

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

FINAL RFP - ROUND 4

Date Received: 1/22/2026

Responses Posted: 2/4/2026

CONTRACTOR						SCDOT		
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation	
1	Attach_A	TP 714	203	<p>714.3.1.1.19 states encroachment on existing retention or detention ponds should be avoided. Ponds that are impacted by designs shall be relocated or redesigned to mitigate impacts. Parcels 71 and 79 (for example) have partial right of way takes in TPA 100-4 (Schematic Right-Of-Way) which impact existing retention ponds for those businesses.</p> <p>Is it the contractor's responsibility to redesign and relocate these ponds and associated stormwater sewer systems in this area or will these items be included as part of the SCDOT right of way negotiations for the property owner to replace based on their future land usage? If the ponds are the responsibility of the team to relocate, should the ponds be located within the proposed right of way and become SCDOT's maintenance responsibility or will some type of easement or permission be obtained to rebuild the ponds on the remaining parcel and ultimately be turned back over to the property owner for maintenance? The area shown in the Schematic Right-Of-Way plans do not appear to have the necessary room to rebuild the ponds in the proposed area being acquired on parcels 71 and 79.</p>	ROW	No_Revision	<p>See TPA 100-3 for guidance on pond/stormwater accomodations for Tracts 71 & 79. SCDOT's intention is to provide a cost to cure on Tract 71 during the negotiation process. There is enough remaining property on Tract 71 to replace the loss to the detention pond based on the Schematic Right of Way. On Tract 79 the appraisal indicates the stormwater will be taken into the stormwater system of the improved road and it can not be reestablished on site due to lack of available space on the remaining tract based on the Schematic Right of Way.</p> <p>There continues to be additional negotiation which has not yet been resolved. SCDOT will supplement this answer when those negotiations have concluded. TPA 100-3 will be updated as information is made available.</p>	
2	Attach_A	TP 714	202	<p>714.3.1.18 states to replace all culvert pipes under 36 inches in diameter that are recommended to be retained and extended. Pipes within the project limits may be replaced in lieu of being repaired. 714.3.1.11 states to replace 15-inch pipe with minimum 18-inch pipe at all locations where design warrants retaining pipes except for driveways and yard drain connections that meet design standards. For parcels within the project scope that have partial right of way takes, is it the SCDOT's intent to replace the pipes and/or stormwater sewer systems within these parcels or are these systems included within the SCDOT right of way acquisitions based on their future land usage?</p>	Hydrology	Revision	<p>All culverts and storm sewer systems that are pertinent to final design shall be replaced if less than 36 inches and/or non-operational. If the final design doesn't impact the culvert or drainage system, then Teams do not have to replace it. Properties impacted shall retain their existing level of drainage whether that is on the SCDOT ROW or not. Adjacent properties shall not be negatively impacted by the projects drainage design.</p>	



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

FINAL RFP - ROUND 4

Date Received: 1/22/2026

Responses Posted: 2/4/2026

CONTRACTOR						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
3	Attach_A	TP 714	202	714.3.1.18 states the existing box culverts shall be retained with extensions, and additional conveyance will be added if required by final design. The preliminary hydraulic drainage design report demonstrates the existing box culverts are hydraulically undersized, as the HW/D is greater than the recommended 1.2. Will the SCDOT provide guidance on the allowed HW/D for post-developed conditions, in the event that additional conveyance measures are needed, to assist with final design? Will the SCDOT allow an HW/D equal to or better than the existing conditions HW/D?	Hydrology	Revision	HW/D at the Seacoast and I-526 crossing will be allowed to be 1.5 or less. This will only be allowed at the crossing location.
4	Attach_A	TP 714	202	714.3.1.1.18 states the existing box culverts shall be retained with extensions, and additional conveyance will be added if required by final design. Have environmental and right of way impacts been considered for culvert extensions, possible supplemental conveyances, bore pits and extended outlet protection?	Hydrology	No_Revision	The intent is to provide a drainage design that meets RFP criteria without replacing the existing culverts under Seacoast and I -526. This design may include additional conveyance provided by jack and bore culverts or retention/detention methods. A future widening may replace those culverts at the time of the widening project. Most jurisdictional features within the proposed RW were considered for impacts in permits. The JD and draft permit application have been provided for reference.
5	PIP	Hydraulics		The existing drainage survey for the culverts under I-526 and Seacost Pkwy. show the upstream invert, of the downstream 10x5 culvert, is at an elevation higher than the outlet invert elevation, of the upstream 9x5 culvert. These data points indicate there is no positive flow between these two boxes in existing conditions. With the requirement to retain and extend the culverts per 714.3.1.18, has the SCDOT considered these reversed inverts do not provide positive drainage in existing conditions? Extensions may worsen this situation, in addition to potential wetland and right of way impacts.	Hydrology	Revision	The intent is to provide a drainage design that meets RFP criteria without replacing the existing culverts under Seacoast and I -526. This design may include additional conveyance provided by jack and bore culverts or increased runoff mediation through the use of retention/detention methods. A future widening may replace those culverts at the time of the widening project.



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

FINAL RFP - ROUND 4

Date Received: 1/22/2026

Responses Posted: 2/4/2026

CONTRACTOR						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
6	Attach_A	TP 400	118, 121	400.3.1.1 instructs the teams to retain the existing inside paved shoulders and to remove the existing outside paved shoulders on I-526. Later, section 400.3.6 states that the paved shoulders must be rebuilt prior to carrying temporary traffic. TPA 200-1 R1 has typical sections for I-526 that appear to show both proposed and future travel lanes running on top of both the retained inside and outside existing shoulders. Following the RFP, the existing outside shoulders would need to be removed and temporary traffic is not allowed on the inside existing shoulders. There is not enough room to rebuild the outside shoulders without shifting traffic away from the outside shoulders to allow room for offsets, temporary barrier, and construction. The RFP does not allow removing the existing inside shoulders and does not allow temporary traffic on the existing inside shoulders. Can SCDOT provide clarification on the retention/rebuilding of the existing paved shoulders on I-526 and if the inside shoulders can be rebuilt to accommodate temporary traffic?	Pavement	Revision	Concrete Shoulders: 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. This was addressed in Addendum 2. Asphalt Shoulders - Outside Asphalt shoulders need to be rebuilt prior to carrying temporary traffic and need to be reconstructed for the final configuration. The inside shoulder can be utilized to carry temporary traffic, but need to be rebuilt in the final configuration. This will be revised in the next addendum.
7	Attach_A	TP 200	107	TP Table 200-4 states that the minimum grade along S-97 (Long Point Rd) is 0.30%. The conceptual design plans do not contain a proposed profile for Long Point Rd past station 18+32.24, but the existing grades where proposed work is required between station 35+00 and 61+00 are below 0.3%. Can proposers match existing grade for S-97 in this vicinity, or will teams be required to fix existing grades < 0.30% with variable depth overlay on S-97? Adjusting the grades to meet the 0.30% reduces clearance under the existing bridges and could result in less clearance than required by the RFP.	Roadway	Revision	Will be clarified in Addendum #3. Table 200-4 S-97 is RELOCATED S-97.
8	RFP	200.3.4	430/694	Concept plans indicate the intention is to keep the existing I-526 EB bridge over Long Point Rd. TP Table 200-3 requires 12 foot right shoulder at this location. Please confirm if a note will be added, similar to existing bridge over Tributary to Hobcaw Creek, to allow a reduced (6 ft) RT shoulder for this bridge and not require bridge widening.	Roadway	Revision	Clarified in Addendum #2.



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

FINAL RFP - ROUND 4

Date Received: 1/22/2026

Responses Posted: 2/4/2026

CONTRACTOR						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
9	RFP	200.3.4	430/694	Concept plans indicate the intention is to keep the existing I-526 EB and WB bridges over Tidal Creek (near station 1360+00). TP Table 200-3 requires a 12 foot right shoulder and 10 foot left shoulder at this location. Please confirm if a note will be added, similar to the existing bridge over Tributary to Hobcaw Creek, to allow reduced shoulders at this location to not require bridge widening. Existing bridges appear to be 44 feet from face of barrier to face of barrier, with 34 feet of traffic lanes, 10 feet of shoulder is available for both shoulders combined. Please clarify if 4' left shoulder and 6' right shoulder is the intent and modify TP table 200-3 accordingly.	Roadway	Revision	Will be clarified in Addendum #3. The intent is to keep I-526 existing bridges over Tidal creek and Tributary to Hobcaw Creek.
10	RFP	200.3.4	430/694	Concept plans indicate the intention is to keep the existing I-526 EB and WB mainline bridges over Tributary to Hobcaw Creek (near station 1443 to 1445). TP Table 200-3 requires a 12 foot right shoulder and 10 foot left shoulder at this location. Please confirm if a note will be added, similar to the existing bridge over Tributary to Hobcaw Creek, to allow a reduced shoulder at this location to not require bridge widening. Existing bridges provides a 10 foot right and 10 foot left shoulder.	Roadway	Revision	Will be clarified in Addendum #3. The intent is to keep I-526 existing bridges over Tidal creek and Tributary to Hobcaw Creek.
11	RFP	Appendix A.3:d	RFP page 23 of 47	Can bridge construction access plan (Appendix A.3.d) be shown on MOT drawings (Appendix A.2) rather than conceptual bridge plans	Structures	No_Revision	Yes, but a sheet should be included in the conceptual bridge plans referencing the MOT plans for bridge construction access plan (A.3.d).
12	RFP	200.3.4/TPA 200-1	430/694	There is a contradiction between TP Table 200-3 and TPA 200-1 (Typical Sections). Please clarify the shoulder width (of both paved and unpaved) of both Line A and Line B. TP Attachment 200-1 states a 10' paved shoulder is required and TP Table 200-3 requires a combination of 4' and 6' paved and unpaved shoulders.	Roadway	Revision	Will be clarified in Addendum #3. TPA200-1 has been revised and is current.
13	RFP	714.3.1.1.18	Page 202 (pdf page 526)	Replace all culvert pipes under 36 inches in diameter that are recommended to be retained and extended. Is it SCDOT intent to replace ALL pipes less than 36" noted in the tables "Post-Development Culverts and Cross-Lines with Recommend Replacements" and "Existing Culverts and Cross-Lines with Proposed Flow Rates" that are being retained AND/OR extended?	Hydrology	Revision	All culverts that are pertinent to final design shall be replaced if less than 36 inches. If the final design doesn't impact the culvert then Teams do not have to replace it.



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

FINAL RFP - ROUND 4

Date Received: 1/22/2026

Responses Posted: 2/4/2026

CONTRACTOR						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
14	RFP	714.3.1.1.18	Page 202 (pdf page 526)	Cross-line pipes within the project limits which have not been inspected shall be replaced when needed for proposed design. Pipes or culverts required for final design within the project description are required to be repaired or replaced. Can the cross-line pipe be retained without repair if it is found to be structurally sufficient?	Hydrology	Revision	Yes, if the pipe is 36 inches in diameter or greater. All pipes less than 36 inch in diameter shall be replaced that are included in the final project design.
15	TP 700	700.3.2	p. 499 of 694	700.3.2 states "Provide new roadside barriers (guardrail or rigid barrier) at each corner within project limits in accordance with TP-200 and SCDOT Standard Drawings". The existing Line 1 bridge over Tributary to Hobcaw Creek's approach slabs do not have concrete barrier parapets. Are MASH barriers required to be installed on the existing approach slabs for this bridge if the bridge is being retained?	Structures	No_Revision	No. The existing pre-MASH guardrail types attaching to the existing bridge can be replaced in-kind.
16	RFP	Technical Propo	p. 30 of 694	Technical Proposal Appendices 1.d. calls for "Cross sections in accordance with the RDM." Is the TP intended to include project wide comprehensive xsc or just xsc where FATC or other optimizations have changed from the concept plans?	Roadway	Revision	Will be clarified in Addendum #2. Intention is to only have cross sections where it differs from the conceptual plans.
17	TP 700	700.3.3.2	p. 504 of 694	700.3.3.2 (Reinforced Concrete Walls) states "Provide a 2-foot high concrete coping securely attached to the top of wall, in accordance with standard MSE Wall coping (width and attachment details may be modified as needed)". Can SCDOT please verify this is necessary for conventional reinforced concrete walls?	Structures	No_Revision	Yes, that is the intent so that all walls on the project match, aesthetically. The coping could be formed and cast with the wall stem for this wall type.
18	RFP	5	5.3	Currently the RFP indicates SCDOT will buy the parcels as shown in the Schematic Right of Way Plans. It further explains that there are 4 additional parcels that SCDOT will acquire based on the teams right of way plans. There are parcels with proposed right of way needed that are outside of the blue areas shown on the "RIGHT-OF-WAY TRACTS ACQUIRED BY SCDOT" diagram that are shown on other pages within the Schematic Right of Way pdf (an example would be parcel 63). Are these parcels going to be acquired by SCDOT since they are in the Schematic Right of Way pdf referenced in the RFP? There are approximately 8 of these parcels.	PM	No_Revision	No. The blue shaded parcels are the only parcels being acquired by SCDOT along with the Hold Off Parcels identified in the RFP. The other pages are meant to supplement the graphic with the exact offsets and areas being acquired by SCDOT. The exhibits only apply to their designated tracts and nothing adjacent to them, as they legally only apply to the tracts in the exhibit title. Adjacent tracts are not part of the Schematic ROW. To further clarify, there are no Schematic Right of Way Plans, only the Schematic Right of Way graphic. The 4 additional parcel acquisitions will be based on the successful team's technical proposal, not Right of Way plans.



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

FINAL RFP - ROUND 4

Date Received: 1/22/2026

Responses Posted: 2/4/2026

CONTRACTOR						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
19	RFP	5	5.3	<p>There are approximately 15 parcels that are not in the Schematic Right of Way pdf at all but are in the conceptual roadway plans and have proposed right of way. Combined with the 8 parcels in the schematic right of way plans but not blue, that would be approximately 23 parcels, based on the current RFP, that are the responsibility of the team to acquire and purchase. Acquiring the parcels is a cost that can be generally estimated. The actual cost of a parcel is not always straightforward and teams will have to carry risk costs for these parcels in their bid. Would SCDOT consider making the actual cost of purchasing the parcels a pass through cost to minimize the amount of risk teams will have to put in their bid? Scoring could be a better way to encourage teams to stay off of properties versus additional money being added to the bid that may not be needed depending on the actual settlement price. With 23 parcels, there could be a significant risk cost that would need to be included in the teams' bids.</p>	PM	No_Revision	<p>Conceptual plans are for information only. Any additional ROW needed to complete the project outside of the Schematic ROW should be depicted in ATCs (per Section 3.8 of the Instructions) to be considered Contractor Designated ROW or will be categorized as Additional ROW post award. We do not anticipate any Necessary Schematic ROW Changes being needed to construct this project. No changes will be made.</p>
20	RFP	14	14.4.1	<p>The RFP indicates, "A Necessary Schematic ROW Change shall arise only where SCDOT determines within its good faith business judgment that it is not physically possible, including through commercially reasonable design modifications, for Contractor to deliver the Basic Configuration within the Schematic ROW." Could the 23 parcels that are not part of the Schematic Right of Way Plans be considered a Necessary Schematic ROW Change since it was deemed needed for the provided conceptual plans that were developed in general to satisfy the basic configuration? While the teams will try to minimize impacts, it seems like there is an argument that these parcels are needed for the basic configuration.</p>	PM	No_Revision	<p>Conceptual plans are for information only. Any additional ROW needed to complete the project outside of the Schematic ROW should be depicted in ATCs (per Section 3.8 of the Instructions) to be considered Contractor Designated ROW or will be categorized as Additional ROW during design. We do not anticipate any Necessary Schematic ROW Changes being needed to construct this project. No changes will be made.</p>
21	Attach_B	TP 714	202	<p>Section 714.3.1.1.18 states "Culverts under different classifications of roadways must be designed by the highest classification of roadway downstream in flow." Additionally, "No overtopping for design or 1% AEP will be permitted." If the 10x5 culvert under Seacoast Parkway is to be designed for the same criteria for the 9x5 culvert under I-526, is the 1% AEP overtopping elevation for Seacoast Parkway considered to be the same 1% AEP overtopping elevation for I-526?</p>	Hydrology	Revision	<p>The design event shall be that of the highest classification in downstream flow. The 10 by 5 under seacoast cant be designed for the 4% AEP when the 9x5 requires the 2% AEP design event. Overtopping will be based on their own relevant grade elevations.</p>



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

FINAL RFP - ROUND 4

Date Received: 1/22/2026

Responses Posted: 2/4/2026

CONTRACTOR						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
22	Attach_B	TP 160		Special Condition #13 of the SCDES BCM Critical Area Permit requires that the boundaries of 38CH0319 be marked on plans. Can SCDOT please provide digital linework of the boundaries of this site?	Environmental	No_Revision	Yes. This information was provided with Addendum #2.
23	Attach_A	TP 200	TP 200.3.2	In the RFP Conceptual Design plans, the radius for the entrance to Line 5 from Long Point Rd is 460-ft, which would only meet a design speed of 40 mph. The required design speed for Line 5 in the RFP is 50 mph. We understand that these plans are provided For Information Only, but we are seeking to understand if this curve is treated like the radius return of an intersection (and thus doesn't need to meet a design speed horizontally as long as AutoTurn turning movements will work for WB-67 and Sight Distance is maintained). Can SCDOT clarify if this specific curve needs to meet the 50 mph design speed for all horizontal design criteria (including radius)?	Roadway	Revision	Clarified in Addendum #2.
24	Attach_B	Third Party	TPA 112-1	The RFP Conceptual Design plans do not include a right turn lane into the Port from WP Conn for trucks coming from Line B. We understand that these plans are provided For Information Only, but do proposers need to include a right turn lane to provide storage for trucks that are queued up trying to turn into that Port Entrance? We do not see this currently specified in the RFP. If so, can SCDOT provide guidance on how to calculate those queues, given there is not a stop controlled or signalized intersection to govern where the queues start? Specifically, we are looking to confirm (1) the spot within the entrance where trucks begin to queue up, (2) how much time a truck should be assumed to spend at the check-in point, and (3) whether we are to assume that the traffic distribution presented in TP-112-1 "SCPA Special Provisions" Appendix C between the two Port Entrances to be the same in the future as in the existing condition? Also, is there a peak hour that teams should design for when determining queue length?	Traffic	No_Revision	No right turn lane is required. Use best engineering judgement in accomodating the Port's back gate. See approved IAR high level analysis to assist with making that judgement.



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

FINAL RFP - ROUND 4

Date Received: 1/22/2026

Responses Posted: 2/4/2026

CONTRACTOR						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
25	RFP	5	31/5.4	Will SCDOT provide all right of way information from the current acquisitions to the teams including negotiated settlement amounts, appraisals, etc. to help with pricing the proposed right of way that is the contractor's responsibility?	ROW	No_Revision	The deeds have been uploaded for what has been recorded. We cannot provide information for tracts that are in current negotiations.
26	Attach_B	Pavement	TP 400.3.3	TP 400.3.3 provides requirements for full depth pavement on Interstate Ramps. TPA 400.3.5 discusses pavement rehabilitation and mentions to "develop Work zone traffic control design and roadway profiles to accomodate the rehabilitation procedures and requirements identified in ... TP Section 400.3.3", but there are no rehab procedures or requirements identified in section 400.3.3. Since the RFP calls for concrete on interstate ramps (with no asphalt overlay), can SCDOT please confirm the rehab requirements for interstate ramps? Will cross slope correction / build up be allowed on interstate ramps?	Pavement	Revision	Rehab of existing ramps will be addressed in Addendum #3.

