

NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
S-2-105 (Old Vaucluse Road) over I-20 Emergency Bridge Replacement
Project ID P044879 - Aiken County

RFP FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW

Date Received: **21-Jul**

Meeting Date: **23-Jul**

CONTRACTOR						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	1	Scope of Work states "Work also includes debris removal at the site within the limits of SCDOT right-of-way. " - Is there any currently known debris besides the existing Bent 2 spread footing that needs to be removed?	Construction	Revision	Sentence removed. No other known debris will need to be removed besides the existing Bent 2 spread footing.
2	RFP		12	Section 4.1 Technical Proposal: Item 2 under "In the Technical Proposal Narrative" section, states that an Org Chart be provided to show how crews will be allocated to the sites and to describe interaction between multiple crews and project management staff. Since there is only one site for this project, please update this section if needed.	Construction	Revision	Section will be revised.
3	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	204	Will the full-depth patching be eliminated from Section 104?	Construction	No_Revision	Section will remain.
4	Attach_A	Exhibit 5		Does Section 401 only apply to S-2-105 (Old Vaucluse Road) and not to I-20? Can SCDOT provide a depth of patching?	Construction	Revision	Please use 6" depth full depth patching for Old Vaucluse.
5	Attach_B	Survey		No existing ROW lines are shown in the Survey information provided. Will SCDOT be providing an update survey file with this information to negate the need for any additional survey to verify existing ROW?	DM	Revision	Property file is anticipated next week & will be provided to the teams as soon as possible.
6	Attach_B	Survey		Will the Department provide additional survey information along I-20 to cover the limits of proposed work? For example, survey limits to cover the limits of the existing guardrail protection for the old bridge which extend roughly 200' beyond the survey limits provided.	DM	No_Revision	No. Due to time constraints, no additional survey will be provided.
7	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	1	Exhibit 4z states "Teams may elect to eliminate Preliminary Roadway and Bridge plan package submittals at their own risk for this project. If teams elect to begin submittals with Right-of-way submittal packages, include any appropriate information shown under Preliminary Submittal Packages with the right-of-way submittal packages. " Are teams allowed to skip ROW Packages and progress straight to Final Roadway Package and/or Final Bridge Packages at their own risk?	DM	Revision	Yes. Revision will be made to Exhibit 4z.
8	Attach_B	Survey		Existing ROW and I-20 best fit alignment is not provided in the survey files, is SCDOT going to provide?	DM	Revision	Property file is anticipated next week & will be provided to the teams as soon as possible. I-20 alignment is anticipated this week & will be provided to the teams as soon as possible



9	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 2	7	Will detour route be provided in Attachment B of the RFP?	DM	No_Revision	Detour will not be provided.
10	Attach_A	Exhibit 4f	3	Section 2.2 states, Fill slopes steeper than 2H:1V will be allowed for this Project to stay within existing right-of-way. Please verify than cut slopes steeper than 2H:1V will also be allowed for construction of roadside ditches?	Geotechnical	Revision	Yes, cut slopes steeper than 2:1 may also be utilized for roadside ditches.
11	Attach_B	Geotechnical	Field Testing Data	The provided geotechnical data includes one SPT soil test boring and one CPT sounding at each end of the bridge. The soil test borings extend to a depth of at least 100 feet, and the CPT soundings extend to a depth of 39 feet. To expedite the design schedule, will SCDOT waive the GDM requirement (GDM Section 4.3.1) that both the SPT soil test borings and the CPT soundings must extend a minimum 10 feet below the anticipated pile tip elevation at the bridge end bents?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	No, meet the GDM requirements.
12	Attach_A	Agreement	pdf 80 of 267 Article XI	During the site visit, the disposition of contaminated soil from the accident was discussed. Can SCDOT update the RFP and attachment B as to the status of contaminated material and any required removal?	HazMaterial	No_Revision	The Contractor is not responsible for the removal of the contaminated soils.
13	Attach_B	Hazmat		Haz mat assessments don't appear to be provided - will SCDOT be providing?	HazMaterial	No_Revision	No hazmat assessments were performed.
14	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	168	Section 2.3 references FEMA flood plain mapping for Beaufort and Hampton Counties, but the project is in Aiken County.	Hydrology	Revision	Exhibit 4e will be revised.
15	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	169	Section 2.5 references SCDOT submitting the NPDES package to SCDHEC. SCDHEC is now SCDES, and SCDES now utilizes E-Permitting and all electronic submissions. Will SCDOT facilitate the E-Permitting process and upload the NPDES package electronically to the SCDES E-Permitting Site? Or will the Contractor/Designer be required to upload the packages once SCDOT creates the project site within the E-Permitting Portal?	Hydrology	Revision	Consultant will upload package to e-permitting for SCDOT submittal.
16	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	181	Section 3.2.6, Preliminary Bridge Hydraulic Design Reports references the NEPA Bridge Replacement Scoping Trip Risk Assessment Form, since SCDOT has indicated no environmental components to this project, will this NEPA form be required?	Hydrology	No_Revision	Not required hydraulically.
17	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	181	Can we assume all references to Bridge Hydraulic Design are ignored since this is a roadway crossing, and it does not need to be struck from the RFP documents?	Hydrology	Revision	Revision. Added "if bridge is over water" to the Exhibit.
18	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	4	Section 2.5 mentions submittal to SCDHEC, can SCDOT revise to SC DES?	Hydrology	Revision	Exhibit 4e will be revised.



19	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	3	Section 2.3.1 states "This project falls within FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) 45049C0450C and 45013C0015G for Hampton and Beaufort Counties in SC respectively. Based on these FIRMs, there are no stream crossings within Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHAs)." Can SCDOT please verify/update?	Hydrology	Revision	Exhibit 4e will be revised.
20	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	1	Section 2.3 states "Paving on I-20 is not anticipated for the scope of this project." Can SCDOT revise this to say "Temporary Paving is not anticipated for the scope of the project"?	Pavement	Revision	Paving of existing I-20 travel lanes is not anticipated.
21	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	2	Section 2.4 states "In areas where existing pavements are widened outside the travel lanes, use 600 psy of Shoulder Widening material and overlay with the Intermediate and Surface course at the rates specified for that road." Can SCDOT clarify/verify where this would be needed?	Pavement	No_Revision	This is standard language. If the existing road width does not conform to the typical section of the proposed design, this requirement applies within the construction limits.
22	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	1	Section 2.2 states "In areas where shoulder paving is required up to the barrier", can SCDOT either remove "up to the barrier" or modify to say "up to the barrier, pier protection, interior bent, MSE wall or end bent slope protection"?	Pavement	Revision	Will revise to generalize that shoulder paving is required throughout the RFP Exhibits and/or SCDOT requirements.
23	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	1	Will driveway at station 67+50 be required to be replaced if impacted in accordance with RFP section 2.1 stating to tie down driveways to the back of right of way or as directed by the RCE? The driveway accessing this property 750 feet to the north is closed with sand mounds and this drive may require relocation due to proximity to guardrail end terminal.	Pavement	No_Revision	The driveway access on the NW end closest to the guardrail can be permanently removed if there are any conflicts with proposed guardrail location. District Maintenance has confirmed this is a secondary access to that property owner.
24	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	1	Request SCDOT clarify I-20 shoulder paving limits adjacent to median protection rigid barrier. SCDOT Standard Drawing 805-860-10 shows flare rates of rigid barrier bridge pier protection, will shoulder paving end where rigid barrier transitions to shoulder barrier. Please clarify what taper rate if any is required to transition HMA Intermediate B back to the I-20 mainline existing paved shoulder?	Pavement	No_Revision	The pavement will not be tapered. Square off pavement at the barrier limits.
25	RFP	18	106	Will SCDOT consider reducing the DBE Goal for this project?	PM	No_Revision	No. The DBE goal will not be revised.
26	RFP		10	Section 3.6 states that Confidential Questions can be submitted but next sentence says that Confidential Meetings will not be offered. Milestone Schedule on p. 25 says Confidential One-on-One Meetings will occur the week of July 21, 2025. Please clarify.	PM	Revision	RFP will be revised. Confidential Meetings will be offered to the teams the week of July 21, 2025.
27	RFP		31	In Section 2 of the "Stipend Agreement", the stipend is listed as \$32,500 instead of \$45,000 noted on p. 11	PM	Revision	Revised.
28	RFP	3	p6 of 28	Section 3.7 - Can SCDOT please confirm the stipend as their appears to be a discrepancy from page 6 of 28 and page 26 of 28?	PM	Revision	Revised.
29	RFP	9	p20 of 28	Ask SCDOT to consider adding another round of Non-Confidential/Confidential Questions for July 28?	PM	Revision	Submittal of NCQ/CQ will be allowed after the release of the Final RFP on 7/29. Submittal date added to milestone schedule.
30	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	136	Section 2.14 Design File: will SCDOT allow use of OpenRoads Designer?	Roadway	Revision	Yes, OpenRoads will be allowed.
31	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	134 & 136	Sections 2.6 & 2.12: Can the Department clarify if grade adjusted SSD values for development of vertical profiles will be required for this project?	Roadway	Revision	It will not be required, Exhibit 4a will be revised.



32	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	134	Will SCDOT consider allowing 6ft shoulder widths (2ft paved w/ 4ft earth) on S-2-105 (Old Vaucluse Rd) to better match existing road section and reduce impacts to approach roadway drainage and/or any additional ROW needs?	Roadway	No_Revision	Shoulder reductions will not be allowed.
33	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	1	Scope of Work states "The work also includes repairing any deficient roadway embankments within the roadway approach limits of the bridge" - can SCDOT further clarify/define what makes a roadway embankment deficient?	Roadway	No_Revision	When the embankment does not meet current design standards, it is considered deficient.
34	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2	Section 2.6 - Is there a maximum allowable grade break from existing to proposed vertical alignment at the project tie-ins on S-105?	Roadway	No_Revision	No. Grade breaks are not allowed & a smooth profile transition is required.
35	PIP	Roadway		Can SCDOT provide a proposed typical section for I-20 underneath the bridge to calculate proposed S-105 bridge vertical clearances? Is the crown point to be assumed in the middle of the future four lane section and match the existing elevations of I-20 WB and EB for the crown point elevation?	Roadway	No_Revision	Provide 17' minimum clearance for the current condition of I-20 & the existing crown point. No proposed typical will be provided.
36	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2	The existing I-20 WB and EB vertical alignments are deficient per the 2021 RDM for design speed of 75mph (design K values for crest vertical curves). Should the proposed S-105 bridge vertical clearance be based on the existing vertical alignment of I-20 EB/WB?	Roadway	No_Revision	Provide 17' minimum clearance for the current condition of I-20 & the existing crown point.
37	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	3	Section 2.9 states, "Existing guardrail that is retained and meets NCHRP 350 requirements, may be extended or repaired using NCHRP 350 guardrail standards." Request SCDOT clarify if the existing guardrail retained onsite after demolition meets these standards and can be connected to the new structure using Pre-Mash bridge connector and end terminal.	Roadway	Revision	All guardrail on Old Vaucluse will be removed and replaced with MASH compliant guardrail, Exhibit 4a will be updated to reflect.
38	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	3	Section 2.9 states, "Provide mash compliant leading end treatments (MT2 or MT3) in all locations where guardrail is terminated on S-2-105". Is this statement intended to allow the use of MT2 end treatments on this high speed road?	Roadway	Revision	MT3 is required, Exhibit 4a will be updated.
39	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	3	In Section 2.10 paragraph 4 request SCDOT remove statement, "contingent upon receiving SCDOT approval". Due to constrained right of way corridor the use of additional length guardrail post will be needed on this project.	Roadway	Revision	Exhibit 4a will be revised. Additional length guardrail is allowable.
40	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2	Roadway Design Criteria is requiring 12 foot travel lanes on S-2-105. Existing plans (docket number 2.508.1) show that the existing roadway was constructed with 10 foot travel lanes. To better utilize the existing 33 foot right of way to accommodate roadside ditches within the existing right of way request SCDOT reduce the travel lane width from 12 feet to 11 feet in accordance with the 2021 SCDOT Roadway Design Manual Figure 15.3-A note 1b which states, "On reconstructed collectors, an existing 22 foot traveled way may be retained where the alignment is satisfactory and there is no crash pattern suggesting the need for widening".	Roadway	No_Revision	Roadway design criteria will not be reduced.



41	Attach_A	Exhibit_2	4	Will either temporary or new right of way acquisition or permissions be allowed for this project? Once concern being the construction of Mash Compliant leading end treatments site grading as detailed in SCDOT Std Drawing 805-115-10. These grading limits appear to extend beyond the existing right of way.	ROW	No_Revision	Right of way acquisition is not prohibited per the RFP. Please see Section 8 of the agreement. Per Exhibit 4a Section 2.11, all permanent facilities must be covered by permanent right of way.
42	Attach_A	Exhibit_4	129	AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 2017, 8th Edition is listed as a Design Reference. RFC Exhibit 4b, Section 2.1.5 references AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 9th edition. Please update accordingly.	Structures	Revision	Exhibit 4 updated to 9th Edition.
43	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	146	Section 2.2.1, second paragraph: no form liner pattern provided in Attachment B	Structures	Revision	Wall Formliner Finish pattern added to Attachment B.
44	Attach_A	Exhibit_4	pdf 129 of 267	Exhibit 4 Design References says to use AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 2017, 8th Edition. Exhibit 4b, 2.1.1, says to use AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 9th edition. Please clarify.	Structures	Revision	Exhibit 4 updated to 9th Edition.
45	RFP	4	p 7 of 28	Section 4.1 - Should retaining wall envelopes at bridge ends be included in Appendix A.1 - Bridge Plans?	Structures	Revision	Yes. Section 4.1 updated.
46	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	3	Section 2.1.7 - Can SCDOT please verify that the prestressed beam algebraic sum implies that the non-composite dead load (with exception of the camber and self weight as noted) and composite dead load including future wearing surface for the algebraic sum shall be calculated at "final" condition?	Structures	Revision	The intent is to use "at-erection" PCI multipliers for camber estimate in conjunction with dead loads applied prior to opening the bridge to traffic. Future wearing surface has been deleted from the calculation.
47	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	3	Section 2.1.8 mentions flat slab superstructures which does not appear to be an allowable superstructure type, can SCDOT please remove the reference to flat slabs?	Structures	Revision	Yes. Reference to flat slabs removed.
48	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	5	Section 2.1.15 states "When the MTBBC2 (TL2 or pre-MASH equivalent) stiffness transition is used, the low point shall be located a minimum of 15 feet beyond where guardrail attaches to rigid barrier.", TL2 is not applicable to this project due to the design speed of 50mph, can refrence to MTBBC2 be removed?	Structures	Revision	Yes. Section revised to require low point 30-feet minimum from where TL3 guardraill attaches to approach slab barrier.
49	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	8	Section 2.1.22 states " Design the approach slab to span the entire approach slab length, minus 6 inches at each end. At deep superstructure ends where the uncompacted aggregate underdrain below the approach slab extends near the end of approach slab, provide a minimum length of 5-feet of approach slab bearing on compacted subgrade material, allowing the approach slab loading to be effectively distributed to the soil prior to termination of the approach slab" - Can SCDOT please define/clarify "deep superstructure" and the distance from the end of approach slab to limits of aggregate underdrain that requires the minimum length of 5' compacted subgrade material?	Structures	Revision	Section reworded to ensure 5-feet minimum length of compacted subgrade at the end of approach slab, regardless of superstructure depth.
50	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	8	Section 2.1.22 states "Design the approach slab to span the entire approach slab length, minus 6 inches at each end." Does this imply that the standard approach slab design within the 2024 standard drawings and details is not to be used for this project?	Structures	Revision	No. Sentence deleted to let current standard instructional memo IM702-AS control (neglect soil and design approach slab to be simply supported). 2024 Structural Drawings and Details are in effect for this project (will be clarified in Exhibit 4 design references).



51	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	2	Section 2.1.5 - Can SCDOT please provide a figure within the PIP similar to the I-26 MM85-101 "Horizontal Clearance Requirements under New Overpasses" which shows a minimum horizontal opening under the proposed S-105 bridge? Or provide the minimum distance from edge of the 4th travel lane on the outside (future) to the rigid barrier in front of the MSE wall?	Structures	Revision	The minimum horizontal clearance, to accomoate the future 8-lane section, is 72'-0" between faces of rigid barrier. This will be clarified in Exhibit 4b, no figure will be provided.
52	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	1	Section 2.1.4 - Is a skew of the proposed bridge required?	Structures	No_Revision	No.
53	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	9	Section 2.2.1 states "For all MSE walls on this project, construct wall facing using precast concrete panels with a modified fractured fin finish in accordance with the formliner pattern provided in Attachment B", can SCDOT please provide the formline pattern in Attachment B?	Structures	Revision	Wall Formliner Finish pattern added to Attachment B.
54	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	5	Section 2.1.15 states "Provide a minimum of one (1) deck drain per span per gutterline, except where the gutterline is on the high side of superelevation". Can deck drains be removed from the entire bridge or one span of structure if calculations prove that they meet RFP requirements?	Structures	No_Revision	No. The intent is to include a minimum of one scupper per span (not located over travel lanes), regardless of meeting spread limits.
55	RFP	4	p6 of 28	Section 4.1.3.c states "Conceptual Bridge Plan and Profile including but not limited to: horizontal and vertical clearances, hydrology data, intent for bridge deck and bridge end drainage, anticipated foundation type, approximate toe of slope with abutment grading and riprap, expansion joint locations and types of joint materials, and bearing conditions at each bent." Can reference to hydrology data be removed?	Structures	Revision	Yes. Section 4.1 will be updated.
56	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 2	161	Section 2.4 references a detour route provided in Attachment B. Will SCDOT please provide this information?	Traffic	Revision	Detour will not be provided. Will Revise.
57	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	1	Request SCDOT share SEGRA's proposed utility plans?	Utilities	Revision	SCDOT will provide to teams via Projectwise.



NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
S-2-105 (Old Vaucluse Road) over I-20 Emergency Bridge Replacement
Project ID P044879 - Aiken County

RFP FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW

Date Received: **21-Jul**

Meeting Date: **23-Jul**

CONTRACTOR						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	126	For removal of existing EBL Shoulder Pier Footings, will SCDOT require removal of the entire footings, or only portion which needs to be removed for construction of the new bridge?	Construction	Revision	Existing footings shall be entirely removed, to eliminate potential conflicts with future widening construction. Scope will be updated to clarify.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit_3	126	If the proposed structure's MSE Wall leveling pads are constructed above the existing EBL Shoulder Pier Footings, can existing footings remain in place?	Construction	Revision	No. Footings in conflict with the MSE Wall footprint need to be removed to eliminate potential issues related to differential settlement at the wall facing. Scope will be updated to clarify that the existing footings shall be entirely removed.
3	Attach_B	Geotechnical		Is the amount of subsurface investigation that has been performed by SCDOT considered adequate for all proposed foundation and wall elements on this project without any additional testing?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	No. Subsurface investigation shall meet the requirements of the GDM.
4	Attach_B	Geotechnical		If additional subsurface investigation is required, will SCDOT allow the additional borings to be obtained after RFC design?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	Yes, but borings would have to be completed and RFC plan revisions submitted and approved prior to construction of foundation elements.
5	RFP	8	37 of 86	Last paragraph on page 37 states that Contractor will be responsible for right of way services and paragraph 2 on page 38 states that right of way services shall include acquisition. Please verify that SCDOT will bear the property acquisition cost for the project and revise the RFP as appropriate?	ROW	No_Revision	No revision. SCDOT will bear the property acquisition costs for the project and provide just compensation to landowners. Contractor shall be responsible for all right of way services defined in Section VIII of the RFP.



6	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	145	If preferable for design and expedited construction, are the use of Prefabricated Concrete Modular Walls, such as Gravix, allowed on this Project?	Structures	No_Revision	No.
7	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	Section 3.0 pdf 179	Will SCDOT allow early submittal of beam sheets to be approved and released for fabrication prior to RFC plans being completed?	Structures	Revision	Yes. Exhibit 4z revised to allow early RFC of beam sheets.
8	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	Section 3.0 pdf 179	Will SCDOT allow early submittal of MSE wall sheets to be approved and released for fabrication prior to RFC plans being completed?	Structures	Revision	Yes. Exhibit 4z revised to allow early RFC of MSE wall design and plan sheets.
9	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	3	Section 2.1.7 - Can SCDOT verify that the prestress, beam self-weight, non-composite dead loads and composite dead loads are to be calculated for the "At Erection" condition for the algebraic sum positive (upward) camber requirement? This would imply that there is no "Final" condition deflections being used for this calculation, can SCDOT please verify?	Structures	No_Revision	Correct. The intent is to use "at erection" camber values and dead loads when the bridge is built to result in net positive camber. This can be checked on the final bridge plans by summing the following values on the beam sheet camber table: at-erection camber (positive) minus the deflections due to diaphragms, SIPs, deck slab, and parapets.



NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
S-2-105 (Old Vaucluse Road) over I-20 Emergency Bridge Replacement
Project ID P044879 - Aiken County

RFP FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW

Date Received: **25-Jul**

Meeting Date: **N/A**

CONTRACTOR						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	RFP	9	pdf 25 of 267	Given the magnitude of change required due to the response to vertical clearances with respect to future widening of I-20, please provide an additional two weeks to be added to the milestone schedule, providing submittal of tech proposals on Tuesday August 19, submittal of cost proposals and public announcement on	PM	No_Revision	No additional procurement time will be added.
2	RFP	3.7	pdf 11 of 267	The magnitude of pursuit design change has created a significant amount of re-design for the pursuit effort. Please revise the stipend amount from \$45,000 to \$75,000.	PM	No_Revision	No change.
3	Attach_A	Agreement	Article.IV.A.1 pdf 59 of 267	The magnitude of the change required due to the response to vertical clearances with respect to future widening of I-20 will create an increase in project scope. Depending upon further clarifications, a minimum of 1 month extra time is requested to be added to the contract time. Please revise the contract completion date to June 21, 2026.	PM	No_Revision	No additional construction duration will be added.
4	RFP	9	pdf 25 of 267	With unknown elements remaining of final RFP changes, please provide a confidential meeting on Friday July 25 so pursuit design can continue without waiting upon the Final RFP.	PM	No_Revision	No additional meetings before the release of the Final RFP.



5	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Section 2.1.21 pdf 144 of 267	If spill through abutments are used, do end span lengths need to be long enough to accomodate a 2:1 slope for the future lowered I-20 profile, or can they be developed for the existing ground? Footings and columns will meet future requirement depths.	Structures	No_Revision	Proposed 2:1 end slopes can be developed based on existing ground, outside of the required 72' horizontal clearance envelope. The slope can be steepened or a cut-wall can be installed as needed with the future widening project.
6	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Section 2.1.5 pdf 139 of 267	If spill though abutments are used and column are outside of the clear zone, will collision protection be required as specified for interior bents?	Structures	No_Revision	No, collision protection requirements apply to interior bents within the clear zone. Per the RFP, guardrail would need to be installed to shield interior bents located within 100' of a travel lane.

