

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

FINAL RFP - ROUND 6

Date Received: 2/10/2026

Response: 02/26/2026

Corrected Response: 03/27/2026

CONTRACTOR					SCDOT		
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	TP 110	15/110.3.2	The RFP indicates a document management plan must be developed by the contractor and that the document control system should, "...store and record all Documents, correspondence, design inputs, drawings, progress reports, technical reports, specifications, submittals, calculations, test results, test reports, inspection reports, Non Conformance Reports (NCR), administrative Documents, independent quality Documents, and other Documents generated under the Contract Documents, including all hardcopy and electronic records." It also says, "...all Documents are to be tracked using a unique Document control number in accordance with TP Section 110.5.5." Please confirm all documents sent to SCDOT including emails should include a Document Control number and need to be stored so they can be logged, tracked, retrieved, and approved. For the document Control Number the RFP indicates it should be in accordance with Section 110.5.5 but this section does not discuss the Document Control Number. Is there any guidance for how the Document Control Number should be developed?	Construction	Revision	Will remove requirements of 110.3.2.D in Addendum #4.
2	PIP	Geotechnical	935-946/GSDR	The two consolidation tests performed by S&ME on samples from borings B14 and EMB14 only provide the Cv data at T50. Can the Cv data at T90 be provided for each load increment?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	Yes, this information will be provided.
3	RFP	TP 714	202/714.3.1.1.18	714.3.1.1.18 states to retain the 10'x5' culvert under Seacoast. Per the existing plans provided in the PIP for the existing culverts, the plans show this 10'x5' as a 9'x5'. Will the SCDOT confirm the box size under Seacoast?	Hydrology	Revision	Can not confirm. Will revise TP to match plans in PIP.
4	RFP	7	203	If the existing bridge on the Line 1 Ramp Bridge over Tributary to Hobcaw Creek is to be retained per RFP Section 714.32, is a hydraulic model required? If so, what design criteria are required to be applied? Will the SCDOT please define the downstream controls for the model for Tributary to Hobcaw Creek (e.g., normal tide, MHHW, storm surge, tidal+storm surge, etc.)? Based on a preliminary model run, the existing bridge will overtop depending on the downstream controls required.	Hydrology	Revision	If retained at or above existing low chord elevation and no adverse design impact, then no hydraulic model required. Modeling required if impacts from final design have adverse effects on bridge crossing(s).



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

FINAL RFP - ROUND 6

Date Received: 2/10/2026

Response: 02/26/2026

Corrected Response: 03/27/2026

CONTRACTOR					SCDOT		
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
5	RFP	7	202	Based on the response to question 3 of the NCQ Round 4, posted on 02/4/26, the SCDOT is going to allow an HW/D of 1.5 for the Seacoast and I-526 culvert crossings. In the event a supplemental pipe(s) need to be added to meet this HW/D of 1.5, will the supplemental pipe(s) also be allowed to achieve an HW/D of 1.5? Will the supplemental pipe(s) be required to be designed to prevent overtopping for the 100-yr storm event?	Hydrology	Revision	Yes. Additional conveyance will be allowed the 1.5 HW/D. Follow RFP and RHDS for overtopping criteria.
6	TP 400 - Pavement	400.3.3	p 440 of 696	Line 1 has an existing HMA pavement section. The RFP requires all ramp pavement to be PCC. This includes ramps east of LPR, where all pavement for mainline I-526 and the existing ramps is asphalt. Per the RFP, a ~90 LF section of the Line 1 ramp, east of the existing bridge over the Trib to Hobcaw Creek before the physical gore with I-526 WB must be widened and replaced with concrete. This ramp only carries 4% trucks. This pavement cannot be replaced with PCC while maintaining traffic on the existing bridge and must be done during the 54 HR ramp closures, which will be very difficult, if possible. Can Line 1, particularly the ~90 LF east of the existing bridge, remain an HMA pavement section with an equivalent SN to PCC, consistent with the remainder of the corridor east of LPR?	Pavement	Revision	Alternatives have been provided. Ramps after gore can utilize Long point road design for new alignment and mainline design for rehabs with exception that surface b can be utilized after gore.
7	TP 400 - Pavement	400.3.3	p 440 of 696	Loop Ramp 4 has an existing HMA pavement section east of the LPR, consistent with the corridor in that area. The RFP requires the new Loop Ramp to be PCC. The AADT on this loop ramp decreases from 10,200 (2024) to 5,400 (2050) with 4% trucks when new Line A is open. ROW and geometric constraints dictate that the proposed Line 4 Loop be constructed with significant conflict to the existing Line 4 Loop, creating an equally significant MOT challenge. The operation of full depth pavement removal, construction of PCC pavement and tying down shoulders in the allowable weekend ramp closure has significant risks. MOT for partial loop ramp PCC construction and maintain 16' travelway also has significant challenges due to grade differences between the new and existing loop ramp alignment. Can the Line 4 loop ramp remain an HMA pavement section with an equivalent SN to PCC, consistent with the remainder of the corridor east of LPR?	Pavement	Revision	Alternatives have been provided. Ramps after gore can utilize Long point road design for new alignment and mainline design for rehabs with exception that surface b can be utilized after gore.
8	TP 400 - Pavement	400.3.3	p 440 of 696	Line 5 has an existing HMA pavement section. The RFP requires the new ramp to be PCC. This ramp only carries 4% trucks. Can Line 5 remain an HMA pavement section with an equivalent SN to PCC, consistent with the remainder of the corridor east of LPR?	Pavement	Revision	Alternatives have been provided. Ramps after gore can utilize Long point road design for new alignment and mainline design for rehabs with exception that surface b can be utilized after gore.



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

FINAL RFP - ROUND 6

Date Received: 2/10/2026

Response: 02/26/2026

Corrected Response: 03/27/2026

CONTRACTOR						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
9	TP 400 - Pavement	400.3.3	p 440 of 696	Line 2 and Line 3 (1391+17 -End Ramp) will carry significantly less truck traffic after Line A and Line B are opened. These ramps will only carry 3% and 5% trucks respectively. Can Line 2 and Line 3 (~1391+17 - End Ramp) have a HMA pavement section with an equivalent SN to PCC?	Pavement	Revision	Alternatives have been provided. Ramps after gore can utilize Long point road design for new alignment and mainline design for rehabs with exception that surface b can be utilized after gore.
10	PIP	Roadway	R1 Conceptual Roadway Plans	Parcels 71 and 79 each have two driveway access points currently - one on Wando Park Blvd and another on Wando Place Drive. Do both entrances need to be maintained in proposers' designs, or is one access on Wando Place Drive (as shown on the conceptual plans) sufficient since the frontage is being taken for both parcels by the Schematic ROW Acquisitions?	Roadway	No_Revision	The existing number of driveway access to each parcel must be provided. Conceptual plans are for information only.
11	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	106 / TP 200.3.4	On TP Table 200-3, the asterisk for Line 1's shoulder width implies that reduced width shoulders could be allowed to fit two lanes on the existing Line 1 bridge (32-ft existing clear width allows room for two 12-ft lanes and two 4-ft shoulders). A sight distance calculation - using RDM section 5.4.2 - for the inside lane results in an HSO of 22.5-ft with a 45-mph design speed, which the existing bridge rail would be in violation of since only 10-ft of HSO would be provided. Will a design exception be approved to violate the sight distance on Line 1 for the existing bridge, or will the existing bridge need to be widened to account for the required sight distance? If the bridge needs to be widened, are there hydraulic concerns about the low chord?	Roadway	Revision	Addendum # 3 to clarify. No design exceptions required.
12	Attach_A	TP 690	161/690.1	Technical Provision 690.1 stipulates that "SCDOT will require partial interchange lighting as defined in section 658 the SCDOT 2025 Standard Specifications for Highway Construction." The previous paragraph specifies lighting needs along the new Port Access Ramps. Will new "Partial Interchange Lighting" be required for the reconfigured ramps at the existing Long Point interchange?	Traffic	No_Revision	No, the intent for lighting is the area indicated by the line and stationing in the technical provision for the new Port Access ramps. The Long Point interchange will only require coordination with Town of Mount Pleasant and Dominion Energy for lighting. No design or construction by the contractor.



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

FINAL RFP - ROUND 6

Date Received: 2/10/2026

Response: 02/26/2026

Corrected Response: 03/27/2026

CONTRACTOR					SCDOT		
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
13	Attach_B	Traffic	TPA 650-1	In the conceptual signing plan provided with the RFP documents, there are overhead signs along I-526 whose support posts are depicted within the concrete barrier between lanes (for example, station 1388+00 RT). There is a standard detail for constructing this situation (805-865-10), however it results in the barrier encroaching on the paved shoulder at each isolated location. Recent SCDOT DB pursuit RFPs (CCR3 for one example) have at times included a stipulation that paved shoulders could be reduced "with concrete median barrier at bridge pier or overhead sign support locations". Can a similar stipulation be added for this project, given the challenges with getting long cantilever signs to span the roadways?	Traffic	No_Revision	Thickness increase should be negligible, no design exceptions are anticipated to be needed for these spot locations. No reductions in shoulder widths at bridge piers are anticipated.
14	Attach_A	TP 809	209	Please clarify the RFP comment regarding Parcel 238 indicating no ROW impacts related to tower relocations. American Tower is situated on privately owned land under a long-term lease. Please confirm whether ROW impacts may still occur, provided the chain-link fence surrounding the cell tower is not impacted (as indicated in the Preliminary Utility Report).	Utilities	No_Revision	TP 809 states "Tract # 238 shall not be impacted in any way which causes the cell tower to become a relocation". Nothing prohibits ROW acquisition from Tract #238, but it is the Contractor's responsibility to provide any necessary offsets required by American Tower & provide access to the site as is currently provided.
15	RFP	5	5.15	Is SCDOT going to delegate full authority to the Contractor to act on SCDOT's behalf with respect to utility coordination and decision-making within the right-of-way?	Utilities	Revision	Yes. With non-prior rights utilities. Addendum #3 will further clarify.
16	RFP	5	5.15	Is SCDOT allowing the DBT to draft its own UA with utilities, recognizing that a project-specific agreement would be better to support coordination?	Utilities	Revision	Yes. With non-prior rights utilities. Addendum #3 will further clarify.
17	RFP	5	5.15	Did SCDOT ensure that UA agreements between the impacted utilities and the selected Contractor was vetted and agreed to during Preliminary Utility Coordination?	Utilities	No_Revision	No. Necessary UA agreements beyond Act 36 & Prior Rights utilities identified in the RFP were not identified during the prep phase due to the agreement necessity being fully dependent on the successful Contractor's final design.
18	RFP	5	P. 104 of 696	Does SCDOT anticipate that the two bid line items will include Act 36 and Prior Rights costs?	Utilities	No_Revision	Please clarify the bid items being referred to, unable to locate based on the description provided.



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

FINAL RFP - ROUND 6

Date Received: 2/10/2026

Response: 02/26/2026

Corrected Response: 03/27/2026

CONTRACTOR						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
19	RFP	5	P. 104 of 696	The previous NCQ 10 (round 2) response stated that the intent of Section 5.15 is to avoid change orders. If estimates are based on unapproved plans, does SCDOT acknowledge the potential for change orders despite this intent?	Utilities	No_Revision	Please clarify the type of change orders the team is requesting feedback on.
20	PIP	Utilities	TP 140.4.4, P. 407 of 696	Dominion Energy has indicated that CAD files for the transmission relocation have been submitted to SCDOT. Please confirm receipt and advise when these files can be shared.	Utilities	No_Revision	Will provide files that are available.
21	RFP	5.15.1.1	36	Is it SCDOT's intent for the selected D/B team to hire a negotiating agent to perform utility coordination and relocation services for that respective utility owner within SCDOT rights-of-way on SCDOT's behalf?	Utilities	No_Revision	Yes, for non-prior rights utilities.
22	RFP	5.15.2.2	37	As long as the Utility Agreements between the D/B firm and utility company abides with RFP and includes necessary language of 23 CFR Part 645 Subparts A and B, can the agreement be project-specific and/or not follow standard SCDOT UA language/ format?	Utilities	No_Revision	Yes, for non-prior rights utilities.
23	RFP/ PUR	140.2.3/ Appendix 1	81-82/ 39-51	Please confirm the Department had discussions with utility owners during the early utility coordination process that Utility Agreements would be between the utility owner and the selected D/B firm, and not with SCDOT. We understand from several utilities in the corridor there is either confusion or that the utility owner will not enter into a direct agreement with the Contractor as mentioned in the RFP.	Utilities	Revision	No. Please see Addendum #3 new definitions that should clarify.
24	RFP/ TP140-3/ TP140-4	140.4.5/ Addendum 1/ Addendum 1	87/ 263/ 165-167	Is it the Department's intent for D/B team's bid to include ACT 36 (in-contract wet utility) costs?	Utilities	No_Revision	Yes. See TP 140 Section 140.4.5, second paragraph in bold.
25	RFP	5.15.2.10	104	Is it the Department's intent for D/B's team to include prior rights dry utility costs if D/B team is performing some or all of that utility owner's relocations?	Utilities	No_Revision	Yes. Follow UAM, including SCDOT Form 3068-B. No. Any prior rights dry utility relocations will be paid through the UA between SCDOT & the utility. Any Utility Adjustment Work associated with prior rights is not required, by this contract, to be included in the contractor's bid. The only costs technically required, by this contract, to be included in the contractor's bid is for "In-Contract Utility Adjustment Work" further described in TP 140.
26	RFP	5.15.4.2	39	If the reason for Section 5.14.4.2 is to reduce change orders, will SCDOT allow/provide a line item, lump sum cost allowance (or not to exceed?) for all dry utility relocations?	Utilities	No_Revision	Will take into consideration.
27	RFP	5.15.4.4	39	Is it the Department's intent for the D/B team to account for right-of-way acquisitions required for utility relocations in the bid without completed RFC plans and utility adjustment plans?	Utilities	No_Revision	Yes.



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

FINAL RFP - ROUND 6

Date Received: 2/10/2026

Response: 02/26/2026

Corrected Response: 03/27/2026

CONTRACTOR						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
28	PIP	Utilities	N/A	Will SCDOT allow utilities currently under existing pavement to be retained in place given minimal grading operations and a suitable depth of cover?	Utilities	No_Revision	This will be determined on a case-by-case basis.
29	PIP	Utilities	N/A	Previous nonconfidential question answer regarding as builts/utility records indicated the PIP would be updated. Can SCDOT provide all available records collected during the Preliminary Utility Report?	Utilities	No_Revision	All available information has been & will be provided via PW transfer folders. Please check exchange folder.

