

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

**FINAL RFP - ROUND 3**

Date Received: 1/6/2026

Responses Posted: 2/4/2026

<b>CONTRACTOR</b>						<b>SCDOT</b>	
<b>Question No.</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Page / Doc No.</b>	<b>Question/Comment</b>	<b>Discipline</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
1	TP 200	200.3.3	p. 429 of 694	Table 200-2, the REL Line - 4 Directional Ramp was given the Loop Ramp station range. Is the intent to apply the station range to the AADT and not the Route description?	Roadway	Revision	Clarified in Addendum #2.
2	TP 200	200.3	p. 427,430 of 694	Request that the design speed for Rel. Line 1 – Directional Ramp, be reduced to 45 mph. Currently, the design speed per Table 200-1 is 50mph. The existing curve of the existing bridge over the tributary to Hobcaw Creek does not meet a design speed of 50mph. To fully utilize the reduced 4' shoulders and proposed 12' lanes over the existing bridge, without bridge widening, a design speed reduction is necessary.	Roadway	Revision	Clarified in Addendum #2.
3	TP 400	0.3.1.1 vs 400.	p. 442- 445 of 694	400.3.1.1 Concrete Mainline (MM 26-28) calls for retaining the existing inside shoulders. 400.3.6 Temporary Pavement says Mainline interstate shoulders shall be rebuilt prior to carrying temporary traffic. Since the existing inside shoulders for the concrete mainline (MM 26-28) are constructed with the same pavement section as the existing travel lanes (File 810.482), can they be retained for temporary/permanent travel lanes as noted in 400.3.1.1 vs. 400.3.6 (rebuilt)?	Pavement	Revision	The inside shoulder of the concrete portion can be used for temporary traffic. It is likely that the inside shoulder is not doweled and was built with a lower strength concrete than the mainline. It needs to be replaced in the final pavement configuration.
4	TPA 200-1	523 typical sec	TPA 200-1 R1	Typical Section #10 (Rel. L-2523) calls for 4' between sidewalk and curb. CADD files call for 2.5'. Please confirm expectations.	Roadway	No_Revision	See revised TPA 200-1 R2.
5	TPA 200-1	S-97	TPA 200-1 R1	TPA 200-1 R1 provided (1) typical section for S-97. Will updated typical sections for S-97 be provided similar to the initial TPA 200-1?	Roadway	No_Revision	See revised TPA 200-1 R2 for a basic configuration, but use the traffic model as well that determines the typical needed along S-97.
6	TP 400	400.3.6	p. 444-445 of 694	In a prior NCQ, it was stated that SCDOT is responsible for temporary pavement design, but reserves the right to determine whether any potential failure is due to reasons such as contractor performance, etc. Could The Department clarify the performance requirements associated with rideability and rutting for service life performance vs. contractor performance? Is it appropriate to have service life performance requirements for "prescribed" temporary pavement sections?	Pavement	No_Revision	We will retain the performance requirements language in the RFP, as poor ride quality and rutting of temporary pavement are not necessarily attributable to design, but rather to construction. Poorly constructed temporary pavement may result in safety concerns, increased maintenance, schedule delays, and potential impacts on permanent pavement performance.
7	TP 200	200.3	p. 427 of 694	Line 5 Design Speed (DS) = 50 per Table 200-1. From S-97 to Line 5, the conceptual roadway radius (420'; DS =35) does not meet a DS = 50. With S-97 DS = 45 would it be allowable/preferred from a safety perspective to maintain a DS = 45 for Line 5? The Line 5 length of acceleration to I-526 DS = 60 for entrance ramp would meet RDM requirements.	Roadway	Revision	Clarified in Addendum #2.



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

**FINAL RFP - ROUND 3**

Date Received: 1/6/2026

Responses Posted: 2/4/2026

<b>CONTRACTOR</b>						<b>SCDOT</b>	
<b>Question No.</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Page / Doc No.</b>	<b>Question/Comment</b>	<b>Discipline</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
8	TP 140	N/A	N/A	Will the SCDOT allow utilities to maintain prior rights within the limits of SCDOT NEW R/W?	Utility	No_Revision	This is determined on a case-by-case basis.
9	RFP	5.15.2.2	p. 102 of 694	Section 5.15.2.2 states the /Contractor is responsible for preparing, negotiating, and entering into Utility Agreements with Utility Companies affected by Utility Adjustment Work'. Could the Department clarify whether it is the responsibility of the Contractor to 'enter into' a Utility Agreement with Utility Companies? Should the Utility Agreements not be between the SCDOT and the Utility Companies?	Utility	No_Revision	SCDOT intends for the Contractor to enter into agreements as specified throughout 5.15.
10	RFP	5.15.4.6	p. 104 of 694	Section 5.15.4.2 states the 'Contractor shall (b) reimburse (out of the Contract Price or otherwise) the Utility Company for its Utility Adjustment Work within the time and in the manner required by the Applicable Utility Agreement, . . ' The statement 'reimburse (out of the Contract Price or otherwise)' indicates that it is the intention of the SCDOT to reimburse the Contractor via change order to cover the Utility Adjustment Work. Could the Department verify this intention?	Utility	No_Revision	No. The intent behind the provisions in this section is to avoid change orders to complete the referenced work.
11	Attach_B	Pavement	TPA 400-1 Pavement Investigation Information	It appears the provided pavement investigation includes corings on I-526 beginning at Long Point Rd. and proceeding to the east. Can pavement investigation data for the project west of Long Point Rd. on I-526 be provided?	Pavement	Revision	A set of cores taken in July as part of the PCC distress investigation can be shared for the eastbound (EB) direction only.
12	Attach_A		TP 1000 Section 502	The cost of concrete pavement patching must include all items which include traffic control, temp lighting, etc. that add to the overall costs. Will SCDOT revise the price to \$650 per square yard to ensure all items needed for patching are covered ?	Construction	Revision	Updated the unit cost in Addendum 2.



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

**FINAL RFP - ROUND 3**

Date Received: 1/6/2026

Responses Posted: 2/4/2026

<b>CONTRACTOR</b>						<b>SCDOT</b>	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
13	RFP	4	4.1 Page 23 Item 4 Appendix A.4	The RFP list several requirements for the CPM schedule but there does not appear to be a requirement to submit the .xer file for the schedule. Is a .xer file required to be submitted with the proposal as it has been on past projects?	Construction	No_Revision	A CPM .xer file is not required with the Technical Proposal on this project.

