

NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
Long Point Road Interchange Improvements
Project ID P041314 - Charleston County

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Date Received: 10/3/2025

Meeting Date: 10/21/2025

CONTRACTOR						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
24	Attach_A	Agreement 14.4.6	p 113 pdf 175	References within Differing Site Conditions section do not correlate to new RFP/Agreement format. Section B. Relief does not match the Article 14 within which it resides.	Construction	Revision	Will revise in Final RFP.
25	Attach_A	Exhibit 1	p 36 pdf 276	References Section 120 of the Technical Provisions, which appears to have been omitted.	Construction	Revision	Will provide with Final RFP.
32	Attach_A	Exhibit 7.I.G	p 3 pdf 317	Builder's Risk – Coverage required is \$100m or PML, please revise to standard language of "in the amount of 50% of the Contract Price".	Construction	Revision	Will revise in Final RFP.
53	RFP	13	NA	Who will be responsible for Vibration Monitoring if needed in GBR PDF page 36 of 51.	Construction	Revision	Section 107 added to TP 1000
62	RFP	13	151	Please clarify if the intent of the WZITS LDs are the be assessed if the outage is caused by fault of the Contractor or their subcontractors.	Construction	Revision	Deleted Article 19.9.2 and modified TP 685.4, this change will be reflected in the Final RFP.
72	Attach_A		TPA 100-2	Please provide the omitted .sid aerial imagery files that are referenced to the "I-526_Orthos_2d_2022.dgn" file provided in "TPA 100-2 Long Point Survey Files.zip"	DM	No_Revision	Files were uploaded to the contractor folders on 10/7/2025 due to the large size. They are for information only.
12	PIP	Environmental	1	Will SCDOT provide CADD or GIS files for the anticipated permitted impacts and the environmental study area?	Environmental	No_Revision	CADD files for the permit drawings will be provided in the Project Informatin Package with the Final RFP.
4	Attach_B	Geotechnical	p 177 pdf 507	711.3.3.6 states "complex MSE wall, as depicted in FHWA-NHI-10-021, are not allowed." Per this document, back-to-back MSE walls are identified as a "complex MSE structure", yet are shown in the concept plans. Are back-to-back MSE walls considered complex MSE walls for this project?	Geotechnical	Revision	Back-to-back MSE walls will be allowed. This will be reflected in the Final RFP.
5	Attach_B	Geotechnical	p 177 pdf 507	711.3.3.9 Seismic Design states "Seismic design of the bridge structures, earth retaining structures, and bridge embankments shall be required in accordance with the GDM and the SCDOT Seismic Design Specifications for Highway Bridges." The GDM requires Roadway Structures to be seismically designed. Are roadway structures such as culverts, overhead signs, culverts, and sound barrier walls, and other miscellaneous structures required to be designed for the EE-I limit states?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	No.
6	Attach_B	Geotechnical	p 181 pdf 511	TP Table 711-3 provides a Deliverable Summary. Are shop drawings only required for MSE Wall ERS types or for all ERS types?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	Shop drawings are required for all ERS types. The first sentence in Section 711.5 states that the table is not intended to be all-inclusive.
7	Attach_B	Geotechnical	1	TPA 711-3 Three-point ADRS curve indicates that the Natural Period of the Soil Column overlaps with the period of the SEE seismic event (T'o). Verify whether the SEOR is required to check that the predominant period of the structure does not coincide with the range.	Geotechnical	No_Revision	SEOR is not required to check the fundamental period of the structure. The requirement was specifically removed for this project based on our review of the project information.
54	RFP	13	NA	Please verify coordinates of Boring EMB06 in the GSDR, PDF Page 23 of 974.	Geotechnical	Revision	Coordinates are not correct on the boring log and will be revised.
8	Attach_B	Hydraulics	p 189 pdf 519	714.3.2 Bridge Hydraulics - Shall the SCDOT Requirements for Hydraulic Design Studies (RHDS) be referenced to determine the design frequencies of bridges and bridge-sized culverts?	Hydrology	Revision	Will revise TP 714 in Final RFP.



9	Attach_B	Hydraulics	p 189 pdf 519	714.3.2 Indicates a 1-D HEC-RAS shall be used. Can this be revised to indicate any hydraulic modeling software approved in the SCDOT RHDS can be used?	Hydrology	Revision	Will revise TP 714 in Final RFP.
15	PIP	Hydraulics	1	Is SCDOT going to provide pipe inspection data on any of the pipes identified in the file "3.LPR Conceptual Plans Pipe Inspection Labels"?	Hydrology	No_Revision	SCDOT has provided all inspection data that the department has.
35	RFP	13	189	For bridges and bridge-sized culverts that are to be constructed, replaced, widened, or extended over tidally influenced water crossings shall 2-D HEC-RAS modeling be performed?	Hydrology	Revision	EOR to determine. TP 714 will be changes to allow for 2D and other modeling in the Final RFP.
51	RFP	13	186	"Repair or replace damaged drainage structures": There are missing videos for a majority of the pipes labeled in the pipe inspection labels document. We will receive additional videos to assess the existing drainage structures?	Hydrology	No_Revision	SCDOT has provided all inspection data that the department has. 714.3.1.1.18 states to replace all pipes under 36 inches in diameter.
55	RFP	13	NA	Page 1-6 of Draft Hydro report concludes no stormwater management, but leaves open the availability to adding stormwater management. What cases would result in the need to implement post-construction stormwater management?	Hydrology	No_Revision	This is dependent on final design.
56	RFP	13	NA	Page 1-5 of Draft Hydro report: Please clarify, post-construction water quality is only required for discharge into Rathall Creek downstream (north) of I-526. No other locations require water quality? The preliminary hydro report mentions Mechanical Treatment Devices, would Low Impact BMPs be preferred?	Hydrology	No_Revision	Follow SCDOT Water Quality Design Manual, RHDS, and HDB's.
57	RFP	13	NA	Will any additional design data/ design files become available from the Draft Hydro Report?	Hydrology	No_Revision	Will provide information that is available with the Final RFP.
69	PIP	Hydraulics		Please provide all drainage design files, to include: HY-8 files, HECRAS, Storm Sewer Design, drainage area delineations, and all associated *.DGN files supporting those designs.	Hydrology	No_Revision	Will provide information that is available with the Final RFP.
70	PIP		Pipe Inspection Info	Please provide all available video and pipe inspections for the existing pipes.	Hydrology	No_Revision	SCDOT has provided all inspection data that the department has.
71	Attach_A		p. 518 / 660 TP 714	Section 714.3.1.1.18 states " <i>Implement the alternatives as directed in appendix C of the 'Preliminary Hydro Report'...</i> " The Preliminary Hydro Report addresses an existing 9' x 5' RCBC with a post-developed HW/D greater than the existing HW/D >1.2. The recommendation in Appendix C is to replace the 9' x 5' RCBC with an 11'x5' RCBC to meet HW/D of 1.2. Is it the SCDOT's intent to replace this RCBC?	Hydrology	Revision	TP 714 will be revised in the Final RFP.
71	Attach_A		p. 518 / 660 TP 714	Section 714.3.1.1.18 states "Pipes or culverts required for final design within the scope of work (exhibit 3) and project limits excluding rehab limits are required to be repaired or replaced. Please clarify the intent as there is no Scope of Work (Exhibit 3) in this document, and there are no defined rehab limits.	Hydrology	Revision	Revisions will be made to clarify in the Final RFP.
72	Attach_A		p. 518 / 660 TP 714	Section 714.3.1.1.18 states " <i>Replace pipes under 36 inches in diameter that are recommended to be retained and extended.</i> " Please clarify whether or not all pipes under 36 inches in diameter are to be replaced within our project limits. The Appendix C recommendations contradict this statement.	Hydrology	Revision	Revisions will be made in the Final RFP to clarify that all culverts under 36 inches in diameter will be replaced that are impacted by final design within project limits.



25	Attach_A	Agreement 1.2.b-c	p 3 pdf 65	(c) Proposal Commitments is in order of precedence after general (b) Response to Request for Proposals. This seems to deviate from the intent of the Proposal Commitments, which are intended to be a distillation, and higher level of, the commitments made in the Response to Request for Proposals. The Technical Proposal Narrative includes discussion regarding approach to the project, which must be dynamic and adapt to challenges during progression of the project. The Technical Proposal Narrative precedence should follow the Proposal Commitments, which are meant to be firm.	Legal	No_Revision	No revision. Direct attention to last two paragraphs of Section 1.2.2 which states the higher quality, more stringent standards, etc. in SCDOT's opinion will resolve any potential conflict.
26	Attach_A	Agreement 1.2.1	p 3 pdf 66	References "Contract Documents shall mean Documents listed in this Section 1.2" then references "Responses to Request for Proposals" in 1.2.b, which is the sole reference to this term in the RFP document. Should there be further clarification regarding what this includes, e.g. Technical Proposal, Cost Proposal, Clarifications?	Legal	No_Revision	No revision. This generic term is inclusive of all written responses submitted in response to this request for proposals.
27	Attach_A	Agreement 13.2.1.4	p 93 pdf 155	"Invoices for premiums for bonds and insurance for NTP Work shall comply with the provisions of Section 13.3.3.4." Should this reference 13.3.3.2?	Legal	Revision	Will revise in Final RFP.
28	Attach_A	Agreement 13.3.3.2	p 98 pdf 160	Please revise to more closely match Standard Specifications 103.11.2, as follows: "Invoices for premiums for bonds and insurance for NTP Work shall be a 3.0% of the total Contract amount, or bond and insurance premiums actually paid, whichever is greater, payable as part of the first Pay Request following NTP."	Legal	No_Revision	No revision. This section is intended to vary from Standard Specification 103.11.2.
29	Attach_A	Agreement 7.3	p 60 pdf 122	Issuance of NTP – references multiple "Preliminary" plans "required in relation to the NTP". No corresponding definitions for the Preliminary plans could be located in the document.	Legal	Revision	Preliminary in this context is self-explanatory. Will revise to lowercase "p" in the Final RFP.
30	Attach_A	Agreement 7.4	p 60 pdf 123	Issuance of NTP – states "The following are required in relation to NTP:" in reference to 7.3(a) thru (n). Relative to NTP how?	Legal	No_Revision	No revision. This provision is self-explanatory.
31	Attach_A	Agreement 19.5.1	p 139 pdf 201	Liquidated Damages for Payroll Reporting – What is the amount of the Liquidated Damages referenced in this section?	Legal	Revision	This provision will be deleted and changed to "Reserved" in the Final RFP.



66	RFP	13	88	RFP, Design Build Agreement, Article 12, Section 12.1.1 (a) [Page 150 of 660] requires Design Work to be (i) designed in accordance with Good Industry Practice and in such a manner that the Project is constructible as designed (ii) the Construction Work shall be free of Defects, (iii) all Work shall be free of Deviations, changes, modifications, alterations or exceptions from applicable Technical Provisions that have not been approved, in writing, by SCDOT; and (iv) all Work shall be fit for use for the purposes, objectives, functions, uses, and requirements set forth in or reasonably inferred from the Contract Documents. Exhibit 1 (Page 285 of 660) defines “Work” as all work required under the Contract Documents, including all design and engineering work. SCDOT’s requirement that the design work be fit for use for the purposes, objectives, functions, uses and requirements set forth or reasonably inferred from the Contract Documents elevates the standard of care for design work above Good Industry Practice (i.e. reasonable skill and care to be exercised that aligns with industry peers) to a level of uninsurable risk not based upon negligent performance. Will SCDOT modify the language as follows: a. The Design Work shall be...(iv) all Work shall be fit for use for the purposes, objectives, functions, uses, and requirements set forth in or reasonably inferred from in accordance with the Contract Documents.	Legal/PM	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make this change. This provision is insurable as it restates one of the definitions of the standard of care.
52	RFP	13	110	Would it be possible to obtain a copy of the design assumptions and pavement design calculations included in the RFP document?	Pavement	Revision	Temporary pavement design will be revised in the Final RFP.
64	RFP	13	110	If it is the intention to overlay all of the PCCP with HMA can the diamond grinding finish be omitted from the PCCP?	Pavement	No_Revision	No, diamond grinding cannot be omitted.
65	Attach_B	Pavement	p 113 pdf 443	Does SCDOT have core or FWD data for the existing shoulders on I-526?	Pavement	No_Revision	We have limited outside shoulder data only.
67	Attach_A		p. 440 / 660 TP 400	TP 400.3.1.2 provides two options for new interstate asphalt mainline East of Exit 28. Option A includes a 25-inch thick pavement section (including GAB) with a Structural Number of 7.3, Option B includes a 16-inch pavement section with a Structural Number of 5.8. Can SCDOT provide clarification for the difference in section thickness and structural number for these two options? And is there a minimum Structural Number that pavement in this area that the design is required to meet?	Pavement	Revision	The designs are based on the perpetual pavement design theory and SN will vary. This will be reflected in the Final RFP.
68	Attach_A		p. 442 / 660 TP 400	Please provide the Soil Support Value to be used in Temporary Pavement Design.	Pavement	Revision	SSV is between 2.4 and 2.9. See revisions in the Final RFP for temporary pavement design.
73	Attach_A		p. 443 / 660 TP 400.3.7	Please provide the pavement structure for the Wando Port Connector.	Pavement	Revision	TP 400.3.1.2 Will be revised in the Final RFP.
17	Attach_B	General	p 9 pdf 339	100.3.4 Coordination of Work - In TP Table: 100-2, there are projects listed. Will plans or complete scopes of the projects be provided for the two Long Point Road projects to assist with coordination?	PM	No_Revision	SCDOT has provided all information received from the District in Table 100-2. If proposers wish to obtain additional details regarding the two Long Point Road projects, they may reach out directly to the Town of Mount Pleasant or Charleston County. At this time, SCDOT does not intend to provide further information beyond what has already been included in the procurement documents.



18	Attach_B	Project Management	p 30 pdf 360	110.5.5.3 Submittal Review Periods - TP Table 110-4 shows "Varies" for review periods by Other Governmental Agencies and Other Public Entities. Please provided anticipated submittals or delete this contract requirement.	PM	No_Revision	The review periods for "Other Governmental Entities" and "Other Public Entities" are shown as "Varies" because these durations are dependent on the individual agency or entity's internal review processes, which are outside of SCDOT's control. The Contractor shall be responsible for coordinating directly with each applicable entity to confirm their specific submittal requirements and review durations, as stated in Note 2 of TP Table 110-4. Therefore, this contract requirement will remain as written.
20	RFP	2.19	p 15 pdf 23 vs p 42 pdf 50	Stipend of \$435,000 vs. \$390,000. Please confirm amount. Please consider increasing to \$550,000.	PM	Revision	Will revise in Final RFP to \$435,000.
31	Attach_A	Exhibit 7.I	p 1 pdf 315	This references Carolina Crossroads Phase 3C.	PM	Revision	Will revise in Final RFP.
63	RFP	13	68	Based on the scope of this project 13% Construction DBE goal seems high. Will the Department consider lowering the goal to 8%?	PM	Revision	Will revise in Final RFP.
65	Other	Other	N/A	Will the U.S. Department of Transportation Interim Final Rule regarding DBE certification issued on September 30, 2025 be applied to this project?	PM	Revision	Will revise in Final RFP.
74				Per the RFQ, the non-shortlisted teams were given the opportunity for a debrief. Will shortlisted teams be given an SOQ debrief opportunity?	PM	No_Revision	After contract execution, all shortlisted teams will be provided an opportunity to be debriefed.
75	RFP	12	p. 50 / 660 Stipend Agreement	Revise stipend agreement amount to match stipend amount listed in Agreement (p. 23 / 660) of \$435,000.00.	PM	Revision	Will revise in Final RFP to \$435,000.
76	RFP	4	p. 36-37 / 660 Section 4.8	In section 4.8 Weighted Criteria Determination, RFP states " <i>the Proposer's Total Cost to Complete will have a weight of 50, the Proposer's Technical Score will have a weight of 20 and the Proposer's Quality Credit Score will have a weight of 30 for a Total Weight of 100.</i> " The Example for Determining the Weighted Criteria Score shows values of 45 for Cost, 15 for Quality Credit and 40 for the Technical Score. Please confirm that the values for Weighted Scoring.	PM	No_Revision	Confirmed. The Proposer's Total Cost to Complete will have a weight of 50, the Proposer's Technical Score will have a weight of 20, and the Proposer's Quality Credit Score will have a weight of 30, for a total weight of 100. The example provided in the RFP is for illustrative purposes only.
77	RFP	2	P. 9 / 660 Section 2.2	The third bullet under Project Goals lists " <i>Align with local land use plans and projects.</i> " Is a list of existing and committed land use plans and projects available?	PM	No_Revision	A specific list of existing or committed local land use plans and projects is not available. Proposers are expected to consider applicable local and regional planning documents and coordinate, as appropriate, with local jurisdictions and agencies to ensure proposed improvements align with current and planned land use objectives.
95	Attach_A		p. 406 / 660 TP 140.3.1.1.Q	Please provide SCPA design and construction criteria.	PM	No Revision	All design and construction criteria provided by SCPA has been supplied in TPA 112-1.
92	Attach_A		p. 408 / 660 TP 140.4.1.1	TP 140.4.1.1 states " <i>Any anticipated shut down of Mount Pleasant Waterworks waterlines greater than 12-inches in diameter shall be coordinated with the construction schedule for the Charleston County Highway 41 Corridor Improvements Project.</i> " Will a construction schedule for the Charleston County Highway 41 Corridor Improvement Project be provided?	PM/Construction	No Revision	Will provide if/when this is available.
13	PIP	Roadway	1	Is SCDOT going to provide GPK, Design labels, and Autoturn files?	Roadway	No_Revision	Files received will be provided.
14	PIP	Survey	1	Is SCDOT going to provide .TIN file?	Roadway	No_Revision	Files received will be provided.
19	Attach_B	Roadway	p 101 pdf 431 p104 pdf 434 p93 pdf 623	200.3.11.A states "Non-mow strips shall be constructed utilizing asphalt". 200.6.3 and 1000.805 both reference asphalt and concrete. Please confirm the acceptable material(s).	Roadway	Revision	Non-mow strip will utilize only asphalt, this will be reflected in TP 1000 in the Final RFP.



36	RFP	13	95	The Design-Build Team requests clarification on the required design vehicle on all roadways to be used for intersection sight distance, turning templates, and roadway geometry. This clarification is necessary as the proposed flyover ramps will accommodate the majority of the truck traffic in lieu of the existing interchange movements.	Roadway	No_Revision	Use the RDM 9.2.5.2 design vehicle specified.
46	PIP	N/A	N/A	Does the department intend on providing geopak design files (.gpk, criteria, shape files, etc.), if so when will those be provided to the design build teams?	Roadway	No_Revision	Will provide information that is available.
78	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	p 429 / 660	TP Table 200-4 notes minimum grades of 0.5% along I-526 from the beginning of the project to sta. 1426+00. The conceptual plans provided depict grades under 0.30% (including 0.00%) within this range. A note states "grades may vary when necessary to tie into existing grades, but may not be less than or exceed the existing grades", but this note does not apply to the "Begin Sta - 1426+00" section. Can SCDOT provide specific station ranges where grades flatter than 0.50% can be used along mainline I-526?	Roadway	Revision	Final RFP will reflect the following revisions: added * to begin station. As specified "when necessary to tie to existing grades".
79	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	p. 430 / 660 TP 200.3.7	RFP states " <i>Use grade adjusted SSD values where the downgrades are 3 percent or greater</i> " - can this be stated to only apply to one-directional movements?	Roadway	No_Revision	Please clarify the question. As stated, it is unclear if a criteria change is needed to be made
80	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	p. 433 / 660 TP 200.3.14	RFP states " <i>A shared-use path (SUP) shall be constructed along the right side of Long Point Road...</i> " Can the Shared Use Path go on either side of the road, so long as connectivity is maintained?	Roadway	No_Revision	Due to negotiations and impacts to properties this will not be revised. In addition, residential access points along the southeast side of Long Point Road lead to its proposed location.
81	Attach_B	Roadway	TPA 200-3 I-526 Line 3 Line 6 Configuration Schematic	"TPA 200-3 I-526 Line 3 Line 6 Configuration Schematic" depicts maintaining the existing loop ramp alignment for Line 6. The required acceleration length of 1120' will impact the bridge to be maintained at approximate Sta. 1442+80. Will SCDOT allow a Design Exception at this location to reduce the acceleration length, or will bridge need to be replaced?	Roadway	No_Revision	No design exception nor bridge impact foreseen as an issue. Acceleration length at this location shall be based on mainline I-526 DS=60 mph and Ramp line 6 DS=25 mph (see table TP-200-1). Acceleration length is per RDM Fig. 10.4-J.



81	PIP	Roadway	Conceptual Roadway Design Files	Please provide the .gpk file and the existing ground .tin surface for the conceptual roadway design.	Roadway	No_Revision	Files received will be provided with Final RFP.
82	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	p. 426 / 660 TP Table 200-1	Wando Park Blvd is classified Urban Local. Will SCDOT allow AASHTO Method 2 to be used for super calculations per section 5.3.3 of the SCDOT RDM for Low-Speed Urban Streets on Wando Park Blvd?	Roadway	No_Revision	Use as RDM criteria allows.
82	Attach_A		TPA 200-1	TPA 200-1 shows 2:1 slopes behind the curb/sidewalk on Wando Park Blvd, Seacoast Pkwy, and Wando Port Connector. Will there be a clear zone requirement behind the proposed curb, or will 2:1 slopes be allowed at the grade break as depicted on the typical?	Roadway	No_Revision	2:1 slopes behind the curb/sidewalk on Wando Park Blvd. Seacoast Pkwy, and Wando Port Connector are permitted without additional clear zone behind the grade break when fill heights do not exceed 5' in accordance with AASHTO Roadside Design Guide 4th, Ed. Section 5.2.1 and Figure 5-1(b).
83	Attach_A		TPA 200-1	The "Alternate Noise Wall Placement" inset in TPA 200-1 depicts a 3:1 back slope inside the clear zone. Will 3:1 backslopes for ditches be allowed inside the clear zone throughout the project? And can dimensions be provided for the slopes on that inset?	Roadway	No_Revision	3:1 backslopes within the clear zone are permitted as an alternate placement for noise barrier wall, not for all ditch locations. Placement shall be in accordance with AASHTO Roadside Design Guide 4th, Ed. Section 3.2.2, where the backslope is obstacle free. Placement of fixed objects within the clear zone may require protection.
33	RFP	13	32	Section 5.6.1 states that SCDOT makes no guarantees or warranties when the delivery date will be for SCDOT to acquire and certify the SCDOT acquired tracts. Section 5.6.3 appears to be in conflict with section 5.6.1 as it allows for schedule relief in the event SCDOT doesn't provide the SCDOT Acquired ROW on or prior to the date set forth on the ROW Certification in the Technical Provision Attachment. Should 5.6.1 be deleted or revised to be consistent with 5.6.3?	ROW	Revision	Will provide the ROW Certification with the Final RFP. If the date in the Certification is not met, then relief would be available.
34	RFP	13	31	5.3.1 (e) states that SCDOT will be reasonable for 50% of the combined costs for all ROW services for Additional ROW from Hold-off Parcels that SCDOT is actively negotiating. Is Additional ROW from Hold-off Parcels referring to property outside the RFP Schematic Right-of-Way?	ROW	Revision	Yes, it is referring to the property outside of the RFP Schematic Right of Way. This TPA will be provided with the Final RFP.
35	RFP	RFP-1, TP 809	p 1 pdf 9 195 pdf 525	Project Description includes R/W acquisition but TP 809 R/W is blank. Please confirm expectations.	ROW	No_Revision	All requirements for ROW acquisitions are contained within Section 5.6, an additional TPA was not warranted for this project.
84	RFP	2	p. 16 / 660 Section 2.15	Section 2.15 a.-c. references "Schematic Right of Way" that design must be contained within. Please provide the Schematic Right of Way.	ROW	No Revision	Will provide in TPAs with Final RFP.
1	Attach_B	Structures	p 172 pdf 502	700.4.1 - Can SCDOT please verify the final finish and anti-graffiti coating requirements are not applicable to the Relocated Line 1 Ramp bridge replacement over Trib to Hobcaw Creek?	Structures	Revision	Will clarify that final finish is not required for exterior beams or substructure for the proposed bridge over Trib to Hobcaw Creek in the Final RFP.
2	Attach_B	Structures	p 165 pdf 495	700.3.1.20 – Are interior pile bents only allowed for the Tributary to Hobcaw Creek bridge replacement if a flat slab structure is proposed?	Structures	No_Revision	Flat slab structure type is required for Tributary to Hobcaw Creek bridge per 700.3.1.6
3	Attach_B	Structures	p 164 pdf 494	700.3.1.16 – What rate of corrosion and design life should be used for the sacrificial thickness if the geotechnical report indicates an aggressive environment?	Structures	Revision	Minimum corrosion rate of 0.001 will be specified for steel piles exposed to soil. This will be reflected in the Final RFP.



16	PIP	Structures	1	Is SCDOT going to provide any preliminary noise vertical layout CADD files?	Structures	No_Revision	No. Conceptual structural layout of noise barrier walls has not been performed. The completed Noise Analysis with design requirements are in the TPA 160.4.
23	Attach_B	Geotechnical	p 157 pdf 487	700 - Will Table 6.1 of the SDS be amended to allow for below ground plastic hinging for bridges with flat slab superstructures?	Structures	Revision	Yes. This will be reflected in the Final RFP.
85	PIP	Structures	p. 13 / 16 Conceptual Bridge Plans	A finger expansion joint is specified at Bent 2. Given the anticipated movements, can alternate joint types be considered?	Structures	No Revision	Yes. Finger expansion joint incorrectly labeled at Bent 2. PIP plans will not be revised.
86	PIP	Structures	p. 13 / 16 Conceptual Bridge Plans	An expansion joint is specified between Spans A and B, though Unit 1 is labeled as a continuous unit. Please clarify.	Structures	No Revision	Continuous label is incorrect. An expansion joint is expected because a "kink" in continuous steel girders at Bent 2 would not be allowed to accommodate tapered edge of deck in Span 2. PIP plans will not be revised.
87	Attach_A		p. 487 / 660 TP 700	Since Long Point Road is not an interstate and Line 4 is not a collector-distributor, does OC "I" apply to any of the bridges shown in the concept plans?	Structures	No Revision	No
88	Attach_A		p. 487 / 660 TP 700	Will below-ground plastic hinging be allowed at the interior bents for the Line 1 bridge over Hobcaw Creek?	Structures	Revision	Yes. This will be reflected in the Final RFP.
89	Attach_A		p. 488, 500 / 660 TP 700	For proposed bridges, Section 700.3.1.4 does not allow for the use of rigid pier protection to protect bridge piers located within the roadway clear zone, while Section 700.3.3.2 does. Which is correct?	Structures	Revision	Language in 700.3.1.4 revised to match 700.3.3.2 and allow the option for modified ZOI rigid pier protection standard, to comply with collision force requirement for new bridges. This will be reflected in the Final RFP.
10	Attach_B	Traffic	p 131 pdf 461	650.3.6 Overhead Sign Lighting - If Type XI sheeting is used is sign lighting still required?	Traffic	No_Revision	Yes. Overhead sign lighting is required.
11	Attach_B	Traffic	p 139 pdf 469	675.1 Does the contractor need to install conduit and handboxes for the future interconnect fiber optic cable installed by SCDOT?	Traffic	Revision	Yes. Provide a service box and conduit tied to the signal and conduit to the interstate mainline to facilitate ITS fiber interconnect. This will be reflected in the Final RFP.
11	Attach_B	Traffic	p 146 pdf 476	Will SCDOT be responsible for preparing all documents and analyses required to update the IAR, if impacted by an SCDOT-initiated change request.	Traffic		Clarification needed. SCDOT has an approved IAR and design change requests initiated by SCDOT are not anticipated.
12	Attach_B	Traffic	p 142 pdf 472	Will SCDOT provide the peak hour traffic counts at the proposed intersections, Long Point Road at I-526 Westbound Ramps, Long Point Road at I-526 Eastbound Ramps and Longpoint Road at Wando Port Connector to verify storage lengths?	Traffic	No_Revision	Counts data from the IAR will be provided with the Final RFP. Counts will need to be collected per TP 675 to develop system timing plans.
21	Attach_B	Traffic	P 139 pdf 469	675.1 - The RFP requires strain poles for proposed traffic signals. There are currently mast arms in these locations, will the Town of Mount Pleasant require mast arms?	Traffic	No_Revision	No new mast arm installations have been identified at this time. Revisions may be forthcoming in regards to existing mast arms. Impacts to the newly installed mast arms at Long Point Road and Wando Park Blvd intersection should be avoided.
22	Attach_B	Traffic	p 149 pdf 479	685.3.1 - Please add TPA 140 that is referenced in RFP for ITS	Traffic	Revision	This is a typo and will be removed in the Final RFP.
37	RFP	13	147	Provide a copy of the approved IAR Report, IAR traffic volumes, the approved Vissim model, and the Synchro files referenced in TP Attachment 680-X.	Traffic	No_Revision	Approved IAR is in the EA. Traffic files will be provided for information purposes only with the Final RFP.
38	RFP	13	147	Confirm the baseline defaults (driver types, headways, truck PCEs, gap acceptance, etc.) used in the approved models to avoid inadvertent changes that affect capacity.	Traffic	No_Revision	VISSIM, Synchro and other computer models and the <i>2022 Existing Conditions VISSIM Model Calibration Report</i> will be provided in the project information package. In addition, the FINAL IAR with appendices is included in TPA 160.4 Long Point Road FONSI Appendices Combined. Please review this data and resubmit question or provide clarifications after review of models and data sets.



39	RFP	13	146	Define how SCDOT wants the “Failure Date” determined, including the specific metric(s) and thresholds.	Traffic	No_Revision	Failure date will be determined when LOS F is reached. VISSIM, Synchro and other computer models and the <i>2022 Existing Conditions VISSIM Model Calibration Report</i> will be provided in the project information package. In addition, the FINAL IAR with appendices will be included in TPA 160.4 Long Point Road FONSI Appendices Combined. Please review this data and resubmit question or provide clarifications after review of models and data sets.
40	RFP	13	147	For SimTraffic runs, please confirm whether fixed or random seeds should be used and how to calculate the 95th percentile queue length across replications.	Traffic	Revision	SimTraffic runs should be randomly seeded for a minimum of 10 runs. See Synchro de Take the average of ten runs with random seeding at a minimum. See SCDOT’s Synchro Defaults Settings TPA, that will be provided with the Final RFP.
41	RFP	13	146	Clarify the acceptance thresholds for analyses deemed “equivalent or better” relative to the approved IAR MOEs.	Traffic	No_Revision	General intent is to maintain or exceed the Level of Service identified in the IAR but may vary for specific operations. Consideration of operational changes will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
41	RFP	13	147	Confirm the required network extent for system MOEs (VMT, VHT, system delay) beyond the minimum one signalized intersection.	Traffic	No_Revision	VISSIM, Synchro and other computer models and the <i>2022 Existing Conditions VISSIM Model Calibration Report</i> will be provided in the project information package. In addition, the FINAL IAR with appendices will be included in TPA 160.4 Long Point Road FONSI Appendices Combined. Please review this data and resubmit question or provide clarifications after review of models and data sets.
42	RFP	13	146	Provide the Port operation assumptions from the IAR (truck volumes by hour, vehicle class splits, gate hours, routing, etc.).	Traffic		VISSIM, Synchro and other computer models and the <i>2022 Existing Conditions VISSIM Model Calibration Report</i> will be provided in the project information package. In addition, the FINAL IAR with appendices will be included in TPA 160.4 Long Point Road FONSI Appendices Combined. Please review this data and resubmit question or provide clarifications after review of models and data sets.
42	RFP	13	148	Confirm the deliverables list, file formats, and review schedule for traffic operations submittals (e.g., Vissim version, Synchro/SimTraffic files, CSVs, shapefiles, and copies of Revised IAR).	Traffic	Revision	Table 680-1 will be revised in Final RFP.
43	RFP	13	146	Define how “Total Denied Entry” should be measured from the models.	Traffic	Revision	Text will be revised to clarify the model requirements in the Final RFP. Please review revision and resubmit question if additional clarification needed.
44	RFP	13	147	Provide guidance on what specific design modifications would trigger an IAR re-evaluation.	Traffic	No Revision	Generally any change to interchange type, ramp access changes, and changes that alter traffic patterns. Design changes will be evaluated on a case by case basis to determine need for re-evaluation.
45	RFP	13	147	Confirm if ramp metering and demand strategies are strictly prohibited in all ATCs, or if exceptions can be considered with FHWA concurrence	Traffic	No Revision	Confirmed per RFP. Design shall not include ramp metering or traffic demand strategies.
47	RFP	13	139	Will SCDOT provide any existing turning-movement counts for the corridor, or is the contractor responsible for all new counts?	Traffic	No Revision	Existing turn movement counts will be provided as appendix to <i>2022 Existing Conditions VISSIM Model Calibration Report</i> . See the Project Information Package. New counts are required per TP 675 for development of signal timing plans.
48	RFP	13	139	Should counts include truck classification and account for Wando Welch Port gate-shift peaks?	Traffic	No Revision	Counts should include heavy truck percentage and should be performed for the defined times in the RFP.
49	RFP	13	139	Please confirm if weekend counts are required at all listed intersections, including the proposed Wando Port Connector.	Traffic	No Revision	Confirmed. Counts are required as written in the RFP to develop signal timing plan.
50	RFP	13	139	Could you confirm the requirement to collect 15-minute interval counts for the entire 5 AM–11 PM window for weekdays and specified weekend hours for each listed intersection, including the proposed Wando Port Connector.	Traffic	No Revision	Confirmed as per RFP to develop signal timing plan.
51	RFP	13	139	The TP requires pushbuttons where pedestrian activity is observed but does not specify requirements for ADA ramps or crosswalk markings. Please confirm expectations.	Traffic	No Revision	Push buttons are a minimum requirement. ADA ramps and crosswalks are required to connect pedestrian facilities as part of this project.
52	RFP	13	139	Are temporary controllers required to be NTCIP compatible and capable of integration with the ATMS during construction?	Traffic	No_Revision	No, contractor will have ownership of signals until project completion.



58	RFP	13	133	TP requires maintaining existing overhead guide signs until removed, but lacks explicit phasing examples or constraints (e.g., permitted durations when signs can be removed). Any constraints for maintaining signage continuity during staged interchange construction.	Traffic	Revision	There are no existing overhead signs with the project limits. This language will be removed from the Final RFP. Existing ground mounted signs are still required to be maintained.
59	RFP	13	NA	Is there a project-specific sign inventory that shows existing sign dimensions, materials, and barcode numbers for all signs within the limits? If not, will SCDOT provide access to prior inventory?	Traffic	No Revision	There is no project specific sign inventory. All existing extruded panel signs (guide signs and Logo signs) are shown in the conceptual signing plan. Layouts for these signs are in the PIP and sign sizes can be obtained from the SignCAD files. There is no inventory or plan for the flat sheet signs. New flat sheet signs should be erected in accordance with the example set of plans and MUTCD and included as part of the comprehensive signing plan. Example set plan will be provided with the Final RFP.
60	RFP	13	NA	Any constraints that will restrict sign placement or restrict use of outside shoulders? (TP mentions coordination with Ports TP 112 but no specifics.)	Traffic	No Revision	Please clarify. Where on the project are you referring to? SCPA is a partner in this project who the successful team will need to coordinate with, but this project will be built within SCDOT ROW & must meet the standards of design set forth by SCDOT.
61	RFP	13	NA	Are there existing pavement condition surveys (permanent markings condition, existing raised marker types and locations) and a GIS or CAD layer of existing markings to speed tie-in design and removal quantities?	Traffic	No Revision	Contrator should gather this information. Existing marking plan sheets can be provided if desired however they do not contain quantities specific to the limits of this project.
61	RFP	13	127	TP 625 outlines removal restrictions but does not detail expectations for temporary markings in multi-stage construction. Could you confirm required materials, durability, and removal timelines for temporary markings?	Traffic	No Revision	Materials, durability, and removal timelines can be found in sections 609.2.1 Temporary Pavement Markings and 609.3.1 Temporary Pavement Markings of the Standard Specification.
62	RFP	13	125	TP 625 requires T-1 preformed tape on interstate, CD routes, and ramps, with thermoplastic on non-interstate asphalt. Could you confirm how to handle material selection at tie-in areas where interstate concrete transitions to asphalt (e.g., ramp terminals and short asphalt sections)?	Traffic	No Revision	Tape should be used on the mainline, CD route, and ramps regardless of surface type. At ramp ends, tape shold be used around the radius returns to the point where the ramp markings tie to the crossing route markings.
90	Attach_A		p. 448 / 660 TP 600.3.2	TP 600.3.2 states " <i>The existing lane widths for all loop ramps shall be maintained during construction. Other ramps should maintain their existing lane widths if possible; however, widths can be reduced to 12 feet as a result of constructability or staging concerns.</i> " TP 600.3.8 states " <i>On ramps that are open to traffic, ensure that at least 16 feet of pavement width and 6 feet of shoulder width is available.</i> " Which prevails?"	Traffic	Revision	Will provide clarification of ramp width requirements in the Final RFP.
91	Attach_A		p. 404 / 660 TP 140.2.3	TP 140.2.3 indicates SUE data collected in 2018 and supplemented in 2022. Has SCDOT consolidated encroachment permits submitted between 2022 and present day regarding any additional utilities established within the project footprint?	Utilities	No Revision	SCDOT's prep consultant had all utilities in the project boundary re-verify their presence or status for this preliminary utility report and SUE work. No additional information is available.
91	Attach_A		p. 405 / 660 TP 140.2.5	Under section 140.2.5 states " <i>Utility Company specific certified Prior Rights information, if applicable, will be provided as part of TP Attachment 140-1 through TP Attachment 140-4.</i> " Please confirm that Prior Rights information provided to teams via ProjectWise in the Preliminary Utility Report and Appendices is the same information referred to as TP Attachments 140-1 through 140-4. If not, please provide.	Utilities	Revision	Yes, confirmed on the prior Rights. TPAs will be revised to reflect contractual requirements to specific utilities with the Final RFP.



92	Attach_A		p. 409 / 660 TP 140.4.4.1	TP 140.4.4.1 states " <i>The Contractor shall design the Project to avoid conflict with relocated transmission line alignment, in accordance with requirements in SCDOT Utilities Accommodations Manual, A Policy for Accommodating Utilities on Highway Rights-of-Way and specifications in TP Attachment 140-1 .</i> " Please provide TP Attachment 140-1.	Utilities	No Revision	Will provide with the Final RFP. This information will be uploaded directly to the team Project Wise folders, as will all utility information.
93	Attach_A		p. 409 / 660 TP 140.4.4.1	TP 140.4.4.1 states SCDOT has entered into a MOA with Dominion Energy Transmission. Please provide a copy of the MOA and the design plans associated with the relocation work to ensure proposed design meets predetermined criteria.	Utilities	No Revision	Will provide with the Final RFP. This information will be uploaded directly to the team Project Wise folders, as will all utility information.
94	Attach_A		p. 405 / 660 TP 140.3.1.1.A	Please provide Mount Pleasant Waterworks design and construction criteria.	Utilities	No Revision	Will provide as soon as available for distribution. This information will be uploaded directly to the team Project Wise folders, as will all utility information.

