

NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
S-31 Cannons Campground Bridge Replacement - Project ID P041165 - Spartanburg County

RFP for Industry Review #1

Date Received: 3/24/2025

Meeting Date: 3/26/2025

						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Agreement	8 of 90	Referencing paragraph 4, if the design criteria requires the purchase of additional r/w, will SCDOT allow relief for schedule and will SCDOT cover the actual r/w (fee simple) land cost?	Construction	Revision	This language has been updated. SCDOT is responsible for ROW acquisition costs if deemed necessary by final design.
2	Attach_A	Agreement	11 of 90	Please waive requirement for a Transportation Management Plan since the existing roadway/bridge is already closed and partially demolished. Contractor will/shall maintain existing detour signage already in place. Or perhaps, is there already a TMP in place given closure and demolition work that has already occurred?	Construction	No_Revision	The Contractor is still required to submit a TMP.
3	Attach_A	Agreement	26 of 90	Please revise the substantial completion date from 8/29/25 to 10/29/25.	Construction	Revision	Substantial Completion Date is updated to 10/29/2025 with additional modifications to the Incentive/Disincentive clause to allow for an incentive of max 30 days at \$8,500/day; the disincentive remains unlimited at the revised amount of \$8,500/day.
4	Attach_A	Agreement	26	The substantial completion date of August 29, 2025 provides an extremely short duration to design and build a 3 span CIP deck bridge and the reinf retaining wall/soil slope that may not be possible as currently defined in the RFP due to design constraints, site constraints, and long-lead material procurement. Please consider adding an additional 90 days to the schedule.	Construction	Revision	Substantial Completion Date is updated to 10/29/2025 with additional modifications to the Incentive/Disincentive clause to allow for an incentive of max 30 days at \$8,500/day; the disincentive remains unlimited at the revised amount of \$8,500/day.
5	Attach_A	Agreement	10 of 90	Due to aggressive schedule, SCDOT should consider a 3 business day review period and 1 business day for verification?	DM	No_Revision	No. Five will remain.
6	RFP		26	Will SCDOT provide a 1 hour confidential meeting with each shortlisted teams to discuss the scope, schedule and alternatives.	DM	No_Revision	Will discuss with all teams at open forum. Since ATCs are not used on this procurement and all RFP criteria is required to be met as written, is there a true benefit to confidential meetings?
7	Attach_B	Environmental	PCE	The RFP lists a commitment to clear trees during a period limited to Nov 15 - March 31 due to tricolored bat. Has SCDOT obtained permission for clearing outside of this time frame for the limited amount of trees present?	Environmental	Revision	Commitment to be removed. Exhibit 6 will be updated. PCE Re-evaluation will be uploaded.



8	Attach_B	Environmental	PCE	Will SCDOT consider obtaining Nationwide 3 permit approval from USACE to be in place prior to or shortly after NTP? Given the condition of the existing bents, these will likely require in-stream removal as well as streambank stabilization.	Environmental	No_Revision	WM - [answer- No. Teams will be responsible for determining permit type and completing requisite documentation. Teams may complete NW3 documentation whenever they desire and if non-reporting, may simply provide to the SCDOT upon announcement.] I'd like discuss why this site is so different from other sites in other packages that this seems to be an issue just on this one bridge. We've not encountered these concerns before.
9	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	141	Section 2.1.3 states to remove and dispose of the bridge and appurtenances. Does SCDOT want to remove the concrete abutments adjacent to and in the stream limits? Will this require environmental approvals?	Environmental	Revision	Yes. Depends on access methods. Discussion during Open-Forum to follow.
10	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	5	Section 2.3.1 & Section 815 of the special provisions refers to the NPDES permit. Does SCDOT already have a NOI in place and would the DB team be able to do a permit modification versus a new SCDES NOI?	Hydrology	No_Revision	SCDOT does not have a NOI in place. Team would be responsible for obtaining a new SCDES NOI permit.
11	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	4	Given the elevation difference between the 100-year water surface elevation and finished grade elevation, can the proposed low-chord be lowered to accomodate the increased structure depth, and prevent purchase of new right of way?	Hydrology	Revision	A revision in exhibit 4e wil lbe made to allow for increased structure depth to reduce the required low chord elevation.
12	RFP	3	6 of 28	Section 3.7 - please increase stipend to \$40,000 given the aggressive post award schedule. Proposers will need to advance design beyond preliminary plans during procurement. Or change the substantial completion to allow an addiitonal 2 months.	PM	No_Revision	SCDOT will discuss and make revisions to the RFP if necessary.
13	Attach_A	Exhibit 5		Referencing Section 107 - since roadway/bridge is already closed, please remove contractor requirements for preparation of a Community and Public Relations Plan. Contractor will provide information at the request of SCDOT.	PM	Revision	Exhibit 5 will be revised appropriately.
14	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2	Exhibit 4A, Section 2.10. The guardrail in the NorthWest quadrant is shown using lengths >12.5'. When using 12.5' increments the guardrail extends into the existing driveway on tract 6. Can we use guardrail in lengths less than 12.5' for this location or use non-mash compliant curved guardrail?	Roadway	Revision	For the NW quadrant, the lower range values for the clear zone can be utilized, Exhibit 4a will be updated to reflect this change. The teams should also explore alternative approaches to guardrail design. The design team has explored a nesting option (being provided in the PIP) and additional flaring of the end treatment to cover the runoff requirements. The conceptual roadway plans provided in the PIP are for information only.



15	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2	Exhibit 4A, Section 2.10 requires leading end treatments and pushes fill slopes outside of existing ROW on tract 16 (NE quadrant). RFQ states that proposed ROW is not anticipated. Can SCDOT modify the leading end requirement in the NE quadrant to avoid right of way purchase?	Roadway	No_Revision	Design team is not seeing a need for additional ROW utilizing a MASH compliant leading end treatment in this quadrant.
16	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2	Will adjustments to the superstructure criteria in Exhibit 4b, Section 2.1.5 or 2.1.6 be considered in the Technical Proposal if interior bent setback criteria of Hydraulic Design Bulletin 2019-1 requires the bridge to be skewed?	Structures	Revision	Bridge bent locations are prescribed per 4b. No skew is required or allowed. 10' interior bent setback criteria per HDB 2019-1 is not a requirement on this project.
17	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	4	Section 2.2.1.5 indicates the proposed low chord shall not be below existing low chord. The Conceptual Plans show the low chord as 712.54. However, the Preliminary Hydraulic Analysis, dated February 14, 2025, indicates the existing low chord is estimated to be 714.16 and the proposed low chord elevation to be 712.53. Is the proposed low chord required to meet the 712.54 or 714.16 elevation?	Hydrology	Revision	A revision in exhibit 4e will be made.
18	PIP	Structures	Conceptual Bridge Plans	Will the removal of the existing retaining walls in the creek redefine the top of the banks under the bridge as they are shown in the Conceptual Bridge Plans?	Structures	No_Revision	No. Bent locations are prescribed per 4b, regardless of top of bank lines on the plans.
19	PIP	Structures	Conceptual Bridge Plans	The conceptual bridge plans show interior bents that are 90 degrees to the centerline of roadway. The existing concrete abutments from a previous bridge that are located next to the channel banks are to be removed per Section 2.1.3 (Exhibit 4b-Structures). When this is done the existing channel banks no longer have the constriction through the bridge. Are the minimum setbacks as shown in Figures 3, 4, and 5 of Hydraulic Design Bulletin 2019-1 considered satisfied by the bent locations required in Section 2.1.5 (Exhibit 4b-Structures) with the removal of the abutments? Additionally, it appears that the conceptual abutments and pier locations currently do not meet setback requirements per HDB 2019-1.	Structures	Revision	See reponse to previous questions. A revision in 4e will be made to waive 10-ft setback criteria for this project.
20	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	1	Scope refers to both an "existing bridge" and a "previous bridge" and details required items to be removed based on those terms. Is it SCDOT intent to remove the existing large concrete abutments adjacent to the channel, or may they remain in-place?	Structures	No_Revision	Yes, removal of existing abutments underneath the existing bridge is the intent.
21	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2	Would cored slabs with concrete overlay be allowed as a possible alternative to the proposed superstructure.	Structures	No_Revision	No
22	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	4	Will SCDOT allow the use of pre-cast substructure and superstructure units including pre-cast deck panels?	Structures	No_Revision	No
23	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	4	If pre-cast deck panels are utilized, what options for finished surface would be allowed? I.e. epoxy overlay, asphalt, pcc overlay, etc.	Structures	No_Revision	No
24	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	141	Section 2.1.5 (and others) Will SCDOT remove all defined bridge criteria, allowing the teams the ability to design a bridge that can be constructed safely as well as meet the scope and schedule requirements? Transmission lines and distribution lines restrict crane use.	Structures	No_Revision	No



25	PIP	Utilities	N/A	Please release the Preliminary Utility Report and all utility information gathered for the project to shortlisted firms as stated in PIP, Utility Information for RFP document. This includes any SUE data, CADD files, etc.	Utilities	Revision	The utility coordination files we have should be on sharepoint.
26	PIP	Utilities	N/A	Will Duke allow any time windows (during low usage demand) to deenergize distribution lines adjacent to the bridge? Otherwise lines are too close and either relocation will be required or road alignment will need to shifted. This will also affect completion schedule if deengerizing can not be attained.	Utilities	No_Revision	Duke has indicated that de-energizing is an unlikely option



NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
S-31 Cannons Campground Bridge Replacement - Project ID P041165 - Spartanburg County

RFP for Industry Review #2

Date Received: 3/31/2025

Meeting Date: 4/3/2025

						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Agreement	30 of 91	Please consider adding the incentive/disincentive back to the contract - why was it removed? Also reference Exhibit 5, Section 108.	Construction	No_Revision	The Incentive/Disincentive was an effort to reopen the roadway prior to school beginning, or within that month. By moving the completion date, that was no longer an option and the I/D was removed.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	4	Ref: Environmental Commitment G, recommended tree-clearing restriction dates appear to be inconsistent with USFWS guidance. Will SCDOT allow clearing outside of summer occupancy (April 1-July 15th), and outside of winter torpor (Dec 15-Feb 15th)?	Environmental	No_Revision	Yes we would and that is what the condition originally specified: clearing outside those periods only to occur during winter hibernating months. See re-evaluation and updated RFP Exhibit 6.
3	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	all	Exhibit 6 has been removed from the RFP. Is this intentional?	PM	Revision	No. Revised IR#2 posted to the website.
4	RFP			For the revised procurement schedule - please provide responses to Confidential Questions prior to submittal of CATCs	PM	No_Revision	Unfortunately due to schedule conflicts this was not possible.
5	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	?	Exhibit 6 is missing from the latest RFP. Will SCDOT be updating Exhibit 6 and the environmental commitments in the PCE?	PM	Revision	No. Revised IR#2 posted to the website.
6	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	3	Will SCDOT grant NPDES offsets less than what is indicated in the RDM to reduce/eliminate easements/permissions?	Roadway	No_Revision	This will be considered on a case by case basis & will require the team to demonstrate why it is not feasible for the project. A blanket approval will not be given.
7	Attach_A	Agreement	41 of 91	Will SCDOT consider using permissions or are easements needed?	ROW	No_Revision	Temporary construction easements will be needed if not covered by permanent ROW.
8	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	5	Will SCDOT consider using walls other than sheet pile walls? (Gravity, Shotcrete, etc.)	Structures	Revision	Given the ROW constraints, need to construct the wall on an existing embankment slope, and accelerated schedule...minimizing the amount of excavation needed seems more appropriate. However, a concrete cantilever wall will be added as an option.
9	PIP	Utilities		Since construction work was underway on this bridge recently, has SCDOT already obtained the required Encroachment Agreement with Duke Energy Transmission? If not, has SCDOT obtained early permission to enter Duke Transmission easement to begin work prior to easement execution?	Utilities	No_Revision	SCDOT is investigating.
10	Attach_B	Survey		Please clarify conflicting information between the provided Survey and SUE dgns depicting the Duke power poles. See screenshot below - green and orange arrows showing difference ~ 2'.	Utilities	No_Revision	SCDOT is investigating.
Additional Questions from 4/3/2025 Open-Forum							
1	Attach_A	Agreement	79 of 91	Regarding Article XVIII - please consider reducing or eliminating the DBE goal of 5% for this project given the limited scope and aggressive schedule.	Other	Revision	SCDOT is discussing internally and will update the RFP if this goal changes.

