

**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS**  
**Interstate 77 Panther Interchange - Project ID P038652 - York County**

**RFP FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW**

Date Received: 1-Oct-20

I Meeting Date: 10/8/2020

					SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Response	Explanation
1	RFP	2	3/45	When will SCDOT provide FONSI	Revision	Yes, draft FONSI has been added to project website. This document is not yet approved by FHWA. The approved document will be uploaded when received.
2	RFP	2	3/45	When will SCDOT provide IJR? Please include Software electronic files (HCS).	Revision	Yes, draft IJR has been added to project website. This document is not yet approved by FHWA. The approved document will be uploaded when received.
3	RFP	2	8	Drainage design that was permitted was not a complete design in that it did not include items such as erosion control, rip rap at pipe ends or stormwater detention. Will the design team be expected to modify the permit to include the complete design? Will the design team be expected to purchase any additional ROW to accomodate the additional erosion control.	No Revision	Yes, the team would be responsible to modify the permit if new features are required. If new ROW is needed, the team is required to purchase it.
4	RFP	2	43	Will the FONSI/NEPA Document (and all associated technical reports) be made available?	Revision	Yes, draft FONSI has been added to project website. This document is not yet approved by FHWA. The approved document will be uploaded when received.
5	RFP	2	43	Which agency is serving as the Lead Federal Agency for the project?	No Revision	The US Army Corps of Engineers is the lead for Panther development project to include permitting for both the development site and interchange. FHWA is the lead agency for the Interchange Justification report and FONSI.
6	RFP	2	43	Can the full permit application (including Mitigation SOP sheets) as well as all comments/comment responses be provided for SAC 2019-00924?	Revision	Yes, we will provide all files that are in our posession.
7	RFP	2	43	Can GIS/DGN files for limits of environmental studies and resource boundaries be provided?	Revision	Yes, we will provide these files.
8	RFP	2	3	RFP states "An approved Interchange Justification Report (IJR) for Exit 81 will be included in Attachment B." It is not included there. Will SCDOT provide this document?	Revision	Yes, draft IJR has been added to project website. This document is not yet approved by FHWA. The approved document will be uploaded when received.
9	RFP	3	7/45	Please provide electronic file (Microstation DGN) of the project study area limits along with any alternative designs (including CAD files) that were considered.	Revision	This information will be provided.
10	RFP	3	10/45	Please consider allowing 10 PATCs and 5 FATCs	Revision	Will revise to allow 10 PATCs and 5 FATCs.
11	RFP	3	1	Exhibit 3 Scope of Work lists "cross slope correction of existing mainline I-77 within the project limits" and sheets 3-3A of the Conceptual Roadway Plans shows to "match existing slope" on I-77 mainline. Is the intent that I-77 mainline will require cross clope correction? If so will a special provisions for cross slope verification be provided?	Revision	RFP Exhibit 3 will be revised. Intent of project is for "match existing" on I-77 mainline.
12	RFP	4	20	Item 5a - Because an integral bridge is required by Exhibit 4b, consider removing the requirement for showing expansion joint locations and types of joint materials.	Revision	Expansion joints will be removed as an item to be shown on technical proposal concept plans.
13	RFP	4	6	Will SCDOT provide applicable Rock Hill design standards for shared use paths as we are required to meet these standards?	Revision	Exhibit 4a has been revised to remove City of Rock Hill standards as a requirement of this project.



					SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Response	Explanation
14	RFP	4	4b	Will SCDOT confirm that if only resurfacing and cross-slope correction is needed on mainline I-77, then no median barrier or drainage work is required between NB & SB lanes?	Revision	RFP Exhibit 3 will be revised. Intent of project is for "match existing" on I-77 mainline.
15	RFP	4	16-17	The Technical Proposal Narrative shall be no more than 10 pages on single sided, letter sized paper. Section 4.1.1.a indicates the graphical CPM schedule, with the typical items listed that generally produces hundreds of activities, is to be included in the Technical Proposal Narrative. Is this the intent from the Department for the CPM schedule to be submitted accordingly? Typically this is a large Primavera CPM, within the appendices, on tabloid paper size, and a separate appendix along with the plansets.	Revision	RFP will be revised to allow CPM schedule to be provided in an appendix.
16	RFP	5	27	Section 5.7 1st paragraph – SOQ scores will be provided when the Cost Proposal is submitted. This is a change from the RFQ which stated the SOQ scores would be provided prior to the issuance of the Final RFP. Will the Department provide the SOQ scores as stated in the RFQ?	No Revision	SOQ scores will be provided prior to issuance of the Final RFP.
17	RFP	8	35/45	Please consider adding a date for receiving Confidential Questions for 10/10 and SCDOT provide responses by 10/15	Revision	We will add a date to receive Confidential Questions on Monday October 12 @ 9:00am with responses by October 20.
18	RFP	8	36/45	Proposers receiving SCDOT's final determination on Formal ATCs on 11/25 and having the Technical Proposal due on 12/1 doesn't allow enough time to incorporate APPROVED ATCs. Please consider a revised Technical Proposal due date of 12/14	No Revision	Due to the expedited project delivery schedule, SCDOT cannot extend the procurement duration.
19	RFP	9	42	Will permit modifications utilize SCDOT USACE Liaisons?	No Revision	Not anticipated to be a liaison.
20	Attach A	Agreement	24/76	Will SCDOT consider providing an early completion incentive due to the aggressive schedule?		Considering providing an early completion incentive.
21	Attach A	Agreement	41/76	Please provide a schedule for right of entry certification for all tracts.	Revision	Will provide draft certification status report by Final RFP
22	Attach A	Agreement	41/76	Please verify all Contractor cost items correctly align with SCDOT cost. For example item (x.) Cost of all commitments in the right of way instruments included in Attachment B. SCDOT has not provided the R/W instruments - please clarify? Also please clarify contractor responsibilities regarding outdoor advertising/billboards tracts.	No Revision	The section referenced is for Contractor-designated right of way or Additional right of way.
23	Attach A	Exhibit 3	1	Please clarify the scope of improvements for existing I77. Milling & Overlay design? Exhibit 3 states cross slope correction and Exhibit 4c makes no mention of applicable pavement design or direction.	Revision	Section 2.2 will be added to clarify the scope of I-77.
24	Attach A	Exhibit 3	1	Please confirm that "alternative types of interchanges will not be considered", even with an ATC.	No Revision	Confirmed, alternative types of interchanges will not be considered, even with an ATC.
25	Attach A	Exhibit 3	1	Exhibit 3 of the RFP states that the "contractor shall be responsible for all cost and schedule impacts related to these utility facilities" discussed in the Preliminary Utility Report. However, in the Agreement, Section VII, it states the contractor is only responsible for costs associated with any temporary relocations or those desired by the contractor for construction staging, access or convenience plus the cost for utility coordination. Please clarify the language in Exhibit 3 or the Agreement as applicable.	No Revision	Article VII, section A.2 places ALL responsibility for utility coordination and costs on the contractor. Proposer should recognize that all utilities on Paragon Way have prior rights.



					SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Response	Explanation
26	Attach A	Exhibit 3	1	The RFP states "construct two-lane loop ramps from One Carolina Drive to I-77 northbound and southbound and one-lane one-way exit ramps for I-77 northbound and southbound connecting to One Carolina Drive." The plans show a two-lane SB off ramp. Should this be one lane as specified in the scope of work?	Revision	RFP Exhibit 3 will be revised to indicate a two-lane SB off ramp.
27	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4d, Pt. 1	Please clarify if overhead signs are required to carry larger signs in the future.	Revision	No, sentence on page 3 and 4 of exhibit will be removed. Sign structures should be designed to carry signs shown in the conceptual plans.
28	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4d, Pt. 3	Please explain how the contractor is to apply the single lane closure restrictions during any time of day when traffic volumes exceed 1200 vehicles per hour per lane? Please consider clarifying or removing this criteria.	No Revision	Lane Closures are not allowed when volumes exceed 1200 vphpl. The tables included in Exhibit 4 shows the times when lane closures are not allowed.
29	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4d, Pt. 5	Given this project involves the construction of a new interchange on I-77, the minimum amount of work associated with I-77, and the I-77 project length is roughly 5600 linear feet, please reconsider the requirement for WZITS.	No Revision	WZITS will be required.
30	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4d, Pt. 5	Given the project length is roughly 5600 linear feet, please clarify the minimum spacing requirements for devices as some of the spacing requirements exceed the physical limits of the project.	Revision	Like other Traffic Control measures, WZITS will likely extend beyond the project limits to cover all traffic conditions. Added sentence to sfor clarification in Section 3 stating "and being one mile prior to the approach of the project limits"
31	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4e	Does SCDOT anticipate any runoff from the proposed development to be entering into the new interchange R/W? If so, how should the DB team account for it during the pre- vs. post-analysis?	Revision	Yes. Exhibit 4e has been revised to clarify how to account for offsite areas and refers to a new item in Attachment B.
32	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4a	With a functional classification of urban major collector for One Carolina Drive, will horizontal curves using an e <sub>max</sub> = 6% be allowed for One Carolina Drive as shown in the Conceptual Plans? Figure 5.3-A of the RDM shows for Urban Arterial/ Collector Facilities, use e <sub>max</sub> = 4%.	Revision	Exhibit 4a will be revised to allow for an e <sub>Max</sub> of 6% on One Carolina Drive, east of I-77.
33	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4a	The RFP states under Exhibit 4a Page 6 Section 2.14 that "Deviations to the buffer or shared use path width will be allowed upon prior approval by SCDOT at the following areas: One Carolina Drive between stations 32+80 and 38+35;". Under Exhibit 4b Page 1 Section 2.1.4, the RFP states "Provide a raised 16'-0" shared-use path on the south side of the bridge, which includes 5'-0" separation from face of curb, a 10'-0" path width, and a 1'-0" shy distance in between the path and the face of railing." Please clarify the buffer and SUP width requirements across the bridge as Exhibits 4a and 4b conflict with one another.	Revision	Use guidance provided in RFP Exhibit 4b. RFP Exhibit 4a will be revised to provide full widths across the bridge. Bridge shall include 5'-0" separation from the face of curb, a 10'-0" path width, and a 1'-0" shy distance in between the path and the face of railing.
34	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4d, Pt. 1	Can SCDOT provide the detailed layouts for the signs in lieu of proposers submitting a written request?	Revision	Will provide.
35	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4b	RFP article 2.1.3 Corrosion Protection states corrosion protection is to be applied in accordance with the BDM. The BDM requires corrosion protection west of a line that runs along I-77 north from Chester to the state line. Is I-77 inclusive in the boundary therefore requiring this bridge to include corrosion protection requirements of the BDM?	No Revision	The BDM corrosion protection requirements apply to bridges that carry interstate or NHS route traffic. Galvanized bridge deck rebar is not required for this overpass bridge.
36	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4a	Will SCDOT allow/approve any geometric (AASHTO controlling criteria) Design Exceptions through the ATC process for any facilities listed in Section 2.2?	No Revision	It is desirable to avoid design exceptions. The preliminary design provided in the Project Information Package does not require any design exceptions. An ATC would need to be submitted and would be approved/denied based on



					SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Response	Explanation
37	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4b	The concept plans show a 3 span bridge. RFP article 2.1.8 Superstructures mentions a 3 span bridge specifically while other configurations are not. Does this imply other span configurations will not be allowed? Does a different span arrangement require the submission of an ATC?	Revision	A 2-span arrangement with a pier in the median of I-77 is not allowed and this will be clarified in 4b. The use of a median pier will require an ATC. A 3-span arrangement or a single span arrangement do not require submission of an ATC.
38	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4b	The concept plans show MSE abutments. RFP section 2.2.1 requires formliner finish. Are MSE walls required for aesthetic purposes, or can they be eliminated?	No Revision	MSE Wall abutments are not required.
39	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4b	The section indicates that new Right of Way shall provide a minimum horizontal distance of 1.2 times the wall height for fill walls. This is not provided for the entirety of the Ramp 3 MSE wall. Please clarify the intent of this section as it relates to cut and fill walls. Will SCDOT allow the lesser new R/W shown in the plans?	No Revision	The 1.2H requirement is not included for fill walls in 4b Article 2.2.4, which only requires 15 feet minimum from the face to the R/W line. The R/W lines shown in the concept plans are consistent with this requirement.
40	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4a	Section 2.14 allows deviations to the buffer or shared use path width upon prior approval by SCDOT along One Carolina Drive between stations 32+80 and 38+35. Section 2.1.4 of Exhibit 4b requires specific dimensions across the bridge. Will deviations to the widths be allowed, and if so, what is the process to obtain SCDOT approval?	Revision	Use guidance provided in RFP Exhibit 4b. RFP Exhibit 4a will be revised to provide full widths across the bridge. Bridge shall include 5'-0" separation from the face of curb, a 10'-0" path width, and a 1'-0" shy distance in between the path and the face of railing.
41	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4b	Section 2.1.15 - Can the conduits that are required by this section be utilized for wiring for lighting or are these conduits in addition to conduits that are necessary for wiring needed for lighting?	No Revision	The conduits required by this section may be utilized for lighting.
42	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4z	Consider removing the requirement for Hydro Reports with Bridge Package submittals.	No Revision	Reports and plans called out in 4z are not applicable to every project.
43	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4c	Where is OGFC required? The RFP states "adjacent to I-77". Exactly where is this defined?	Revision	Scope and 4c will be revised to clarify work required along I-77.
44	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4c	Concerning OGFC, the RFP reference states "see notes in Section 2.2". There is no note in Section 2.2 concerning OGFC. Please explain.	Revision	Section 2.2 and 2.3 has been added and modified.
45	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4c	Can SCDOT provide the SN required for the temporary pavement design?	No Revision	No, this will not be provided.
46	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4c	Can SCDOT provide the pavement design calculations that were prepared for the project?	No Revision	No, this will not be provided.
47	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4e	Exhibit 4e says to provide inlets along barriers or retaining walls to meet spread requirements for future widening conditions. What are the future widening conditions?	No Revision	4e says "in locations where designs account for a future widening". We have not called out to consider a future widening.
48	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4e	Section 2.1 of Exhibit 4e states, "replace all 15 inch pipes with minimum 18 inch pipes at all locations unless design analysis warrants retaining 15 inch pipes, to include driveways." Are existing 15 inch pipes allowed to remain as long as they meet current design criteria?	No Revision	Yes they can remain.
49	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4e	Section 2.1 of Exhibit 4e states, "all drainage structures shall be immediately accessible to the final surface grade by either a manhole or grate access and new storm sewer systems shall not include blind junctions." Are blind junctions allowed when extending existing pipes?	No Revision	A new blind junction cannot be constructed. If there's an existing blind junction it can remain.





					SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Response	Explanation
50	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4e	Section 2.1 of Exhibit 4e states, "Avoid placing drainage structures under pavement and adjacent to pavement where excavation for maintenance of the structure would impact the pavement structure in roadway sections without curb and gutter. Avoid placing drainage structures in locations where access can only be obtained with a lane closure. In addition to the drainage structures covered in the Standard Drawings, this applies to locations where two different pipe sizes and shapes are connected, such as with collars, headwalls, and bulkheads." Are all existing pipes under the interstate that requires extension need to be replaced to avoid a collar or other structure under pavement/shoulder?	Revision	The following statement, <i>this applies to locations where two different pipe sizes and shapes are connected, such as collars, headwalls, and bulkheads</i> , has been deleted.
51	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4e	Section 2.1 of Exhibit 4e states, "At locations where fill height is greater than or equal to ten feet, provide a minimum five foot buffer between the toe of fill and the nearest top of bank of any proposed sideline ditch or swale." Is the intent to fix existing conditions within the project limits that don't meet this criteria even if it requires additional right of way and/or environmental impacts?	No Revision	No, the intent is in reference to new construction.
52	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4z	Please elaborate on the requirements for the Conceptual Work Zone Traffic Control Plans and the Work Zone Traffic Control Plans to be submitted with final plans. What documents or references define the requirements, and are cross sections and temporary profiles required for each stage of construction?	No Revision	The requirements are as stated in SCDOT's Procedures and Guidelines for Work Zone Traffic Control Designs and all other applicable references listed Exhibit 4. Cross sections are only required at critical locations where elevation changes may impact traffic, temporary barrier wall locations, temporary pavement, etc.
53	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4d, Pt. 3	What ramps & loop ramps are being referenced in this Staging section, as there appear to be no existing ramps/loops impacted by construction? We want to ensure we understand the restrictions.	No Revision	Ramps and loop ramps of adjacent interchanges, as traffic control limits often go outside project limits.
54	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4d, Pt. 3	Can the outside lane of traffic on I-77 Northbound be closed for the duration of construction?	No Revision	Yes, there are no single lane closure restrictions on I-77 NB at this location. However, the SCDOT reserves the right to suspend a lane closure if any resulting traffic backups are deemed excessive by the SCDOT.
55	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4d, Pt. 3	As a reduced regulatory speed limit is to be allowed on all routes, will MOT design standards be allowed to be reduced for these speeds?	No Revision	No. MOT design standards shall meet the posted speed limit in effect prior to construction.
56	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4d, Pt. 3	Does construction staging coordination need to take into account the development of Blue & Black Blvd, One Carolina & Hiram Way? How does that impact construction schedule & penalties?	No Revision	Contractor shall construct to the tie point within SCDOT right of way. Construction staging coordination shall take into account the development of Blue & Black Blvd. Please clarify question.
57	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4d, Pt. 3	What are the requirements of coordination for the opening of the interchange along with the practice facility development? Will the contractor be able to barricade off this side of the interchange until development construction is complete?	No Revision	In discussions with Panther's development team.
58	Attach A	Exhibit 4	4d, Pt. 6	The RFP states "Light standards (35' poles) located within the right of-way or within the clear-zone of the roadway should be equipped with breakaway supports designed so that no fixed part of the support extends further than three inches above ground level." The 35' light pole spec provided in Attach B is not shown as breakaway. Should this be the pole used, even though it is not shown as breakaway?	Revision	SCDOT will provide a break-away detail from the City of Rock Hill.



					SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Response	Explanation
59	Attach A	Exhibit 5	57 & 60	Pg 57 "The CONTRACTOR is not responsible for the maintenance or construction of permanent SCDOT ITS elements" Pg 60 "The CONTRACTOR will install all new ITS components....." Please clarify.	Revision	Contractor will be responsible for removal of existing ITS elements and installation of new ITS elements.
60	Attach A	Exhibit 5	57	Prior to commencing construction the department will provide removal of existing CCTV cameras and cabinets only – and not remove camera poles, concrete cabinet pads, fiber cable, conduit, pull boxes. Contractor is to remove DMSs and return to DOT – and to remove and dispose of all other ITS elements per the section Removal Salvage and Disposal of Equipment and Materials. Can SCDOT provide a list of what ITS devices are currently within the project limits? The .kmz file provided only shows pullbox locations.	No Revision	The kmz provided on the website shows all ITS equipment in and near to the construction limits. Included within the construction limits are one DMS sign on structure spanning I-77, one concrete camera pole and camera, and associated cabinets, splice boxes, and conduits.
61	Attach A	Exhibit 5	57 & 58	Pg. 57 "The new 120 SMFOC (Fiber Optic Cable) shall be spliced in a newly installed service box to the existing 120 SMFOC". Pg. 58 "The fiber optic backbone shall be 144 fiber single-mode cable.....". Please clarify the preferred number of fiber.	Revision	Single mode fiber trunk cable shall be 144 count and shall be Prysmian cable.
62	Attach A	Exhibit 5	58	"New 144 SM fiber optic Backbone cable installed along I-126 shall be a Prysmian cable....." Please clarify/address reference to correct project.	Revision	This will be corrected to I 77.
63	Attach A	Exhibit 5		What is the location of the nearest existing Field HUB cabinet? Is there a Communications Interconnect Drawing / Schematic for the I-77 corridor? Is this a daisy chain type architecture back to the Hub or home-run connections back to the Hub, etc.?	No Revision	SCDOT will supply splicing diagram upon award.
64	Attach A	Exhibit 5		The RFP mentions Siecor interconnect centers – while earlier it mentions Gator patch as an option. – Please clarify what is required: are both options for this contract?	No Revision	Both are accepted based on cabinet size. Camera cabinet furnished by SCDOT (SCIPCAB1) will require gator patch for fiber optic termination in cabinet. DMS sign cabinet furnished by Contractor can accommodate either fiber optic enclosure.
65	Attach A	Exhibit 5	63 & 64	On Page 63, the RFP gives the option for the Pull Cord (as either non-detectable vs detectable version) – while on Page 64 it calls for the detectable version – Please clarify.	No Revision	All conduits with fiber optic cable installed shall have a detectable muletape type DT1250/4P installed. All other conduits shall have a muletape type WP1250P installed for future use.
66	Attach A	Exhibit 5	16	Figure 1 that contains the maximum allowable particle velocity is only partially showing. Can you please provide the entire figure?	Revision	Figure has been corrected.
67	Attach B	Hydraulics		The Hydraulics Report references HY-8 analysis and GIS analysis. Please provide the electronic files used to develop the Hydrology and Hydraulics Report?	Revision	File will be added to the Project Information Package.
68	Attach B	Hydraulics		Are there any electronic files available for the proposed drainage design shown in the Right of Way plans?	Revision	File will be added to the Project Information Package.
69	Attach B	Pavement		Can one-way ESALs in the critical lane be provided for year 2021, 2022, and 2023 at the locations shown under the Pavement section of Attachment B?	No Revision	No, this will not be provided.
70	Attach B	Roadway		Please clarify the reason for providing this [Lane Designation Illustration] document. Do proposer changes affecting this document require an ATC?	No Revision	Yes. The lane designation illustration is to make the layout and configuration of the interchange and One Carolina Drive as shown a requirement.
71	Attach B	Roadway		Please clarify the reason for providing this [One Carolina Drive Profile] document. Do proposer changes affecting this document require an ATC?	No Revision	The intent of the One Carolina Drive Profile is to lock in the profile of the mainline. This profile will be required to tie into sideroads on the Panthers site in several locations and coordination would be needed to revise the profile. Changes affecting the One Carolina Drive Profile would require an ATC.



					SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Response	Explanation
72	Attach B	Roadway	Lane Illustration	Lane continuity is not being maintained for the eastbound through lane on One Carolina Drive. The eastbound through lane is being developed as an auxiliary lane as it is being continued across the bridge. Past guidance from SCDOT has not allowed this. Is SCDOT allowing the final design to keep the eastbound through lane development as shown in the Conceptual Plans?	No Revision	For lane designations, refer to the Lane Designation Illustration as lane movements provided there would be needed. A deviation from the Lane Designation Illustration would require an ATC.
73	Attach B	Roadway		Does SCDOT require ATCs to modify One Carolina Drive profile, Lane Designations, and Preliminary ROW plans?	No Revision	Yes, a modification to the One Carolina Drive profile, Lane Designation Illustration, and Preliminary ROW plans will require an ATC.
74	Attach B	Structures		Please clarify if MSE formliner pattern is required for MSE retaining walls not visible from I77 or Panthers facility - ie walls along Ramp 3 (sta 561+73 to 570+00) and One Carolina Drive east of I77 (sta 41+75 to 46+15)? Or please consider removing formliner requirement for retaining walls not visible from I77 or Panthers facility.	No Revision	Formliner pattern is required for all walls on the project to maintain the architectural theme for all users of and properties adjacent to the interchange.
75	Attach B	Traffic	1	The conceptual signing plans provided are from before Celanese Road to after Dave Lyle Boulevard. Are we to provided new signing for the corridor as shown in the plans or just for exit 81, Panthers interchange as defined in the scope of work?	No Revision	The conceptual signing plans clearly states, "signs with no notes are existing signs and are included for reference only. These signs should be retained." Notes are provided for each new sign including Exit 81 signs. Notes are also provided for all other signs that need to be removed or relocated.
76	Info Package	Geotechnical	5	The Geotechnical Baseline Report text states that boring elevations were obtained from GIS. How accurate are these elevations?	Revision	Borings are being surveyed and reports and boring log files are being revised.
77	Info Package	Hydraulics	BOD Pg. 9	In the Hydraulic Basis of Design Report, it states: "No detention will be allowed within the functional footprint of the proposed interchange." Would SCDOT allow for detention within the interchange?	Revision	Exhibit 4E has been updated to clarify that detention is not allowed within the interchange.
78	Info Package	Roadway		The provided roadway CAD files do not match conceptual roadway plans. Please clarify or provide correct documents/files.	Revision	Updated roadway CAD files have been added to the project website.
79	Info Package	Roadway	Plans	The PC locations for Hiram Way and Old Paragon Way are not compliant with Figure 9.2-C of the RDM. Exhibit 4a Section 2.11 states "Develop intersections in compliance with SCDOT Roadway Design Manual." Is SCDOT allowing a deviation of the RDM and RFP at these two locations?	No Revision	PC locations identified in RDM Figure 9.2-C are not controlling criteria and are considerations per RDM Section 9.2.4. The intent of this project for Hiram Way and Old Paragon Way is to provide a tie in to the existing roadbed without excessive impacts. A deviation of PC's in proximity to the intersection will be allowable.
80	Info Package	Roadway	Plans	The vertical curves for Ramp 2, Ramp 3, and Old Paragon Way at the intersections with One Carolina Drive are not compliant with Section 9.2.7.3 of the RDM. The RFP states "Develop intersections in compliance with SCDOT Roadway Design Manual." Is SCDOT allowing a deviation of the RDM and RFP at these locations?	No Revision	The plans are provided For Information Only. However, the vertical curves on Old Paragon Way are located at a stop condition and meet the 15 mph specified in the RDM for stop conditions. Although ramps 2 and 3 are signalized, there is an "end of roadway" condition, as there is no through movement, and design will be allowed as shown.
81	Info Package	Roadway	Plans	The location of VPC's and VPT's of the vertical curves for the profiles for Ramp 2, Ramp 3, Ramp 4, and Old Paragon Way relative to the location of the edge of travel for One Carolina Drive are not compliant with Section 9.2.7.3 of the RDM. The RFP states "Develop intersections in compliance with SCDOT Roadway Design Manual." Is SCDOT allowing a deviation of the RDM and RFP at these locations?	No Revision	Note 3 under RDM Figure 9.2-F and RDM Figure 9.2-G indicates that actual field conditions will determine final design. A deviation from RDM will be allowable where field conditions are not practical to provide the 10'.



					SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Response	Explanation
82	Info Package	Roadway	CAD Files	The turning templates provided are not compliant with the RDM. The RDM states in Section 9.2.5.1 that "The AASHTO A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets provides the design details for these vehicles." The Green Book gives values for the centerline turning radius needed for each design vehicle. Some of the turning templates provided are using less than those values. If the Green Book values are applied to the provided concept design, the throat widths will more than likely increase in order to meet the required inside clearance stated in Section 9.3.2.1 of the RDM. The RFP states "Develop intersections in compliance with SCDOT Roadway Design Manual." Is SCDOT allowing a deviation of the RDM and RFP at these locations?	Revision	A deviation of the 2' clearance referenced in RDM Section 9.3.2.1 will be allowable when the 2' is not practical or will cause further impacts to the project. Templates should not track over curb and gutter or into the travel way of oncoming traffic. Exhibit 4a will be revised to clarify.
83	Info Package	Roadway	Plans	Figure 10-77 of the 2018 Green Book shows a recommended auxiliary lane distance of approximately 1500 ft for a two-lane exit. The provided Concept Plans show a distance of 500 ft. For the final design, is SCDOT going to require an auxiliary lane distance of approximately 1500 ft or can the final design keep the auxiliary lane distance of 500 ft as shown in the Concept Plans?	Revision	RFP will be revised to address auxiliary lane distances.
84	Info Package	Roadway	Plans	The RFP states to follow SCDOT, FHWA, and AASHTO guidelines for C/A. The concept design for the Hiram Way intersection and Ramps 1&4/Blue and Black Blvd intersection do not meet the 750' distance in the ARMS manual. Please clarify.	Revision	Exhibit 4a has been revised. Control of Access should be provided as shown in the Preliminary Right of Way Plans in Attachment B.
85	Info Package	Roadway	Plans	How will SCDOT address issues/deviations in the conceptual design for which SCDOT is acquiring R/W? Proposer suggests SCDOT formally address all deviations from the RDM and ARMs in the RFP. Given the project schedule, it is not reasonable for the successful DBT to correct design deviations as some of these may affect R/W if SCDOT requires compliance with the RDM and ARMs as Exhibit 4 requires. Please address.	Revision	The lane designation illustration summarizes the requirements for the interchange and One Carolina Drive as shown. Proposers should develop their technical proposals in accordance with the information provided or submit an ATC where the RFP allows.
86	Info Package	Roadway	Plans	The conceptual road design shows impacting a large portion of the site drainage and what appears to be water quality/stormwater detention ponds for Tract 36. Is it the intent to have the Team: -Design and construct replacement facilities on SCDOT right-of-way (DOT thereby assuming maintenance of the ponds and drainage structures), -Design and construct replacement facilities elsewhere on the private property, or -Leave the replacement design and construction to the property owner as a part of SCDOT's right-of-way negotiations with them?	No Revision	Leave the replacement design and construction to the property owner.
87				Will SCDOT provide the development and design plans for the Panthers practice facility development?	Revision	Will provide in the Project Information Package.





**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS**  
**Interstate 77 Panther Interchange - Project ID P038652 - York County**

**FINAL RFP - ROUND 1**

Date Received: 10/22/2020

Meeting Date: 10/29/2020

					SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Response	Explanation
88	RFP	9	42	In review of the R1 Conceptual Roadway Plans in the Project Information Package and the USACE Permit (SAC 2019-00924) in Attachment B, it was noted that impacts to Waters of the United States appear to be present in the plans that are not covered by the existing USACE Permit. This is apparent at Sta. 538+50 where impacts are only shown on the permit on the upstream/west side of I-77 for NWW-4 (refer to Permit Sheets 3 and 9 vs. Plan Sheet 6). Is a permit modification assumed to be a requirement – even without changes to the project limits as shown in the R1 Conceptual Roadway Plans?	Revision	It is the intent of SCDOT to complete the modification associated with these impacts.
89	RFP	9	42	Is the Design Build Team responsible for mitigation costs associated with impacts in the R1 Conceptual Roadway Plans that were not included in the Section 404 Permit?	No_Revision	SCDOT will be responsible for mitigation costs associated with the pending SCDOT permit modification. Proposer's will be responsible for any further mitigation costs for additional permit modifications.
90	Attach_B	Environmental	Permit Drawings	In review of R1 Conceptual Roadway Plans provided, there are elements that are required in order to meet design requirements such as rip rap and other erosion control features that do not appear in the plans nor the permit drawings. Is a USACE Permit modification assumed to be a requirement in order to meet design requirements for the current design?	Revision	It is the intent of SCDOT to complete the modification associated with these impacts.
91	PIP	Roadway	Sheet 9	According to the R1_Conceptual Roadway Plans (Sheets 8, 9, and 11) Streams NWW-2, NWW-3, and NWW-2A appear to be diverted under I-77 to a new outfall location that would drain into a detention pond on Tract 18. This is diverting a large portion of the drainage area of Stream NWW-2A into the proposed pond. Were potential de-watering impacts considered during the Section 404 Permit Process for the portion of Stream NWW-2A that would be upstream from where the ultimate pond outfall would tie back into Stream NWW-2A?	No_Revision	Tributary 2A will not be diverted into a pond. Water will continue to be conveyed to tributary 2A through the new 54" culvert under I-77.
92	RFP	9	42	If un-permitted dewatering impacts would occur from the diversion of the drainage area of Stream NWW-2A would occur (based on the drainage design included in the RFP), is the contractor responsible for a permit modification to cover this additional impact?	No_Revision	Not applicable as tributary 2A is not being diverted in a pond.
93	RFP	10	44	If un-permitted dewatering impacts would occur from the diversion of the drainage area of Stream NWW-2A would occur (based on the drainage design included in the RFP), is the contractor responsible for additional mitigation costs?	No_Revision	Not applicable as tributary 2A is not being diverted in a pond.



					SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Response	Explanation
94	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z		The RFP dated October 19, 2020 included a revision in Exhibit 4z to include 'noise barrier wall alignment'. In the Noise Impact Assessment included in Appendix K of the FONSI none of the barrier analyses results met both of the feasible and reasonable criteria as per the SCDOT Traffic Noise Abatement Policy. Is it the intention of the SCDOT to include noise barriers in the project even if they do not meet the feasible and reasonable criteria as per the SCDOT Traffic Noise Abatement Policy?	No_Revision	No. Items included in 4z are standard requirements. Any items not included in the scope of work do not need to be submitted.
95	Attach_B	Environmental	Permit Condition b.5	Will contractor be responsible for preparation of as-builts as described in the USACE Permit Special Condition b.5.	No_Revision	Yes.
96	PIP	Geotechnical	GBLR	Does SCDOT anticipate further subsurface corrosion series laboratory testing, or is the amount of soil corrosion testing provided in the GBLR sufficient for final design?	No_Revision	The final decision is up to the Geotechnical and Structural Engineers of Record, but we are OK with only using the information already provided.
97	PIP	Geotechnical		Following award, can the soil and rock samples collected by S&ME be made available to the successful bidder?	No_Revision	Yes.
98	Attach_B	Hydraulics	Proposed Land Use	Does the additional impervious from the development need to be accounted for in the pre- vs. post-development in terms of required volume storage and peak flow attenuation, or only for sizing of drainage structures? (i.e. Does the proposer assume that none of the additional impervious area draining to the DOT right-of-way will be captured in a stormwater BMP and that SCDOT will be required to oversize BMPs for peak flow reduction?)	No_Revision	The additional impervious from the development, draining through the interchange area, needs to be accounted for in pre- vs. post-development in terms of both volume storage and peak flow attenuation and for the sizing of drainage structures. Based on preliminary analysis, at a minimum 6.5 acres of additional impervious acres is anticipated from the development that will drain through the interchange area. The 6.5 acres of additional impervious area occurs west of proposed Ramp 1 and north of proposed One Carolina Drive, as seen in Attachment B. It is assumed that none of this additional impervious area draining to SCDOT right-of-way will be captured in a stormwater BMP.
99	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	1	Can the design build team propose an asphalt design for One Carolina Way and cross/connector roads that is different from the pavement design in the RFP through an ATC assuming the design shown was meant for I-77 and the Ramps? Can SCDOT please provide SN for Ramps and One Carolina Drive?	No_Revision	SCDOT will not provide structural numbers for ramps or One Carolina Way. SCDOT would consider an ATC for an alternative pavement design.
100	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c		Is information available for the existing pavement structure on Paragon Way & I-77?	No_Revision	No.
101	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c		Can the existing Paragon Way pavement structure be utilized in final condition or should it all be replaced?	No_Revision	No, it should all be replaced.
102	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c		Page 2 states that "Temporary pavement designs are only to be used for pavements that will be removed upon completion of this phase of the project and will not be considered for Interim Design Components." Page 3 of the Exhibit 4c states that "If temporary pavement is to be incorporated in the final pavement structure, it must be...." Will temporary pavement be allowed to be incorporated into the final pavement structure with an ATC?	No_Revision	Yes.
103	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	1	Will SCDOT allow an alternate pavement design other than the one shown in Section 2.1? If so, will SCDOT provide traffic data for that design?	No_Revision	SCDOT will not provide structural numbers for ramps or One Carolina Way. SCDOT would consider an ATC for an alternative pavement design.



					SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Response	Explanation
104	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	1	I-77 typical section show HMA Surface Course Type A for the entire project limits. Is the intent for mill and surface course the entire project?	No_Revision	No. The intention is to mill and replace existing OGFC only.
105	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	Section 2.2	What is the required width of the surface plane and OGFC application, is it the entire width of the existing traveled lanes on I-77 or only the outside lane impacted by the ramp tie-ins?	No_Revision	The existing OGFC will need to be removed and replaced entirely within the project limit.
106	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	Section 2.2	What is the required length or station range of the surface plane and OGFC application, is it the entire length of the project or only the outside lane impacted by the ramp tie-ins?	No_Revision	The existing OGFC will need to be removed and replaced entirely within the project limit.
107	RFP	4	Section 4.1, P. 20	Since the availability of any individual is subject to change due to health issues, domestic issues, injury, death, resignation, termination, military leave, maternity leave, etc., no proposer can unconditionally guarantee the availability of a Key Individual in the future. Will SCDOT accept a conditional guarantee of availability for Key Individuals?	Revision	Revision will add "barring any unforeseen circumstance"
108	Attach_B	Roadway	Prelim. R/W Plans	What entity is responsible for demolition of the billboard signs located on tracts 19, 20, and 21? These tracts are shown as total takes on the R/W data sheet in the PIP Conceptual Roadway Plans.	No_Revision	Negotiations are on-going with the property owner. RFP will be updated to include moving and demolition items if required through right of way negotiations.
109	PIP	Roadway		Will the driveway connection at Tract 36 to Old Paragon Way be the responsibility of the DBT or will it be the responsibility of the parcel owner? Also, who is responsible for Tract 36's internal access road impacts impacted by One Carolina Drive?	No_Revision	The Design-Build team is not responsible for driveway or access road relocation on Tract 36.
110	RFP	8	39	What is SCDOTs responsibility for accommodating by replacement or compensation, the existing detention basin between I-77 and the DHL building, to the current/previous owner in this parcel?	No_Revision	The DHL detention pond will be relocated. Negotiations are on-going with the property owner to determine how to execute this work.
111	RFP	8	39	Will the DB team have to facilitate or accommodate access for DHL to the rear of their property/building during construction?	No_Revision	The DB team will not be responsible for internal site access on the DHL tract.
112	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2	Is the Design Team responsible for providing SCDOT an access road to the proposed detention to be added to Tract 18?	Revision	Yes. Direction will be provided in an Addendum to the RFP.
113	RFP	8	39	What has SCDOT committed to provide to DHL for the driveway at the north end of the DHL building?	No_Revision	Negotiations are on-going with the property owner. It is anticipated that SCDOT will provide compensation to the property owner for impacts so property owner can relocate the driveway outside of the proposed right of way and maintain internal circulation.
114	RFP	4	23/4.4	Does a redacted copy of the technical proposal have to be submitted even if the proposer is not removing any information?	No_Revision	Yes.
115	RFP	4	17/4.1	Can SCDOT clarify what "Special Contract Requirements" are being referred to in this section of the technical proposal?	No_Revision	Any project-specific requirements, i.e. right of way access dates, project milestones, etc.
116	PIP	Roadway		Can SCDOT provide the sheet files for the R1 Conceptual Roadway Plans that include the typical sections, r/w data sheet, property strip map, reference data sheets, plan, and profile sheets?	Revision	Updated files have been added to the website.
117	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	1	Can you please confirm that if only resurfacing and/or cross-slope correction is needed on mainline I-77 and no bridge piers are placed in the median, then no median barrier work is required between NB & SB lanes?	No_Revision	Confirmed. The existing median barrier may be retained in this situation.



					SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Response	Explanation
118	PIP	Roadway	Typ. Sec.	The outside shoulder rebuild requirements are unclear in the typical sections. Can a station range of outside shoulder replacement areas be provided?	No_Revision	The intent of this project is to reconstruct outside shoulders on I-77 within ramp development areas and adjacent to concrete barrier. Station ranges will not be provided as outside shoulder reconstruction will be dependant on final design.
119	PIP	Roadway	X62	Can you please confirm that even if slopes are draining towards MSE wall, if barrier is present behind the wall to direct drainage, no valley gutter is required behind the wall?	No_Revision	Confirmed. The toe of barrier is allowed to act as the gutterline in this situation.
120	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 3		Are 11' lanes allowed on I-77 during construction?	No_Revision	Yes.
121	Attach_A	Agreement	Section VII, P. 35/76	Through SCDOT's utility coordination efforts, does the City of Rock Hill plan to utilize state provided relocation reimbursement, per Senate Bill 401, for any impacts to their water or sewer facilities? Can proposers contact the Utility Owners?	No_Revision	The utilities have prior rights, so Senate Bill 401 does not apply. The Proposers may contact the Utility Owners.
122	PIP	Utilities		York Electric Coop estimated relocation costs in the Preliminary Utility Report is \$46,000, which per YEC was based on relocating via underground bore within their current easement. The current YEC easement is in conflict with One Carolina Drive and associated northbound interchange ramps, which now fall within the new C/A. Has the SCDOT approved YEC preliminary plans to relocate via directional bore through the new C/A, or will YEC need to relocate outside the new C/A as typically required, which would likely require YEC to pursue and easement along tract 36 (DHL).	No_Revision	Yes, SCDOT will allow YEC to bore in the existing alignment of the overhead powerline.





**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS**  
**Interstate 77 Panther Interchange - Project ID P038652 - York County**

**FINAL RFP - ROUND 2**

Date Received: 11/4/2020

I Meeting Date: 11/6/2020

					SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Response	Explanation
123	PIP	Hydraulics		There were 2 files uploaded on 10/12/20 under Project Information Package – Hydrology, files 4 and 5. It appears the files are copies of 3. Preliminary Pipe Inspection Report. Please confirm files 4 and 5 are the correct files to be downloaded.	Revision	The correct files have been added to the website.
124	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 4	1	The RFP requires the use of mast arms for signals and the intersection of One Carolina Drive/Hiram Way and One Carolina Drive/Blue and Black Blvd are fairly large. Proposer has concerns to achieve the required signal head distances without using span wires instead of mast arms. Please confirm mast arms are required and applicable to the intersections identified.	No_Revision	Mast arms are required and applicable. Mast Arms shall incorporate City of Rock Hill specifications.
125	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Section 2.2 / 1	Under Section 2.2 for Design Speed, the RFP states a design speed of 40 mph for Hiram Way. The concept design utilizes a design speed of 25 mph for the northern leg of Hiram Way. In order for Hiram Way to meet a 40 mph design speed, the horizontal and vertical geometry would have to be significantly revised. Please confirm the design speed shown in the RFP for Hiram Way.	No_Revision	The design speed for the route shall remain 40 mph as shown. However, a 40 mph design speed at the intersection is impractical based on impacts that would occur. This project will tie to the remaining portion of Hiram Way and a 25 mph design speed in the area of the intersection is acceptable.
126	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Section 2	There is no design criteria stated for Old Paragon Way. Please add design criteria for Old Paragon Way?	No_Revision	Old Paragon Way (L-2615) is shown in Section 2.1-2.3 as an Urban Group 4. This roadway is not owned or maintained by SCDOT and is just a tie in. Follow the criteria in the RFP.
127	PIP	Hydraulics	Pipe Inspections	Based on the video pipe inspection reports with recommendations provided, the I-77 median drainage appears to be in need of major repairs. Is it the intent of this RFP to repair / replace the median drainage within the project limits? The repairs will involve introduction of an additional traffic control phase and involve reconstruction of the center median barrier and inlets.	Revision	The spreadsheet in Attachment B will be revised. The intent is not to repair/replace median longitudinal drainage.
128	PIP	Hydraulics	Concept Roadway Plans	Please confirm the existing storm drain system for Tract 36 (shown on Sheet 14 of the conceptual roadway plans) that overlaps the New R/W for One Carolina Drive can be removed/abandoned and that proposers shall make no provisions to include site runoff from Tract 36 in the new storm drain system for One Carolina Drive	Revision	Based on Right of Way negotiations, SCDOT will be taking over responsibility of the Tract 36 drainage system impacted by the project including relocation the detention pond. Scope of work will be revised to include this design and construction work.
129	PIP	Hydraulics	Pipe Inspections	Based on the video pipe inspection reports with recommendations provided, the existing storm drain system on Old Paragon Way requires repairs. Is it the intent of this RFP to repair / replace the existing storm drain drainage system beyond the project limits shown on the Conceptual Roadway Plans?	No_Revision	The intent is not to extend past the project limits. However, if a downstream pipe needs to be upsized to accommodate drainage changes from this project then yes, those pipes would need to be upgraded.



130	PIP	Roadway	8	On the Conceptual Roadway Plans provided with the RFP, from approximately station 554+50 to station 557+50 left of 1-77, the proposed pipe, ditch and construction limits are shown outside of existing and proposed right-of-way. These features are shown encroaching into the right-of-way of L-2191 (Corporate Blvd) which is listed as a local road not maintained by SCDOT. This encroachment is not listed on the provided right-of-way data sheet included with the Conceptual Roadway Plans. Will SCDOT be responsible for securing right-of-way for this work?	Revision	SCDOT is currently re-evaluating this area to determine if right of way is required. If right of way is required, SCDOT will be responsible for acquisition.
131	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Section 2.11	Turning movements for One Carolina Way onto Paragon Way do not meet the requirements/preferences set forth, are revisions to the RFP plans required or is the design allowed to remain as shown?	No_Revision	Please clarify the requirement that is not being met at this location. Turning templates for a WB 62 at this location have been ran and were previously included in the PIP.
132	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 2	Section 2.2	Is it required to protect sign bridges with guardrail and keep uprights in the clear zone for overhead signs or is it required to extend the sign bridges to the clear zone and avoid protection as shown on the preliminary plans?	No_Revision	It is always desirable to keep fixed objects and hazards outside the clear zone. If impractical , fixed objects and hazards can be protected with barrier. Sign structures that span roadway should be protected by guardrail. See 4d Part 1 section 2.2.
133	PIP	Roadway	Concept Roadway Plans Sheet 12	If slope permissions are being obtained on a tract, are additional fill/cut slope impacts allowed other than what is being shown in the Conceptual Roadway Plans provided in the RFP?	No_Revision	Please provide clarification and specific details. Design and construction shall abide by the agreed permissions and should not vary from what is shown in the plans at any location.
134	Attach_A	Exhibit_4	Art VII.A.2	Response to previous Question #25 states " ... A.2 places ALL responsibility for utility coordination and costs on the Contractor." Please clarify if this response is in discrepancy with A.2 indicating that the Contractor is responsible for coordination, temporary relocations, avoidance measures, but also in Exhibit 3, current or planned relocations, and in A.2 that SCDOT is responsible for utility's with prior rights permanent relocation costs per Federal Code.	Revision	Exhibit 3 will be revised to remove any language related to utilities as Article VII of the Agreement controls. Article VII will also be revised to indicate which specific utilities that will not be the responsibility of the proposer. Contractor will be required to coordinate with York Electric to determine final placement of their line.



**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS**  
**Interstate 77 Panther Interchange - Project ID P038652 - York County**

FINAL RFP - ROUND 3						
Date Received: 11/12/2020					Meeting Date: 11/17/2020	
					SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Response	Explanation
135	RFP	3	11 of 46	If ATCs are permitted on tract 36, what is the base design and/or criteria by which ATCs will be evaluated against?	No_Revision	The RFP requires items to be designed and constructed in-kind. ATCs would be evaluated based on previous plans and requirements. Relocation of serviceable items is not precluded.
136	RFP	3	11 of 46	Is there a base design for mitigating the impacts on tract 36 that can be shared with the shortlisted teams to evaluate ATC options?	No_Revision	No final concept plans were completed for tract 36 so no plans will be provided.
137	RFP	3	18 of 46	Please confirm that the reference being made to the gatehouse on tract 36 is the existing security gate with all its appurtenances and not a separate guardhouse structure to be design and constructed which currently does not exist.	Revision	There is not gatehouse on the proerpty. RFP will be revised to state "entrance/exit gates".
138	Attach_A	Agreement	10 of 77	Will the contractor or SCDOT be responsible for negotiating the design changes of the impacts to tract 36 with the owner?	No_Revision	SCDOT
139	Attach_A	Agreement	16 of 77	Is the owner of tract 36 considered a third-party approver?	No_Revision	No
140	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	1	Design criteria has not been provided for most of the cost to cure items associated with Tract 36. RFP states to design and construct the impacts in-kind. Will additional criteria be provided for each item?	No_Revision	Design and construction in accordance with the Internation Building Code and local regulations and requirements. No additional criteria will be provided.
141	RFP	4	4.15.c, pg 18 of 46	Does the exisitng detention pond on Tract 36 fall under the regulation of DHEC's Dams and Resevior Safety Act? Is the pond a regulated dam according to the DHEC criteria? If so, what is its Hazard Potential?	No_Revision	No the pond does not have a regulated dam.
142	Attach_A	Agreement	17 of 77	Please clarify which circumstance SCDOT would be entitled to a reduction in Contract Price in the amount equal to the estimated value of the ATC on the Cost Proposal if the ATC cannot obtain approval. We assume this case would only include ATC's that increased the value of the Cost Proposal but added value to SCDOT and therefore, quality credit assigned to the proposal score.	No_Revision	Assumption is correct.
143	Attach_A	Agreement	16 of 17	Can SCDOT provide what third-parties would provide approval of ATC's?	No_Revision	No third parties are involved in the approval of ATCs
144	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	1	The scope revisions to Track 36 are a significant change to the original scope. Would SCDOT consider increasing the stipend due to the scope increase?	Revision	Stipend will be increased to \$140,000



145	RFP	2	PDF pg 68 & 131 of 394	Page 16 of 77 in RFP states that the Contractor is responsible for obtaining necessary permits for all impacts to the retention system on Tract 36. Page 1 of Exhibit 3 (Scope of Work) says "SCDOT recognizes the potential that a relocated pond would remain in SCDOT right of way such that long-term ownership and maintenance would be required." Has SCDOT spoken with City of Rock Hill and/or SCDHEC to confirm that they will approve the industrial permit modification for a 3rd party not associated with the Industrial Park and will SCDOT be allowed to own the water quality/detention pond without having control of the property it services?	No_Revision	Yes, since SCDOT will own the R/W for Tract 36, SCDHEC will perform the permitting. We have spoken with them and find no issues with SCDOT taking over this pond.
146	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	PDF pg 131 of 394	Page 1 of Exhibit 3 states that "The Contractor is responsible for mitigating all impacts to the hydraulic conveyance and retention systems on Tract 36." When will SCDOT be providing the approved/existing permit for the industrial park/Tract 36?	No_Revision	The as-built information has been added to Attachment B. We are trying to get a copy of the permit. If we obtain this it will be added to the website.
147	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	PDF pg 199 of 394	Is the design requirement for relocating the existing water quality/detention pond on Tract 36 just to match the capacity of the existing pond as shown on the as-built pond data provided in Attachment B?	No_Revision	Yes to the storage capacity and additionally, meet the water quality and discharge requirements as required modeled in the as-builts.
148	Attach_B	Hydraulics	3. Project Inspector Pipe Inspections R1 & PIP/Hydrology /7.Project Inspector Pipe Inspections Excel	The pipes listed in the pdf provided in Attachment B for the Pipe Inspection Report does not match the pipes listed in the Excel file provided in the Project Information Package. Please confirm that only the pipes listed in the pdf are included in the scope of this RFP.	No_Revision	The pipes in the excel file includes all of the pipes within the project that were surveyed. The revised file in Attachment B was revised to include instruction for making structural repairs and/or replacments to crosslines within the project limits.
149	RFP	4	PDF pg 23 of 394	According to page 18 of 46 of the RFP, impacts to Tract 36 could be minimized through bridging. This alternative design could result in bridge piers located within the pond. These bridge piers could negatively affect the capacity of the pond. Would adding bridge piers to the pond require a modification to the existing permit for the industrial park?	No_Revision	Any reduction in storage within the existing ponds will have to be replaced in kind.
150	RFP	9	44	Is the Department still preparing a Section 404 Permit Modification (as stated in Non-Confidential Reponse #88) to cover impacts of the RFP plans (was not clarified in Addendum 2), that were not included in the approved Section 404 Permit?	Revision	No. Due to the changes in the hydrology requirements, it is anticipated that a permit modification would be required and that a single modification is preferable to multiple ones. Thus, the modification to include the north pipe crossing is the responsibility of the Contractor.
151	RFP	9	44	If the Department is submitting a Section 404 Permit Modification (as stated in Non-Confidential Reponse #88) to cover impacts of the RFP plans (was not clarified in Addendum 2), when will it be submitted to the USACE?	Revision	See response to Question #150. SCDOT is not submitting a permit modifcaiton request.
152	RFP	9	44	If the Department is submitting a Section 404 Permit Modification (as stated in Non-Confidential Reponse #88) to cover impacts of the RFP plans (was not clarified in Addendum 2), can a copy of the application be provided to the Contractor?	No_Revision	Modification will be the responsibility of the Contractor.
153	RFP	9	44	If the Department is submitting a Section 404 Permit Modification (as stated in Non-Confidential Reponse #88) to cover impacts of the RFP plans (was not clarified in Addendum 2), when is approval anticipated?	No_Revision	See response to Question #150. SCDOT is not submitting a permit modifcaiton request.





154	RFP	2	PDF pg 68 of 394	It appears that the expansion of the pond on Tract 36 (based on the RFP plans), would need to occur in an area of Tract 36 that is outside of the limits of environmental studies (cultural resources, federally listed species survey, and wetland delineation). It is the design teams understanding that the relocation of the pond is not an ATC. Is the completion of these studies the responsibility of the contractor?	No_Revision	Yes. Updated studies would be responsibility of the Contractor to be included in the FONSI re-evaluation. SCDOT will coordinate with FHWA on behalf of the Contractor.
155	RFP	2	PDF pg 68 of 394	It appears that the expansion of the pond on Tract 36 (based on the RFP plans), would need to occur in an area of Tract 36 that is outside of the Section 404 Permitted Limits. It is the design teams understanding that the relocation of the pond is not an ATC. Is the completion of a Section 404 Permit Modification the responsibility of the contractor?	Revision	Yes. Preparation of the permit modification would be responsibility of the Contractor.
156	RFP	2	PDF pg 68 of 394	Is the completion of a Industrial Stormwater Permit Modification the responsibility of the contractor if the pond expansion on Tract 36 is not the result of an ATC?	No_Revision	Yes.
157	RFP	2	PDF pg 68 of 394	It appears that the expansion of the pond on Tract 36 (based on the RFP plans), would need to occur in an area of Tract 36 that is outside of the Study Area utilized for the NEPA document/FONSI. Is the completion of a NEPA Re-evaluation the responsibility of the contractor if the pond expansion is not the result of an ATC?	No_Revision	Yes. See question #154.
158	RFP	4	PDF pg 22 of 394	Is information available related to potential hazardous discharges that may have occurred on Tract 36 and drained to the existing stormwater pond?	No_Revision	None known.
159	RFP	4	PDF pg 22 of 394	If hazardous discharge information is available for Tract 36, when would it be provided to the Contractor?	No_Revision	Anticipated to be investigated as part of additional field studies associated with re-evaluation that is the responsibility of the Contractor.
160	RFP	8	PDF pg 41 of 394	The milestone calendar does not show a date for SCDOT's response to the Tract 35/36 ATC. On what date can we anticipate a response to our ATC#6 from SCDOT?	No_Revision	We are targeting Friday, November 20 so any revisions can be included in the re-submittal on Monday, November 23.
161	RFP	9	PDF pg 41 of 394	If SCDOT receives the necessary information during the ATC meeting on November 17th will they be willing to provide a final decision on those ATC's by Friday November 20th?	No_Revision	SCDOT will consider based on discussions at the confidential meetings.
162	RFP	10	PDF pg 41 of 394	What time is ATC#6 due on Monday, November 16th?	Revision	ATC #6 (Tract 36 ATC) deadline will be adjusted in Addendum 3.
163	RFP	11	PDF pg 41 of 394	Tract 35 is identified as an ATC. Should this be tract 36?	Revision	yes
164	PIP	ROW		Can SCDOT provide an estimated date of when we can expect the Cost to Cure Analysis discussed on the November 6th call?	Revision	Cost to cure analysis document has been uploaded to the Project Information Package
165	PIP	Traffic		Can SCDOT provide an estimated date of when we can expect the DHL traffic operation requirements for internal circulation discussed on the November 6th call?	Revision	DHL does not operate during 3rd shift or weekends so activities affecting existing operations will be allowed during these times. Work can take place during 1st and 2nd shift as long as there are no impacts to existing operations unless otherwise approved by the property owner. Additional requirements will be discussed in Addendum 3.
166	PIP	Roadway		Can SCDOT provide an estimated date of when we can expect the design criteria for the DHL driveway discussed on the November 6th call?	No_Revision	Paving information has been provided in Project Information Package. No other design criteria will be provided. The design shall address the impacts in-kind.



167	Attach_B	Hydraulics	8. Gekko Pond As-Built & R4 Conceptual Roadway Plans	The pipe sizes shown in the Gekko Pond As-Built plans provided in Attachment B do not match the pipe sizes shown in the survey SCDOT provided. Will SCDOT provide clarification as to which is correct?	No_Revision	Currently investigating the discrepancies and will provide a response at the open-forum meeting.
168	RFP			It appears that the answers given by SCDOT to some of the Non-confidential Questions are no longer valid. Will SCDOT go through and correct "responses" and "explanations" before the next publication of answers to not have conflicting requirements published?	No_Revision	No, SCDOT will not go back through all answers and correct them based on revisions to the Final RFP made through Addendums. The answers provided are "non-binding" and do not amend or form part of the Final RFP.
169	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 4	PDF pg 192 of 394	WZITS liquidated damages specifications outline damages assessed at \$2,500 per quarter hour interval and \$500 per hour interval. Please clarify intent of how start/stop times will be assessed for purposes of imposing liquidated damages?	No_Revision	SCDOT ITS will identify outage, confirm, and notify contractor. LDs begin when the contractor is notified and end when SCDOT ITS confirms it has been restored.
170	PIP	Roadway	Conceptual Roadway Plans	Please clarify the construction station ranges for Blue and Black Blvd NB and Blue and Black Blvd SB. The roadway plans specify tying in with Developer at station 10+95.95 but the typical sections specify construction between stations 10+00 to the tie-in with One Carolina Drive.	No_Revision	R4 conceptual plans show Blue and Black Blvd. NB and SB stationing beginning at station 10+95.95. Please clarify where in typical sections note station 10+00. Regardless, station 10+95.95 is specified in the "XS_Tie_With_Developer" PDF in Attachment B, which would be the requirement.
171	PIP	Roadway	Conceptual Roadway Plans	Please provide a typical section to be used at the business entrances along Paragon Way that are affected by construction. Please include one for the asphalt driveways as well as one for concrete driveways.	No_Revision	Typical sections for business entrances along Paragon Way will not be provided. DB teams should design based on the right of way provided in Preliminary ROW Plans R1 in Attachment B. PIP is for information only.
172	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 4	PDF pg 185 of 394	The RFP states "The traffic signal at One Carolina Drive at Hiram Way shall have both the eastbound and westbound left turn movements from One Carolina Drive designed for protected-only phasing." The Contractor can infer from this that this intersection will be signalized. The RFP does not directly identify any other intersections to be signalized. Please provide a list of all intersections that are to be signalized.	Revision	Intersections that will be signalized: One Carolina Drive @ Hiram Way, One Carolina Drive at I-77 SB Ramps/Blue and Black Blvd, One Carolina Drive at I-77 NB Ramps.
173	Attach_B	Traffic		Is SCDOT still planning to provide a break-away detail from the City of Rock Hill as stated in the response to Question 58?	No_Revision	Contractor to use standard poles included in Attachment B.
174	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	PDF pg 141 of 394	The RFP is requiring 2400' of acceleration lanes not including tapers. With this new acceleration lane length the concept plans violate the RFP. Will the Conceptual Roadway Plans be revised?	Revision	The SB on-ramp shown in the concept plans meets the 2400'. RFP will be revised to address the NB on-ramp. NB on-ramp must be tied into I-77 prior the bridge at Eden Terrace, similar to what is shown in the concept plans. The Conceptual Roadway plans will not be revised.
175	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	PDF pg 141 of 394	The 2400' of acceleration violates section 10.3.2 of the RDM. Is SCDOT waiving the requirement for the distance between successive tapers?	No_Revision	Section 10.3.2 and corresponding Figure 10.3-A are in reference to ramp junctions, i.e. separate ramps merging/diverging, and does not apply to a single ramp tapering from 2 lanes to 1 lane. Traffic analysis has been conducted for the concept design.
176	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	PDF pg 141 of 394	Will SCDOT expect that the tapers of successive entrance and exit terminals to be connected with an auxiliary lane where the distance between is less than 1500 feet?	No_Revision	Guidance in RDM Section 10.3.2 is for tapers of successive entrance and exit terminals. 1500' will not be required between the tapers on the same ramp.
177	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	PDF pg 141 of 394	The 2400' of acceleration will require widening under the Eden Terrace Bridge. Are modifications to this bridge now part of the scope of the project?	Revision	No, modifications to the Eden Terrace bridge are not a part of the scope. RFP will be revised to address the NB on-ramp. NB on-ramp must be tied into I-77 prior the bridge at Eden Terrace, similar to what is shown in the concept plans.



178	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	PDF pg 141 of 394	The extension of the acceleration lanes extend beyond the survey provided. Does SCDOT have survey in this area or will this need to be acquired by the teams?	No_Revision	All available survey information has been provided in PIP. Any additional survey will need to be acquired by the teams.
179	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	PDF pg 141 of 394	In revising the acceleration length requirements in the plans to reflect the added RFP design criteria, the lanes extend beyond the project and survey limits. Is this the SCDOT's intent or will the criteria be revised to be in accordance with acceleration lengths provided in Section 10.4.2.3 of the RDM?	Revision	RFP will be revised to clarify acceleration lane requirements. Provide 1200' of acceleration lane on I-77 SB for the single lane portion of the ramp. 1200' will not be achievable on the I-77 NB on-ramp due to the Eden Terrace overpass. Modification to the Eden Terrace bridge is not a part of the scope of this project.
180	PIP	Roadway	Concept Roadway Plan Sheet 12	The wall at Ramp 3 requires spill slopes outside of the proposed slope permissions show on the RFP plans. Is it the intent of SCDOT to acquire the additional permissions or will the wall needed to be lengthened?	No_Revision	Refer to updated conceptual ROW plans, note #2.
181	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	PDF pg 359 of 394	Which detail in referenced standard drawings 805-525-01 & 805-525-02 is to be used on this job? Is paving behind the guardrail post required?	No_Revision	All details provided in standard drawings 805-525-01 and 805-525-02 are acceptable. Paving behind the guardrail is only required when/if the final design necessitates it.
182	PIP	Roadway	Concept Roadway Plan	The RFP plans have a Broken Back Curve where the tangent is less than 1500' on One Carolina Drive. Is the SCDOT's intent to revise the RFP to allow the criteria in Section 5.2.2.5 of the RDM not be met?	No_Revision	Guidance in RDM Section 5.2.2.5 is a desirable condition. As such, the RFP will not be revised and a design consistent with RFP plans in regards to the horizontal alignment of One Carolina Drive will be acceptable. The horizontal alignment shown in RFP plans will not preclude proper superelevation from being developed per RFP.
183	RFP	4	20/46	Under Section 4.1 Technical Proposal, under number 16c for Plan Sheet requirements for the technical proposal, Addendum #2 added a requirement that states "Location and size of stormwater ponds and anticipated routing for drainage pipes and structures". Please clarify whether or not proposed drainage pipes and structures need to be shown for the project limits or just what is associated with the stormwater pond(s) for Tract 36.	No_Revision	The intent is just for the drainage features on Tract 36 associated with the impacts to the DHL facility.
184				What are the stream buffer requirements for SCDOT since the relocated Tract 36 pond will be encompassed by new ROW? Will The City of Rock Hill stream buffer requirements apply to Tract 36 since SCDOT is taking over the pond?	No_Revision	The buffer requirements will be in accordance with SCDOT and SCDHEC requirements.
185	Attach_A	Agreement	43/77	Please provide survey for entirety of Tract 36 in order to confirm relocated pond grading requirements and verify existing stormdrain network. If SCDOT cannot provide this information, then proposers cannot assume risk for changes to right of way requirements post award for the Tract 36 pond per the Agreement Section VIII, Paragraph H (page 43/77). Timing does not allow proposers to mobilize and conduct surveys.	No_Revision	All available survey information has been provided in Project Information Package. Any additional survey will need to be acquired by the teams. As-built plans are also available in Attachment B.
186				Do The City of Rock Hill stream buffer requirements apply to Tract 18?	No_Revision	The buffer requirements will be in accordance with SCDOT and SCDHEC requirements.
187	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	4	Since Addendum 2, Section 2.10 Ramps, has added new language for the dual lane loop ramps - please define "Full lane widths"? New added language is not clear.	No_Revision	"Full lane width" refer to the width of the travel lanes around the dual lane loop ramps. 16' lane widths shall be maintained, without any lane width reduction, until the PT of the loop ramps.
188	Attach_B	Traffic		Please provide the Peak Hour Trips for Driveways on Tract 36.	No_Revision	SCDOT does not have this data. To determine peak hour trips, use latest version of the ITE Trip Generation Manual and any pertinent data from the facility located on Tract 36.
189	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	3	Can the relocated pond on Tract 36 utilize wet detention to match the existing condition or does SCDOT require dry detention for relocated Tract 36?	No_Revision	Yes.
190	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	4	Regarding Section 2.5, does the revised Addendum 2 language in this Section apply to the whole I-77 Panthers interchange project or just impacts on Tract 36?	Revision	The language has been revised. The NPDES permits are to be acquired through SCDHEC.



191	RFP	8		Please correct typo for Tract 35 to Tract 36 on the procurement schedule.	Revision	To be corrected in Addendum 3
192	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	1	Regarding Section 2.1, Addendum 2 revision does not eliminate correction of I-77 median drainage deficiencies noted in the video pipe inspections. Please include language to eliminate I-77 median drainage scope of work for pipe repairs/replacement, or eliminate the I-77 median drainage portion of the video pipe inspections that includes recommendations for repairs/replacement.	Revision	The Attachment B information was previously revised to only include crossline pipes. The original file that includes median and sideline drainage was removed from Attachment B and put into the PIP folder for information only. 4e has been revised to remove "and median" drainage structures.
193	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	4	Regarding Section 2.10, Please confirm that the statement "Provide 1,200' for acceleration before the final lane taper." is still referring to the dual lane portion of the ramp and not the acceleration lane on I-77 for the single lane portion of the ramp.	Revision	RFP will be revised to clarify acceleration lane requirements. Provide 1200' of acceleration lane on I-77 SB for the single lane portion of the ramp. 1200' will not be achievable on the I-77 NB on-ramp due to the Eden Terrace overpass. Modification to the Eden Terrace bridge is not a part of the scope of this project.
194	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	6	How essential is the access road having to come off Ramp 3 (between 572+50 and 574+50) since it will be crossing the stream in order to access the pond on Tract 36? Is this a requirement or preference? And if required, is the design-build team responsible for those additional jurisdictional stream impacts as a result of the proposed access road? Is an ATC required to change the access location between (572+50 and 574+50)?	No_Revision	Access Road coming off Ramp 3 in accordance with RFP is a requirement. The stations provided for the access road gate in RFP are approximate, i.e. the exact location of the access road along Ramp 3, and there is some flexibility in gate location dependant upon where a constructible dirve for construction/maintenance vehicles can be located. An ATC would not be required for a change in the access gate location. If the access road increase wetland or stream impacts, contractor will be responsible for including impacts as part of the required permit modification.
195	PIP	Roadway	Conceptual Roadway Plans	Is the impacted driveway connection on Tract 36 required to be relocated from the new created intersection of One Carolina Drive and Old Paragon Way per the SCDOT ARMs Manual? If yes, will SCDOT consider an ATC to retain existing driveway connection matching the existing driveway location as shown in the RFP Conceptual Roadway Plans?	Revision	Addendum 3 will address. No ATCs to leave driveway as is will be accepted.
196	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	6	"Provide Chain Link Double Swing Gate in fencing between approximate stations 572+50 and 574+50". Is it safe to assume that the gate location in the fence needs to be within the identified station limits but not necessarily the access from the ramp, which can be designed within the target section of the ramp?	No_Revision	Gate location provided in RFP is approximate. Gate shall be located where it is constructible and allows for entry of construction/maintenance equipment. Access from the ramp does not need to be provided between the stations in the RFP.
197	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	1	Will SCDOT or the Tract 36 owner provide acceptance/rejection of the design and construction of the cost to cure items associated with Tract 36?	No_Revision	SCDOT
198	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	1	Design criteria has not been provided for most of the cost to cure items associated with Tract 36. RFP states to design and construct the impacts in-kind. Are all items impacted expected to be replaced or may these items be relocated (e.g. signage, lighting, fencing, etc.)?	No_Revision	The RFP requires items to be designed and constructed in-kind. It does not preclude relocation of items which are in serviceable condition.
199	RFP	6	4	Per RFP Exhibit 6, Article 3(1), SCDOT will not provide any mitigation credits. Can it be assumed that surplus credits from the Landsford Tract PRM shall be purchased by the Contractor to offset any required mitigation associated with a modification to the Section 404 permit for impacts on Tract 36?	No_Revision	SCDOT does not have this information.
200	RFP	2	PDF pg 68 of 394	Page 16 of 77 in the RFP states that the Contractor is responsible for all permitting made necessary by ATC designs. Please confirm that should the Design-Build Team develop an SCDOT approved design that both incorporates the requirements of Addendum 2 and does not propose any impacts additional to what was shown in the RFP Plans provided by SCDOT, will SCDOT still be responsible for modifying the USACE Permit to accommodate the RFP plans design as indicated in SCDOT's reponse to non-confidential question #88?	Revision	Contractor will be responsible for the permit modification.





201	RFP	1	PDF pg 21 of 394	How will minimization of ROW impacts to tract 36 be evaluated and quantified into quality points? (i.e. 1acre reduction in acquisition = 10 quality points, maintenance of existing traffic flow ~ 10 quality points, etc.)	No_Revision	SCDOT will evaluate proposer designs based on impacts associated with the Preliminary Right of Way Plans.
-----	-----	---	------------------	---	-------------	---



**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS**  
**Interstate 77 Panther Interchange - Project ID P038652 - York County**

FINAL RFP - ROUND 4						
Date Received: 11/20/2020					Meeting Date: 11/24/2020	
					SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Response	Explanation
202	Attach_B	Environmental	Corps Permit	Since the approved Corps permit includes the entire site development and the new interchange, please provide the wetland and stream impacts allocated to the interchange project. There must be a clear delineation between the two projects in order to determine responsibility in case impacts are exceeded.	No_Revision	No. The permit does not allocate or assign impacts per project type (development vs. interchange). Limits for the interchange will be established by the end and begin stationing of the DOT project.
203	PIP	Utilities	1. Prelim Utility Report, Page 82. Potential Utility Conflicts Location Map	Existing Duke Energy Transmission lines are stated to be relocated by Duke. The Utility Conflict Location Map provided shows the proposed relocation for the western parallel transmission lines around the new interchange. However, there are no relocations or tie-ins shown or provided for the east-west existing transmission facilities crossing I-77. Will they be removed? Relocated? If relocated, where? Please provide information including the relocation design for this section of transmission facilities so we can properly determine any conflicts with the proposed design.	No_Revision	This line will be relocated by Duke Energy north to a crossing near the Eden Terrace Bridge. No impact is expected to the interchange project.
204	PIP	Utilities	1. Prelim Utility Report, Page 82. Potential Utility Conflicts Location Map	Please provide sag curve diagrams with elevations for Duke Energy Transmission facilities running east-west across I-77. This would include six (6) poles labeled as P325 through P331 (five (5) spans).	No_Revision	No diagrams are available. No impact is expected to the interchange project.
205	RFP	4	16 of 46	In Section 4.1 please consider increasing the Technical Proposal Narrative maximum page count from 10 to 12 pages.	No_Revision	Page count maximum will remain at 10.
206	RFP	8	37 of 46	When does SCDOT anticipate the execution of the funding agreement with SC Coordinating Council for Economic Development and Panthers Football, LLC?	No_Revision	SCDOT does not have an answer this question at this time. Per the RFP Section 7.2 "Proposer agrees to hold the Proposal offer available for acceptance a minimum of 90 calendar days after the submission of its Cost Proposal.
207	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f		The user notes on Sheet 3 of 5 of SCDOT Standard Drawing 713-01c indicate that a geomembrane shall be used west of I-77 and the alternate typical section shall be provided. Since the bridge is over the dividing line, will a geomembrane be required?	No_Revision	Yes, because deicing salts are typically used in this area, the geomembrane is required.
208	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	PDF pg 280 of 394	There is currently a NB message sign at approximately STA 555. The RFP states: "The existing dynamic message signs (DMS) that are currently in place within the project limits shall be replaced with new DMS as part of the new ITS system." The Conceptual Signing Plan flags the STA 555 Message sign as "VARIABLE MESSAGE SIGN TO BE RELOCATED." Is the sign from STA 555 to be relocated? If so, to what station?	No_Revision	The existing sign at Sta 555 will not be relocated, it will be removed as it does not meet SCDOT's current specifications. The new sign at Sta 589 will be the only DMS in the project.



209	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 4	PDF pg 190 of 394	The RFP states "One new DMS sign on cantilever structure shall be provided on I-77 northbound near approximate station 589+00." Is the intent to have 2 Northbound Dynamic Message Signs within less than a mile. Are both Dynamic Message Signs are intended to be new or will one will be new and one will be a relocation of the existing Dynamic Message Sign?	No_Revision	No, the new sign at Sta 589 will be the only DMS in the project.
210	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 4	PDF pg 192 of 394	WZITS liquidated damages specifications outline damages assessed at \$2,500 per quarter hour interval and \$500 per hour interval. Please clarify intent of how start/stop times will be assessed for purposes of imposing LDs.	Revision	SCDOT ITS will identify outage, confirm, and notify contractor. LDs begin 2 hours after the contractor is notified and end when SCDOT ITS confirms it has been restored.
211	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 4	PDF pg 192 of 394	WZITS liquidated damages calculate to \$10,000 per hour. There are many reasons a system could go offline, including items beyond the contractor's control such as wireless service interruptions. Will the contractor be responsible to pay liquidated damages from the moment the system goes offline or will a grace period be allowable to give the contractor time to mobilize and remediate any deficiencies?	Revision	\$2,500/quarter hour LD's will be removed. \$500/hr LD's will remain for all outages and will be assessed beginning 2 hours following notification of the outage.
212	PIP	Roadway	Right of Way Certification R1	The updated ROW certification posted 11/18/20 indicates the billboards themselves are not affected by ROW. However, given that these tracts (19,20, & 21) are total takes and based on the RFP design it appears as though access to said billboards cannot be maintained safely. Will SCDOT be responsible for removal and disposal of said billboards?	Revision	ROW Certification will be updated.
213	PIP	Roadway	R4 Conceptual Roadway Plans	The Conceptual ROW plans posted on 11/09/20 show only 4 moving items, 0 removal and disposal items, and 0 new fences on this project. Please confirm and update the RFP to indicate that based on the negotiation with all property owners (with the exception of Tract 36) as listed in the updated ROW certification posted 11/18/20 that no additional moving, removal & disposal items, or new fences are necessary.	No_Revision	There are no additional items.
214	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 4	PDF pg 195 of 394	The RFP states, "Direct burial poles must be of breakaway design if located within the clear zone of the right of way" Please confirm that the structural light poles specified are not direct burial poles.	Revision	Confirmed, the poles included in Addendum 3 will be of breakaway design. The breakway base detail will be included when received from the manufacturer.
215	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 4	PDF pg 195 of 394	The RFP states, "Direct burial poles must be of breakaway design if located within the clear zone of the right of way" Please confirm that the structural light poles specified do not have to be protected if in clearzone.	Revision	RFP will be revised to clarify. The poles included in Addendum 3 will be of breakaway design.
216	PIP	Roadway	R4 Conceptual Roadway Plans	What is the acceptable replacement of the impacted guardrail and concrete barrier protecting the NB bridge approach to the Eden Terrace Overpass? The Conceptual Roadway Plans impact this but the replacement is not shown. Is a MASH upgrade required & what type of concrete barrier is acceptable?	No_Revision	The intent is to retain the existing concrete jersey barrier and match existing pavement elevations in this tie-in area. For guardrail impacted by the lane taper, replace the stiffness transition with pre-MASH stiffness transition (use 805-690-30) and other pre-MASH guardrail as necessary.
217	RFP	4	PDF pg 22 of 394	Is it SCDOT's intention that the bullets provided under Question 1-A (page 17) are to be addressed as items within the graphically-depicted Critical Path Method (CPM) Schedule or as narrative responses within Project Delivery and Approach section?	No_Revision	Items should be addressed in the CPM schedule graphically. Narrative can accompany the CPM schedule in the Project Delivery and Approach Section as needed.



218	RFP	4	PDF pg 42 of 394	How much time should the Contractor allocate in our schedule to allow for the execution of the South Carolina Coordinating Council for Economic Development and Panthers Football, LLC funding agreement?	No_Revision	SCDOT does not have an answer this question at this time. Per the RFP Section 7.2 "Proposer agrees to hold the Proposal offer available for acceptance a minimum of 90 calendar days after the submission of its Cost Proposal.
219	Attach_B	ROW	Right of Way Certification R1	Page 1 of the updated ROW certification posted 11/18/20 indicates that 1 tract has been secured. However, on page 2 it shows none are secured. Please clarify.	Revision	ROW Certification will be updated.
220	Attach_B	Traffic	Street Lighting	Will light arms be permitted on the signal poles to provide intersection lighting?	Revision	Yes, City of Rock Hill is in process of providing the mast arm detail to be used where mast arm luminaires can be used. It will be the taller mast as seen at other locations in the City. The other lighting equipment shall meet specifications provided in Attachment B.
221	Attach_B	Structures	Sht.4 of Plans	The Bridge Conceptual Plans detail a two-foot wide paved decorative buffer strip on the shared use path. We did not see any requirement for that in the RFP. Does the Department expect to see some type of visual separation detailed between the traffic and the 11-ft. outer portion (10-ft path and 1-ft. outside shoulder) of the shared use path as it crosses the bridge?	No_Revision	No, a decorative buffer is not required on the bridge. The 2'-0" width may match the rest of the raised shared-use-path.
222	Attach_B	Traffic	Street Lighting	The provided luminaire and poles still do not meet 100% coverage. Can we substitute with City of Rock Hill approved poles and specs that do meet the required 100% coverage? Is this considered an ATC?	Revision	Use the new poles provided in Addendum 3; at intersections, the City has a standard with a taller mast to be used with luminaire. Revision to be addressed in Addendum 4.
223	Attach_A	Agreement	PDF pg 44 of 394	The RFP states "The driveway for Tract 36 nearest to One Carolina Drive shall be located, at minimum, 250 feet from One Carolina Drive as measured between the nearest edge of travelled way for each roadway." Does the One Carolina 250' offset for the Tract 36 driveway apply to the entire length of the driveway or just the tie with existing Paragon Way? A 250' offset of One Carolina Drive in the RFP Plans the entire length of the driveway would encroach into the building and be unable to tie with the back loading dock area.	Revision	SCDOT will consider the driveway as meeting 50 or more peak hour trips for which ARMS indicates a 220' spacing. The 220' minimum from One Carolina Drive applies to the tie-in with existing Paragon Way. The remaining portion of the driveway leading to the west side of the building is to be relocated only as needed to maintain similar characteristics as the existing drive.
224	Attach_B	Traffic	6. Mast Arm LED Signs	The LED mast arm sign specification says to use a 6' x 20" viewing area. MUTCD specifies 12" letters for overhead street name signs. Even at 8" letters, using Type C lettering, it would very difficult to fit "Blue and Black Blvd" on a 6' sign. Is it permissible to use an 8' sign if needed?	No_Revision	Yes. Street name signs are required to be 12" in height. The width is listed as variable, per Traffic Engineering Guideline (TG) No. 1, so they can be as wide as needed while still fitting on the mast arm.
225	Attach_B	Traffic	13. SCDOT Supplemental Spec for Rdwy Lighting	Section 3.14 Standard Roadway Lighting Poles in the SCDOT Supplemental Specifications for Roadway Lighting states "Poles shall be 35 feet or as specified in the plans." The pole details from Structura show a max height of 30'. Which does SCDOT prefer? The original RFP states 35' but has been removed in subsequent addendums.	No_Revision	The pole details in Attachment B should be used.
226	Attach_A	Exhibit_4	Division 600 ITS Section 4 page 60	Is the existing hub cabinet at camera 7 to be removed or relocated? Will the new cabinet be SCDOT supplied, contractor installed?	No_Revision	Yes, SCDOT will supply the hub cabinet for camera 7, and the contractor will install. For DMS, the cabinet is included with the sign.





227	Attach_A	Exhibit_4	Division 600 ITS Section 10 c. page 79	Can you please clarify the permitted fiber optic splice spacing? Will splicing be permitted at the beginning and end of the project limits, and the hub cabinet at Camera 6?	No_Revision	The new section of fiber (reel ends) will be spliced at both ends of the project located at Camera 8 and Camera 6. The new camera (Camera 7) will be spliced into the trunk cable at the new location. The new DMS will be spliced into the existing trunk cable near station 600 prior to camera 6. Contractor will need to make provisions to access existing trunk cable which may require a directional bore across I-77 since existing trunk cable is installed on the southbound side of I-77 and new DMS will be installed on the northbound side of I-77.
-----	----------	-----------	---	--	-------------	---

