

NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS

Carolina Crossroads Phase 3—I-20/26/126 System Interchanges Design-Build Project - Project ID P039720 - Richland and Lexington Counties

FINAL RFP - ROUND 6

Date Posted: 9/18/2023

Non-Confidential Meeting Date: 9/18/23

						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement		11.1.4 & 11.1.8 - Can the language in these provisions be changed so the Project Specific policy wraps up at Final Completion. Alternatively, can it be clarified if the Contractor can satisfy the requirements by purchasing a Completed Operations/Products endorsement after Final Completion?	Legal	No_Revision	No Change
2	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement		11.1.4 - Can the bullets under the Qualified Insurers section be broken out into a subsection addressing insurance coverage requirements?	Legal	Revision	RFP to be updated.
3	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement		11.1.5 - Please note: The requested CPA letter is non-typical and we are currently investigating whether it will be possible to provide the requested letter.	Legal	Revision	RFP to be updated.
4	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement		11.1.5 - Please clarify whether a CPA letter is required only for retentions above \$1m or for all retention levels.	Legal	Revision	RFP to be updated.



5	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement		11.1.11.2 - Exhibit 7 sets subcontractor limits but 11.1.9.2 makes it a contractor decision – could you please clarify this?	Legal	Revision	RFP to be updated to clarify that Contractor is responsible for determining whether more insurance is required beyond the minimum provided in Exhibit 7.
6	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement		11.1.22(c) - Can this be clarified to trigger builders risk insurance at start of construction? This change aligns with Exhibit 7.	Legal	Revision	RFP to be updated.
7	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement		11.1.22(e) - This section says SCDOT will directly pay premiums. Is this correct? What is SCDOT's planned payment process?	Legal	Revision	RFP to be updated. Section 11.1.20 (e) to be updated to reference Section 13.3.3 for payment.
8	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement		11.1.9.3 - Can this be changed from 45 days to 60 days? This is not required but is preferred.	Legal	No_Revision	No change.
9	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement		11.1.17.2 - In re: the "benchmark" referenced, Please clarify whether there will actually be insurance benchmarking in this contract and, if so, how that would function.	Legal	Revision	RFP to be updated.
10	RFP	4	33 of 58	CPM Schedule (.xer) should not be required with Technical Proposal Submission. If SCDOT would like to see specific filters and/or a critical path printout in PDF format included in Appendix A.4 please specify in RFP Section 4.1.6.	PM	No_Revision	No change.



11	RFP	4	33 of 58	Please clarify that the intent of SCDOT is not to "manipulate" proposer's schedules in Primavera P6, but intent is to analyze proposer's schedules.	PM	No_Revision	SCDOT's intent is to utilize the Proposer's schedule for review/analysis, not manipulate it. Having this file will assist SCDOT in their review of the Technical Proposal. Any questions regarding their CPM schedule will be provided in accordance with the SCDOT Provides Committee Questions Prior to Presentations date in the Milestone Schedule so they can be discussed during the Proposer's presentation.
12	TPAs	Environmental	160-22	Please provide more clarity to the Clearing Moratorium Location document to include stationing and ROW limits to clearly designate restricted clearing areas.	Environmental	Revision	TPA to be updated.
13	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement		5.2.1(a)i - Please revise to clarify that "entrance construction" is referencing temporary construction entrances , but not inclusive of temporary easement for driveway tie ins. This clarification should also be made to the definition of "Additional Areas" in Exhibit 1.	ROW	No_Revision	No change. Temporary easements for driveway tie-ins would be considered Addtl Areas.
14	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement		5.4.1 - All references to TP Section 890 should be updated to 809. There is no TP Section 890.	ROW	Revision	RFP to be updated.
15	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement		5.2.1.v - Consider revising to clarify temporary construction elements. ""Contractor shall also be responsible for the removal of all temporary elements constructed outside the Project ROW constructed by the Contractor, for the Project unless the property owner agrees in writing the temporary elements can remain."	ROW	Revision	RFP to be updated.
16	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement		Please confirm SCDOT will use the Utility Allowance to fund the Team's cost for utility coordination, management of the utility adjustment process and supplemental SUE during the pre-construction and construction phases of the Project.	Utilities	No_Revision	Confirmed. The SOV will include a line item for Utility Risk/Utility Management that may be used to cover the costs for work mentioned.



17	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement		For Section 5.1 and Section 5.3, please confirm that SCDOT will handle the acquisition and pay 100% of the cost of securing the required ROW for proper driveway tie-ins (meeting requirements of TP 200.3.3) using the MSA / Schematic ROW Plans.	ROW	No_Revision	Driveway tie ins would be considered Additional Areas and would be the responsibility of the Contractor to obtain. See language in Agreement Section 5.15.2
18	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement		Agreement Section 19.1- Given the "Partial Acceptance" which was revised to not limit only to the Quality Credit Matrix Early Opening Commitments (ITP Section 4.1, Item 2d, 2e and 2f), we ask SCDOT change the definition to include any "early openings" to be committed in the proposers' Technical Proposal subject to the \$5,000/day LD (or higher amount chosen by proposer).	Legal	No_Revision	No change.
19	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-714		Section 714.3.1.3 of the RFP states "Headwater conditions for the existing crosslines shown in TP table 714-2 shall be limited to pre-construction water surface elevations for the design storm and 1-foot below the subgrade for the adjacent roadway for the appropriate design storm." If the adjacent roadway is a secondary road and not the control for overtopping on the mainline (profile lower than mainline profile) can a design storm for the secondary route be applied in regards to evaluating the headwater elevation?	Hydrology	Revision	Headwater shall be evaluated for the design storm of the adjacent roadway. If the adjacent roadway is a secondary route, the headwater shall be limited to existing conditions and 1-ft below the subgrade of the roadway.
20	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement		Late changes to Exhibit 7 related to insurance requirements are still under review. Additional comments or questions may be sent after the 10:00 AM 9/15/23 deadline.	Legal	No_Revision	Changes may not be made due to late submission of questions.
21	RFP			Due to the late posting of Addendum 11 and the extent of changes additional questions may be submitted after the question deadline, but no later than 5:00 PM 9/15/2023.	PM	No_Revision	Changes may not be made due to late submission of questions.
22	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-200	TP 200.3.2	Can SCDOT please confirm that "resurfacing" in the TP's without an explicit mention of cross-slope correction or revised cross slope revision can be placed as a standard thickness at existing grade?	Hydrology	Revision	Confirmed. See section 200.3.2 for areas and mill and fill requirements as shown in TPA 200-5. Please note, Addendum 12 will correct formatting in section 200.3.2.1.



23	TPAs	Project Management	TPA Section 110-1	Section 3.2.2 of Section 110-1, item #34 states, Process and schedule for development, review, approval and monitoring of Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) implementation including daily inspection and weekly reporting in, accordance with TP Attachment 110-5 or as otherwise required by South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC) requirements;" Suggest revising to the frequency outlined in SCDOT's General Stormwater permit, #SCR160000, dated August 2022, to weekly inspections and an inspection within 24 hours of any rain event 0.5in or more."	Other	Revision	Erosion control inspections will be required to follow the June 2016 SCDOT guidance document provided in previous addendum. TPA 110-1 will be updated to align with this requirement.
24	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-714	714.3.1.3 Crossline Drainage Structures	TP Table 714-2: Crossline Locations. Will SCDOT consider adding to Table 714-2 culverts: 2102 (60") and 2202 (60") as the proposed headwater is outside of the Right of Way while trying to meet the proposed HW/D ratios.	Hydrology	No_Revision	No change.
25	TPAs	General	TPA 100-1	No updates were highlighted in Magenta in TPA 100-1_R7 that was provided by SCDOT. Please update TPA 100-1 with the changes made in Magenta for Addendum 11.	Other	No_Revision	No change. Highlighting methodology of TPAs is reflective of the revision numbering (ie. R1, R2, etc) which is not necessarily aligned with the addendum number formatting.
26	TPAs	Project Management	TPA 110-2	No updates were highlighted in Magenta in TPA 110-2_R3 that was provided by SCDOT. Please update TPA 110-2 with the changes made in Magenta for Addendum 11.	Other	No_Revision	No change. Highlighting methodology of TPAs is reflective of the revision numbering (ie. R1, R2, etc) which is not necessarily aligned with the addendum number formatting.
27	TPAs	Right of Way	TPA 809-03	No updates were highlighted in Magenta in TPA 809-3_R3 that was provided by SCDOT. Please update TPA 809-3 with the changes made in Magenta for Addendum 11.	Other	No_Revision	No change. Highlighting methodology of this document is SCDOT ROW standard.



28	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-140	140.4.4	Can SCDOT please provide the Design and Construction criteria for the City of West Columbia and the Town of Lexington since these Utility owners have been identified for possible in-contract work?	Utilities	Revision	RFP to be updated.
29	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-140	140.4.4	Can SCDOT please provide the MOA for the City of West Columbia and the Town of Lexington since these Utility owners have been identified for possible in-contract work?	Utilities	Revision	RFP to be updated.
30	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-140	140.4.4	Both the City of West Columbia and Town of Lexington as designated as "In-Contractor" work, but this should be "In-Contract".	Utilities	Revision	RFP to be updated.
31	RFP	4	Page 30 of 58	For the special emphasis details to be included in Appendix A.1, please confirm color prints are acceptable.	Other	Revision	Yes, ITP to be updated to reflect the acceptance.
32	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-700	TPA 700-8 R3	Can SCDOT provide the quantity for the approach slab crack repair? In the new TPA 700-8 R3, Bridge Deck Evaluation Report, WJE did not include the condition of the approach slab, which is inaccessible due to the existing overlay.	Structures	No_Revision	No change. Per TPA 700-8 Section 9, conditions of approach slabs can be evaluated after they are exposed by the Contractor.
33	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement	Exhibit 7	We request for the insurance language related to the Commercial General Liability Insurance that was added in Addendum 11 be modified as follows: "Contractor's Commercial General Liability policy shall contain no provision providing that the limits available to an additional insured are less than the limits available to the Contractor. SCDOT shall be given all the same rights and insurance coverage as Contractor. Contractor shall maintain Commercial General Liability coverage to include liability coverage for damage to insured's completed work equivalent to that provided under ISO CG 0001 for eight (8) years after Final Completion."	Other	Revision	RFP to be updated.



34	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement	Exhibit 7	<p>We request for the insurance language related to the Umbrella / Excess Liability Insurance that was added in Addendum 11 be modified as follows: "Contractor's umbrella policy shall contain no provision providing that the limits available to an additional insured are less than the limits available to the Contractor." SCDOT shall be given all the same rights and insurance coverage as Contractor. Contractor shall maintain umbrella coverage to include liability coverage for damage to insured's completed work equivalent to that provided under ISO CG 0001 for eight (8) years after Final Completion."</p>	Other	Revision	RFP to be updated.
----	-------------------	-----------	-----------	--	-------	----------	--------------------

