

**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
I-77 Exit 26 Interchange - P042443 - Richland County**

RFP FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW ROUND 2

Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	SCDOT	
						Response	Explanation
1	Attach_B	Environmental		With multiple contractors working under the same USACE permit, how does SCDOT plan to handle a violation outside of the design-builder's control that results in a cease and desist order for all operations under the permit?	Environmental	No_Revision	The USACE understands that portions of the construction will be developed by various entities such as Scout's contractor, Norfolk Southern/Palmetto Rail's contractors, and SCDOT's contractors. SCDOT will coordinate with the USACE during any possible violations that are not associated with SCDOT's portion of the project to ensure work can continue for its site. If, however, a violation occurs under the DB team's control, the contractor will assume responsibilities as outlined in the agreement.
2	Attach_B	Environmental		Tri colored bats are anticipated to be listed within the next couple of months. If the listing and subsequent consultation does not occur prior to the technical proposal submission, how does SCDOT plan to handle schedule delays associated with clearing moratoriums?	Environmental	No_Revision	Acoustic surveys were performed as part of the biological analysis and TCBS were not detected. Per standard FWS conditions, if the listing occurs, SCDOT will assist the DBT in coordination with the Service. Per the FONSI (pg 21) it is anticipated the absence of the species will not trigger clearing moratoriums.
3	Attach_B	Environmental		Referencing the Final Permit SAC 2023-00690_12Jan_signed....document, please confirm the intent to pipe the entire 6,020 lf of Beasley Creek as shown on Sheet 4 of the permit impact map (PDF 14/207) and Sheet 1.18 (PDF 34/207)? This will ultimately affect how the drainage connects to it as well.	Environmental	No_Revision	Per the permit, NWW 11 (Beasley Ck) will be piped for 6,020 as indicated on permit sheet 1.18 (PDF 34). There are interconnected ponds proposed in some locations along the piped sections per the site development plans.
4	RFP	4	Page 1/Section 4e	Section 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.1.4: Do these drainage design requirements apply to the rehab section of the project? Example, if a pipe is to be extended due to a shoulder improvement, is it SCDOT's intent to perform a hydraulic analysis?	Hydrology	No_Revision	Pipes should just be extended where proposed design doesnt change runoff. No hydraulic analysis intended for rehab section.
5	RFP	4	Page 1/Section 4e	Section 2.1.1 states "Ensure offsite areas that affect the hydraulic systems and outfalls of this project are accounted for". Will SCDOT provide offsite development information for Scout, etc. that may affect the drainage within the new right-of-way, particularly within the interchange?	Hydrology	No_Revision	SCDOT is not aware of any Scout drainage entering SCDOT's R/W.



6	RFP	4	Page 1/Section 4e	Section 2.1.2 states "Perform hydraulic analyses, to include headwater and tail-water effects, on all cross-line and median drainage structures for the design storm event." When existing structures are structurally sound but are undersized and will not meet the HW/D requirements within SCDOT's Requirements for Hydraulic Design Studies, will SCDOT allow retainage of these culverts in place if existing headwater conditions can be maintained or improved at each of the crossings?	Hydrology	No_Revision	Culverts within base scope(excluding pavement rehabilitation) that do not meet criteria shall be upsized and drainage design shall meet all RFP criteria.
7	RFP	4	Page 2/Section 4e	Section 2.1.13 states "Ensure proposed drainage systems are not constructed under future lanes. What are the future widening conditions?"	Hydrology	Revision	Reference to future lanes has been removed from 4e. The only widening addressed in the scope relates to future inside lanes along I-77.
8	RFP	4	Page 2/Section 4e	Section 2.1.7 states "Repair or replace damaged drainage structures". Does SCDOT have a field inspection report for the drainage structures? Does this apply to the rehab section?	Hydrology	Revision	Structures were not inspected, only pipes/culverts between the structures. Work on structures is not prescribed unless a propoers design impacts the structure. Tie-ins to existing strcutures will be required where pipes are specified for replacement and required by final design. Exhibit 4e will be revised to clarify.
9	RFP	4	Page 3/Section 4e	Section 2.1.19 states "Cross-line pipes within the project limits which have not been inspected shall be replaced." If the EOR determines a pipe is not needed in this location, is it SCDOT's intent to still replace the pipe?	Hydrology	Revision	If the EOR determines that a pipe is not needed in an existing location or warranted in the proposed drainage design, then it is not be required to be replaced. However, if the pipe is to be abandoned, it shall be flowfilled.



10	RFP	4	Page 4/Section 4e	Section 2.1.19 states "Field and video inspections have been performed on the majority of existing cross-line structures within the project limits. Implement the alternatives as directed in the "Existing Pipe Evaluation Results and Recommendations" located in Attachment B. Pipes within the project limits may be replaced in lieu of repaired." The Attachment B inspection report includes recommendations for pipes that may not be within the project limits. Will SCDOT revise the report to remove those pipes outside of the project limits or is it the intent to perform those recommendations on all pipes within the report?	Hydrology	Revision	Only pipes required for final design within base scope excluding rehab limits are required to be repaired or replaced. Report will not be revised. Exhibit 4e will be revised to clarify.
11	RFP	4	Page 8/Section 4b.	Section 2.1.20 states "For bridge decks with future accommodations, provide deck drains to satisfy the spread requirements based on the future conditions. For bridges crossing roadways with allowances for future conditions, locate drains so they do not discharge onto current or future travel lanes." What are the future widening conditions?	Structures	Revision	The future I-77 typical section includes four mainline travel lanes in each direction with associated shoulders and future widening towards the median. See Exhibit 4b Section 2.1.4.
12	RFP	4	Page 6/Section 4e	Section 2.5.1, NPDES Permitting: Due to schedule, will SCDOT consider obtaining the NOI from SCDHEC based on the preferred design?	Hydrology	No_Revision	SCDOT only has concept plans and not a final alignment to obtain an accurate and complete NOI.
13	RFP	5	Page 107/Section 815	Section 815 states "Within existing right of way, clean and repair existing concrete ditches that will be retained. Within existing right of way, clean and repair existing asphalt paved ditches that are to be retained and overlay with 200 lbs/sy HMA Surface Course Type C or D." There are quite a few of these ditches within the project limits and many may not be affected by the project at all, i.e. median ditches. Is it still the SCDOT's intent to repair all concrete/asphalt ditches? What are SCDOT's intentions in the rehab section of the project?	Hydrology	Revision	The intent is to repair all asphalt/concrete ditches with deficiencies within the base scope limits. Repair is not intended in the rehab limits unless the design directly impacts the facilities. Exhibit 5 will be revised to clarify.
14	RFP	5	Page 106/Section 815	Section 815.C references SCR160000, effective January 2013. This permit was reissued in July 2022. Does SCDOT still want to follow the old permit?	Hydrology	Revision	Not allowed to follow old permit. July 2022 must be followed. Exhibit 5 will be revised to clarify.
15	PIP	Hydraulics	Stormwater Report/Appendix B.8	The culvert designs in the PIP have been performed in CulvertMaster, which is not an approved SCDOT hydraulic design program. Will SCDOT provide culvert output from HY-8 and/or the HY-8 design files?	Hydrology	Revision	SCDOT will provide HY-8 output and design files.



16	Attach_B	Hydraulics	Page 7/ I-77 Exit 26 Pipe Inspection Report	The pipe inspection report recommends replacing an 84"x84" RCBC at station 631+00. The existing plans show it as a Double 7'x6' RCBC. The downstream connecting culvert is a Double 8'x7'. Is it SCDOT's intentions to size the structure hydraulically and replace all sections of the connected system or to replace up to and match the downstream culvert size? This culvert is outside the rehab and main section of the project, does SCDOT want it analyzed?	Hydrology	No_Revision	No need to analyze unless final design changes runoff that this culvert will convey.
17	PIP	Hydraulics		Given the very aggressive schedule on this project, it is critically important for the successful proposer to expedite design leading to early start of construction. For this reason please consider moving sections/appendices of the Stormwater Report from the PIP to Attachment B. Recommendation to move Table 1, Appendices B.1, B.8 and B.11 to Attachment B. Presumptively SCDOT has already reviewed/approved these sections and would save SCDOT review time during the design phase and the proposer from resubmitting and gaining approval of the same information so long as proposers design doesn't alter the work already performed by SCDOT's Design-Build Prep Consultant.	Hydrology	No_Revision	No. Files will remain in the PIP.
18	PIP	Hydraulics		Please provide most current Scout Motors Grading Plan(s) or those dated 1-31-24, with all supportive hydraulic computations and cadd files.	Hydrology		Requested from T&H. SCDOT is investigating this issue further.
19	PIP	Hydraulics		Please confirm the location of the Dual 60" pipes located along the Connector Road Sta 125+00 to 137+00? Traditionally SCDOT would not approve this configuration for a longitudinal culvert under a roadway.	Hydrology		SCDOT is investigating this issue further. High likelihood of 60" dual remaining.
20	PIP	Hydraulics		In the stormwater report on Sheet D8 (PDF page 535/543) the cross pipe under the Connector Road at Sta 139+50 is labeled as a dual 24" RCP but on Sheet D10 (PDF 539/543) the pipe is labeled as a dual 60" RCP. Please clarify.	Hydrology	Revision	Per T&H plan these are 24" RCP.
21	RFP			What are the commitments made between SCDOT and Scout? Based on the terms of the contract, it is possible for any damages associated with these commitments to be passed down to the contractor.	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT and Scout do not have an agreement or contract. The State has committed to opening the interchange by a date certain. There is no passdown, but the State's promise to deliver on time is reflected in the due date and liquidated damages.
22	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	Page 2/ Section 2.1.1	The PCC Pavement is required to be Diamond Ground for the Surface Texture. If the pavement is going to be overlaid with HMA, does it need to be Diamond Ground?	Pavement	No_Revision	This question was asked and answered in the previous round of questions. Yes, PCC pavement is required to be diamond ground.
23	RFP	5	5.3	Please clarify quality credit score item B.2 "Early opening of relocated US 21 to avoid at-grade railroad crossing up to 10 months." Item does not specify what 10 months is relative to. Please edit to state 10 months prior to substantial completion if this is the intent.	PM	Revision	Revision will be provided in IR#2



24	RFP	4	4.1.6	Please consider removing the cost loading requirement from the CPM schedule. This requirement provides little to no value in evaluating a proposer's ability to complete the project in a timely manner.	PM	Revision	Cost Loading Requirement will be removed from the CPM Schedule Submittal
25	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 15/H.4.a.	Will meetings be weekly or bi-weekly?	PM	Revision	Weekly meetings will be required.
26	PIP	Roadway		Please provide the aerial photography background with the Roadway Microstation files.	Roadway	No_Revision	Will provide on SharePoint. This file is extremely large.
27	RFP	2	Section 2.1 / 6 of 394	Project Description lists project termini as a function of Mile Markers - can the termini of the pavement rehab / overlay and the project itself be given in terms of centerline stationing to more accurately determine termini based on the conceptual plans?	Roadway	No_Revision	Survey is unavailable for the limits of the rehab portion of the project. As per standard SCDOT practice mile markers are used to identify the termini of this rehabilitation area. Pave through the current concrete to asphalt joint.
28	RFP	2	Section 2.1 / 6 of 394	Project Description lists southern project termini for the northbound pavement work only. Can project termini along southbound pavement work be included in the description? Can northern project termini be provided as well in both directions along I-77?	Roadway	No_Revision	There is no rehabilitation for I-77 southbound. Project termini would be dictated by the proposer's design.
29	PIP	Roadway		Please confirm the Paved Shoulder Widths. Per Exhibit 4a – Roadway Design Criteria, Interstate 77 3-lane section (NB/SB) Shoulder (inside) widths are 12ft total (10 ft paved, 2 ft earth) and 2-lane section (SB) are 10 ft total (4ft paved, 6ft earth). Design files and Conceptual Plans are consistent with this requirement, but provided cross-sections are not. For example; at XSC STA. 1715+00, SB inside shoulder shows 8ft paved, 2ft earth, and NB inside shoulder shows 12ft paved, 2ft earth. Design criteria and concept plans do not match. Using wider shoulders than the concept design could increase impacts and require a permit modification.	Roadway	No_Revision	Conceptual plans are provided for information only. Please see note on sheet X0. Please refer to Exhibit 4a & the typical sections for shoulder width requirements.
30	Attach_A	Agreement	Page 44/VIII.E.1.a	In this item it is noted that right of way that was needed for the initial design and not included in the plans (Additional Right of Way) is the cost responsibility of the contractor. Why is this cost not SCDOT's responsibility? Having the Teams responsible for this cost will add risk and make it more difficult to meet the fixed price.	ROW	Revision	Acquisitions related to Tracts 2 and 3 will be finalized based upon successful proposer's design. All other acquisitions have been based on the preferred alternative (i.e. Project Designated Right of Way). Additional Right of Way acquisitions (i.e. necessitated by successful proposer plans in areas not Tracts 2 and 3) beyond this Project Designated ROW will be the responsibility of the Contractor. ROW acquisition diagram and language will be clarified.

