

**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS**  
**Bridge Package 14 - Contract ID 1162220 - Cherokee County**

**RFP FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW**

Date Received: 19-Aug

|              |          |            |                |   | SCDOT       |   |
|--------------|----------|------------|----------------|---|-------------|---|
| Question No. | Category | Section    | Page / Doc No. | Question/Comment  | Response    | Explanation   |
| 1            | Attach_A | Agreement  | 25             | Please verify that BMP install and clearing/grubbing operations in advance of utility relocations do not require a notice of closure.   | No_Revision | This is correct for the S-226 site only which is currently open to traffic.   |
| 2            | Attach_A | 8          | 9              | "A complete submittal package shall be limited to one phase (ex. Preliminary/Right Of Way (ROW)/Final/Release For Construction (RFC)) of one roadway segment or structure and include all design deliverables specified in Exhibit 4z." Suggest change to "...one roadway segment AND/OR structure..." to allow roadway and structure plans to be submitted simultaneously. | Revision    | Will revise to include "and/or".  |
| 3            | Attach_A | Exhibit 5  | 19             | "The contractor shall monitor vibrations at no less than four locations at each specific site of construction activity along the perimeter of the project during all foundation and embankment construction activities." Does this apply to sites containing no structures within 300 feet of any vibration inducing construction activity?                                 | No_Revision | No.   |
| 4            | Attach_A | Exhibit 5  | 20-21          | Figure 1 - Vibration Criteria on page 20 is partially cutoff. Please provide full figure.   | Revision    | Figure will be provided.  |
| 5            | PIP      |            |                | Appendices A, B and C in the baseline geotechnical report for S-11-106 are for S-11-86 over Kings Creek. Please provide appendices for S-11-106.  | Revision    | Report will be revised and provided to the teams.   |
| 6            |          | Hydraulics | n/a            | Can the South Carolina Bridge Scour Envelope Curves Template, 2016 referenced in the Preliminary Hydraulic Analysis Memo provided by SCDOT for each bridge be provided to the design teams?   | No_Revision | The link is provided on SCDOT's website<br><a href="https://www.scdot.org/business/hydraulic-bridge.aspx">https://www.scdot.org/business/hydraulic-bridge.aspx</a><br>USGS SIR 2016-5121  |
| 7            |          | Hydraulics | n/a            | Is there a minimum distance upstream a dam has to be located within for it to be included in the hydraulic analysis?  | No_Revision | There are no SCDOT Hydraulic requirements other than directions on modeling in Exhibit 4e of the RFP, however the EOR should model and determine whether or not the upstream dam has an hydraulic impact downstream. There is some guidance in the RHDS 2009, Sec 1.3.1 Step 2 Section 2 Job Site Inspection. The 2nd paragraph states to note presence of Hydraulic structures upstream and downstream at a distance at least equal to the floodplain width. |
| 8            | Attach_A | Exhibit 5  | 40             | "The Contractor's bid shall include 2000 square yards of full depth asphalt pavement patching." Will pavement patching be limited to bridge approaches or do detour routes also qualify for patching?   | No_Revision | The full depth patching is not limited to bridge approaches. Patching quantity is also intended for detour routes.  |
| 9            | Attach_A | Exhibit 5  | 40             | The unit price of \$52 per square yard of full depth asphalt patching is low. Consider revising unit rate to \$75/SY.   | Revision    | Will revise the RFP to show a higher unit rate price of \$75.00   |



|    |          |           |          |   |             |   |
|----|----------|-----------|----------|---|-------------|---|
| 10 | Attach_A | Agreement | 77 of 91 | There is a discrepancy in the Professional Services DBE % (0.4% vs 0.8%)  | Revision    | Section will be revised. Professional service percentage is 0.4%  |
| 11 | PIP      | Forms     |          | On the Quality Matrix Form, is the number requested a sequential numbering of ideas, or the bridge number for which the idea is applicable?   | No_Revision | The number requested is for sequential numbering.   |
| 12 | RFP      |           | n/a      | Agreement section XVIII. DBE: Page 77 of 91 references 0.4% from Professional Services but Page 78 of 91 references 0.8%. Please clarify.   | Revision    | Section will be revised. Professional service percentage is 0.4%  |
| 13 | RFP      | 2         | 5        | Confidential Risk Register and Conceptual ATC Meetings are stated to be "in advance of the release of the Final RFP". This is inconsistent with the Milestone schedule found on page 33.  | Revision    | Section will be revised. Due to tight schedule, the meeting will come shortly after the release of the Final RFP. |
| 14 | RFP      | 3         | 6        | "Once the Final RFP is issued, SCDOT will allow Proposers to submit additional non-confidential questions or comments to point out mistakes or ambiguities in the RFP." The milestone schedule found on page 33 does not show a non-confidential question period after the Final RFP has been issued. | Revision    | Milestone will be added for submittal of Non-Confidential Questions.  |
| 15 | RFP      | 3         | 14       | Appendix A - Conceptual Plans list skips "A.2". Please confirm there are no additional conceptual plans required other than Roadway Plans, Bridge Plans and CPM Schedule.   | Revision    | Correct. Section will be revised to show in sequential order.   |
| 16 | RFP      | 4         | 15       | Please confirm that the "Quality Commitment Matrix" Form on the SCDOT Design-Build site, under Standard Forms, is the "Quality Credit Matrix" referenced in section 4.1.  | Revision    | Correct. Title has been updated.  |
| 17 | RFP      | 4         | 33       | Please consider adding a non-confidential and confidential question submittal date to the milestone schedule after SCDOT's Final Determination of Formal ATCs. (Monday, October 3, 2022)  | Revision    | A NCQ/CQ submittal will be included after the Final Determination shown in the milestone schedule.                |
| 18 | Attach_A | Agreement | 10       | Will SCDOT consider decreasing the initial review period from 15 business days to 10 business days?   | No_Revision | No. Initial review will stay 15 business days.  |
| 19 | Attach_A | Agreement | 62-64    | B. Defense and Indemnification Procedures. This article makes several references to Section I, Section II.C, Section II.C.2, Section C.1, Section II.C.3, and Section II.G, but these sections are either mis-labeled or missing. Please clarify.   | Revision    | Section references will be revised.   |
| 20 | Attach_A | Agreement | 77-78    | We have reviewed the opportunities for DBE subcontractors on the project and feel the DBE goal of 11.6% is high for the scope of work. Would SCDOT consider revising the DBE goal?  | No_Revision | No.   |
| 21 | Attach_A | Agreement | 77-78    | Sentence 4 states "DBE committals for the .8 percent must be submitted no later than 30 calendar days from contract execution." Please define "the .8 percent". This appears to contradict the requirement of .4 percent to be met at the time of bid opening.  | Revision    | Section will be revised. Professional service percentage is 0.4%  |
| 22 |          | Survey    | 77       | Do the lines labeled CCR & CCL in the MicroStation survey files provided by SCDOT denote the top of channel banks?  | No_Revision | Yes, the lines labeled CCR & CCL denote top of creek bank, right and left at the time of survey.                  |
| 23 | RFP      | 4         | n/a      | RFP Exhibit 4a-Road Design Criteria, Section 2.2 (45 MPH) and Attachment B – Supplemental Project Design Criteria, Roadway 1. CLRB_TYP.pdf (50 MPH) show different DS for S-86. Please clarify  | Revision    | RFP Exhibit 4a will be revised to 50 mph design speed for S-86.   |



|    |          |                 |   |  |             |   |
|----|----------|-----------------|---|--|-------------|---|
| 24 | Attach_A | Agreement       | 1 | Please clearly define the limits of new pavement required at each site.  | No_Revision | Limits of new pavement will be based on actual design. Limits of new pavement shall be provided up to profile tie-in. Refer to Exhibit 4c for further details on locations where new pavement ties to existing pavement.  |
| 25 | Attach_A | Exhibit_3       | 1 | "This work also includes repairing any deficient roadway embankments within the roadway approach limits of each bridge." Please define the roadway approach limits of each bridge.   | No_Revision | Roadway approach limits will be based on actual design. Deficient roadway embankments shall be repaired within project begin and end termini to be in accordance with RFP.  |
| 26 | Attach_A | Exhibit_3       | 3 | 2.15 "Clear all right-of-way within the project limits." Consider changing to "Clear the entirety of the ROW at the bridge sites and extend clearing a distance of 75' from the end of each bridge."   | Revision    | Section will be revised. Intent is to clear and grub the entirety of the right-of-way, with the exception of grubbing in wetlands. Contractor shall clear but not grub in the wetlands.   |
| 27 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4a      | 2 | Can the criteria in Exhibit 4a section 2.8 be applied if you are replacing the existing sag vertical curve with two vertical curves in order to move the low point off of the bridge?  | No_Revision | Yes, the criteria in exhibit 4a section 2.8 can be applied to all proposed vertical curves within project limits.   |
| 28 | PIP      |                 |   | Please provide MicroStation CAD files of the Conceptual Roadway Design.  | Revision    | Available conceptual roadway design files will be provided in PIP.  |
| 29 | PIP      |                 |   | The conceptual roadway plans provided for S-138 Over Goucher Creek and S-56 Over Horse Creek do not indicate new ROW, however these sites do not appear to meet either of the ROW requirements presented in Exhibit 4a, 2.15. Is there an exception to the ROW requirements at these two sites if the new bridge can be constructed within the existing ROW? | Revision    | RFP Exhibit 4a will be revised to clarify. Conceptual roadway design files provided in PIP are for information only. Design teams shall refer to RFP, exhibit 4a when determining requirements for roadway design including right-of-way. There is no exception to the ROW requirements at S-138 or S-56. |
| 30 | RFP      |                 | 1 | Project Goals "Avoidance of right-of-way acquisition at S-86 over King Creek." Please clarify that avoidance of ROW acquisition is for Kings Mountain National Military Park only.   | Revision    | Revision. Section 2.2 Project Goals will be revised for clarity.  |
| 31 | PIP      |                 |   | Please provide MicroStation CAD files of the Conceptual Bridge Plans.  | Revision    | Conceptual Bridge CAD files will be provided and provided in the Project Information Package.   |
| 32 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4a      | 1 | "New signs shall be erected over the entire length of the project, including, at a minimum, stop signs on all intersecting routes." Please provide begin and end stationing for each site to clearly define "entire length of project"   | No_Revision | Not intended for detour routes, only signs inside the immediate project limits (from begin to end stationing around the bridge).  |
| 33 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4d_Pt 2 | 1 | "Existing signs, if applicable, shall be maintained during construction." Does this mean that existing detour signage if applicable may be utilized by the contractor?   | No_Revision | No. Contractor must provide their own signage. District will reclaim existing detour signage.   |
| 34 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4d_Pt 2 | 2 | Vertical clearance and crossing route number signs are not applicable to any of the proposed bridges within the scope of this project. Consider removing.  | No_Revision | This is part of standard bridge package language.   |



|    |          |                 |    |  |             |  |
|----|----------|-----------------|----|--|-------------|--|
| 35 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4d_Pt 2 | 5  | 4 of the 5 bridge sites have detours currently in place. Please add language to clarify that Contractor is not responsible for installation and maintenance of detours until "Notice of Closure" has been submitted. | Revision    | Section will be revised to clarify.  |
| 36 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4d_Pt 2 | 5  | Is the name of the road being detoured required on all detour signs?   | Revision    | Yes. Provide road names on all detour signs.   |
| 37 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4d_Pt 2 |    | Please confirm roadway lighting, ITS design, traffic signal and communication plans, and interchange modification reports are not applicable to any of the bridge sites within this project.                         | No_Revision | Items are not applicable. This language is a part of a template.   |
| 38 | Attach_B | Exhibit 5       |    | Please provide the current and future ADT traffic projections referenced in section 2.3 of Exhibit 4a.   | Revision    | Current and future ADT traffic projections will be provided in Attachment B.   |
| 39 | Attach_A | Agreement       | 37 | Has there been any upfront utility coordination with Duke Transmission on S-86 over King Creek? Conceptual plans show impacts to their easement.   | No_Revision | The Preliminary Utility Report contains information based on the original concept plans. After the initial concept plans and immediately before issuance of the RFP for Industry Review, Exhibits 3 and 4a were revised to avoid impacts to the Kings Mountain Park. No further coordination was done with Duke due to assumed avoidance of the grading impacts. |
| 40 | Attach_A | Agreement       | 37 | If an eligible water/sewer utility under ACT 36 has conflicts with proposed construction, how will the MOA process be handled and added to the contract?   | Revision    | Language will be added to the Agreement Article VII in an Addendum to clarify.   |



**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS**  
**Bridge Package 14 - Contract ID 1162220 - Cherokee County**

**RFP FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW**

Date Received: 25-Aug

| Question No. | Category | Section         | Page / Doc No. | Question/Comment   | SCDOT       |   |
|--------------|----------|-----------------|----------------|--|-------------|---|
|              |          |                 |                |  | Response    | Explanation   |
| 1            | Attach_A | Agreement       | 25             | Follow up to question 1 from RFP For Industry Review. Please clarify that BMP install and clearing/grubbing in advance of utility relocations do not require a Notice of Closure and therefore do not begin the construction time is applicable to all sites.  | No_Revision | For the closed bridges BMP installation and clearing/grubbing in advance of utility relocations will require a Notice of Closure and therefore begin the construction time. |
| 2            | Attach_A | Exhibit 5       | 40             | Can there be a minimum quantity set for each mobilization of patching? Please consider a minimum of 165 SY per mobilization for patching.  | No_Revision | A minimum patching quantity will not be set for each mobilization.  |
| 3            | Attach_A | Exhibit 5       | 40             | Per the RFP for patching, "The pavement shall be removed to a depth of six (6) inches as directed by the RCE. In the event unstable material is encountered at this point, then such additional material shall be removed as directed by the RCE. The volume of material removed below the patch shall be backfilled with crushed stone and thoroughly compacted in 4-inch layers with vibratory compactors." How is the removal and backfill of the unstable material to be paid? | No_Revision | Removal and backfill of unstable material is included in the unit price for full depth patching per the Special Provision.  |
| 4            | Attach_A | Exhibit 4d_Pt 2 | 6              | "Pavement on detour routes will be maintained by SCDOT." This statement is inconsistent with the response to Question 8 from the RFP For Industry Review Questions and Answers, which stated "Patching quantity is also intended for detour routes." Please clarify.   | Revision    | This clarification has been made in Exhibit 4d - Part 2 and Exhibit 4c of the RFP. Patching quantity includes bridge approaches and detour routes.                          |
| 5            |          |                 |                | The location of boring B-5 for bridge S-226 in the Geotechnical Subsurface Data Reports and Field Testing Data Files does not appear to be correct. Please confirm.  | Revision    | Location of B-5 was in error. This has been revised.  |



**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS**  
**Bridge Package 14 - Contract ID 1162220 - Cherokee County**

**FINAL RFP - ROUND 1**

Date Received: 9/7/2022

| Question No. | Category | Section      | Page / Doc No. | Question/Comment   | Discipline    | SCDOT       |   |
|--------------|----------|--------------|----------------|--|---------------|-------------|---|
|              |          |              |                |  |               | Response    | Explanation   |
| 1            | Attach_A | Exhibit_4a   | 3              | Is it SCDOT's intention for clearing and grubbing of R/W to be performed if that portion of R/W cannot be accessed without crossing a stream/creek or tributary?   | Roadway       | Revision    | The intent is not to clear past streams/creeks within right of way. Exhibit 4a will be revised to clarify.  |
| 2            | Attach_A | Exhibit 6    | 1              | Who is responsible for a change in scope if the USACE identifies a least environmentally damaging alternative that differs from what is required in the RFP?   | Environmental | No_Revision | The winning team is responsible for obtaining a permit for their own final design.  |
| 3            | Attach_B | Geotechnical |                | The supplemental borings (R-1 and R-2) provided at Kings Creek appear to have been drilled in the ditch line below the cut slopes which does not help in evaluating the global stability of the cut slopes. Can SCDOT provide any addition geotechnical information from within or on top of the cut slopes to evaluate global stability?"       | Geotechnical  | No_Revision | Respectfully, the borings do provide useful information at the toe of the cut slopes. No, any additional information deemed necessary for evaluating any cut slopes will be the responsibility of the Design-Build Team.  |
| 4            | Attach_A | Exhibit 4e   | page 4         | Will SCDOT accept the bridge lengths and stationing as laid out in Attachment B where the surveyed top of bank does not provide the required 5 ft setback to the end bent slope? (i.e. S-106 and S-56).<br><br>Is an ATC required? Or do the Teams need to lengthen these bridges to maintain the PCDM-11 abutment setback requirements of 5 ft. | Hydrology     | Revision    | Conceptual Bridge Plans are For Information Only and located in Project Information Package. Bridge end stations, bench elevations, and bridge end excavation/grading may be adjusted. 5-foot abutment setback is required at the toe of proposed 2:1 slope (bench location) at the centerline existing ground line shown on the bridge plans. Regrading of channel banks to bottom of creek at the upstream bridge corners at S-106 is required to establish 2:1 spill-through slopes at this location. Minimum bridge lengths provided in the RFP are acceptable. |
| 5            | Attach_B | Structures   | S-226          | Existing plan shows 2:1 slope at EB 2 cutting into the channel 20 ft right of CL Survey.<br><br>Is the bridge length as shown acceptable? Or should the bridge be lengthened to meet the PCDM-11 requirements?   | Hydrology     | Revision    | Top of berm may need to be lower than depicted on Conceptual Bridge Plans, to meet 2:1 projection requirement, and is controlled by the 5' maximum distance from bottom of superstructure requirement in Exhibit 4b. Also, see response to previous question.   |



|    |          |            |          |   |           |             |  |
|----|----------|------------|----------|---|-----------|-------------|--|
| 6  | Attach_B | Structures | S-138    | The existing slopes under the bridge do not appear to align with the survey as provided. The end slopes appear to be more eroded than the survey shows.<br><br>Is the bridge length as shown in the provided documents acceptable? Or should the bridge be lengthened to meet the PCDM-11 requirements? If the Teams use the survey as provided, and the bridge needs to be lengthened post award, will this be considered a "changed condition?" | Hydrology | Revision    | Existing topography in the survey files provided shall be used for procurement. Minimum bridge lengths provided are acceptable pre and post award. If additional channel erosion is encountered during construction, 2:1 spill-through slope projection may be extended lower to re-establish channel banks. |
| 7  | Attach_A | Exhibit 4e | 4-5      | Section numbering on page 4 and 5 for sections 222-234 is inconsistent with section numbering within other sections.  | Hydrology | No_Revision | Section numbering is shown correct.  |
| 8  | Attach_A | Agreement  | 52       | Will the Department consider extending the 5' radius that is referenced in Agreement section XIII.B.1 to cover the distance from the SCDOT test holes to the closet conceptual bridge foundation location so that the contractor does not have 100% of the foundation installation risk.  | Legal     | No_Revision | This is SCDOT's standard subsurface condition provision.   |
| 9  | Attach_B | Traffic    |          | Are there any active or future maintenance contracts that cover any of the 5 detour routes provided in Attachment B?  | Pavement  | No_Revision | (S-72) on the detour for S-138 over Goucher Creeki is under contract for resurfacing with a contract completion of 06/2023.  |
| 10 | RFP      | 5          | 22 of 41 | Will SCDOT assign quality credit points for improving the hydraulic opening (length of bridge or height of low chord) at any / each site beyond minimum requirements?   | PM        | No_Revision | SCDOT will accept the minimum values specified as long as they meet all the requirements of the RFP. Quality Credit will only be given when a team can demonstrate added value.  |
| 11 | RFP      | 5          | 22 of 41 | How many quality credit points will SCDOT assign for an extended warranty (per each year of extension) in addition to the required 3 year warranty? Is there a maximum number of points available (i.e. max number of years of warranty?). What assurances need to be provided to achieve these points in quality credit?   | PM        | No_Revision | SCDOT does not see any value on extending the warranty for low volume bridge packages.   |
| 12 | RFP      | 5          | 22 of 41 | How many quality credit points will SCDOT assign for early delivery of the entire contract (per day / week / month)? Is there a maximum point value associated with accelerated delivery of the contract?   | PM        | No_Revision | Quality Credit points are not preassigned but are established based on the entirety of the technical proposal and the added value being provided. As noted in Section 4.1, SCDOT values schedule certainty including early completion.   |
| 13 | RFP      | 5          | 22 of 41 | How many quality credit points will SCDOT assign for early delivery of S-138 over Goucher Creek (per day / week / month)? Is there a maximum point value associated with this accelerated delivery?   | PM        | No_Revision | Quality Credit points are not preassigned but are established based on the entirety of the technical proposal and the added value being provided. As noted in Section 4.1, SCDOT values schedule certainty including early completion.   |
| 14 | RFP      | 5          | 22 of 41 | How many quality credit points will SCDOT assign for early delivery of S-86 over King's Creek (per day / week / month)? Is there a maximum point value associated with this accelerated delivery?   | PM        | No_Revision | Quality Credit points are not preassigned but are established based on the entirety of the technical proposal and the added value being provided. As noted in Section 4.1, SCDOT values schedule certainty including early completion.   |



|    |          |            |          |   |         |             |  |
|----|----------|------------|----------|---|---------|-------------|--|
| 15 | RFP      | 5          | 22 of 41 | How many quality credit points will SCDOT assign for early delivery of S-106 over Suck Creek (per day / week / month)? Is there a maximum point value associated with this accelerated delivery?                              | PM      | No_Revision | Quality Credit points are not preassigned but are established based on the entirety of the technical proposal and the added value being provided. As noted in Section 4.1, SCDOT values schedule certainty including early completion.                             |
| 16 | RFP      | 5          | 22 of 41 | How many quality credit points will SCDOT assign for early delivery of S-56 over Horse Creek (per day / week / month)? Is there a maximum point value associated with this accelerated delivery?                              | PM      | No_Revision | Quality Credit points are not preassigned but are established based on the entirety of the technical proposal and the added value being provided. As noted in Section 4.1, SCDOT values schedule certainty including early completion.                             |
| 17 | RFP      | 5          | 22 of 41 | How many quality credit points will SCDOT assign for early delivery of S-226 over Unnamed Stream (per day / week / month)? Is there a maximum point value associated with this accelerated delivery?                          | PM      | No_Revision | Quality Credit points are not preassigned but are established based on the entirety of the technical proposal and the added value being provided. As noted in Section 4.1, SCDOT values schedule certainty including early completion.                             |
| 18 | Attach_A | Agreement  | 25       | Would SCDOT allow clearing and BMP install in advance of utility relocations without a Notice of Closure for sites that are currently closed if the Contractor installs and maintains detour signage prior to beginning work? | PM      | Revision    | Yes. Contractor may clear and install BMPs in advance of utility relocations without a Notice of Closure for sites currently closed if the Contractor installs and maintains detour signage prior to beginning work. Notice of Closure definition will be revised. |
| 19 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4a | 3        | When driveways must be relocated in order to install a longer bridge or guardrail at the end of the bridge, does the relocation have to be completed within existing or proposed ROW?   | ROW     | No_Revision | No, ROW does not necessarily have to be purchased to relocate a driveway on an existing tract.   |
| 20 | Attach_A | Exhibit_3  | 1        | Will a roadway alignment shift (submitted as an ATC if necessary) be allowed at any site other than S-86 to avoid stream or utility impacts?  | Roadway | No_Revision | Roadway alignment shifts will not be allowed via an ATC. An alignment shift is allowed per the criteria for S-86.  |





|    |          |            |   |   |            |          |  |
|----|----------|------------|---|---|------------|----------|--|
| 21 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4a | 3 | <p>Suggest the following revisions to the second and third paragraph of Exhibit 4a Section 2.15 for clarity: “For bridge sites that currently have a complete 75 feet right-of-way width on each side of the structure and where the <del>new</del> length of 75 foot wide right-of-way <del>will be provided</del> is at least 45 feet from each end of the bridge, no additional right-of-way is necessary unless the design and construction results in permanent facilities extending outside of the existing right-of-way.</p> <p>For bridge sites that do not currently have a complete 75 feet right-of-way width on each side of the structure <del>and</del> <u>or</u> where the <del>new</del> length of 75 foot wide right-of-way is not present at least 45 feet from each end of the bridge, provide a minimum right-of-way width of 75 feet on each side of the structure centerline <del>and</del> <u>a</u> minimum <u>of</u> 75 feet from each end of the bridge. Provide right-of-way described within this paragraph regardless of whether the design requires this right-of-way or not.”</p> | Roadway    | Revision | A revision to RFP exhibit 4a will be made to clarify.  |
| 22 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4e | 4 | Is the bench elevation at the bottom of the abutment slope to be set at the approximate natural ground elevation or as needed to meet hydraulic design requirements, abutment toe setback requirements and/or designer preference?  | Structures | Revision | The bench elevation (toe of proposed 2:1 spill-through slope) may be adjusted as needed for both hydraulic modelling and setback requirements. 5-foot abutment setback is required at the toe of proposed 2:1 slope at the centerline existing ground line shown on the bridge plans. At the upstream bridge corners at S-106, regrading of channel banks to bottom of creek is required to establish 2:1 spill-through slopes at this location. |
| 23 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4e | 4 | When rip rap is placed on the abutment slope is the projected abutment slope to be extended from the face of rip rap similar to Hydraulic Design Bulletin 2019-04 or from the earthen portion of the abutment slope?  | Structures | Revision | The projected abutment slope may be the proposed 2:1 ground line, regardless of presence of riprap, and this will be clarified in 4e for this project. Riprap requirements are in accordance with the SCDOT Standard Drawing for bridge end riprap.  |
| 24 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4e | 4 | Can the total minimum bridge lengths provided in Attachment B/Hydrology be reduced if all other hydraulic design criteria are met?  | Structures | Revision | Reduction in bridge length requires evaluation through the ATC process and hydraulic modelling would need to demonstrate compliance with all requirements. Bridge ends will not be allowed within the limits of the existing bridge ends (to comply with PCDM-11). At S-138 Goucher Creek the minimum bridge length will be revised to 120 feet.   |
| 25 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4e | 4 | Do the abutment slope setback requirements apply only to the stream/creek below the bridge or do they also apply to tributaries/ditches upstream and downstream of the bridge as well?  | Structures | Revision | See response to previous questions above regarding abutment setback. This will be clarified in 4e.   |



|    |          |            |    |   |           |             |   |
|----|----------|------------|----|---|-----------|-------------|---|
| 26 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4a | 1  | What year is the "design traffic volumes" based off of?   | Roadway   | No_Revision | Open year is 2020 while design year is 2040. See "Traffic Projections" in Attachment B.   |
| 27 | Attach_A | Agreement  | 25 | Follow up to question 1 received on 25-Aug. from RFP For Industry Review: For sites that require utility relocation - Can the Construction Time begin when the Contractor mobilizes to the site for bridge construction in lieu of clearing and grubbing for utility relocation? A suggested alternative may be for the SCDOT to provide an assumed utility relocation duration in the Agreement for each bridge and therefore reduce the risk to the Contractor's construction schedule. | Utilities | Revision    | Agreement has been updated to allow for clearing and grubbing for utility relocations in advance of the clock starting for Notice of Closure. |

