

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

FINAL RFP - ROUND 7

Date Received: 3/3/2026

Response: 3/09/2026

CONTRACTOR					SCDOT		
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	RFP		page 15, TP 1000	In TP 1000 section 109 there is a reference for "SECTION 806: REPAIR EXISTING CONTROL OF ACCESS FENCE". However, that section does not appear to be included in the RFP. Please advise	Construction	Revision	All control access fencing will be replaced for this project; SCDOT does not anticipate repairing any existing fence within the project area.
2	Attach_A		TP-711	Are we allowed to used unit skin friction and end bearing values for the Cooper Marl obtained from published load test data reports and technical papers?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	Use of publised design values for the Cooper Marl would be reasonable. However, the appropriate resistance factors would still need to be applied. Use of the load test resistance factor would not be allowed unless a load test was performed for this project.
3	Attach_B	Hydraulics	TP 714	If needed to address hydraulic spread, can additional scuppers be added to existing bridges that are to be retained?	Hydrology	No_Revision	Yes.
4	PIP	Hydro	N/A	The existing plans for the 9x5 box culverts provided within the Public Information Package Hydro Section references a "Miscellaneous Data Sheet". Can this sheet also please be provided?	Hydrology	Revision	Yes. Sheet will be added to PIP. File 810.439.3065
5	Attach_B	Pavement	118,121	Based on the response to question 6 of the NCQ Round 4, The inside asphalt shoulder can be utilized to carry temporary traffic and a revision would be in addendum #3. no revision was made, is the intent to not allow temporary traffic on the inside asphalt shoulder?	Pavement	Revision	Addressed in addendum 4.
6	Attach_B	Pavement	TP 400.3.3	Based on the response to question 26 of the NCQ Round 4, Rehab of existing ramps will be addressed in Addendum #3. Is the intent to not allow pavement rehab on the existing ramps? Also, question 6, 7, 8, 9 responses in Round 6 seem to indicate there is a change that would allow rehab and using HMA pavement but the RFP does not seem to reflect this. Will it be included in Addendum #4?	Pavement	Revision	Addressed in addendum 4.
7	RFP	400.3.3	pdf page 439/696	The RFP (Technical Provision Section 400.3.3, "Interstate Ramps/Loops and Wando Port Connector") requires ramps to be 10 inches of plain jointed Portland Cement Concrete (PCC) pavement. Will SCDOT require all Ramps/Loops, even those that are currently asphalt pavement to be PCC pavement?	Pavement	Revision	Loops now have alternatives in addendum 4. Connector is still concrete.



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

FINAL RFP - ROUND 7

Date Received: 3/3/2026

Response: 3/09/2026

CONTRACTOR					SCDOT		
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
8	PIP		TP-111.1	The Municipal Agreement in TP 111-1 grants SCDOT the right to improve several of the roads owned/maintained by the Town of Mount Pleasant for this project with broad authority, but makes no mention of structures like bridges or culverts and does not indicate the amount of revisions to their roads that are allowed. From our conversations with the Town, we understand that they are not willing to undertake maintenance of any structures on the roads that they own/maintain (such as Shipping Lane, Seacoast Rd., and Wando Park Blvd). There is also question about what changes to the alignment and/or profile the Town would be amenable to. If proposers were to introduce a bridge or culvert or make significant changes to the alignment or profiles on one of their road within the schematic ROW, is it the proposers responsibility to seek approval for the revisions? Based on the RFP, it would appear that if a third party approval was not able to be obtained, the proposer would have to revert to the previous design that the Town has approved. Please confirm that is accurate. Also, confirm that SCDOT would not be willing to take over maintenance of the roadway if the Town would not approve the revised design.	PM	No_Revision	No determination has been made at this time. A final determination will be made based on the successful team's technical proposal.
9	RFP	200.3.11	TP 200 Page 109/PDF 429/696	The existing I-526 median contains a cable median barrier, but I-526 Typical Sections 2 and 3 do not show any median barrier. Additionally, the RFP section 200.3.11 indicates requirements for cable median barrier, including reset or reused barriers, but does not stipulate where they are required. Does SCDOT require a cable median barrier in this project's completed I-526 median?	Roadway	No_Revision	Location of cable median barrier will be is determined per detail, clear zone requirements and based on teams design.
10	RFP	200.3.4	pdf page 426/696	Can the department clarify the shoulder widths of Line 4? There appears to be conflicts between TP Table 200-3, TPA 200-3, and TPA 200-1.	Roadway	Revision	Clarified in Addendum 4.
11	RFP	200.3.4	pdf page 426/696	Concept plans show a I-526 right shoulder of 10' wherever there is barrier and noise wall, table 200-3 states that right shoulders on I-526 be a total width of 12' please confirm expectation.	Roadway	No_Revision	Shoulder width being paved will be based on team's final design but shoulders should be paved up to barriers and noise walls.
12	TPA	700-7 R2	1	Per TPA 160-5 R1 Environmental Commitment #6 "The CONTRACTOR shall comply with this commitment. Absorbptive material is anticipated as being installed on identified barriers per the Noise Study Section 9.4.1. The CONTRACTOR shall include a parallel barrier analysis for proposed barriers as identified in the noise study to confirm use of absorbptive material on parallel faces." Per TPA 700-7 R2 3rd paragraph under Materials section "For all noise barriers on this project, provide sound absorbptive material integral with and on the interstate traffic face of the precast concrete panels." These two statements/criteria seem to be contradictory. Is an absorbative material integral with and on the interstate traffic faces of the precast concrete panels required for all noise wall barriers, regardless of whether or not they are parallel?	Structures	Revision	TPA 700-7 will be revised to refer to Environmental Commitment language, which governs.



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

FINAL RFP - ROUND 7

Date Received: 3/3/2026

Response: 3/09/2026

CONTRACTOR					SCDOT		
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
13	PIP	Utilities	Preliminary Utility Report Appendix C	Dominion Energy Plans to place Transmission pole #22 inside proposed ROW. The coordinates Dominion provided do not match the PDF plans. Can SCDOT provide the coordinates for Pole #22? What guidance has been provided to Dominion Energy Transmission on the distance they can field adjust the placement of the pole? Accordingly to the preliminary utility report and associated minutes from design build prep meetings, Dominion has approximately 9-10' of movement available and they are to meet a 20' clearzone.	Utilities	Revision	DESC's final plans and CADD file has been received. Will be provided at next addendum.
14	PIP	Utilities	Preliminary Utility Report	Mount Pleasant Waterworks owns existing easements throughout the project area. Mount Pleasant would seek new easements if relocations are deemed necessary. Has SCDOT discussed this potential additional aquisition with property owners? Will any new easements required for relocations be exempt from the restrictions on additional Right of Way acquisitions? An example area would be near the noise wall located on Tract 69.	Utilities	No_Revision	SCDOT does not intervene in a utility's ROW or easement process. The "Additional ROW" provisions apply to the project alone.
15	RFP	RFP 140.4.5.1	88 RFP Addendum No. 3	RFP states "At no time during construction shall the existing segments that are being relocated / adjusted be taken out of service until the new segments are placed into service". Additionally, for pressurized water and sewer main work, the MPWW TP Attachments 140-3 and 140-4 for water and sewer construction include conceptual relocation plans that allow for shutdowns during tie-ins based on the details of how the new segments are tying into the existing segments at the limits of the relocations, thus, do allow for service outage of the existing segments before the new segments are placed in service. Can the RFP be edited to allow for the tie-ins of water main and pressurized sewer main to be allowed during shutdowns as is envisioned by MPWW?	Utilities	No_Revision	This language is included to support a utility owner's requirement for uninterrupted service for reasons specific to this area and project. The utility owner, not SCDOT, reserves the right to determine when and how it's system is to be operated or otherwise affected by adjustments.
16	PIP	Utility	TP 140.4.4 (pg 407 of 696)	NCQ - Round 6 #20; when will Dominion transmission relocation CADD files be provided?	Utilities	Revision	DESC's final plans and CADD file has been received. Will be provided at next addendum.
17	RFP	5.15.4.2	105 of 696	NCQ - Round 6, #26; What is the anticipated timeline for SCDOT to take into consideration an "allowance" for all subcontractor work for dry utility relocations?	Utilities	No_Revision	SCDOT does not pay for non-prior rights utility relocations.
18	RFP	5.15.4.2	105 of 696	NCQ - Round 6, #26; What is the anticipated timeline for SCDOT to take into consideration an "allowance" for all real estate work (purchase of ROW and easements) for dry utility relocations?	Utilities	No_Revision	SCDOT does not purchase ROW for utility relocations.
19	RFP	5.15.4.2	105 of 696	If any In-Contract work requires Replacement Utility Property Interest (such as easements outside DOT ROW necessary for the Project Work), is this excluded from the Contractor Work and therefore not to be included in the bid price? Examples include MPWW's proposed easements for their relocation work.	Utilities	No_Revision	SCDOT does not purchase ROW for utility relocations.



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

FINAL RFP - ROUND 7

Date Received: 3/3/2026

Response: 3/09/2026

CONTRACTOR					SCDOT		
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
20	RFP	5.15.4.4	105 of 696	If any Utility Adjustment Work requires Replacement Utility Property Interest (such as easements outside DOT ROW necessary for Project Work), is this excluded from the Contractor Work and therefore not to be included in the bid price? Example includes Dominion Energy Distribution electric easements for their required relocation work.	Utilities	No_Revision	Dominion Energy Distribution relocation will be handled under the UA between SCDOT & Dominion, as they have prior rights.
21	RFP	5.15.1.1	102 of 696	This could be interpreted that Contractor is responsible for cost of all Utility Adjustment Work, which is incongruent with other utility language in the RFP. Will the Department revise this section to state that the Contractor is responsible for coordination of all Utility Adjustment Work?	Utilities	No_Revision	No language changes will be made.

