

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

FINAL RFP - ROUND 1

Date Received: 4/26/2024

I Meeting Date:

5/2/2024

							SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation	
1	Attach_B			Please provide definitive schedules for adjacent projects (Railroad spur / US 21 Tie in, Railroad Bridge over I-77, Scout Motors Drive Widening, Community Road Widening) as they are critical to producing a CPM schedule.	Construction	Revision	Schedule/dates and language to be added to RFP.	
2				Does the MSA concept Scout Motors Drive Bridge over I-77 and Community Rd require daytime lighting under the bridge based on the length?	Construction	No_Revision	This lighting will not be required.	
3	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	Section 714 / pdf Page 349	Exhibit 4e, Section 2.1.19 has been clarified for scope of work expected, however, Exhibit 5, Section 714 of the Special Provisions has not. These two sections are in conflict with one another and create unnecessary risk for the contractor. Please revise Section 714 of the Special Provisions to reflect the same requirements in Exhibit 4e, Section 2.1.19.	Hydrology	Revision	Language will be added to clarify.	
4	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	Section 2.0 / pdf Page 189	Please provide the assumptions utilized in the RFP's recommended pavement section for interstate and non-interstate roads. Please include the assumed ESALs, the Modulus of Subgrade reaction (pci) and the Soil Support Value (SSV).	Pavement	Revision	Pavement design assumptions will be posted in Attachment B.	
5	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	Section 2.2 / pdf page 188	The RFP states, "Clean and reseal joints in accordance with section 504 and random cracks as specified in section 505." "Random cracks" is unquantifiable. Please add Section 505 to Exhibit 5 and include a quantity for bid, similar to the last paragraph in Section 502 (pdf page 315).	Pavement	No_Revision	This question was asked previously. The teams should make their own assessments based on the repair procedures provided in Attachment B.	
6	RFP	3	Section 3.9.1 / pdf page 17	Would SCDOT consider raising the maximum number of formal ATCs from 12 to 20?	PM	No_Revision	No.	
7	Attach_A	Agreement	Section VII / pdf Page 94	Please provide the anticipated completion date for the at grade RR crossing on US 21.	Railroad	Revision	4/30/2025	



8	Attach_A	Exhibit 8	Page 1	Will the required pedestrian fencing for the US 21 over NSRR bridge utilize a curved top of fence similar to what's shown "With Sidewalk" or vertical fencing as is what's shown "Without Sidewalk" within the Norfolk Southern Public Improvement Projects Manual Overhead Bridge Details Bridge Fencing (pdf 157 of 183)?	Railroad	No_Revision	Per NS, since there no pedestrian facilities planned as part of this project, the "without sidewalk" fence detail will suffice.
9	Attach_A	Exhibit 8	Page 1	Will the required pedestrian fencing for the US 21 over NSRR bridge be required to be attached to the top of the barrier as is shown within the Norfolk Southern Public Improvement Projects Manual Overhead Bridge Details Bridge Fencing (pdf 157 of 183) or will attaching the pedestrian fencing on the outside fascia of the parapet be allowed?	Railroad	No_Revision	Per NS, attaching the fence to the outside of the barrier wall will be acceptable.
10	Attach_A	Exhibit 8	Page 1	Norfolk Southern Public Improvement Projects Manual Appendix E-7 Section 2 (2) Submittal Requirements (pdf 38 of 183) states "Rating sheets showing that cranes or lifting devices are adequate for 150% of the actual weight of the pick, including all rigging components. A complete set of crane charts, including crane, counterweight, and boom nomenclature is to be submitted. Safety factors that may have been "built-in" to the crane charts are not to be considered when determining the 150% factor of safety." Will the 150% of the actual weight of the pick requirement be required for this project since the railroad has been deemed to be "inactive" during construction of the US 21 over NSRR bridge?	Railroad	No_Revision	Per NS, if the track is not in service during bridge construction, the 150% safety factor for overhead lifts is not a requirement NS will be checking.
11	Attach_B	Roadway	Section 2.3 / pdf Page 165	Can the inside and outside shoulder widths on the flyover bridge be swapped to allow for more stopping sight distance without widening the structure?	Roadway	No_Revision	No.
12	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Section 2.9 / pdf page 164	What criteria shall we use in determining the horizontal sight line at the corner of the T-Bridge for the Right Turn movement from Scout Motors Drive onto Ramp CONRPC (the ramp to SB I-77)? In particular, what design speed needs to be assumed for that turning movement to generate the HSO to set the barrier for the bridge? Is there a minimum radius that will be allowed for that radius return?	Roadway	Revision	PIP plans are provided for information only. Interesection shall meet the requirements of the RDM. A revision to Exhibit 4a will be provided to clarify the design speed for HSO calculation when a concrete railing is present at a ramp intersection.
13	Attach_A	Exhibit_3		Please clarify if receiving lanes for the future dual left turn from US-21 Northbound to the I-77 Southbound should be provided on the I-77 Southbound ramp.	Roadway	No_Revision	No, they are not required as part of this project.



14	Attach_B	ROW		When will the ROW from Richland County be acquired and available for the Contractor to begin work? This is important for the proposal CPM schedule and the Dominion Energy relocation along Scout Motors Drive.	ROW	No_Revision	The road design/alignment in this area is constrained per the Final RFP and Attachments. As such, when ROW plans are submitted by the Contractor and ultimately reviewed and approved, the Contractor can begin work. Right of entry will be granted by Richland County after ROW plans are reviewed and approved. ROE/ROW dates are an estimation of when this would be available.
15	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 4	Section 2 / pdf page 207	What is the minimum clear distance allowed behind the back face of freestanding temporary concrete barrier wall and the work zone?	Traffic	No_Revision	Standards does not allow equipment, materials or personnel on foot to work within 6 feet of freestanding barrier wall due to the deflection of the wall that may occur as a result of impact by an errant vehicle.
16	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 4	Section 2 / pdf page 207	What is the minimum clear distance allowed behind the back face of an anchored temporary concrete barrier wall and the work zone?	Traffic	No_Revision	Two feet. The Department has approved anchored barrier wall that will deflect up to two feet when struck by an errant vehicle.
17	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 4	Section 2.6 / pdf page 215	The RFP states that "SCDOT will allow full closure of Community Road within the project limits until March 31, 2026." It later states, "Lane closures on I-77 are prohibited when closures occur along Community Road or US 21." Is it the intent of SCDOT to prohibit lane closures on I-77 until March 31, 2026? Please revise the RFP to allow lane closures on I-77 simultaneous with closures of Community Road until completion of Interim Condition 1.	Traffic	Revision	No that is not the intent. The RFP will be revised to remove language concerning Community Road from the I-77 lane closure restrictions. US 21 will remain.
18	Attach_A	Exhibit_4d Part 5		Question 127 in R1 Non-Confidential questions was responded with "pedestrian accomodation expectations will be clarified". Please direct where these were documented or provide said expectations.	Traffic	No_Revision	Bike and ped accomodations are not included in the scope of work, this is clarified in Exhibit 3. Minimum requirements at signals shall be provided per the latest Traffic Signal Design Guidelines.
19	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 4	Page 9	Section 2.6 regarding Community Road indicates full closure is allowed until March 31, 2026. The next sentence below states "Lane closures on I 77 are prohibited when closures occur along Community Road or US 21.". Please clarify if lane closures day or night (either or both) will be permitted on I-77 if proposer chooses to fully close Community Road in the period leading up to March 31, 2026.	Traffic	Revision	No that is not the intent. The RFP will be revised to remove language concerning Community Road from the I-77 lane closure restrictions. US 21 will remain.
20	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 4	Page 6	Please clarify which Roadway/Route the table at the top of Page 6 applies to. The Table provides traffic restrictions but no route is defined.	Traffic	Revision	Table on page 6 will be deleted.
21	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 4	Page 216	Please remove highly restrictive condition of "Traffic is not allowed to run on milled surfaces on interstate pavements". Suggest placing a time restriction for this condition, rather than a blanket, restrictive statement.	Traffic	No_Revision	We will investigate (via coring) and determine if this is acceptable for use. Potential revision to RFP if this is determined to be allowable.
22	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 4		Regarding "Traffic is not allowed to run on milled surfaces on interstate pavements", the "Scout Interchange Pavement Investigation Summary" states that previously the southbound mainline had been overlaid with 200# of Surface B & 110# of OGFC. Would SCDOT allow traffic to run on "micromilled" surfaces once the OGFC is removed from the roadway?	Traffic	No_Revision	We will investigate (via coring) and determine if this is acceptable for use. Potential revision to RFP if this is determined to be allowable.



23	PIP	Roadway	DWG. No. 8 / 1. R1 Conceptual Plans	Santee Cooper's new transmission structure #24 is approximately 40' from the MSE wall and 33' from the fill limit along Community Road near STA 121+50 per the RFP concept. However, the roadway design on the Santee Cooper relocation plans reflect a different concept which would provide greater clearance. The RFP concept distances would violate the 50' clearance request stated in the preliminary utility report and Santee Cooper's typical right-of-way encroachment guidelines. Is this encroachment clearance acceptable to Santee Cooper? If so, will SCDOT provide the appropriate documentation.	Utilities	Revision	Santee Cooper intentionally set their poles at the base of the fill slopes in the concept plans. SCDOT is requesting Santee Cooper to provide concurrence with the <50' clearance.
24	PIP	Utilities	Pgs. 14, 15, 16 of 549 / UC Report Appendix B	Santee Cooper is relinquishing and being provided new easement for their relocations while at the same time SCDOT is obtaining right-of-way, who's rights/easement will supersede? This determination will dictate if a Santee Cooper owned right-of-way encroachment permit will be applicable. If applicable, who will be the responsible party for coordinating and filing for Santee Cooper's right-of-way encroachment permit.	Utilities	No_Revision	Santee Cooper will be allowed within the SCDOT Right of Way while retaining prior rights. It is expected for the Contractor to follow Article VII with encroachment permits so the encroachment permit reflects the final design.
25	PIP	Utilities		IR RFP # 3, Question 35 Follow Up: There appears to be potential conflicts and or less than desirable cover for the following utilities that have not been addressed as impacted within the Preliminary Utility Report. Will SCDOT be working with Utility Owners to relocate these utilities or will Proposers be required to include mitigation strategies to avoid impacted these utilities? - 48" Waterline crossing I-77 near power transmission easement - 20" Sewer Force Main crossing I-77 near power transmission easement Waterline Crossing I-77 at approximate station 1672+00	Utilities	Revision	SCDOT is engaging in further coordinating efforts with these utilities. The RFP will be revised to include these findings. To date, the aforementioned utilities have indicated little concern that there are significant impacts and/or can be avoided through final design.
26	PIP	Utilities		IR RFP # 3, Question 36 Follow Up: There are several potential point conflicts between drainage systems, pavement structure, excessive fill, and retaining walls with the 4" plastic gas line that currently runs parallel to Community Rd. The preliminary utility report and RFP language says the CONTRACTOR shall allow this line to remain in place. However if CONTRACTOR determines the gas main is in direct conflict or there are other construction activities that reduce cover or cause the CONTRACTOR to work in close proximity increasing the likelihood of damage or raise safety concerns, can the CONTRACTOR enforce SCDOT's rights and require the utility to relocate at their own cost?	Utilities	Revision	Exhibit 7 will be revised to further clarify. Dominion has indicated to SCDOT they wish to avoid a complete relocation of the gas line and SCDOT has agreed to this accommodation under the conditions currently specified in Exhibit 7. It is understood by both parties that there may be specific sections of the gas line where avoidance or protect-in-place are not feasible. Where mitigation or relocation is necessary, Article VII of the RFP Agreement applies to the gas line.



27	PIP	Utilities		IR RFP # 3, Question 37 Follow Up: As the RFP states there is not any in-contract utility work anticipated, however if there are impacts that could cause relocation, or at minimum, to perform protect in place measures to the City of Columbia's facilities (typically at their expense), who will be responsible for Act 36 of 2019 MOA coordination and execution? Will this work be processed as change order after project award?	Utilities	No_Revision	The Utility Agreement with said utility would be ammended to cover the relocation. However, neither SCDOT or the aforementioned utilities have indicated concern of further impacts during construction.
28	Attach_B	Utilities		Please provide definitive dates for utility relocations. These are needed for proposers to utilize in the Proposal CPM schedule.	Utilities	Revision	The RFP will be revised with the latest information.
29	Attach_B	Utilities		Please provide a key sheet for the utility owners within the SUE file. There are 9 communication (T) owners shown but no legend or key to identify owners.	Utilities	Revision	This will be provided in Sharepoint.
30	Attach_B	Utilities		RFP, Exhibit 7, part 2 mentions Utility Avoidance Requirements in Attachment B. Please clarify location and file(s) associated with these requirements. Some avoidance language was found in the PIP section in the provided Preliminary Utility Report.	Utilities	No_Revision	This document is available via Sharepoint
31	Attach_B	Utilities		RFP, Exhibit 7, part 2 mentions Utility Avoidance Requirements in Attachment B. Please clarify location and file(s) associated with these requirements. Some avoidance language was found in the PIP section in the provided Preliminary Utility Report.	Utilities	No_Revision	This document is available via Sharepoint

