ft/sec. Due to the age, stiffness, and fabric of the deeper strata, has The Department considered whether using the soil column value of 577 ft best represents the frequency content of the seismic soil response, notwithstanding the typical definition in GDM Section 12.4?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	Yes. Use the ADRS curves provided in the RFP.
8	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f	SC Seismic ADRS Curve pdf page 204	The lower limit of TNH shown in the ADRS Curve Table on page 204 is 0.31, but if the 4H/V formula (shown in the table) is used, the calculated number is 1.28. Please clarify what lower limit of TNH is to be used.	Geotechnical	No_Revision	The lower limit is 0.31 as shown in the provided ADRS curve. The calculations consider both the Simplified Procedure and Successive 2-Layer Approach to provide a range for TNH.
9	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f	SC Seismic ADRS Curve pdf page 205	The RFP Exhibit 4f provides the ADRS curves for the project. It also provides the calculated natural period of the soil column. The ADRS curves are considered final. Based on the design team's evaluation, the structure configuration, and the final seismic soil-structure interaction (including SSL softening effects), may the natural period of the soil column TNH range be revised from that listed in the RFP to best represent the site condition?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	No. Use the ADRS curves provided in the RFP. Note that the period of the earthquake does not coincide with the natural period of the soil column.
10	PIP	Hydraulics	Existing Pipe Hydraulic Report	Have video pipe inspections been performed? If so, can those files be provided?	Hydrology	No_Revision	These will be provided in the Project Information Package via ProjectWise Exchange folders.
11	PIP	Hydraulics	Existing Pipe Hydraulic Report	If an existing crossline pipe does not currently meet the HW/D requirements, will SCDOT allow these pipes to be retained if headwater conditions are maintained or improved?	Hydrology	No_Revision	This would be considered pipe specific and not a general project wide acceptance. HW/D at all locations shall be improved to be less than 1.5. Please provide specific pipe(s) and locations in question.
12	PIP	Hydraulics	Existing Pipe Hydraulic Report	Please provide .dgn files with preliminary drainage area delineations used in Existing Pipe Hydraulic Report.	Hydrology	No_Revision	These will be provided in the Project Information Package.
13	RFP	3	Pg. 15	Due to the change in design criteria and procurement schedule, please consider increasing the stipend amount to $1.1 million. This is equal to the total amount of stipends that would have originally been paid to two teams if three teams would have been shortlisted.	PM	Revision	SCDOT is discussing and considering this request.
14				Responses to confidential questions submitted on 4/23/2025 and confidential meeting follow up questions submitted on 5/14/2025 have not been provided by SCDOT. Please provide a response to these questions as soon as possible.	PM	No_Revision	We are investigating this and will correct if necessary.

15	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Pg. 3	Exhibit 4b, Section 2.1.4 titled "Prestressed Concrete Girders" instructs proposers to use the severe corrosive conditions stress limits found in AASHTO LRFD Table 5.9.2.3.2b-1 for the “entire girder…(not only the “Precompressed Tensile Zone”). Is the intent of the modification to prohibit the use of AASHTO LRFD Section 5.12.3.3.6, which modifies the required stresses and design approach for the tops of the ends of girders made continuous? If so, would a moderately corrosive stress limit be permissible due to the relatively protected girder location?	Structures	Revision	Better control of concrete cracking at the service limit was the desire with the respect to the AASHTO Guide Specification for service life design, under the assumption that girder ends may be exposed to deicing salts at leaking expansion joints, over the life of the structure. Requirement will be revised to use the moderate corrosion stress limit in Table 5.9.2.3.2b-1.
16	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Pg. 1	Section 2.5 Horizontal Alignment states the proposed design shall be an equal or better safety performance than the base line alignments found in Attachment B 4.I95_AlternativeC2_Reference Data as determined by a Highway Safety Manual analysis. Additionally, Attachment B provides the I-95 over Lake Marion Alternative C2 HSM Crash Prediction Analysis Memo R1 output for comparison. To ensure an equivalent comparison can be performed, please provide the input file that generated the Alternative C2 HSM Crash Prediction Analysis Memo, including the input parameters.	Traffic	Revision	This will be provided in Project Information Package.
17	Attach_B	Traffic	Alternative C2 HSM Crash Analysis Memo	Please confirm that lane widths in the Analysis are 12-ft wide for the entire corridor.	Traffic	Revision	This will be provided in Project Information Package via HSM Input File. Note: the initial utilization of IHSDM was intended to develop a minimum safety baseline for teams to match or improve specifically regarding horizontal geometry. The analysis was tailored to specifically analyze alignnments, lanes, and shoulders. Barriers and clear zones were not included in this analysis.
18	Attach_B	Traffic	Alternative C2 HSM Crash Analysis Memo	For the shoulders used in the analysis, please provide the following; Shoulder start and end locations, edge of pavement location, shoulder cross slope, and shoulder widths.	Traffic	Revision	This will be provided in Project Information Package via HSM Input File. Note: the initial utilization of IHSDM was intended to develop a minimum safety baseline for teams to match or improve specifically regarding horizontal geometry. The analysis was tailored to specifically analyze alignnments, lanes, and shoulders. Barriers and clear zones were not included in this analysis.
19	Attach_B	Traffic	Alternative C2 HSM Crash Analysis Memo	Was outside barrier data included in the analysis? If so, please provide the following; Barrier start and end locations, edge of pavement, offset of outside barrier to edge of travel way.	Traffic	Revision	This will be provided in Project Information Package via HSM Input File. Note: the initial utilization of IHSDM was intended to develop a minimum safety baseline for teams to match or improve specifically regarding horizontal geometry. The analysis was tailored to specifically analyze alignnments, lanes, and shoulders. Barriers and clear zones were not included in this analysis.
20	Attach_B	Traffic	Alternative C2 HSM Crash Analysis Memo	Was clear zone data included in the analysis? If so, please provide the following; Clear zone start and end locations, edge of pavement, clear zone width.	Traffic	Revision	This will be provided in Project Information Package via HSM Input File. Note: the initial utilization of IHSDM was intended to develop a minimum safety baseline for teams to match or improve specifically regarding horizontal geometry. The analysis was tailored to specifically analyze alignnments, lanes, and shoulders. Barriers and clear zones were not included in this analysis.
21	Attach_B	Traffic	HSM Memo	Please provide IHSDM Analysis files to teams to ensure that the same parameters are being met for comparison. We would ask that this request be expedited if approved in order to meet Horizontal Alignment FATC submittal date of June 26, 2025.	Traffic	Revision	This will be provided in Project Information Package via HSM Input File. Note: the initial utilization of IHSDM was intended to develop a minimum safety baseline for teams to match or improve specifically regarding horizontal geometry. The analysis was tailored to specifically analyze alignnments, lanes, and shoulders. Barriers and clear zones were not included in this analysis.

Post Office Box 191
Columbia, South Carolina 29202-0191

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

22	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	Pg. 1	Following up on Question 59 from 1/23/2025 and Question 3 from 5/7/2025 regarding the forthcoming revision to RFP Exhibit 7 to include information the Contractor will need to implement post-award for in-contract utility relocations. Please provide a status to this RFP revision and confirm the full relocation costs is not included in the cost proposal.	Utilities	Revision	The MOAs for Town of Santee have been executed. Exhibit 7 will be revised to include the in-contract work.
ADDITIONAL QUESTION FROM 6/25 NCQ MEETING							
1	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	Section 2.0 pdf 196 of 346	This is a follow-up to the response to Question 11 provided on June 25, 2025. The existing 24-in crossline half-line pipes connected by an inlet at station 5291+00 both show HW/D > 1.5 in the Existing Pipe Hydraulic Report. These crossings are referred to as Pipe 37 (I95 SB) and Pipe 38 (I95 NB). If the headwater is contained within the median inlet for Pipe 37 without surcharging into he ditch, can this pipe be retained? If the drainage area to Pipe 38 doesn't change and no new imperviousness from this project is being added to the drainage area, can this pipe be retained in place with an HW/D > 1.5?	Hydrology	Revision	A revision will be made in exhibit 4e so that only pipes 37 and 38 will need to be replaced.
2	PIP	Hydraulics	2. Existing Pipe Hydraulic Report	Exhibit 4e, Section 2.1 Roadway Drainage states "Adequately size and replace all drainage components that are analyzed within the project limits and found to be undersized." The "2. I-95BridgeReplacement Lake Marion ExistingPipeHydraulicReport" located in PIP/Hydro lists pipes 23, 34, 37, 38, and 56 as hydraulically deficient. If hydraulic conditions are improved or maintained as a result of the project construction, can these existing pipes be retained in place?	Hydrology	Revision	A revision will be made in exhibit 4e so that only pipes 37 and 38 will need to be replaced.
3	RFP	3	Section 3.12 pdf 16 of 346	The resubmittal of Formal ATCs was due on May 20, 2025, however Addendum 1 of the Final RFP was not issued until June 5, 2025 with Addendums 2 & 3 coming after that date. There was a lot of new information in those Addendums and we request that the department consider adding additional non-horizontal alignment related ATCs so that teams may address some items that were not captured in the original Final RFP.	PM	Revision	This will be revised in addendum #4. Three additional ATC not related to Horizontal Alignment may be submitted per the revised milestone schedule.
4	PIP	Environmental	3. Sonar Data	Sonar data was provided which included .SDS files which is the raw data from a side scan sonar system (SSS). SSS data is intended to create a mosaic image of the seabed, which was provided. If the system that was used to obtain the survey was a Marine Sonic, they could have acquired depth information. The DPT (depth) from the SDS is most likely a conversion form pressure and attitude sensors that could produce XYZ right under the towed instrument. You would have an approximate single beam bathymetry, and not a full swath multi beam bathymetry for accurate floor mapping. We request that XTF and DPT files be produced and provided, if possible.	PM	Revision	XTF files will be provided in PIP via ProjectWise. DPT files are not currently available. A bathymetric survey was included within the survey documents so water depth information should be available.
5	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Page 11,12	Exhibit 4b, Section 2.1.23 Slope Protection states "Armoring of the western embankment face of the causeway, in the vicinity of the abandoned US 301 roadway, shall extend from bridge-end-riprap of the relief bridge to the bridge-end-riprap of the main bridge." This is interpreted to mean that armoring is required along the western embankment shoreline along the causeway that bends and meanders from the bridge-end-riprap of the relief bridge to the bridge-end-riprap of the main bridge. Please confirm this interpretation.	Structures	Revision	The interpretation is correct. "In the vicinity of the abandoned US 301 roadway" will be deleted. Amoring of the entire western causeway embankment is required in between bridge-end-riprap.

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
I-95 over Lake Marion - Project ID P041130 - Clarendon and Orangeburg Counties

FINAL RFP - ROUND 3 (ADDENDUM #4 & #5)

Date Received: 7/24/2025

						SCDOT	
Question No.	**Category**	**Section**	**Page / Doc No.**	**Question/Comment**	**Discipline**	**Response**	**Explanation**
1	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	pdf pg 244	(33) of Section 806 says "For all other piers in the lake, remove substructure to a depth of two (2) feet below the lakebed." Would SCDOT allow removal of the existing 21-in octagonal piles completely instead of cutting two feet below the lakebed. Removing the piles entirely would be a more efficient operation.	Construction	Revision	Yes. The Contractor may either remove substructure two feet below lakebed or fully remove substructure.
2	PIP	Hydraulics		Pipe inspection videos only include pipes on north end of Lake Marion. Can pipe inspection videos for pipes on south side of lake be provided?	Hydrology	Revision	SCDOT has provided all that the department has access to. A revision has been made to 4e in reguards to replacement of existing pipes.
3	Attach_B	Hydraulics		Please provide pipe inspection reports including the Existing Pipe Evaluation Results and Recommendations table.	Hydrology	Revision	Will put both existing pipe report and inspection report in PIP. A revision has been made to 4e in regards to replacement of existing pipes.
4	PIP	Hydraulics	Existing Pipe Report and Pipe Inspection Videos	Can SCDOT provide a report or list of which pipe videos go with which pipe? It is difficult to determine which video goes with which pipe.	Hydrology	Revision	SCDOT has provided all information that the department has access to. Match by stationing. A revision has been made to 4e in reguards to replacement of existing pipes.
5	PIP	Hydraulics	Pipe Inspection Videos	Was a video pipe inspection performed for all existing pipes? We are unable to locate pipes 37 and 38?	Hydrology	Revision	SCDOT has provided all information that the department has access to. Will put additional report in PIP that refers to pipes 37 and 38. A revision has been made to 4e in reguards to replacement of existing pipes.
6	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	Section 610 Pg. 83	Exhibit 6, Section 610: Closing Northbound Rest Area During Construction states to "Remove all existing asphalt shoulders adjacent to concrete pavement and reconstruct using one of the options provided in Exhibit 4c, Section 2.1. The existing paved shoulder width varies throughout the rest area. Please provide the asphalt shoulder width to be reconstructed.	Roadway	No_Revision	Design the ramps per RDM typical.section.
7	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	pdf page 172	Substructures section of Structures Design Criteria says "Locate proposed interior bent foundations to avoid conflict with existing bridge foundations". If existing substructure and piles are removed entirely, could proposed bents be along the centerline of existing interior bents?	Structures	No_Revision	No. The intent of this sentence on this project was to eliminate the risk of placing proposed foundations in conflict with existing piles, in case they cannot be entirely removed easily. Blanket approval will not be provided.

Post Office Box 191
Columbia, South Carolina 29202-0191

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

South Carolina Department of Transportation

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS RECEIVED							
1	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c		Please clarify the limits of pavement in the RFP. Does the limit of pavement match the limit of permanent work/reconstruction or the limits of pavement marking revisions?	Pavement	Revision	Eradication of pavement markings shall not be allowed on the final pavement surface. Asphalt pavement requiring revised pavement markings shall be milled and replaced at a minimum depth equal to the surface course for that route.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	Pg. 1	The RFP Exhibit 3 Scope of Services provides guidance for the shared used path connections to the cul-de-sac at Bass Drive and the straight termination at S-14-230. The scope further states excess pavement shall be removed. Please clarify the location of where excess pavement shall be removed. It is unclear if pavement along Old US 301 causeway outside of the width of the SUP with 1' paved shoulders (14' total) typical section is to be removed.	Roadway	No_Revision	Remove all excess pavement outside the limit of the SUP typical from begining to end.
3	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	Pg. 1	The RFP Exhibit 7 Section 2.1 states the list of Town of Santee approved designers are included in Attachment B. During review of the documentation, only approved contractors has been provided. Please provide the list of designers/engineers as well.	Utilities	Revision	List of preferred design firms will be added to Attachment B.
4	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	Pg. 1	The RFP Exhibit 7 Section 2. states CONTRACTOR is responsible for all utility work, including all costs, utility coordination, permitting, design and construction necessary for utility work of In-Contract scope of work utility facilities that are in conflict with the CONTRACTOR'S design. Please confirm contractor is to include cost in the bid for only the impacted utilities of the Town of Santee, regardless of the bid quantities/schedules provided in Attachment B.	Utilities	Revision	The RFP will be revised to clarify. The intent is for the contractor to be responsible for the costs of and oversight/coordination of accommodating the in-contract wet utility work within the contractor's specific design and means to construct the project. The Contractor shall not include the bid or anticipated actual cost of the utility work in their cost proposal. The process is intended to be similar to how ROW services and certain ROW costs are structured. This is intended to occur without need for contract change requests.

Post Office Box 191
Columbia, South Carolina 29202-0191

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