

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

**FINAL RFP - ROUND 2**

Date Received: 12/4/2023

Non-Confidential Meeting Date: 12/7/2023

						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	RFP	4	p26 of 92	Per the RFP, "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". Will bridge deck grooving and/or bridge deck grinding be required to be performed before the project is deemed "Open to Traffic"?	Construction	Revision	SCDOT will revise the RFP and remove the May 31, 2024 interim condition stipulation. The June 21, 2024 date of Substantial Completion will be adjusted to June 28, 2024 and the higher liquidated damages will apply after that date if the project is not substantially complete.
2	RFP	9	p47 of 92	Per the RFP, "All permits necessary for completion of this project shall be procured by the CONTRACTOR....The CONTRACTOR shall submit permit applications to SCDOT. SCDOT will submit the permit application to the appropriate permitting agency indicating that CONTRACTOR is acting as an agent for SCDOT. " Can this please be revised to state that contractor shall submit all required permit applications except the General Permit, as per the Open Forum held on 11/30/2023, the General Permit has already been submitted by SCDOT?	Environmental	No_Revision	Language applies to all applicable permits to complete the project and not just GP. No revision will be made.
3	RFP	9	p47 of 92	Can SCDOT please verify that the submitted General Permit for the project includes all wetland impacts within the proposed ROW limits as shown within the Conceptual Roadway Plans (Rev 1)?	Environmental	No_Revision	Yes. All wetlands within proposed right of way will be accounted as impacted.
4	RFP	9	p49 of 92	Per the RFP, "Cost, preparation, revision, acquisition, compliance, and adherence to conditions of any permits required by federal, state, or local laws or regulations; The CONTRACTOR is responsible for any mitigation required by permits. Compensatory mitigation may be available through an approved mitigation bank or Permittee Responsible Mitigation (PRM) as define in EPA's 2008 Mitigation Rule". Does SCDOT already have mitigation allocated for permanent impacts? If so, has SCDOT purchased those credits or have a plan to purchase those credits once the RGP is approved? We want to ensure there is not a need to provide compensatory mitigation for this project.	Environmental	No_Revision	Mitigation for the obtained GP will be covered by SCDOT. If impacts increase due to a team's design changes, the contractor shall be responsible for preparing all necessary documentation to obtain requisite authorizations including additional mitigation.
5	RFP	9	p49 of 92	Is an environmental compliance plan required to be submitted to SCDOT prior to construction?	Environmental	No_Revision	Yes. SCDOT Compliance will work with teams to review during demo plan development.
6	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f		Section 13.9 of the GDM on page 13-25 requires approval by OES/GDS to use shear wave velocities methods for determination of soils resistance to liquefaction. Will SCDOT allow the use of shear wave velocities methods for determination of soils resistance to liquefaction?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	No, the use of shear wave velocities will not be allowed.



7	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	Page 1; Section 2.1 (pdf 150)	RFP states "Remove or otherwise modify existing pavement in accordance with Section 205.4.5 of the standard specifications prior to placement of new embankment." The standard specifications also allow that "If suitable and approved by the RCE, this material may be used to construct embankments" in Section 202.4.5. If existing concrete pavement material is deemed 'suitable for use in constructing embankments' (as noted in Section 202.4.5 of the standard specifications), can the existing concrete pavement be left in place for fill heights greater than 3-ft?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	The two sections referenced are only related in that Section 202.4.5 of the Standard Specs is specific to reuse of material that has been removed. Reuse of the removed material would still be subject to approval by the RCE based on how the material is proposed for reuse and the suitability of that material.  Section 205.4.5 of the Standard Specs is specific to how to treat existing pavements within two feet of the proposed subgrade. Existing pavements greater than two feet below the proposed subgrade can be retained without modification.
8	Attach_A	Exhibit 7		The existing Bent 2 columns are 2.0' wide (longitudinally) and are located between existing Tracks 1 and 2 which are about 24.125' apart (CL-CL). The distance from CL Existing Bent 2 to CL Existing Track 1 is about 10.84' and to CL Existing Track 2 is about 13.28', so the minimum distance from CL track to face of column is about 9.84'. SCDOT/CSX criteria requires removal of obstructions to 3' below top of rail and does not allow shoring within 10' of centerline track. Shoring cannot be installed to remove the columns while remaining compliant with SCDOT/CSX criteria. Please provide revised criteria that will allow for safe removal of the columns assuming a minimum clearance of 2' from face of column to face of shoring and a shoring thickness of 1'.	Railroad	No_Revision	SCDOT has proposed the following questions to CSX: 1) Will shoring be required for existing pier/footing removal to 3' below grade, because CSX Manual prohibits shoring within 10' of a track centerline? and 2) Will portions of existing footings 3' below grade be allowed to remain below the future track configuration?  <b>Per CSX: there isn't enough informatino about the project and plan development to answer the two questions with any certainty.</b>
9	Attach_A	Exhibit 7		The existing Bent 2 footings are 5.5' (longitudinally) and are located between existing Tracks 1 and 2 which are about 24.125' apart (CL-CL). The distance from CL Existing Bent 2 to CL Existing Track 1 is about 10.84' and to CL Existing Track 2 is about 13.28', so the minimum distance from CL track to edge of footing is about 8.09'. CL Existing Bent 2 to CL Future Track 2 is about 4.16', so the Existing Bent 2 footing will be beneath Future Track 2. Existing top of footing is about 8' below top of rail. SCDOT/CSX criteria requires removal of obstructions to 3' below top of rail, does not allow shoring within 10' of centerline track, and does not address obstructions below future tracks. Will SCDOT/CSX require complete removal the Existing Bent 2 footings? If so, shoring cannot be installed to remove the footings while remaining compliant with SCDOT/CSX criteria. Please provide revised criteria that will allow for safe removal of the footings assuming a minimum clearance of 2' from face of footing to face of shoring and a shoring thickness of 1'.	Railroad	No_Revision	SCDOT has proposed the following questions to CSX: 1) Will shoring be required for existing pier/footing removal to 3' below grade, because CSX Manual prohibits shoring within 10' of a track centerline? and 2) Will portions of existing footings 3' below grade be allowed to remain below the future track configuration?  <b>Per CSX: there isn't enough informatino about the project and plan development to answer the two questions with any certainty.</b>



10	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 39; Section VII.B.1 (pdf 71)	Please clarify the schedule availability of the CSX Flagman for construction operations. While the Final RFP does state that SCDOT will be responsible for flagging operations, it does not specify the availability of coverage. This directly affects project schedule. Will you please clarify if this is restricted to a 5 day workweek (daytime only), or 7 days per workweek (daytime only), or 7 days per workweek (daytime and nighttime)?	Railroad	No_Revision	All flagging operations (5, 6, or 7 days; day or night) will be the responsibility of the Contractor to coordinate through a request to CSX. SCDOT will cover all costs associated with any approved or necessary flagging operations for the purposes of demolition or construction activities. Note: scheduling could be impacted by flagger availability.  Per CSX: Typically one (1) flagman works 5-6 days/week at 13hr max. shift (this includes setup and breakdown time, resulting in between 10-11hrs of track protection +/-) Once assigned to the project, he will remain until the Contractor requests his release. We do not recommend releasing a flagman from this project until it is complete.
11	Attach_A	Agreement	Pages 39 & 40; Section VII.B.4 (pdf 71-72)	The response to Non-Confidential Question Nos. 51 & 52 indicated that SCDOT would furnish all railroad agreement costs and that language would be clarified. Section VII.B.4 of the Final RFP states that the Contractor is responsible for this cost. Will SCDOT please clarify?	Railroad	No_Revision	SCDOT will cover all costs associated with any approved or necessary flagging operations for the purposes of demolition or construction activities. The contractor is responsible for obtaining right of enter (ROE) from CSX and any costs associated with the ROE.
12	Attach_A	Agreement	Section II.H.4	Would SCDOT consider adding a meeting with SCDOT, Contractor, and CSX representatives on a weekly basis to coordinate and discuss progress on CSX agreements, design submittal reviews, construction submittal reviews?	Railroad	No_Revision	In SCDOT's early correspondence with CSX they have expressed interest/availability for status or progress meetings after Contract award. However, arrangement of these meetings will be the responsibility of the Contractor. If desired and appropriately coordinated with CSX, SCDOT will be available to attend such meetings. SCDOT has provided contact information in Exhibit 8 for those CSX or representatives responsible for the items listed in the question.
13	RFP	4	4a	There is no mention of rumble strips in the RFP. The existing US 17A/US21 roadway has rumble strips along the outside white lane line. Does SCDOT desire rumble strips to be incorporated into the proposed designs?	Roadway	Revision	Yes. Will add reference in Exhibit 4c to ED 53.
14	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	Pages 108 & 109; Section 805 (pdf 298-299)	RFP Exhibit 5 (Special Provisions) Section 805 states "Provide non-mow strip between the edge of pavement and the face of guardrail when that distance is less than 20 feet." Standard Drawing 805-525-01 shows also providing the non-mow strip behind the proposed guardrail, up to a point 1-ft shy of the shoulder break for standard guardrail applications. Given that the typical section for US-17A will include guardrail 10-ft away from the proposed ETW, is it the department's intent to pave from shoulder break to shoulder break (minus the 1-ft unpaved bench on either side) for the entire length of the job where MGS3 guardrail is present? Or will mow strips only be required at the end terminals as shown on Standard Drawing 805-115-10 (Leading End MT3 Treatment Type)?	Roadway	No_Revision	See updated Attachment B "US 17A Guardrail Details". Where guardrail is present, asphalt non-mow strip is required from edge of paved shoulder as shown in this detail.



15	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	1	Per RFP Section 2.1.3 Removal and Disposal of Existing Bridges - "Remove and dispose of the existing structures and appurtenances, including modified concrete crib retaining walls at each abutment, in accordance with the SCDOT Standard Specifications and the latest edition of the CSX Railroad Public Project Manual." Can SCDOT please provide any existing plans/additional information for the existing crib walls and the recent soil nail wall modification on the existing end bent 1 side?	Structures	No_Revision	We have requested this information from CSX and have not received it. We cannot find existing crib retaining wall plans in SCDOT Plans Library.
16	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	Page 4; Section 3.1 (pdf 179)	RFP states partial submittals will not be allowed. In order to meet design and construction timelines, would SCDOT consider allowing multiple bridge submittals for substructure and superstructure components?	Structures	Revision	Separate RFC sets for substructure and superstructure will not be allowed. Partial submittals will introduce additional 10-day review windows with CSX. Additionally, substructure design depends on final seismic modelling for this bridge. The entire bridge will need to be designed and detailed to complete seismic modelling so it does not seem that much time can be saved in trying to advance substructure to RFC without superstructure. Prestressed concrete beam sheets may be extracted and released for construction following completion of load rating QA review, if desired, to help advance girder shop plan review and fabrication.
17	Attach_A	Exhibit 7		When will all conflicting utilities be relocated based on SCDOT's current coordination and/or agreements with the utility companies and their monitored progress? Please confirm all utilities to be relocated are still tracking to be completed prior to NTP.	Utilities	No_Revision	SCDOT continues to coordinate with utility companies and the intent is to have all utilities relocated prior to NTP. However, SCDOT does not control utility relocation schedules and there is potential for one or more utilities to not be completely relocated prior to NTP. As such, the RFP contains a 4 week window for utility relocations. If all relocations are complete prior to NTP the 4 weeks will be available for the Contractor to begin operations.

