

**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
P042942 - US 17A/21 over CSX Emergency Bridge Replacement**

RFP FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW - UPDATED

Date Received: 11/14/2023

Meeting Date: 11/16/2023

							SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation	
1	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	46	In reference to Item 32, will Fuel Adjustment Indexes apply to this project?	Construction	No_Revision	Yes.	
2	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	48	In reference to Item 38, if any material within the existing embankment from the original ground line (before US 17A/21 was built) to the current ground surface does not meet Item 37, will it have to be removed and replaced with no additional time or compensation?	Construction	No_Revision	No. The material may remain in place.	
3	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 26 of 92; IV.A.1. (pdf 58)	During the site visit on 10/27/23, a completion date of May 31, 2024 was indicated ahead of Hurricane Season which begins June 1, 2024. The RFP states "The new bridge shall be opened to traffic prior to May 1, 2024. The Project shall be Substantially Complete prior to May 31, 2024." We understand that the main intent is to have this route open for critical evacuations in the event of a hurricane. With that goal in mind, would SCDOT consider revising the agreement to state that the bridge will be opened to traffic prior to May 31, 2024?	Construction	Revision	The intent was for the bridge to be open to traffic prior to or on May 31, 2024. Substantial completion should be complete prior to or on June 21, 2024. This language will be added/adjusted.	
4	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 10 of 92 Paragraph 6 (pdf 42)	Given the accelerated nature of the project, will SCDOT consider expedited submittal review times in addition to what they are already doing?	DM	Revision	Review times have been compressed to the extent practical and have been coordinated and concurred with by CSX RR. However, 4z will be revised to allow for teams to submit at a minimum, Preliminary and Final Bridge plans and Final Roadway plans. Teams may elect to skip Preliminary and R/W Roadway submittals at their own risk.	
5	RFP	2	3	When will SCDOT provide the full archeological survey showing area that is unavailable till 1/31/2024? Should this condition be added to the Agreement?	Environmental	Revision	Information will be added to website. Agreement will be updated when NPCE is signed by FHWA. Language will be clarified.	
6	RFP	2	3	Has SCDOT started the Nationwide 3(a) permit preparation based on the Concept Roadway Plans included in the PIP?	Environmental	No_Revision	Yes. In light of design developments, SCDOT will be obtaining a GP for impacts. A copy of the application will be provided to teams as well as the approved permit.	
7	Attach_A	Agreement	49	Since the existing road, culverts, bridge, etc. are more than 50 years old, can the reference to 50 years in paragraph 3 be changed to 100 years so that these assets are not consider archeological remains or historical structures?	Environmental	No_Revision	No. SHPO has concurred with qualifying historic archeological remains. A copy of the 106 report and concurrence letter will be provided. Items in question were not of concern to SHPO.	
8	Attach_B	Environmental		When does SCDOT anticipate providing the NEPA document?	Environmental	No_Revision	When it is signed by FHWA.	
9	Attach_B	Environmental		Has SCDOT completed a jurisdictional determination or an initial draft stream and wetland delineation that can be shared immediately?	Environmental	No_Revision	Delineation files will be shared once provided to the USACE. No streams identified onsite, only wetlands.	
10	RFP	2	3 of 26	Section 2.5 - Please consider providing draft environmental commitments prior to the completion of the NPCE as they may have an impact on the Teams' designs.	Environmental	No_Revision	FHWA will not allow sharing of draft commitments prior to a NEPA decision.	



11	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	1	Long eared bats are assumed to be listed as endangered by the time of construction, will SCDOT make an a determination on the long eared bats? Has any coordination with the US Fish & Wildlife been done to date and can that be shared with the design build teams?	Environmental	No_Revision	Determinations made. Section 7 coordination is complete. Information will be provided to teams.
12	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	1	Is SCDOT requiring clearing/grinding the entire proposed ROW width or only within toe of fill slopes? Will clearing/grinding be required with wetlands/ditches?	Environmental	Revision	Clearing and grubbing will be within construction limits and clearing only out to right of way.
13	RFP	2	Page 3 of 26; Paragraph 3 (pdf 8)	With regard to the archeological data recovery, the RFP states that the "the selected Proposer shall cooperate during these efforts." Can SCDOT expand on the cooperation efforts anticipated? Should the selected Proposer have archeological staff on the team to assist with this cooperation?	Environmental	No_Revision	SCDOT will oversee data recovery activity. Contractor will need to coordinate with SCDOT consultant for safe access and providing safe work area for them to complete the recovery effort.
14	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	Page 1; Section 2.0 (pdf 170)	Given the short schedule of the project, would SCDOT consider eliminating the Preliminary Road Geotechnical Report and only require the Final Road Geotechnical Report?	Geotechnical	Revision	Yes, though this would be at the DB team's risk.
15	Attach_B	Geotechnical	1. Draft Geotechnical Information	Based on the geotechnical information provided with the RFP, it appears that no Seismic Cone Penetration Tests were performed. Given the seismic requirements of the site, will Seismic CPT's be performed and the results provided as an addendum to the RFP?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	No. Shear wave and compression wave velocities were measured using downhole geophysical test methods in a cased soil testing boring and this data was provided with the Draft Geotechnical Information and will also be provided with the final reports.
16	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f	Page 5; Response Spectrum data (pdf 168)	The lower limit value for TNH, shown in the provided ADRS curve in Exhibit 4f, is not consistent with the formula written above it ($4 \cdot H/V^*s,H$). Can you confirm if it's a typo or if the formula needs to be changed.	Geotechnical	No_Revision	The lower limit value for TNH and the equation are correct. However, the TNH value is based on the 2-successive layer method, and not on the equation in this case.
17	Attach_B	Geotechnical	1. Draft Geotechnical Information	When does SCDOT anticipate providing the complete Geotechnical Baseline Report?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	The Geotechnical Baseline Report and Subsurface Data Report should be available by the end of this week if not sooner.
18	Attach_B	Geotechnical	1. Draft Geotechnical Information	Please clarify how the coordinates for geotechnical boring locations (CPT and SPT) were obtained. Were they determined by survey, or handheld GPS, or some other method?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	Test locations were surveyed.
19	Attach_B	Geotechnical		Is the performance based method (utilized in SPTLIQ that is provided in SCDOT Website) acceptable in identifying the liquefied zones?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	Yes, though note both SPT borings and CPT soundings were performed and the GEOR should be evaluating the data for both. Is there any reason to think that SPLIQ would not be allowed?
20	Attach_A	Agreement	50	In relation to Section XI, Will SCDOT complete and provide all HAZMAT surveys for all structures (bridge, walls, culvert) by December 4, 2023?	HazMaterial	No_Revision	Yes, this information will be provided as soon as it is available, but no later than release of the Final RFP. Sampling of the walls and culvert were not performed.
21	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	1	Per the RFP, the existing 4'x6' RCBC is to be "analyzed, designed, and extended to meet all criteria". It is assumed that this culvert is an abandoned cattle crossing. Per pre-RFP meeting, SCDOT indicated this culvert was likely a "cattle crossing" and could be demolished. Please clarify.	Hydrology	Revision	Scope has been updated to keep and extend culvert.
22	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	4	"2.5 NPDES Permitting" does not reference coordination with OCRM. Attachment for DHEC's More Common Permits highlights "Non-Coastal." Confirm if SCDOT has established this to be a "Non-Coastal" review with DHEC or if OCRM coordination is anticipated since a portion of the project is in Beaufort County. Is it possible for OCRM to waive a Coastal Zone Consistency Review given the very aggressive schedule?	Hydrology	No_Revision	No Coastal Zone Consistency waiver to SCDOT's knowledge. Full reviews have been streamlined on small projects recently.



23	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2	Section 2.1.19 - Can SCDOT please confirm that the existing 30" RCP at approximately Sta. 1095+00 is structurally sufficient and can be retained?	Hydrology	Revision	SCDOT can not confirm. Initial analysis is that the culvert is undersized and will need to be replaced. Teams should analyze and design accordingly. Project Scope will be revised accordingly.
24	Attach_B	Hydraulics	1. Toe-Ditch Detail	Would SCDOT consider the removal of the Toe-Ditch Detail from Attachment B to minimize additional right-of-way, environmental and utility impacts?	Hydrology	No_Revision	R/W should be set. SCDOT will not remove Toe-Ditch Detail from Attachment B.
25	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	Page 4; Section 2.5 (pdf 162)	Has SCDOT started early coordination with OCRM in regards to obtaining a NOI and CZC permit to minimize potential delays in schedule impacts?	Hydrology	No_Revision	SCDOT has not started early coordination. See question 22 question above.
26	Attach_A	Agreement	10	Will SCDOT change all references to number of days in paragraph 6 to one (1) day? Most of the references say five business days, which is the equivalent of 7 calendar days, and this is about 6% of the contract time allowed to complete the roadway and bridge sufficiently to open to traffic. Exhibit 4z includes numerous submittal packages. Just 4 end-on-end submittal packages will burn about 25% of the allowed time.	Legal	No_Revision	Review times have been compressed to the extent practical and have been coordinated and concurred with by CSX RR. However, 4z will be revised to allow for teams to submit at a minimum, Preliminary and Final Bridge plans and Final Roadway plans. Teams may elect to skip Preliminary and R/W Roadway submittals at their own risk.
27	Attach_A	Agreement	15-16	Will SCDOT change the time limits in Table 5a for Levels 4, 5, and 6 to 24 hours to accommodate the very aggressive delivery schedule?	Legal	Revision	SCDOT is open to a minor compression of levels 4, 5, and 6. Additional internal discussion is needed.
28	Attach_A	Agreement	53	Will SCDOT remove Section XIII.A.2 from the Agreement?	Legal	No_Revision	This section will remain unchanged within the agreement.
29	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	36	Is the DBE Committal Sheet or DBE Utilization Commitment Plan required with the Cost Proposal?	Legal	No_Revision	Requirements are explained in the DBE special provision.
30	RFP	3	6	Due to the extensive amount of pre-bid work required by a proposer to be in a position to meet SCDOT's delivery schedule, will SCDOT please consider adding a Stipend of at least \$100,000?	Other	No_Revision	SCDOT will discuss internally and consider the addition of a stipend. Stipends will not be awarded for this project.
31	RFP	3	6	If the project is cancelled, will SCDOT provide a Stipend of at least \$300,000?	Other	No_Revision	SCDOT will discuss internally and consider the addition of a stipend in the event of project cancellation. However, this is a very low risk and the amount would be determined and listed in the agreement and not the amount requested. A Stipend for procurement cancellation will not be granted for the reasons outlined above.
32	RFP	3	6 of 26	Section 3.6 - Confidential Questions - Typically confidential 1 on 1 meetings are for ATC discussions. Since ATC's are not allowed for this project will SCDOT consider removal of confidential questions and 1 on 1 meetings?	Other	Revision	Due to the accelerated schedule, the intent was to offer teams the opportunity for a confidential meeting if needed; they are not mandatory. We will clarify the language accordingly.
33	RFP	8	20 of 26	Section 8.9 - Conflict of Interest - Can SCDOT please confirm there are no consultant firms that are precluded from this pursuit due to a conflicts of interest? Should the geotechnical engineer who provided the drilling for this project be precluded (F&ME)?	Other	Revision	There are three firms that are precluded from pursuit: F&ME, Brockington, and CECS. These firms will be added to the list.
34	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	1	Can SCDOT please clarify whether or not the 4x6 RCB will need to be extended or flowable filled? Based on our teams preliminary evaluation the culvert is not required to be extended and can be flowable filled as the culvert is outside of the FEMA 500-year flood plain.	Other	Revision	Culvert is to be retained and extended. Scope will be revised to require this.



35	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	1	Can SCDOT please confirm it will be allowable to forego Preliminary Roadway Plans Package submittal?	Other	Revision	CSX requires submittal of Preliminary and Final Bridge plans. Will revise 4z to allow teams to omit preliminary and R/W Roadway plans at their own risk.
36	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	1	Can SCDOT please confirm it is acceptable to skip both the Preliminary Submittal Package and Right-of-Way Submittal Package at the contractor's own risk?	Other	Revision	CSX requires submittal of Preliminary and Final Bridge plans. Will revise 4z to allow teams to omit preliminary and R/W Roadway plans at their own risk.
37	Attach_A	Agreement	10 of 92	Per the RFP on page 26 of 92 - Section IV Contract Time Project Schedule: "Time is of the essence". Per the RFP Section D.6 (Design Review) on page 10 of 92, "The initial review period for each submittal package shall be 10 business days following the date SCDOT receives an accurate and complete submittal in conformity with the contract. SCDOT review comments will be sent to the CONTRACTOR, who shall respond within five business days and prior to subsequent phase submittals. SCDOT will then status CONTRACTOR'S responses and will provide additional comments, if any, within five business days. If any open comments remain after the initial 10 day review and subsequent five day review and comment periods, there will be no time constraint for the CONTRACTOR to respond. For all subsequent rounds of CONTRACTOR responses, SCDOT will status CONTRACTOR'S responses and will provide additional comments, if any, within five business days." Due to the time of essence required for this project, will SCDOT consider a 5 business day initial review period in lieu of the aforementioned 10 business day initial review period?	Other	No_Revision	Review times have been compressed to the extent practical and have been coordinated and concurred with by CSX RR. 10 days is the minimum.
38	RFP	4	7 of 26	Section 4.1 - Is a schedule required to be included in the Technical Proposal Narrative?	Other	No_Revision	We do not intend to require a schedule as a part of the Technical Proposal. However, teams will not be penalized for providing one.
39	Attach_B	Survey		The current survey does not show jurisdictional streams/wetlands, can SCDOT please provide this information?	Other	No_Revision	Final survey was received and uploaded to the website earlier this week. Additional wetlands information, if not available will be provided when GP application is submitted.
40	Attach_B	Survey	1. US 17A Preliminary Surveys	When does SCDOT anticipate providing the Final Survey files?	Other	No_Revision	Final survey was received and uploaded to the website earlier this week.
41	Attach_A	Agreement	10	Referencing paragraph 6, will CSX and SCDOT review the plans concurrently? If we have to satisfy all SCDOT comments before CSX gets the plans, the delivery schedule will be compromised.	Railroad	Revision	SCDOT and CSXT will review the plans concurrently within 10 business days maximum.
42	Attach_A	Agreement	40	Can the 15-day reference in paragraph 7 be changed to 5 days?	Railroad	Revision	Will be adjusted to 10 days to match intent.



43	Attach_A	Agreement	40	Can the 14-day reference in paragraph 8 be changed to 5 days? Time is of the essence as 14 business days will be almost three calendar weeks.	Railroad	Revision	It is anticipated that the Construction Agreement will be in place prior to NTP. As such, the referenced 14 days will not likely be relevant. Language to be adjusted as necessary.
44	Attach_A	Agreement	40	Will SCDOT coordinate with CSX and prepare/provide the separate right-of-entry agreement that will be required between the Contractor and the Railroad as described in paragraph 9 of the Agreement so that such can be executed with the Agreement?	Railroad	No_Revision	The Contractor will acquire their own right of entry agreement with CSXT.
45	Attach_B			Will the executed Railroad Agreement be provided by December 4, 2023? If not, when?	Railroad	Revision	Please clarify if the intent was December 4 or January 4? It is not anticipated that the finalized agreement will be executed by the referenced December date. Pertinent information will be provided within Exhibit 8 when available.
46	Attach_A	Exhibit 8	1	Will SCDOT please provide the frequency of trains through the project site and the construction time frame windows that CSX is allowing? Additionally, what is the average number of trains per day, max speed (mph) of trains, and if there are any passenger trains on these lines for railroad insurance purposes?	Railroad	No_Revision	This information is publically available on the FRA database. The milepoint is 444.1 and crossing number is 632440L.
47	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 39 of 92; VII.B.4. (pdf 71) Page 46 of 92; VIII.C.9. (pdf 78)	VII. Railroad Coordination states "This includes all expenses such as railroad flagging operations except as defined above in Section VII.B.1.", while VIII. Right of Way Acquisition states "This includes all expenses such as railroad flagging operations." leaving off the exception as defined. VIII. Right of Way also includes the following additional language that is not part of the Railroad section; "The CONTRACTOR shall include all costs associated with these requirements in the final bid price. Once a contract is executed, SCDOT shall administer invoicing for costs to the Railroad Company or Companies. Monies will be deducted from the CONTRACTOR's progress payments after payments are made to the Railroad Company." Please clarify which section takes precedence.	Railroad	Revision	This language will be clarified and adjusted to reflect intent of SCDOT's railroad coverages.
48	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 40 of 92; VII.B.7. (pdf 72) Page 47 of 92; VIII.C.12. (pdf 78)	VII. Railroad Coordination states " The CONTRACTOR shall attend a mandatory meeting with the SCDOT's Utilities Office and Railroad Projects Office within 15 days after the Notice to Proceed." VIII. Right of Way states "The CONTRACTOR shall attend a mandatory meeting with the SCDOT's Utilities Office and Railroad Projects Office within 30 days after the Notice to Proceed." Please clarify.	Railroad	Revision	Will be adjusted to 10 days to match intent.



49	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 40 of 92; VII.B.9. (pdf 72) Page 47 of 92; VIII.C.14. (pdf 79)	VII. Railroad Coordination states "The required PE Agreement, between SCDOT and Railroad, has been executed to allow the Railroad to review or comment on any design questions or submittals from the CONTRACTOR. The Construction Agreement, between SCDOT and Railroad, must be executed before any demolition or construction activities can begin at the railroads." VIII. Right of Way states " The required PE Agreement, between SCDOT and Railroad, must be executed before Railroad will review or comment on any design questions or submittals from the CONTRACTOR. The Construction Agreement, between SCDOT and Railroad, must be executed before any construction activities can begin at the railroads. " Please clarify.	Railroad	Revision	SCDOT has an existing PE agreement. It is anticipated that the Construction Agreement will be in place prior to NTP. As such, the referenced 14 days will not likely be relevant. Language to be adjusted as necessary.
50	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 39 of 92; VII.B.1 (pdf 71)	RFP states SCDOT will be responsible for procuring up to 100 days of flagging. Is this 24 hours a day, 7 days a week?	Railroad	Revision	Requests for Flagging options for 24 hours a day, 7 days a week would have to be made from SCDOT. It may not be possible or practical and would likely require (4) flagman and significant overtime charges. SCDOT's intent is to provide flagging services for one standard daytime shift per day. Additional discussions with CSX are necessary and we will clarify the definition of or intent of a "flagging day" in Exhibit 8. SCDOT will cover the cost of flagging operations for this Project.
51	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 40 of 92; VII.B.1 (pdf 71)	Will the Railroad be able to provide flagging 24 hours a day, 7 days a week? What is the cost of flagging per day if exceeds the provided 100 days?	Railroad	Revision	Requests for Flagging options for 24 hours a day, 7 days a week would have to be made from SCDOT. It may not be possible or practical and would likely require (4) flagman and significant overtime charges. SCDOT's intent is to provide flagging services for one standard daytime shift per day. Additional discussions with CSX are necessary and we will clarify the definition of or intent of a "flagging day" in Exhibit 8. We have requested cost clarifications from CSX. SCDOT will cover the cost of flagging operations for this Project.
52	Attach_A	Agreement	Pages 39 & 40 of 92; VII.B.3 & 4 (pdf 71-72)	Paragraph 3 states "CONTRACTOR shall be responsible for assisting SCDOT in the development of the railroad agreement by providing requested information", Paragraph 4 states "The CONTRACTOR shall be responsible for all costs to the Railroad Company or Companies for services provided by the Railroad or the Railroad's Agent, as detailed in the executed Railroad Agreement between the SCDOT and the Railroad". If the Railroad Agreement will not be finalized until after a contractor is selected, how does SCDOT intend for these costs to be captured as part of the contractor's price proposal?	Railroad	Revision	SCDOT will furnish all railroad agreement costs and up to 100 days of flagging operations as clarified above. Anything outside of the construction agreement and above and beyond the 100 days of flagging will be the responsibility of the Contractor. Language will be further clarified.
53	Attach_A	Agreement	Pages 39 of 92; VII.B.4. (pdf 71)	RFP states "The CONTRACTOR shall be responsible for all costs to the Railroad Company or Companies for services provided by the Railroad or the Railroad's Agent, as detailed in the executed Railroad Agreement between the SCDOT and the Railroad". If the Railroad Agreement has been executed, can a copy be provided for review?	Railroad	No_Revision	The existing railroad PE agreement will not be shared at this time. All pertinent information will be provided in Exhibit 8.
54	Attach_A	Exhibit 8	Page 1 (pdf 326)	Please provide the number of trains per day and what type, freight and/or passenger.	Railroad	No_Revision	This information is publically available on the FRA database. The milepoint is 444.1 and crossing number is 632440L.



55	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 39 of 92; VII.B. (pdf 71)	Please confirm that the Railroad will not require crash walls for this project.	Structures	No_Revision	CSX Public Projects Manual requires crash walls when piers are located within 25-feet of a track. Given the clearances required in the RFP, crash walls will not be required. CSX has reviewed the clearance envelope diagram and did not request crash walls.
56	PIP	Roadway		Based on the Conceptual Roadway Plans, will SCDOT require grade adjustments for the 4% grades on the bridge approaches since greater than 3%?	Roadway	No_Revision	No.
57	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	1	Section 2.6 - Can SCDOT please confirm grade adjusted K values are not required for this project?	Roadway	No_Revision	Confirmed.
58	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	1	What is the criteria for the driveway at the south approach? What is the maximum allowable raise of grade? What are the driveway pavement requirements?	Roadway	No_Revision	Property owner does not want any grade changes to the driveway. Tie to existing pavement as closely as possible & minimize impacts. If driveway should need to be reconstructed, utilize US 17A roadway pavement design & meet ARMS requirements.
59	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	1	Section 2.3 shows 7% truck, while PIP conceptual bridge plans title sheet shows 11% truck, can SCDOT please confirm 7% trucks is correct?	Roadway	Revision	Official percentage is 14% trucks. Will revise accordingly.
60	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	1	Section 2.0 - Can SCDOT please confirm that terrain should be classified as rolling? Rolling terrain allows for 5% max grades, but conceptual plans reflect a maximum grade of 4%. Surrounding terrain at project site more closely reflects level terrain.	Roadway	No_Revision	Conceptual plans are for information only. No change necessary.
61	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2	Section 2.9 (Clear Zones) - In the third paragraph, consider revising to explicitly allow for guardrail in areas of new right of way and wetland impacts. Removing statement requiring "SCDOT advanced approval" reduces risk for DB Teams.	Roadway	Revision	Will revise language.
62	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	1	There appears to be jurisdictional wetlands on the south approach. Will SCDOT consider allowing 1.5:1 side slopes to avoid these jurisdictional wetland impacts?	Roadway	No_Revision	No.
63	RFP	Exhibit_4a	Sec. 2.9, 3rd Paragraph	RFP States: "For those areas where no guardrail currently exists, design fill and cut slopes to obtain clear zones and to avoid the need for protection." Will SCDOT consider relaxing guardrail requirements as portions of the existing roadway fill slopes warrant guardrail, but do not have guardrail. With proposed raises in grade, additional length of guardrail will greatly reduce project footprints and amount of fill.	Roadway	Revision	Will revise language.
64	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Page 1; Section 2.3 (pdf 132)	Roadway Design Criteria lists the truck percentage on US 17A/US 21 as 7%. The SCDOT Traffic count website, the bridge SI&A and the conceptual bridge plan cover sheet all show a truck percentage of 11%. Please confirm the truck percentage to be used.	Roadway	Revision	Official percentage is 14% trucks. Will revise accordingly.
65	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Page 1; Section 2.2 (pdf 132)	The RFP lists the design speed for the bridge at 55 mph. The posted speed at this location is 45 mph and the design speeds for the vertical curves that we are tying into on either side of the bridge both below 50 mph. Would SCDOT consider lowering the DS from 55 mph to 50 mph to allow for K Values more in line with the rest of the US 17A/US 21 corridor in this area? Doing so would significantly reduce the project length, fill heights, utility impacts and ultimately the total project cost.	Roadway	No_Revision	Posted speed is 55 mph per SCDOT sign inventory & Google Earth street view. Design speed will remain 55 mph as this is a US Route & a Hurricane Evacuation Route.



66	Attach_A	Agreement	8	Paragraph 4 states that Right of Way services shall be the responsibility of the Contractor. In the pre-RFP meeting, SCDOT stated SCDOT would be responsible for all right of way scope elements based on the Conceptual Roadway Plans. Given the very aggressive nature of the project, SCDOT needs to retain all scope elements related to right of way acquisition to be able to meet SCDOT's delivery schedule.	ROW	Revision	SCDOT will acquire all ROW and perform all ROW services for this project with the exception of any ROW or services necessary as dictated by the Contractor's plans if outside of SCDOT conceptual footprint.
67	Attach_A	Agreement	41	Please clarify if SCDOT or Contractor is acquiring right of way including right of way acquisition services. In pre RFP meetings SCDOT indicated it would be responsible for all right of way acquisition activities.	ROW	Revision	SCDOT will acquire all ROW and perform all ROW services for this project with the exception of any ROW or services necessary as dictated by the Contractor's plans if outside of SCDOT conceptual footprint.
68	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	1	Section 2.1.3 - Are the entirety of the existing soil nails on the End Bent 1 side to be removed?	Structures	No_Revision	The excavation required to create the bridge opening will likely result in complete removal of nails. If portions of nails extend into in-situ soil below the limits of required concrete slope protection, they may be left in place provided they do not conflict with slope protection installation.
69	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	1	Section 2.1.3 - "Heavy equipment will not be allowed to bear directly on top of the existing concrete crib retaining walls supporting each existing end bent. One of the existing walls was damaged in a train collision and repaired with soil-nails and shotcrete facing." Can SCDOT please specify the minimum offset that "heavy equipment" will be allowed in vicinity of the existing crib walls?	Structures	No_Revision	Offset is subject to demolition plan review by CSX. Per CSX, their preferred offset is one that is determined by way of engineered signed and sealed calculations and creates a safe slope, eliminates the possibility of the slope collapsing, and/or becoming unstable at any time during construction/demolition activities.
70	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2	Section 2.1.5 - Can SCDOT please provide Stations for Begin Bridge and End Bridge along CL US 17A / US 21 that all teams will have to abide by as the stations in the conceptual bridge plans are located in the PIP?	Structures	Revision	Yes.
71	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2	Section 2.1.6 - Does DM0108 revisions to BDM Sections 15.5.3.1 and 15.5.3.3 indicating "severe corrosion conditions" apply for prestressed concrete girder stress limits for this project?	Structures	No_Revision	Yes. Project is located in Beaufort county (being partially located in Hampton county does not change the requirement).
72	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2	Section 2.1.6 - Can SCDOT please remove reference to structural steel plate girders regarding maximum allowable beam spacing as structural steel girders are not allowed for this project?	Structures	Revision	Yes.
73	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	5	Section 2.1.15 - Can SCDOT please provide geotechnical base line report recommendations for the soil corrosion characteristics since the baseline report has yet to be provided?	Structures	Revision	To be included once baseline report is received.
74	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	5	Section 2.1.15 - Can SCDOT please confirm steel H-piles and steel pipe piles are not allowed at interior bents, including for columns supported by pile footings?	Structures	Revision	GBLR recommendations have been reviewed and indicate a corrosive soil environment. A steel pile corrosion rate will be specified in the RFP.
75	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	5	Section 2.1.15 - Can SCDOT please clarify that drilled piles with steel H-piles placed within a bore hole are not allowed at interior bents?	Structures	Revision	Pile footings will not be allowed at interior bents.
76	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	6	Section 2.1.19 - Can SCDOT please clarify that the 2:1 spill through abutment slopes are to be sloped 2:1 perpendicular to the end bents?	Structures	Revision	Yes, will clarify.



77	PIP	Structures		Conceptual Bridge Plans show the top of railroad clearance envelope at Elevation 44.0. With the proposed 23'-0" minimum vertical clearance this would equate to a top of rail Elev. 21.0. Is the minimum vertical clearance envelope to be developed based on the PIP's conceptual bridge plans top of rail elevation of 21.0 or the surveyed top of rail within Attachment B?	Structures	No_Revision	The minimum vertical clearance is to be developed based on the surveyed top of rail elevations. Elevation 44.0 was a conservative assumption to ensure the conceptual grade and conceptual project limits achieve 23'-0" minimum clearance.
78	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2	Regarding 2.1.5 - Will the 62' approach spans be required to be the same material type and beam depth as the 122' main span?	Structures	Revision	Yes
79	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2	Regarding 2.1.5 - "Use 62'-0" approach span length (both) and 122'-0" main span length." Is the prescribed 122'-0" main span considered a minimum length?	Structures	No_Revision	No. Exact span arrangement is prescribed.
80	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2	If a FIB is utilized, will the design need to abide by FDOT Index 20010 Series Prestressed Florida-I Beams (Rev. 01/16) table showing the maximum bonded prestress force for different FIB sizes?	Structures	No_Revision	No. SCDOT and AASHTO prestressed concrete design requirements apply with respect to concrete stress limits.
81	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	Page 1; Paragraph 3 (pdf 130)	During the site visit on 10/27/23, SCDOT indicated that the box culvert near station 1115+00 should be analyzed for conveyance, and if not needed, it should be filled with flowable fill. The RFP states the culvert "appears to not continuously convey water but may act as a relief. Analyze, design and extend culvert to meet all criteria." Does SCDOT still intend for the box culvert to be filled if hydraulic analysis indicates it is not needed?	Structures	Revision	No. Retain and extend box culvert.
82	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Page 6; Section 2.1.19 (pdf 141)	RFP states "Design Interior Single and Multi-Column Bents using cast-in-place reinforced concrete bent caps and columns supported on cast-in-place reinforced concrete drilled shafts." Would SCDOT consider allowing pile footings to support interior bents?	Structures	Revision	SCDOT has considered pile footings, but will allow only drilled shafts at interior bents for this project. Concerns with pile footings (which may not be realized until final design) include steel pile corrosion, undesirable plastic hinging below ground at interior bents in the seismic model, and the possible need for structural mitigation for seismic liquefaction.
83	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	Page 5; Section 2.1.15 (pdf 140)	If pile footings are allowed for interior bents, can Steel H Piles and Steel Pipe Piles be used for the footings?	Structures	Revision	Pile footings will not be allowed at interior bents. H Piles and pipe piles are options at end bents.
84	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	1	Since US 17A/21 is closed and detoured, is a TMP necessary along with a Community and Public Relations Plan? Can these components be eliminated from the Agreement so the Contractor can focus on more important components of the project?	Traffic	No_Revision	TMP is required for all jobs, this is currently closed and detoured. A simple but detailed TMP mimicking the currently available detour schematic (see below) is acceptable. The Community/Public Relations Plan has been relaxed from standard language, however, we are open to additional discussion. A TMP is required per Federal Guidelines and the components of the TMP are dictated by the project classification. SCDOT doesn't see many work hours or risk associated with the Transportation Operations (TO) and Public Information (PI) portions of the TMP. Since this project is classified as "Intermediate" the TMP is required with a Detour Plan and will include some TO and PI strategies.
85	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 2	6	When will SCDOT provide the detour plan?	Traffic	No_Revision	There is a detour schematic available on our public website here: https://www.scdot.org/us17a-21-over-csx-rr/default.aspx



86	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 2	Page 6; Section 2.4 (pdf 155)	It is noted that the Contractor is to Install and maintain road closure and detour signing and devices. The department has already closed the road. Is it the intent for the contractor to replace the department's devices and signs?	Traffic	No_Revision	Yes. The contractor will be responsible for replacing and maintaining the detour.
87	Attach_A	Agreement	38	In pre-RFP meetings, SCDOT indicated it would be responsible for all utility coordination responsibilities. Exhibit 3 indicates utility coordination is responsibility of the contractor. Since extensive utility coordination must be done immediately and prior to NTP, and since SCDOT has already begun such work, will SCDOT retain all utility coordination services required as described in Section VII.A on pages 37-39 of the Agreement? Given the very aggressive nature of the schedule, the project would be better served if SCDOT retained all scope elements related to Utility Coordination services.	Utilities	Revision	At this time, SCDOT is anticipating that all utility impacts will be mitigated prior to NTP or within the utility window . If the Contractor's plan necessitates additional changes to the utilities, they will be responsible for this coordination and associated work.
88	Attach_A	Agreement	40	Will SCDOT provide a complete and detailed report the Contractor can rely on for each Utility requiring relocation within the Railroad's ROW, along with the time each Utility will require to complete their Agreement and Work per paragraph 10?	Utilities	Revision	At this time, SCDOT is anticipating that all utility impacts will be mitigated prior to NTP or within the utility window . If the Contractor's plan necessitates additional changes to the utilities, they will be responsible for this coordination and associated work.
89	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	1	Will SCDOT please provide complete all pertinent contact information for all utilities located within the project limits (Exhibit 7) by November 17,2023?	Utilities	Revision	At this time, SCDOT is anticipating that all utility impacts will be mitigated prior to NTP or within the utility window . If the Contractor's plan necessitates additional changes to the utilities, they will be responsible for this coordination and associated work.
90	Attach_B			Will SCDOT provide copies of the final agreements and/or understandings with all utility companies by December 4, 2023? If not, when?	Utilities	No_Revision	December 4 or January 4? Utility information will be provided to each team when finalized.
91	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	1	Can SCDOT please provide utility contact information?	Utilities	Revision	SCDOT will revise Exhibit 7 once this information is available.
92	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	2	Can SCDOT please provide clarification if utility companies will be allowed to use the conduits within the barrier parapets?	Utilities	No_Revision	SCDOT has notified utilities that three conduits will be available.
93	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	2	"The Department has provided all meeting notes and information received from the utilities in the Project Information Package." Can SCDOT please verify this has been provided?	Utilities	Revision	This will be forthcoming as available. As applicable, information to be provided to each teams ProjectWise portal.
94	Attach_B	Utilities		Will signed and sealed SUE plans be provided?	Utilities	No_Revision	SUE has not been obtained for this project.
95	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 37 of 92; VII.A.1 (pdf 69)	RFP states "The DEPARTMENT has initiated utility coordination with the following known utility conflicts". What is the current status of the relocation efforts?	Utilities	Revision	At this time, SCDOT is anticipating that all utility impacts will be mitigated prior to NTP. If the Contractor's plan necessitates additional changes to the utilities, they will be responsible for this coordination and associated work.
96	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 40 of 92; VII.B.8. (pdf 72) Page 47 of 92; VIII.C.13. (pdf 79)	The RFP indicates a minimum 14-day approval time-frame for all railroad agreements. Does this include utility permits for utilities crossing the railroad right of way? Will SCDOT assist in expediting the utility permits with CSX?	Utilities	No_Revision	With SCDOT assistance, Utilities will pursue their own agreements for relocations.



97	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 37 of 92; VII.A.1 (pdf 69)	If SCDOT is expediting utility relocation efforts, will as-built plans for any completed relocations be provided to the contractor for inclusion in the final deliverable?	Utilities	No_Revision	As-builts of relocated utilities will not be available prior to award. When available, Information showing proposed relocations will be provided to teams through ProjectWise.
98	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	Page 1; Section 2. (pdf 323)	Please provide contact information for the listed utility companies.	Utilities	Revision	SCDOT will revise Exhibit 7 once this information is available.
99	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 37 of 92; VII.A. (pdf 69)	Has SCDOT coordinated with the utility company on the type of poles they plan to utilize? If they are planning to use self supporting engineered poles in this location, the time required for ordering materials for the UT company would be extensive.	Utilities	No_Revision	SCDOT has coordinated with Dominion, at this time they intend to install wooden poles for the relocated portions.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FROM OPEN FORUM MEETING

100	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f	Page 2 / Section 2.1.2 (pdf 165)	The CSXT Soil and Water Management Policy requires soils generated from its property either to be used on CSXT property, if approved, or disposed of at a CSX approved disposal facility. It cannot be re-used on the project outside of the CSXT limits. We anticipate structure unclassified excavation and drilled shaft spoil material to fall into this requirement. Has a disposal area been designated by CSXT. If not, will this information be provided by SCDOT prior to the cost proposal or will it be handled as extra work?	Construction	No_Revision	The soil has to be profiled to a landfill by a CSXT Environmental GEC, this process has not started. A quantity of spoil and a location maps showing the locations of soil removal will need to be provided. CSXT will discuss with CSXT Environmental once the quantity, location map and formal request are received by SCDOT. SCDOT will work up conceptual earthwork estimates and locations and request conceptual evaluation from CSX. Updates will be provided, if available, via addenda.
101	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Page 1 / Section 2.1 (pdf 136)	Please confirm that Corrosion Protection is not required for rebar in bridge decks.	Structures	No_Revision	Corrosion Protection (i.e. Galvanized or coated) will not be required for the bridge deck rebar.
102	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 8 of 92 / Section II.B.4 (pdf 40)	SCDOT's response to Question 67 in the 11/16/23 Open Forum Meeting stated, "SCDOT will acquire all ROW and perform all ROW services for this project with the exception of any ROW or services necessary as dictated by the Contractor's plans if outside of SCDOT conceptual footprint." The ROW established by the conceptual footprint does not appear to include any ditches or the toe ditch detail. The NPDES line location offset from toe of slope is also not included. Please ensure that the ROW acquired will be adequate to cover all extents of disturbance when these items are included.	ROW	Revision	The proposed ROW is intended to be adequate to cover extents of disturbance of new shoulders, side slopes, and ditches. The NPDES line will be adjusted, if needed, to remain within the new proposed ROW line as shown in SCDOT's conceptual plans.
103	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 8 of 92 / Section II.B.4 (pdf 40)	SCDOT's response to Question 67 in the 11/16/23 Open Forum Meeting stated, "SCDOT will acquire all ROW and perform all ROW services for this project with the exception of any ROW or services necessary as dictated by the Contractor's plans if outside of SCDOT conceptual footprint." Please confirm that if additional ROW needs to be acquired, the Contractor is only responsible for the cost to acquire and that the actual cost of real property will be the responsibility of SCDOT.	ROW	Revision	If necessary for the Contractor's plan, SCDOT will be responsible for the costs related to the real property and the Contractor will be responsible for the services associated with acquisition.
104	RFP	7	p39 of 92	Are the 100 flagger days to be provided by SCDOT required to be consecutive or can they be broken up into segments?	Railroad	Revision	SCDOT will cover the cost of flagging operations for this Project.
105	RFP	7	p39 of 92	If over 100 flagger days and the contractors are to incur that cost, what is that cost per day? Are we paying the SCDOT or paying an approved 3rd party? If 3rd party, do you have a list of approved 3rd party flaggers?	Railroad	Revision	SCDOT will cover the cost of flagging operations for this Project.



**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
P042942 - US 17A/21 over CSX Emergency Bridge Replacement**

FINAL RFP - ROUND 1

Date Received: 11/27/2023

I Meeting Date: 11/30/2023

Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	SCDOT	
						Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Agreement	10	Paragraph 6 appears to reference submittals covered by Exhibit 4z. Will SCDOT and CSXT construction submittals and subsequent reviews also be limited to 10 business days?	DM	No_Revision	Construction submittals will be expedited per discussions with CSX. However, the review duration is based on the quality of the submittal and no firm duration will be provided.
2	Attach_A	Agreement	17	Referencing Paragraph J, what constitutes the Contract Deliverable for Clearing and Grubbing Plan? Is this a different submittal than the NPDES and construction limits shown on the Roadway Plans? Or do the Roadway RFC plans constitute the Clearing and Grubbing Plan submittal? Please describe the Contract Deliverable for Clearing and Grubbing plan.	Roadway	No_Revision	The NPDES limits may suffice for the clearing and grubbing plan provided they clearly show the limits of clearing and of clearing and grubbing. A narrative to support the clearing and grubbing operation should be provided to address items such as MOT needs, protection of RR property, etc.
3	Attach_A	Agreement	26	Jurisdictional Agency approval guidelines in the PIP allow 128 days for SCDHEC Construction Coastal permit (also includes 35 days for CZC), which is 85% of the time allowed to substantially complete the project. What is SCDOT's approach to expedite Agency approvals and what are SCDOT's expectations from SCDHEC/OCRM and the Contractor in this process? What amount of time should the Proposers use for Agency approvals as the Proposer develops their schedule and cost associated with the Project Delivery & Approach?	Environmental	No_Revision	SCDOT has begun early coordination, and will continue to coordinate, with all involved agencies to ensure minimization of reviews and delays on necessary approvals.
4	Attach_A	Agreement	40	Please provide Right of Way - Right of Entry dates for each parcel	ROW	No_Revision	Right of Entry for the non-CSXT properties was granted November 20, 2023.
5	Attach_A	Agreement	47	Section IX Permits states the SCDOT will obtain a General Permit and SCDOT will provide the approved permit to the awarded design team. Can SCDOT provide the assumed wetland impact shapes or limits and/or a copy of the GP application to proposers so we can know whether or not our design is covered by the SCDOT prepared GP?	Environmental	Revision	Feature boundaries have not been approved by USACE. Impacts are accounted for out to proposed new RW shown in conceptual design. We can share a figure showing impacts.
6	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	1	Will SCDOT consider allowing the existing 6x4 box culvert @ Sta 1115+00 to be replaced/extended with a round pipe culvert?	Hydrology	Revision	Yes. The RFP will be revised to allow for adequately sized pipe to be provided for drainage and the existing culvert remaining annular space will be filled with flowable fill.
7	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	1	Referencing Section 2.1.3, will temporary shoring be required for demolition of the two existing bent crash walls due to the depth of removal required and their proximity to the Railroad tracks?	Railroad	No_Revision	The demo must be completed in accordance with the CSX Public Projects Manual. Shoring requirements are defined in the Temporary Excavation and Shoring section of the CSXT Public Project Information Manual under the Construction Submission Criteria section.
8	Attach_B	Structures		Will SCDOT request a new Asset ID number from the Bridge Maintenance Office during project procurement ? This new number will need to be in all the load rating documentation and on the plans. There is usually a lag of several weeks from the request to the new number being issued.	Structures	Revision	Yes. SCDOT will provide the new Asset ID.



9	PIP	Geotechnical		During the most recent open forum discussing questions, SCDOT stated that soil borings were taken at the proposed culvert extension. From review of the Baseline Geotechnical Report it doesn't appear borings were taken near the existing 6x4 box culvert around station 1114+35. The nearest borings appear to be 200-300' away from the culvert location. Will SCDOT provide borings per the GDM to be utilized for the design of the box culvert extension or confirm expectations for any required field exploration at the culvert extension given the aggressive schedule?	Geotechnical	Revision	The RFP will be revised to allow for adequately sized pipe to be provided for drainage and the existing culvert remaining annular space will be filled with flowable fill. We do not have borings at the box culvert location and will not be providing them at this point in the procurement. The GDM only requires exploration of pipes greater than or equal to 48 inches in diameter, so if the pipe is less than 48 inches, no geotechnical exploration of this location will be required.
10	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2.12	The RFP states the project is "not part of any South Carolina bicycle tour routes or pedestrian plans and additional bicycle/pedestrian accommodations are not required." According to sctrails.net, US 17A / US 21 is listed as "Local Bike Route - Other". Can SCDOT verify that no bicycle accommodations are required for this project?	Roadway	No_Revision	No revision. Full width shoulders will allow for any future bike lane.
11	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 1	1	"The white edge lines may be 6 inches in width if sufficient shoulder width is present to allow for bicycle traffic." What is the purpose of this statement if exhibit 4a, Section 2.12, states "additional bicycle/pedestrian accommodations are not required."?	Traffic	Revision	2' shoulders do not constitute as "sufficient shoulder width" for bicycle lane traffic. Standard width edge lines are acceptable where applicable. Statement will be adjusted/removed.
12	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2.10	RFP Exhibit 4a Section 2.10 states "Non-mow strips shall be constructed of asphalt." Exhibit 5 Section 805 B. Materials states "Construct the non-mow strip using a minimum 4" HMA Surface Course or a 4" Class 2500 Portland Cement Concrete." Can SCDOT please clarify the desired pavement type for non-mow strips?	Roadway	No_Revision	Exhibit 4 takes precedence over Exhibit 5 per the RFP agreement. Asphalt non-mow strips are required.
13	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2.4 & 2.10	RFP Exhibit 4a Section 2.4 states "Develop traffic lane and shoulder widths in compliance with SCDOT Roadway Design Manual." The Roadway Design Manual states on Figure 16.3-A Footnote 2 "Where guardrail is required, increase the shoulder width an additional 3.75 feet." No where in the Roadway Design Manual is a compressed guardrail shoulder break discussed, thusly 3.75 feet is required behind the face of guardrail, which would preclude the use of the compressed guardrail shoulder. Can SCDOT clarify the language in Section 2.4 to allow compressed guardrail shoulder break in areas where right of way or environmental impacts dictate that standard guardrail shoulder break cannot be built?	Roadway	No_Revision	Section 2.10 states additional length guardrail posts may be utilized & therefore standard drawing 805-215-00 applies. No revision.
14	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2.0	The RFP states to "classify the terrain as rolling." The Roadway Design Manual defines rolling terrain as "Locations where the natural slopes consistently rise above and fall below the roadway grade line and, occasionally, steep grades present some restriction to the desirable horizontal and vertical alignment." The project location does not seem to support this, but rather level terrain. Can SCDOT verify which terrain classification best fits this project?	Roadway	No_Revision	Rolling. See IR Question 60 response.



15	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2.4	RFP Exhibit 4a Section 2.4 states "Develop traffic lane and shoulder widths in compliance with SCDOT Roadway Design Manual." The Roadway Design Manual states on Figure 16.3-A Footnote 2 "Where guardrail is required, increase the shoulder width an additional 3.75 feet." RFP Section 2.10 states "Provide non-mow strip under guardrail in accordance with the guidance found in the Exhibit 5, Special Provisions Section 805." In RFP Special Provisions Section 805 states "Provide non-mow strip under guardrail as shown in the plans, in accordance with plan details, standard drawings 805-525-01 & 805-525-02, and these special provisions." The guardrail shoulder widths dictated by the Roadway Design Manual (widen shoulder 3.75 feet) do not match with widths in standard drawing 805-525-01 which show a 5.0 feet shoulder behind the face of guardrail. Can SCDOT please clarify the required shoulder widths for guardrail and required widths and dimensions of the non-mow strip?	Roadway	No_Revision	Section 2.10 states additional length guardrail posts may be utilized & therefore standard drawing 805-215-00 applies. Non-mow strip shall end at the shoulder break for additional length guardrail application.
16	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2.6	RFP Exhibit 4a Section 2.6 states "Develop vertical curves, grades, and clearances in compliance with SCDOT Roadway Design Manual." The Roadway Design Manual states in Section 4.1.3 "Where practical, the designer should attempt to meet downgrade-adjusted SSD values." and again in Figure 6.5-A Note 2 "For crest vertical curves, consider grade adjustments where the downgrade is 3 percent or greater." Can SCDOT consider adding language to the RFP to explicitly state that grade adjustments for downgrades will not be required to reduce risks to the teams?	Roadway	Revision	It is not practical at this project location & this question was answered in the IR Question 57 response. Will add language to Exhibit 4a to further clarify grade adjusted SSD is not a requirement for this project.
17	Attach_A	Exhibit 8	p1	Will a preliminary geotechnical report also be required for CSX's review of the preliminary bridge plans?	Geotechnical	Revision	Per CSX: We need to review all bridge, roadway, drainage, utility, construction phasing etc., just send us everything from a plan standpoint. Geotech logs as part of the plans are fine, but they are generally just for our information and we do not "approve" Geotech reports.
18	Attach_A	Exhibit 8	p1	Will the Preliminary and /or Final Geotechnical Report be reviewed by CSX? Will the Preliminary and/or Final Seismic Report be reviewed by CSX?	Geotechnical	Revision	Per CSX: Geotech logs as part of the plans are fine, but they are generally just for our information and we do not "approve" Geotech or Seismic reports.
19	Attach_A	Exhibit 8	p1	Can SCDOT and/or CSX please provide allowable construction windows for work within CSX ROW?	Railroad	No_Revision	Per CSX: Contractor shall plan to perform work under the natural windows of operation (i.e. in between trains) and under flagman control (i.e. no planned outages or rerouting of train traffic).
20	RFP	4	p26 of 92	Per the RFP, " Time is of the essence. The Project shall be substantially complete on or prior to June 21, 2024. As US 17A/21 is an official hurricane evacuation route, the new bridge shall be open to traffic on or prior to May 31, 2024. " Can SCDOT please define what "Open to Traffic" means?	Construction	No_Revision	"Open to traffic" means roadway is operational for two way traffic.
21	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	p6	Will SCDOT and/or CSX require the construction casings for the drilled shafts to be drilled/screwed versus vibrated due to the vicinity of the railroad tracks to the casing locations?	Structures	Revision	Per CSX: We would request that an SC Licensed Geotechnical engineer provide their engineering recommendation on this question. Will vibrating the casings into place cause settlement of the track(s)? SCDOT will not preclude vibrating in casing. However, Contractor will need to provide analysis/information to CSX for review and approval prior to implementation. Exhibit 4f will be revised to note this CSX requirement.



22	Attach_A	Exhibit 8	p1	Per the RFP a minimum of 10 days is required for CSX reviews. What is CSX's maximum review period? At how many days past their required 10 day minimum will SCDOT agree that CSX's review has impacted the schedule?	Railroad	No_Revision	The 10 day minimum establishes the design review period to plan for when developing schedules. The intent is for reviews to be complete within 10 business days.
23	Attach_A	Exhibit 8	p1	Is utilizing two cranes for picking/erection of beams considered "dynamic"? If so will this require an exception from CSX? Per their Public Projects Manual, on p131, "4. Dynamic hoisting operations are prohibited when carrying a load with the Potential to Foul. Cranes or other lifting equipment shall remain stationary during lifting. (i.e., no moving picks)." If this operation is considered dynamic then we would request that the CSX design variance/exception be started as soon as possible so as to not delay the schedule.	Railroad	No_Revision	Per CSX: Dual cranes are common and allowable provided the cranes remain stable when performing hoisting operations (i.e. can't pick and walk crane).
24	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	p2	Please confirm end bridge stations - should the Begin Bridge station be 1105+03.38?	Structures	Revision	Yes. Will revise Exhibit 4b.
25	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	p1	Per the RFP, "There is an existing 4 by 6 concrete box culvert at Sta. 1115. Analyze, design and extend the box culvert to meet all criteria." If the RC box culvert is determined to be oversized, would it be allowed to place a smooth wall pipe within the culvert as the extension and flowable fill the RC box culvert?	Hydrology	Revision	Yes. The RFP will be revised to allow for adequately sized pipe to be provided for drainage and the existing culvert remaining annular space will be filled with flowable fill.
26	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f	Page 2 / Section 2.1.2 (pdf 165)	SCDOT's response to Question 100 from the Non-Confidential Question responses for the RFP for Industry Review dated 11/16/23 stated, "A quantity of spoil and a location maps showing the locations of soil removal will need to be provided." Please clarify who needs to provide this information.	Construction	No_Revision	SCDOT has attempted to provide a preliminary estimate for spoil amounts and locations to get preliminary feedback from CSX. This information will be provided when available. However, this is merely for information only and it will be each Team's responsibility to provide this information to CSX for review and approval.
27	Attach_A	Agreement	Pages 47-49 of 92 / Section IX.B / Section X.A.5 (pdf 79-81)	Section IX.B states "All permits necessary for completion of this project shall be procured by the contractor." (pg 47 of 92). Section X.A.5 states "The Contractor is responsible for any mitigation required by the permits." (pg 49 of 92). Since SCDOT will be obtaining the GP, please confirm that SCDOT will provide mitigation for impacts resulting from the preliminary construction limits. Also, please confirm that in the event a permit modification is needed, the Contractor will be responsible for the modification, including any additional mitigation costs required.	Environmental	No_Revision	SCDOT will provide mitigation for the approved GP based on SCDOT's conceptual design. It will be the Contractor's responsibility to modify the permit or any environmental documents as necessary based on the Contractor's design changes beyond what is approved.

