

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Exh	Page	Section	Comment	Response	RFP Revision
2	3	1	1	Project Summary states "the pavement for the Project consists of both concrete and asphalt",... and add one (1) travel lane with paved shoulder". Exhibit 4c Pavement Design Criteria page 1 – 2.1 Mainline Pavement New Lane includes an HMA Overlay with PCC Pavement – 10" thick. This section conflicts with the "Typical Section" found in Attachment B: Document R27002 which shows Cement Stabilized Base with an Asphalt Intermediate and Surface course. The Exhibit clearly calls out Attachment B, please clarify Document R27002.	Typical section pavement is conceptual and for information only. Exhibit 4c describes the pavement design. See Final RFP, Exhibit 4c.	yes
3	3	1	1	I-77 Mainline NB & SB from Station 1302+50 to 1510+00 bullet point 1 states "Add one (1) travel lane towards the median in each direction." Please verify that this will also require the removal of existing paved shoulders in median...and paved shoulder in median in each direction , as noted in the previous section of I 77 Mainline Station 1170+00 to 1302+50.	This section does require removal of existing paved shoulder. See Final RFP.	yes
4	3	1	1,2	It states to "repair and/or replace storm drainage appurtenances". The HDR SMDR only encompasses the widening portion of the project. Is the Contractor responsible for survey, pipe videos and hydraulic analysis to insure all existing drainage in the rehabilitation section is structurally sound and meets all current SCDOT design criteria?	When pipes in the rehab section are extended, work will follow EDM 24. Pipes not touched require no work. See Final RFP, Exhibit 4e.	yes
5	3	1		22. EXHIBIT 3—SCOPE OF WORK page 1----1st section of I-77 has "Install milled-in rumble strips" other sections do not, are they required in all sections?	Yes	yes
6	3	1		23. EXHIBIT 3—SCOPE OF WORK page 1----2nd and 3rd section of I-77 has "Cross Slope Verification/Correction" 1st section does not, is it required in the 1st section?	No. 1st section is not required because it already had cross slope correction.	no
7	3	1		24. EXHIBIT 3—SCOPE OF WORK page 1----2nd and 3rd section of I-77 has "Repair and/or replace control of access fencing" 1st section does not, is it required in the 1st section?	No. Completed in latest rehab project.	No
8	3	1		25. EXHIBIT 3—SCOPE OF WORK page 1----1st, 2nd and 3rd section of I-77 has "Re-install signal loop detectors along ramps." Will they only be required if the existing are damaged?	Yes, only if damaged by the work.	yes
9	3	1		26. EXHIBIT 3—SCOPE OF WORK page 1----1st, 2nd and 3rd section of I-77 has "Pave under guardrail adjacent to paved shoulders." Is this only for new guardrail?	Pave under all guardrail. Will provide special provision. See Final RFP.	yes
10	3	1		Will Cross Slope Verification/Correction be required for the I-77 Mainline NB & SB from Station 1170+00 to 1302+50?	No revisions. Not required in this section.	no
11	3	2		Please clarify the Scope for the MM 21.5 to MM 27.0. The project Scope reads to "Repair and/or replace storm drainage appurtenances". The SWDR by HDR was only performed up to MM 21.5.	RFP has been revised to clarify requirements for the rehab section. Pipe extentions in rehab section shall comply with EDM 24. See Final RFP.	yes
12	3	2		3. Page 2 of Exhibit 3 states "Repair and/or replace storm drainage appurtenances" for I-77 SB from Station 1510+00 and 1801+00. Will SCDOT provide video pipe inspection reports in this area? Is the contractor required to provide a complete hydraulic design and report, including video inspection, for this rehab section of the project?	RFP has been revised to clarify requirements for the rehab section. Pipe extentions in rehab section shall comply with EDM 24. See Final RFP.	yes
13	3	2		4. Page 2 of Exhibit 3 states "Clearing and improving I-77 clear zone" for I-77 SB from Station 1510+00 and 1801+00. Is the intent to clear and grade as necessary to provide 46 feet of clear zone on the outside and grade the median as necessary to meet current median cable standards in this rehab section? Are these grading and drainage improvements consistent with the Categorical Exclusion?	SCDOT will revise clear zone section in Exhibit 4a.	yes
14	3	1, 2		Please clarify "adjust and/or improve shoulders, side slopes and ditch banks." Does this mean to widen the shoulders to meet the criteria in the areas where no widening is being done (the SB rehabilitation section), or just improve them through patching and/or overlay? Is the work on side slopes and ditches just to be what is required to meet the clear zone requirements?	Will clarify. See final RFP.	yes

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Exh	Page	Section	Comment	Response	RFP Revision
15	3			15. From Station 1170 to 1187 I-77 has 3 lanes existing. Will an only an overlay be required in this section?	This depends on Proposer's design. New lanes will be developed and dropped in this area. Also consider auxil lane on outside. Pavement details are included in Exhibit 4c.	yes
16	3			Does SCDOT have current traffic counts along the corridor	Traffic data is available in the CE-C and ATR data is available here http://www.scdot.org/getting/trafficCounts.aspx	no
17	4	2	Des. Ref.	The AASHTO A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Street, 2001 is listed. Is it the SCDOT's intent to not utilize the 2004 and 2011 editions?	Yes, must meet AASHTO 2001. No RFP revisions necessary.	no
18	5	9	107	Monitoring of Construction Related Earthborne Vibrations: Will SCDOT define what structures require a pre-construction condition assessment so there a known quantity for all proposers? The Special Provision indicates monitoring vibrations at no less than 4 locations. We assume this does not mean 4 locations simultaneously (i.e., four vibration monitors collecting data at once). Will SCDOT verify this assumption so there is a known quantity of vibration monitors for all proposers?	Intent is to monitor at minimum four nearby locations during vibration producing activities at a local site. If multiple local sites within project limits have vibration producing activities, multiple quadrants would be monitored simultaneously. See Final RFP. No, contractor determines monitoring locations. Yes, simultaneous at minimum of 4 locations.	yes
19	5			We understand that pipe underdrain and vertical stacked pipes are likely located throughout the project and that there is the possibility that all locations do not show up on the provided asbuilts. Will the SCDOT consider added a statement to the RFP alerting the other teams to the possible issue?	Added appropriate statement. See Final RFP, Exhibit 4e for revisions.	yes
20	8			We are unable to locate the Number of Passenger and/or Freight trains for both the CSX Railroad at rr milepost S350 and Norfolk Southern Railroad rr milepost R98.88. All Proposers will need this for their insurance quotations, and it is not in any of the documents. Can SCDOT provide this information?	Will provide. See Final RFP.	yes
21	1 RFP	4	II.C	SCDOT indicates they will issue NTP no later than 45 days from the effective date of the Agreement. Page 24 of 30, Cost Proposal Bid Form defines "Construction Time" as Calendar Days from NTP to substantial completion. Therefore, "Construction Time" includes time for design, approval, coordination, right-of-way procurement, permitting, etc. Would SCDOT consider utilizing an NTP #1 (to start the contract) and NTP #2 for start of actual construction?	SCDOT prefers a single NTP. No RFP revisions necessary.	No
22	1 RFP	4	II.C	The current scope of work includes repairs to the existing road based upon surveys the Proposers will do prior to bid. With the NTP #1 tied to the start of the contract and presumably 6 months to 1 year of design, the Proposers are at risk for the continued erosion/maintenance of the project for an additional year. Would SCDOT consider utilizing a NTP #2 for start of actual maintenance of the road by the Design-Builder?	No RFP revisions. See Standard Specs 104.7.1 for maintenance responsibilities.	no
23	1 RFP	5	2.G	When is the expected approval date for the CE Document?	Approved on June 2. Will add to website. Deleted RFP, Article II.G.	yes
24	1 RFP	14	IV.A	There are multiple Sub-section 1's within the Technical Proposal Section. To avoid confusion, would you consider renumbering the sections continuously, or giving each sub-section a separate title?	Will re-number. see Final RFP.	yes
25	1 RFP	14	IV.A.1	The Technical Proposal is required to include the Project Delivery and Approach. Is this section to be included in the 20 page limit? Is this section used in consideration of quality credit points provided to the Proposer?	Part 1: Yes, included in 20 pages. Part 2: No quality points are assigned to the Project Delivery and Approach. Commitments could be discussed in Project Delivery and Approach.	no
26	1 RFP	14		Would the Department consider assigning specific quality points to enhancements relative to the 46' clear zone requirement?	No revisions. Quality Points are based on commitments made by Proposer. Clear zone enhancements could be included in Quality Points item 2.	no

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Exh	Page	Section	Comment	Response	RFP Revision
27	1 RFP	15	IV.A.2	This section states, "Potential commitments could involve...mitigation measures to prevent concrete joints from propagating through HMA surfacing...". Is mitigation of concrete joints propagating through the HMA surfacing a requirement of the pavement design? Should it occur, will it be considered a repair that will be required during the three year warranty period? (Also page 40 of 54 with respect to warranty and component repair)	Mitigation measures are included in pavement design. Deleting this clause. See Final RFP.	yes
28	1 RFP	15		2. Page 15 of the RFP requires "Conceptual plans including cross sections..." be submitted with the Technical Proposal. Is the intent to receive a complete set of plans including cross sections for the entire project? Please clarify.	Proposer will "provide enough detail to illustrate...." See final RFP.	no
29	1 RFP	15		What is the required sheet size for concept plans? 11"x17"?	Yes 11X17. See Final RFP.	yes
30	1 RFP	15		Is there a preferred roadway cross section interval for concept plans? 100' in tangent & 50' in curves?	Proposer will "provide enough detail to illustrate...."	no
31	1 RFP	15		Will roadway profile sheets be required in the concept plans?	Not required, but Proposer will "provide enough detail to illustrate...." See Final RFP.	no
32	1 RFP	16	IV.A.1.2	The Conceptual MOT plans are to include durations. While the 'B' portion of the bid will be contractually binding, please confirm these conceptual MOT plan durations will not be contractual requirements?	No proposed revisions. MOT durations are conceptual. MOT duration commitments are binding.	no
33	1 RFP	19	V.G	Please clarify the valuation of the daily cost. One location states \$4,000 and the Cost Proposal bid form has \$10,000.	daily cost = \$10,000 per day. See Final RFP.	yes
34	1 RFP	20	V.G	Definition of item "dc" denotes the daily cost as \$4,000 per day. Page 24 of 30, Section IX, Cost Proposal Bid Form indicates "dc" as \$10,000 per day. Please clarify the daily cost value. Also, it was noted on our download dated May 27th that the Cost Proposal Bid Form "dc" was \$4,000, however, another download on May 28th reflects the \$10,000 per day. Please mark up the documents with revision notifications if the SCDOT is making revisions to the preliminary documents.	dc = \$10,000 per day. Will revise in final RFP.	yes

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Exh	Page	Section	Comment	Response	RFP Revision
35	1 RFP		Bid Form	We understand SCDOT's desire for the rapid completion of the project and specifically to minimize impacts to the traveling public. With this in mind we recommend that the NTP be split. The SCDOT would issue a NTP-1 for the critical pre-construction activities (receipt of the 401/404 permits and completion of critical RFC plans) and then issue NTP-2 which will be the start of the "construction" including any land-disturbing activities. The Construction Time evaluated on the Bid form would then be evaluated from NTP 2. To Substantial Completion. This approach provides SCDOT with a more accurate timeframe for traveler's impacts and user delay.	SCDOT prefers a single NTP. No RFP revisions necessary.	no
36	1 RFP			16. What plans are required for the rehab only section?	Proposer will "provide enough detail to illustrate...."	no
37	1 RFP			Is there a preferred scale for the roadway conceptual plans?	"provide enough detail to illustrate...."	no
38	2 Agreement	8	II.D	Please consider allowing a two-week, (10-business day) review period for design submittals. The 3-week, 15-day review period could be reserved for large/complex packages like MOT, final roadway or final bridge plans.	No RFP revisions necessary.	no
39	2 Agreement	8		1. Page 8 of the Agreement – Will the 15 business day review period be applied to Preliminary ROW, Final ROW, Final Design Review, and RFC Plans? Previously it has only been applied to Preliminary ROW and Final Design Review Plans, with a 5 business day review for the Final ROW and RFC Plans to confirm the comments have been addressed. Please clarify.	15 business days for all listed. No RFP revisions.	no
40	2 Agreement	13	3.B.1.g	Pertaining to premium right of way costs and second appraisal, SCDOT states that "No additional amount for overhead and profit will be considered for this item." Would SCDOT consider striking this statement "No additional amount for overhead and profit will be considered for this item.", or revising Article VIII to allow the direct transaction between the SCDOT and the owner for the premium and second appraisal?	Revised this statement. Direct transaction is not practical. see final RFP.	yes
41	2 Agreement	17	IV.A	Has SCDOT determined a maximum contract time?	No maximum contract time is established. No RFP revisions.	no
42	2 Agreement	17	IV.A	Please consider expanding the definition of "Substantial Completion" to address the placement of Final OFGC and Final Pavement Marking and all signs for the Project. We want to assure all Proposers understand the definition and address the "B" time uniformly	No proposed revisions.	no
43	2 Agreement	20	IV.B	Please consider adding "Timely Utility Relocations" to the list with the following proviso or footnote: "If said utility companies interfere or fail to relocate utilities in a timely manner, SCDOT may, on an individual basis, consider a time extension for utility company delays when CONTRACTOR can demonstrate that coordination efforts have been made to expedite the utility relocation, and that the delay has a direct impact on the Critical Path."	Item 9, Page 20 refers to Article VII, in which this is already stated. No proposed revisions.	no
44	2 Agreement	22	V.A	This paragraph states all testing laboratories used on the Project must be AASHTO certified. As none of the asphalt testing laboratories at the Asphalt plants have this certification, we request the paragraph be clarified that the testing labs at asphalt plants be SCDOT-certified, while all other material testing labs be AASHTO-certified.	Will clarify. See Final RFP for revisions.	yes
45	2 Agreement	26	VI.A.8	Please change the language that the Contractor's Lead Designer / Engineer provide the required Professional Liability Policy for the Errors and Omissions insurance instead of the Contractor.	Contractor provides proof of the required insurance. No proposed revisions.	no

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Exh	Page	Section	Comment	Response	RFP Revision
46	2 Agreement	28	VII.C,D	This language puts an incredible burden and risk on the contractor considering that it is difficult to obtain hard commitments from the utilities prior to submittal of proposal and that the utilities can have emergencies that divert their resources to higher priorities at any time. For this and other reasons SCDOT has modified this language to allow for time if the following conditions are met: "The resolution of any conflicts between utility companies and the construction of the Project shall be the responsibility of CONTRACTOR. If said utility companies interfere or fail to relocate utilities in a timely manner, SCDOT may, on an individual basis, consider a time extension for utility company delays when CONTRACTOR can demonstrate that coordination efforts have been made to expedite the utility relocation, and that the delay has a direct impact on the Critical Path. CONTRACTOR shall not be entitled to additional compensation for interference or delays in utility relocations."	No proposed revision.	no
47	2 Agreement	29		What degree of accuracy is required for showing utilities on As-Built plans? Level D SUE?	Added reference to As-Build Manual. see final RFP.	yes
48	4a	1	1	The RFP states that "the geometric design developed by the Contractor shall be an engineering solution that is not merely an adherence to the minimum SCDOT and/or AASHTO standards." Can the term "merely" be defined? Will a Proposer be considered non-responsive if they meet the minimum standards? If so what level above minimum will be considered acceptable?	Earlier sentences are adequate. Will omit. See Final RFP.	yes
49	4a	1	1	17. Exhibit 4a page 1, section 1 – Please explain the last sentence and how it will impact the design and approval of plans.	Earlier sentences are adequate. Will omit. See Final RFP.	yes
50	4c	1		5. Page 1 of Exhibit states "Milled-in rumble strips shall be use on all shoulders." Does this apply to ramps or only the I-77 mainline?	Only on the I-77 mainline. See Final RFP.	yes
51	4a	2		27. EXHIBIT 4a page 2—last sentence states that "all trees within the 46' zone shall be cut down and ..." This sentence seems to conflict with the preceding paragraph which allows some exceptions. Please clarify.	Agree. See Final RFP for revisions.	yes
52	4a	3	2.10	The RFP states all guardrail that does not meet current design standards shall be replaced. Who will determine if any existing guardrail or end treatments currently does not meet design standards? Will the Design-Builder be required to replace any Trinity ET Plus guardrail End Terminals currently within project limits?	All ET's that are reset or reused must be listed on the QPL. New ET's must be listed on the QPL. Determination of adequacy is joint responsibility. Contractor shall make design determinations & RCE will make acceptance determinations. See Final RFP	yes
53	4a	3	2.8	The RFP states that "the upper range value established in the current edition...shall be used". Does this mean the highest value of the upper range or is there a threshold of which the designer can choose the sight distance?	Will omit sentence. See Final RFP for revisions.	yes
54	4a	3	2.9	18. Exhibit 4a, page 3, section 2.9 – will accel/decal lane lengths be based on speed charts only or should traffic volumes be considered?	Design per HDM. See Final RFP.	yes
55	4a	4	2.10	Will the Design-Builder be allowed to use the SCDOT Standard Drawing 805-821-00 for single slope barrier in bifurcated sections greater than 6"? If not will the Design-Builder be required to develop a new standard drawing for this scenario? If so will the barrier need to be crash tested?	Not allowed to use 805-821-00 in bifurcated sections greater than 6". Contractor shall design the barrier for this case. See Final RFP.	yes
56	4a	4	2.10	If Consultants are to design barrier, would the SCDOT consider establishing criteria for geotechnical and structural design of barrier? GDM appears to not be applicable for Extreme Event 2 load case.	Revised Exhibit 4b for structural design. Geotechnical design for barrier shall be according to Section 9.4 of the GDM, Table 9-1 from Bridge Design Memorandum - DM0310, and Table 8-11 from Bridge Design Memorandum - DM0211.	yes

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Exh	Page	Section	Comment	Response	RFP Revision
57	4a	4	2.10	19. Exhibit 4a, page 4, section 2.10 – what pavement design is required between the paved shoulder and concrete median barrier? Can the I-20 median barrier be removed and replaced with jersey faced to match the existing instead of single slope?	Paved shoulder section will be extended to median barriers. I-20 median barrier will match the existing. See Final RFP for revisions.	yes
58	4a			10. Can the new profile in the widening section be spline grade?	No spline will be allowed. See Final RFP for revisions.	yes
59	4a			11. Can the new profile in the rehab section be spline grade?	No spline will be allowed. Will revise in rehab section details. See Final RFP for revisions.	yes
60	4a			12. What are the ramp resurfacing limits? Please clarify for all ramps within the widening and rehab project limits.	SCDOT intent is to resurface ramps to edge of pavement line of intersecting roads. See Final RFP for revisions.	yes
61	4a			20. Will fill slopes be allowed to vary from those shown in the SCDOT HDM Figure 13.3A as long as the fill slopes meet Roadside Design Guidelines?	Will clarify. See Final RFP for revisions.	yes
62	4a			21. Will additional length guard rail post be allowed to reduce the shoulder width behind the guardrail?	SCDOT intent is that additional length guardrail will not be allowed, but understand need for options at potential impact areas. See Final RFP for revisions.	yes
63	4a	4		How far under the guardrail does the pavement need to extend	Added special provision. See Final RFP.	yes
64	4a	1		Will extra length guardrail post be allowed instead of the additional 3.5' graded shoulder for guardrail?	Intent is not to allow, but will be allowed for avoidance of R/W & environmental impacts. See Final RFP.	yes
65	4a	2		Can the crash analysis that supports / recommends a 46' clear zone be provided?	No RFP revisions. Crash data is available to public at Department of Public Safety.	no
66	4a	4		The Department has removed the standard drawings for median barrier walls with retaining heights exceeding 6", in May 2015. Once the contract is awarded, will the selected contractor / designer be responsible for including signed and sealed construction drawings of all median barriers & retaining walls exceeding 6" in retaining heights?	Yes, face of wall must be crash tested, structure of wall shall be LRF design. See final RFP, Exhibit 4b.	yes
67	4a	5		Once the contract is awarded, what are the dimensions of the sheet sizes for submittals? Full size 22"x36"? Half Size 12"x18"?	Provide plan sheet sizes as directed in RFP.	no
68	4a	All		Has the existing geometry for the project been evaluated for potential design exceptions, such as vertical alignment and vertical curve stopping sight distance for example? Would the department consider a design exception for existing geometry as an ATC?	No, SCDOT has not evaluated for potential design exceptions. Design exceptions are not allowed as ATCs.	no
69	4a	All		Will there be any requirement for vertical clearance under existing bridges other than that stipulated in the HDM?	HDM & Exhibit 8. no RFP revisions.	no
70	4a			Is cross slope correction required on the ramps?	No. no revisions.	no
71	4a Roadway Design Criteria & 4c Pavement Design Criteria	1 & 3		It appears that the Department will not allow Spline grades for proposed roadway profiles. The proposed PCC pavement widening is proposed adjacent to existing PCC pavement, the top elevations must match however per RFP. This means that asphalt layer place on top of the newly widened PCC pavement must be variable in some cases to accommodate smooth PGL vertical geometry, which conflicts with page 1 of 4c Pavement Design Criteria. Is it the intent of the department to place variable asphalt thickness on top of the proposed widened PCC pavement to accommodate smooth proposed PGL vertical geometry? Page 1 of 4c Pavement Design Criteria calls for (2) 200 psy lifts of Surface Type B and one (1) 110 psy lift of OGFC on new widened PCC pavement.	yes, place variable asphalt to accommodate smooth vertical geometry. Will clarify. See Final RFP for revisions.	yes
72	4a Roadway : 2.4	2	2.4	It is stated that "Grade adjusted K values shall be considered where the grades are 3 percent or greater." The use of the word "considered" indicates judgment may be exercised and the use of the adjustment is not necessarily required. Please clarify.	Will clarify. See Final RFP for revisions.	yes
73	4a Roadway : 2.7	2,3	2.7	The bullet list is presented as a list of exceptions, however the second bullet does not appear to be an exception, to the criteria above. Please clarify.	Correct. Second bullet is the criteria. See final RFP.	yes
74	4a Roadway : 2.7	2,3	2.7	Shoulder grading is mentioned specifically, however, it appears that the context of this requirement applies to grading of the entire clear zone area. Please clarify.	Applies to entire clear zone area. See final RFP.	yes
75	4a,4b			14. What bridge pier protection is required in the I-77 median? Piers will be within the 46' clear zone (30' +/-) from new travel lane in the median. What protection is required for the piers on the outside?	Concrete pier protection is required for bents that are located within a distance of 30 feet to the edge of roadway. Bents that are located a distance of 30 feet or greater from the edge of roadway, but are within the clear zone, shall be protected in accordance with the requirements of Exhibit 4a. See Final RFP for revisions.	yes

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Exh	Page	Section	Comment	Response	RFP Revision
76	4b	1	2.1.1	Will existing load rating files be provided? If so, is there a particular format/program by which the Design-Builder will have to prove sufficient load rating?	See Final RFP for revisions. Available load rating information will be provided in Attachment B. Contractor's design can not reduce the existing load rating.	yes
77	4b	1	2.1.1	Please confirm LRFD deck overhang designs for the I-77 Ramp E bridge is limited to only the widened side.	Confirmed. See Final RFP for revisions.	yes
78	4b	2	2.1.3	Please confirm that bridge widenings must not mix girder material types including with the submission of an ATC. For example, the use of P/S Concrete Girders will not be permitted when a bridge consists of steel girders.	Confirmed. Will not accept as ATC. See Final RFP for revisions.	yes
79	4b	3	2.1.10	Please clarify "geometrically capable of surviving a crash test for Test Level 5"? Do all barrier details utilized require a previous crash-test?	See Final RFP for revisions.	yes
80	4b	4	2.1.12	Are there any length requirements for the barrier transition at the US 21 overpass other than the transition rate?	Yes, the End Wall segment for the thrie beam connection is 4 feet in length and 32 inches in height. See Final RFP for revisions.	yes
81	4b	7	2.1.21	Regarding joint rehabilitation, please confirm if the intent is to replace joints in-kind with current material specifications or if the design builder is responsible for sizing/selecting replacement joints to meet current criteria.	Joints shall be sized based on current standards. See Exhibit 5 of the Final RFP for revisions.	yes
82	4b	7	2.1.21	This section outlines Bridge Rehabilitation requirements for the project. Please clarify that all other bridge maintenance items not listed for the existing structures for the duration and warranty period will be the responsibility of the Owner.	No revisions. Specific work items are listed. Warranty applies only to work performed by Contractor.	no
83	4b	7	2.1.21	All bridge rehabilitation items and quantities have been listed. Please confirm who determines the final quantities for the bridge rehabilitation items ("Engineer" – the DB engineer or the Owner "RCE as per the Special Provisions")?	No revisions. RCE.	no
84	4b	7	2.1.21	Please clarify responsibility for the bridge rehabilitation quantities should they be other than those indicated in Section 2.1.21. Will SCDOT issue a Change for the quantity revisions in accordance with Section III.B.2 of the Agreement (Price and Time)?	No proposed revisions. Unit price is stated in Special Provisions. Time is based on CPM.	no
85	4b	10	2.3.1	Please clarify in the last paragraph "seismically induced ground deformations" when defining which culverts will need seismic analysis. Does this refer to liquefaction? If so, what is the threshold settlement?	See Final RFP for revisions. Will refer to SCDOT Seismic Design Specifications.	yes
86	4b	13	2.3.3.7	How will "structural adequacy" of existing box culverts be established and what criteria will be required to make/defend that determination?	See Final RFP for revisions. Will omit paragraph.	yes
87	4b	18	3.3	Please confirm it is the Department's intent that the design builder will have to submit all design calculations, not just upon request.	Confirmed. No RFP clarification needed.	no
88	4b	5		Please clarify the requirement that the replacement transitional slabs "shall match the total width of the travel lanes". Is shoulder width to be considered?	Will clarify. See Final RFP for revisions.	yes
89	4b	7		Please clarify that the approach and transitional slab replacements are all to be in-kind replacements.	See Final RFP for revisions.	yes

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Exh	Page	Section	Comment	Response	RFP Revision
90	4c	1	1	The last paragraph states, "Include 2000 SY of 10" full depth concrete patching and 1000 SY of full depth asphalt patching in accordance with the Special Provision in Exhibit 5." Notwithstanding the project length being 12 miles and the quantity above being quite small for the length, please add clarity for the following: who determines the location and sizes for patching ("Engineer" – the DB engineer or the Owner "RCE as per the Special Provisions"?) and should the quantities increase, how is the over run to be paid, as the Owner has identified it as a quantifiable risk. Please add clarity should the concrete or asphalt patching quantities overrun that will allow the Design-Builder to be compensated as a Construction Change Directive.	RCE determines locations and size of patching. No proposed RFP revisions. Refer to Special Provisions Section 502. (****ck quantity w/ lab & Thompson****)	no
91	4c	1	1	Further to the statement, "Include 2000 SY of 10" full depth concrete patching and 1000 SY of full depth asphalt patching in accordance with the Special Provision in Exhibit 5", please note also page 20 of 54, Contract Time Adjustment item 3 or Differing site conditions and Article XIII, Differing Site Conditions. Please add clarity should the concrete or asphalt patching quantities overrun and contract time be required that will allow the Design-Builder to be compensated in time as a Construction Change Directive.	Time is based on CPM Schedule (Agreement p. 20, Paragraph B.2). No proposed revisions. Expected full depth patch is 9". See Final RFP.	yes
92	4c	1	2.1	The RFP states in exhibit 4c 2.1 "the new mainline pavement shall consist of PCC overlaid with HMA." However, the detail shown in the roadway plans package on the SCDOT website for this job suggests a section consisting of asphalt with cement stabilized aggregate. Please clarify.	Exhibit 4c shows intended pavement design. Attachment B pavement section is an earlier design and is for information only. See final RFP.	yes

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Exh	Page	Section	Comment	Response	RFP Revision
93	4c	2		Was SCDOT's intent to carry the OGFC across the entire shoulder	No, extend 4 feet beyond edge of travel lane line	yes
94	4c			Will an ATC be considered that changes the pavement type for the new lane widening?	No. See Final RFP for revisions.	yes
95	4c			Will an ATC be considered that changes the base type for the new lane widening?	Yes. See Final RFP for revisions.	yes
96	4C			What is the pavement design for the outside ramp that connects Percival Road to I-20?	Will add instructions in Final RFP.	yes
97	4c			9. Is milling of the existing concrete pavement allowable? If so, what is the maximum allowable depth?	No. Only allowed at ties to existing pavement. See Final RFP for revisions.	yes
98	4c			13. What is the existing outside paved shoulder material for I-77? Has SCDOT acquired cores in the shoulder and will they be provided?	SCDOT will provide data from cores and other pavement design data.	yes
99	4c	2		Do we have to prove the 3.30 structural shoulder number is accurate	See final RFP for revisions.	yes
100	4c	3		Please clarify that the variable milling up to 2.5" in depth applies only to the areas where proposed pavement is tied to existing pavement transversely, at the ends of the project. This also referenceces an intermediate course that should be 2 -200psy Surface courses.	No milling is allowed except tie-ins to existing PCC. See Final RFP for revisions.	yes
101	4c			Will the Department accept ATCs for the mainline pavement design?	No. ATCs will be considered for shoulders & material below PCC. See Final RFP for revisions.	yes
102	4d	1	PART 1	28. EXHIBIT 4d PART 1 page 1 section 1.2----Permanent Signing states that signing is required on "...any modified interchange ramps". Please define "modified"? Is any signing required on the crossing routes?	If staging or final design impacts the sign, shall be required. Impacts include relocating, removing, causing to be non-compliant, etc.	yes
103	4d	1	PART 4	30. EXHIBIT 4d PART 4 page 1---- What if any ITS is required in this project?	No ITS work is required.	No
104	4d	5	PART 1	29. EXHIBIT 4d Part 1page 5 section 2.3.3----states that SignCAD files for all the signs shown on the conceptual signing plans are available. Can they be included in Attachment B?	will provide.	no
105	4d Traffic Design - Part 2	20		What temporary travel lane width will the department allow during construction? 11 feet?	See Procedures and Guidelines for Workzone Traffic Control Design Guidelines.	no
106	4d Traffic Design - Part 4	1		Will the CONTRACTOR be responsible for maintenance of ITS elements during construction of the project?	No.	no
107	4e	1	1	Drainage design is to be performed per the SCDOT's Requirements for Hydraulic Studies, May 2009. As noted in the HDR SWDR (Page 36), 14 Cross Lines, including pipes and box culverts were analyzed. 8 of those had HW/D >1.2. Of those 8, only 3 were recommended to be abandoned or replaced. The report acknowledges that the maximum design standard of HW/D of 1.2 is exceeded; stating that the construction of this project will not affect upstream elevations significantly, etc... Will SCDOT allow the maximum design standard of HW/D of 1.2 to be exceeded on these cross lines?	No. Contractor is responsible for complying with RFP criteria. No RFP revisions.	no
108	4e	1	1	Drainage design is to be performed per the SCDOT's Requirements for Hydraulic Studies, May 2009. As noted in the HDR SWDR (Page 36), an analysis of the existing closed drainage systems showed some of the pipes to be flowing greater than 94% flow depth. Will SCDOT allow closed systems to exceed this criteria?	Closed systems shall be designed to meet RFP criteria. No RFP revisions.	no
109	4e	1	2.1.2	Please clarify if the 50-yr storm event for surcharging applies for all median inlets or just those located in sags. The HDR SWDR on Page 37 notes that they only analyzed the 50-yr for median ditch inlets in sag locations.	Yes, all median inlets as required in Exhibit 4e, Section 2.1.2. No RFP revisions.	no

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Exh	Page	Section	Comment	Response	RFP Revision
110	4e	8	2.2.2	Given the comprehensive nature of SMDR and the Video Inspection Report provided, please identify what areas of the project limit were not inspected? This section places additional responsibilities on the Contractor for the work "not inspected within project limits". Please provide a detailed description and directions of what existing pipes that were not inspected, so an assessment me made to undertake this effort pre-bid or post-bid.	Will provide clarification. See Final RFP.	yes
111	4e	8	2.2.6	What is the proposed method to verify structural integrity of the pipe proposed for lengthening or retainage? This is an unusual requirement and places undue risk on the Contractor. We request that this requirement be removed.	Verify structural integrity in accordance with EDM-24. See Final RFP.	yes
112	4e	9	2.4	What stream crossing(s) if any does SCDOT expect coordination with FEMA and Local Agencies on this Project?	All crossings listed as Zone A or Zone AE on the Richland County FIRM maps that will be impacted.	no
113	4e	9	2.5.3	The RFP states that "for existing outfalls that have not been inspected, the Contractor shall perform the necessary repairs and/or rehabilitations as required." For the rehabilitation sections with no widening, outfalls could be obstructed or buried. It is unknown what repair work will be required, and whether or not ROW will be affected. Would SCDOT consider locating these in advance of the Final RFP?	Repair work for outfalls is not required in rehab section. See Final RFP.	yes
114	4e	9	2.5.3	The RFP states that "for existing outfalls that have not been inspected, the Contractor shall perform the necessary repairs and/or rehabilitations as required." For the widening section, are there outfalls that were not inspected in the SMDR? If so, outfalls could be obstructed or buried. It is unknown what repair work will be required, and whether or not ROW will be affected. Would SCDOT consider locating these in advance of the Final RFP?	Yes, some outfalls were not inspected. SCDOT will not locate additional outfalls. See final RFP.	yes
115	4e	9	2.5.4	Section 4.12 of the SMDR list outfalls that were inspected. Some of the outfalls such as STA 1379+05 were not found and are assumed to be covered up. To ensure positive drainage, the design-build team may have to excavate significantly outside of R.O.W. and possibly even cut roads downstream. The Stormwater Report says "There is some uncertainty regarding the location of this outfall. EP-1605 is assumed to cross under Legrand Road approximately 100' after the railroad bridge over I-77. It was not located in the field and is assumed to be buried. The outfall needs to be located. If the outfall location is where assumed, the outfall should be excavated to ensure positive drainage. Right-of-way issues may exist near this outfall." Would SCDOT consider locating these outfalls in advance of the Final RFP?	RFP addresses all outfalls that have been located in advance. No further locations will be conducted by the SCDOT. See final RFP.	yes
116	4e			Clarify if drainage design requirements are applicable within the rehabilitation section (I-77 SBL MM 21.5 to MM 27.0).	Rehab section design will comply w/ EDM 24. If pipes are extended, will require EDM 24. See Final RFP.	yes
117	4e			Regarding the applicability of the requirements for inlet, pipe, and outfall repairs and inspection, please confirm that the "project limits" do not include the rehabilitation section (I-77 SBL MM 21.5 to MM 27).	RFP has been revised to clarify requirements for rehab section. See Final RFP.	yes
118	4e			What design storm is to be used as the basis for the drainage design during construction for work zone traffic control plans?	Design for 5-yr storm event. See Final RFP.	yes

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Exh	Page	Section	Comment	Response	RFP Revision
119	4f	3	2.2	Regarding the seismic analysis of the existing and widened embankments, the Geotechnical report indicates potentially liquefiable soils to be present in the bridge embankments of Windsor Lake and Jackson Creek. Section 2.2 of Exhibit 4f in the RFP states that slope stability must be evaluated in accordance with the GDM for any new embankment taller than 3ft. However, Section 2.3 of Exhibit 4f states that seismic design is not required for new or existing embankments at the 10 widened bridge locations. Please confirm that no seismic analyses/design is required at any of the 10 widened bridge locations for either new or existing embankments, regardless of height and regardless of liquefaction potential. And please confirm that new embankments greater than 3ft in height only require settlement and slope stability analysis associated with service and strength loading.	No seismic design required on new or existing embankment. See Final RFP for revisions.	yes
120	4f	1		Will the Department provide the gINT files referenced in Exhibit 4f?	yes.	no
121	4g	1		Does the "I-77_Microstation.zip" contain the jurisdictional wetland & stream delineations referenced in the CE document & Jurisdictional Determination? Would like to verify the features in "r27002topo.dgn" are the same one referenced in CE document GIS figures.	provided on 6/9 & 6/10.	no
122	9 Att B	2	1.1	hand referencing asbuilts of past projects involving I-77 & I-20. In the plans, pipes which were drawn in per these asbuilts are assumed to still exist, and are noted as such." Will the Design-Builder need to locate these pipes with survey and have them videoed to determine if they can be retained in order to meet the requirements of EDM 24.	Final RFP is revised to clarify EDM 24 compliance. See final RFP for revisions.	yes
123	9 att B		4.9	The HDR SMDR lists several existing cross-lines that have HW/D ratios greater than the maximum design standard of 1.2 in which they reason that the pipes do not require additional capacity due to the fact that this project "will not affect upstream headwater elevations significantly, and will not have a detrimental effect on upstream properties." Will SCDOT accept this solution to leave them as is?	Contractor's design must meet RFP Criteria. Information provided is preliminary. No revisions.	no
124	9 att B			Please provide the Microstation file containing the existing drainage pipes and boxes as shown in the HDR SWDR – under their Appendix A – Plan Sheets.	provided on 6/9.	no
125	9 att B			Please provide the Geopak Drainage file (the .GDF file), the actual Microstation file that was associated with it (showing Node numbers, etc...) and the Drainage Library File (the .DLB file), if altered from the standard.	will provide.	no
126	9 att B			Please provide the Microstation files containing the Cross Drainage Pipe Drainage Areas and Time of Concentration flow paths, if it exists.	This file, Culvert_Drainage_Basins.dgn is under the I-77_FIS_Firms.zip file and was provided on 6/9. A new drainage folder has been uploaded to the website.	no
127	9 Attach B			Can the existing pipe survey dgn CAD files and Geopak drainage models from HDR be provided? These appear to be missing.	Files are located on website. No RFP revisions.	no
128	9 Attach B			Please provide details of the LiDAR DTM provided for road design, including vertical accuracy and horiz/vert control.	Will provide in Attachment B.	no
129	9 Attachment B files			Were obscured areas field surveyed in the dtm provided?	No. The only ground surveys were ground control and drainage ditches.	no
130	9 CE Document	4		Does the CE-E show the locations of the 317' stream impacts	Impact calcs provided in Attachment B.	no
131	9 CE Doc			Can we escrow mitigation credits	No	no
132	3	1		Will SCDOT provide additional survey for the rehab section of the project	No additional survey will be provided.	no
133	4c	1		Did SCDOT intend for the pavement structure to be Surface type B or Surface type A	Surface Type B	no

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Exh	Page	Section	Comment	Response	RFP Revision
134	4c	1		Will SCDOT provide the ESAL per truck for road group along the project and provide the pavement design loadings for their pavement design.	Pavement section is revised to eliminate need for pavement design inputs. See Final RFP for revisions.	yes
135	4c	1		Will SCDOT provide corings and pavement design data	Available corings & data provided in Attachment B.	no
136	4d-Part 2	12		Must temporary concrete barriers be placed on pavement	Details provided in Final RFP.	yes