

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

FINAL RFP - ROUND 3 // UPDATED

Dates Received: 6/24/2024 and 7/8/2024

7/9/2024

Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_B		Scout Site Grading Plan	The Scout Site Grading Plan does not appear to account for toe ditch details within the future SCDOT ROW. The addition of these toe ditches will reduce cover over the 48" waterline and 10" force main potentially resulting in less than desirable cover. Can SCDOT provide as-builts for the new 48" Waterline and the 10" force main? If minimum cover or impacts to the utilities are encountered, please provide direction to DB teams concerning the toe ditch requirements.	Utilities	Revision	SCDOT will provide the as-builts as soon as they are available. Coordinating efforts to date with both the Scout site and the utility companies have determined further impacts can be avoided through design.
2	Attach_B	Environmental	FONSI - Appendix L Hazardous Materials	The SCDOT concept roadway plans show impacts to the hazardous material monitoring wells located at the Mini Mart along US 21 near Sta. 682+00 LT. and RT. Appendix L - Hazardous Materials included in the approved FONSI note these wells are active. If these wells are impacted by design, will these wells require relocation and who is responsible for these relocations?	HazMaterial	Revision	Per our coordination with SCDHEC, impacted monitoring wells will require closure and relocation. The Design-Build Team will be responsible for the closure and relocation of impacted monitoring wells.
3	Attach_B	Utilities	Page 1 / Utility Avoidance Requirement	Utility avoidance document requires avoidance of OH Transmission Pole 13-2 at STA 357+75. This pole is believed to be a distribution pole. Is it the intent to avoid the costlier and more significant OH Transmission Pole 13-1 at STA 358+66 RT?	Utilities	Revision	The RFP requires no impacts to transmission poles or any poles carrying transmission power. Pole 13-2 does not need to be classified as a design avoidance. The avoidance document will be revised.
4	Attach_B	Utilities	Page 1 / Utility Avoidance Requirement	Utility avoidance document requires avoidance of OH Transmission Pole 13-7 at STA 684+00. This pole is believed to be a telecom/service pole. Is it the intent to avoid the costlier and more significant OH Transmission Pole 14-3 at STA 685+75?	Utilities	Revision	The RFP requires no impacts to transmission poles or any poles carrying transmission power. Pole 13-7 does not need to be classified as a design avoidance. The avoidance document will be revised.
5				The impacts shown in the SCDOT concept roadway plans to the jurisdictional tributary (Tributary 54) along I-77 Northbound between approximate Sta. 1765 to Sta. 1770 were not included in the environmental permit. Will SCDOT purchase and secure the credits for this mitigation or is this the DB team responsible for this cost and effort?	Environmental	Revision	SCDOT will purchase credits.
6				It was stated in an earlier Q/A Open Forum meeting that the grading that is being placed by the Scout developer would be constructed and inspected to SCDOT specifications. It is our understanding that no geotechnical investigation or design analysis is required for these fill areas where less than approximately 5 feet of additional fill will be required to reach plan grade. Does SCDOT concur?	Geotechnical	No_Revision	No. While the DB Team may not need to verify compaction of the material placed by the Scout developer, it will still be the DB Team's responsibility to perform design analysis for the project to satisfy the requirements of the RFP and GDM based on the material being constructed and inspected to SCDOT specifications.



7	PIP	Roadway	Concept Roadway Plans/ Dwg. No. 11	The RFP requires work by DB Contractor (pavement removal, ditches grading/fill slopes, etc.) to be performed within NSRR right-of-way along existing US 21 and Farrow Road. Please confirm there is no required RR Agreement and no required RR Flagging to perform the scope of work outlined in the SCDOT RFP. Or, please confirm who bears the cost should an agreement end up being required in the future.	Railroad	No_Revision	NSRR has confirmed that the minor grading expected per the RFP scope and demonstrated as part of the concept plans should not require a PE or Construction Agreement. It should be handled as a Right of Entry through NSRR. The risk of needing agreements should be low as long as impacts of the Contractor's design to the NSRR ROW are less than what the RFP concept plans indicate. The provisions of Article VII.B of the Agreement will apply concerning costs.
8				In response to the response/Explanation to comment #13 dated 6/10/2024: The documents included in Attachment B for NSRR did provide proposed grades for the rail line and were helpful. However, they do not adequately address the scope of the Boomer Road relocation nor limits of pavement removal or construction to be performed by NSRR. Please confirm whether NSRR will remove and replace the pavement for the construction of the spur line and be responsible for all traffic control to perform the construction of the spur line across US 21. Please confirm how much pavement along existing Boomer Road will be removed and who would be responsible for the signage necessary to direct vehicles to the relocated Boomer Road. Please confirm if NSRR will design, permit, and construct the relocated Boomer Road connection and no work will be necessary by the contractor.	Railroad	Revision	All work associated with the at-grade crossing of the spur line on existing US-21 and the Boomer Road relocation will be handled by NSRR as shown in the plans. Once traffic is shifted over to the new US-21 roadway, NSRR will remove pavement on existing US-21 to about 10' from the centerline of the rails. The design build team will then remove all other pavement on the existing US-21 roadway. The Boomer road relocation requires no work from the design build team. The RFP will be revised to clarify.
9	Attach_A	Agreement	55	XIII.B.1: The radius for Type 1 DSC should be expanded to 50 feet from the center of the test hole.	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT is not amenable to this change.
10	Attach_A	Agreement	23	III.B.: Impacts caused by permitting issues should be compensable.	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT is not amenable to this change.
11	Attach_A	Agreement	31	IV.D.: Please cap the total amount of liquidated damages assessable by the Owner.	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT is not amenable to this change.
12	Attach_A	Agreement		Please provide a mutual waiver of consequential damages.	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT is not amenable to this change.
13	Attach_A	Agreement	23	III.B.: Impacts caused by inaccurate utility information should be compensable.	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT is not amenable to this change.
14	Attach_A	Agreement	40	VII.A.4.: Interference or delay caused by utility relocations should be compensable.	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT is not amenable to this change.
15	RFP	4	Pg. 23 of 47	The schedule narrative is restricted to 5 pages, excluding the Gantt charts. To provide the amount of information requested in the narrative, we request the page limit not be restricted.	PM	No_Revision	SCDOT is not amenable to this change.



16	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Pg. 3, Section 2.4	From what point does the sight distance need to be analyzed for the concrete railings within interchange ramp intersections (e.g. from the Stop Bar? From 50-ft back of the stop bar?). Are proposers expected to use stopping sight distance for this analysis? The situation at hand for the CONRPC at Scout Motors Drive does not follow any of the Intersection Sight Distance cases presented in Section 4.4 of the SCDOT RDM.	Roadway	Revision	A graphic will be provided in the PIP to clarify the intention of the sight distance at concrete railings.
17	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Pg. 2, Section 2.3	For the inside shoulders on the 2-lane sections of Southbound I-77, can the RFP be revised to note "4 ft. *MINIMUM* paved" shoulders?	Roadway	No_Revision	Please clarify what size paved shoulders are being proposed. Extra width temporary pavement shoulders are not to remain in place, if that is the intent of this question, because this promotes inappropriate use by motorists.
18	Attach_A	Agreement	Pg. 53 of 93, Section XII	Will contractor be responsible for demolition, removal, and disposal of all structures and their appurtenances within SCDOT Right of Way even if the structure falls outside of the proposed Limits of Disturbance?	Construction	No_Revision	Yes, Contractor shall be responsible for the demolition, removal and disposal of all structures and their appurtenances within the SCDOT ROW and not restricted to a proposed Limits of Disturbance.
19	PIP	Roadway	Conceptual Plans Sheet X173 (pg. 213 of 531)	Anticipated grading from the Railroad embankment along NB I-77 under the new railroad bridge does not appear to account for adequate space behind the proposed rigid barrier. Can SCDOT provide updated proposed DTM files from the proposed railroad project to confirm the limits of their grading relative the proposed edge of shoulder?	Railroad	Revision	Standard Drawing 805-860-25 should be applied in this situation with shoulder grade at rigid barrier tying in to 2:1 concrete slope protection behind it (constructed with railroad bridge project). In this case, only 6" minimum distance is required between back of barrier and slope protection. The referenced DTM will be provided.
20	PIP	Roadway	R2_ROW Graphic	Please provide the right-of-way documents which are being negotiated so the Teams can determine if there are any special environmental conditions that the contractor would be obligated to remediate.	Environmental	No_Revision	SCDOT is unable to provide ROW documents at this stage in the acquisition. The only information available is found in the ESA Phase 1 and Phase 2 reports which are found in Attachment B.
21	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a		As shown in Exhibit 4a, Section 2.2, Design Speed for Farrow Road is 45mph. Using the AASHTO Method 2 for development the horizontal curves, the proposed Farrow Road Centerline radius is 371'. RDM Figure 5.3-F, Minimum Radii for Low-speed Urban Streets for a 371' radius is 35 mph. Is a 35 mph design speed allowable as Farrow Road approaches US 21 in a stop condition and remains within the ROW limits acquired by SCDOT as shown in Attachment B, R2_ROW Graphic.pdf?	Roadway	No_Revision	Yes, RDM 9.2.4.1 applies.



22	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c		1 Referencing Section 2.1.1, questions regarding diamond ground surface of the PCC have been asked previously. Please clarify why diamond grinding is required only to be overtopped with Asphalt? Seems like an unnecessary expense.	Pavement	Revision	There are multiple benefits including that the grinder will already hav to be mobilized to project for patching which elimiates this expense. Diamond grinding is required on new concrete surface prior to placing temporary traffic, and it improves the smoothness of 50 year old existing concrete pavement prior to overlay which effects longterm performance. Additionally, Exhibit 4c will be revised to clarify that diamond grinding is required for all new concrete pavement, existing concrete pavement, and full depth concrete pavement patches.
23	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c		3 Referencing Section2.2, first bullet - please clarify I77 NB approach slabs treatment at Wilson Blvd. Should approach slabs be overlaid? or should PCC mill include up to approach slab joints? Please clarify definition of "Bridge Structure" relative to intended pavement scope of work.	Pavement	Revision	Tie in asphalt to the second expansion joint ~ 100' way from bridge end.
24	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c		4 Please clarify asphalt overlay tie in to existing concrete ramps? Is milling of concrete pavement permitted for tie-ins to existing concrete ramps? Please clarify/describe tie in requirements.	Pavement	Revision	Revision will be made to bullet to allow milling for tieing in at ramps. Requirement will be to variable mill 0-2 inches to tie in each lift of asphalt. Terminate each lift of asphalt with a butt joint.
25	Attach_B	Environmental	Permit	Regarding Tributary 54 and Contractor responsibility for obtaining the permit modification, can SCDOT confirm it will be responsible for obtaining mitigation in the event say 700 are impacted?	Environmental	Revision	SCDOT will secure an additional 20 freshwater wetland credits and 4,500 stream credits that will be avaiable to offset impacts. The Contractor will be responsible for securing mitigation credits for impacts requiring more than these available credit amounts.
26	Attach_B	Roadway	Typicals	Updated Typical No. 2 (NB I-77 Sta. 1709+50 to 1720+15) & No. 5 (SB I-77 Sta. 1717+00 to 1757+00.00) reference to retain existing inside Shoulder. Exhibit 4c ,Pavement Design Criteria, Section 2.1 references to remove inside shoulders. Is it correct to remove the inside shoulders per the RFP within the extents shown in Typcicals No. 2 and No. 5 and replace with the full asphalt pavement consisting of Option 1 or 2?	Roadway	Revision	DB teams shall follow the requirements of Exhibit 4c of the RFP. Typical sections will be updated to refer to Exhibit 4c.
27	Attach_B	Roadway	Typicals	Typicals No. 3 (NB I-77 Sta. 1720+15.00 to 1807+00.00) and No. 4 (SB Sta. 1750+55.74 tp 1717+00 & Sta. 1757+00.00 to 1766+00.00) reference PCC pavement and GABC. Exhibit 4c ,Pavement Design Criteria, Section 2.1 references full depth asphalt pavement for inside shoulders consisting of Option 1 or 2. Is it correct that to full depth asphalt pavement is to be constructed in lieu of PCC inside shoulder pavement per the RFP within the extents shown in Typcicals No. 3 and No. 4?	Roadway	Revision	DB teams shall follow the requirements of Exhibit 4c of the RFP. Typical sections will be updated to refer to Exhibit 4c.
28	Attach_A	Exhibit_3		Please clarify signal and ramp work to be performed at Wilson Blvd Exit regarding Addendum 3 and Addendum 4 scopes of work. For Exhibit 3 IC#1, should the second bullet reference I77 Southbound? Will SCDOT update the PIP Roadway Plans?	Traffic	Revision	No, the scope is accurate in describing the work to be done at the I-77 Northbound off-ramp to US-21 as part of IC#1. No further revisions to the conceptual plans are anticipated. However, the graphic in Attachment B will be ammended to match the Scope.



29	Attach_A	Agreement	Pg.43 of 93, Section VIII & Scout ROW Exhibit	The RFP and the Scout ROW Limits figure indicate design is not allowed outside of limits shown in the figure. The limits appear to follow the proposed ROW from the Preliminary Plans provided by SCDOT. On the Scout Motor site south of the I-77 interchange adjacent to Community Rd., the construction limits shown in the preliminary plans are outside of the proposed ROW. Will construction limits outside of the figure be covered by a Right of Entry agreement to allow construction of the back slope of the ditches?	Roadway	Revision	Yes, work will be completed under Right of Entry agreement. RFP Agreement will be updated to clarify where construction limits outside of the proposed ROW will be allowed.
30	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	Pg. 4, Section 2.0	The first note after the Submittals table indicates if ROW plans are not anticipated then they ROW and Preliminary plans submittal can be combined. Since SCDOT has acquired ROW and will be obtaining a Right of Entry for the remainder of the project, will ROW plans be required? If not, can the Teams combine the ROW and Preliminary plans submittals?	Roadway	No_Revision	Per Exhibit 4a, all ROW shall be captured in the plans by the DB Team. ROW Plans will be required. All ROW has NOT been acquired and will be based on the DB team's design.
31	Attach_B	Environmental	2. Final_Permit_SA C-2023-00690_12Jan2024_signed_appvl.pdf	It appears that the Original Permit used a slightly different design than the SCDOT provided Preliminary Plans. After receiving the LOD file we did an additional check on the permitting limits and there appears to be a "hole" in the permit on Community Rd. near 118+20 Rt and this area is partially under the proposed pavement as shown in the provided Preliminary Roadway plans. This could impact the schedule because this area has an Interim Condition date. Would SCDOT consider trying to update the Permit to include areas that were not originally permitted but would need a permit based on the Preliminary Plans as soon as possible to ensure critical areas are ready for construction before the Team's possible permit mod is approved after award ?	Environmental	No_Revision	The SCDOT will not submit a permit modification prior to award.
32	RFP	5	Pg. 29 of 47, 5.3	In the Innovation and Added Value chart for Item B it notes minimizing impacts to traffic including but not limited to closure duration of Community Road could score up to 5 points for innovation. Does closing Community Rd. for less than the allowed duration constitute minimizing impacts? How many days less than the allowed time would be enough to score points? The teams are trying to determine if spending more money on construction to get Community Road open early would be worth the possible points scored. Any information to help make this determination would be appreciated.	Railroad	No_Revision	SCDOT values schedule certainty. Achieving early completion as defined in the RFP may be awarded an overall value to the project as determined by the evaluation committee.
33	Attach_A	Agreement	Pg.42 of 93, Section VII B	It is noted - If Railroad property is impacted by this project, the following provisions shall apply:. Since the spur will not be railroad property as it will be SCDOT property and a agreement for the rail to use it, then these provisions appear not to apply. However, based on previous experience in similar situations with rail, we have still coordinated the overpass design, received input, updated designs, and eventually obtained a letter indicating the rail had no exceptions to the design before proceeding with construction. Can SCDOT confirm this or a similar review approach will be required for the bridge over the spur line?	ROW	No_Revision	Plan reviews for this overpass by NSRR will be conducted concurrent with SCDOT reviews.



34	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	Pg. 9, Section 2.1.20	The RFP indicates deck drains should be designed to accommodate future conditions for spread. It also indicates deck drains are not allowed to discharge directly into railroad right of way. Is the spur easement considered railroad right of way in this criteria or can deck drains discharge into the spur easement? If deck drains are not allowed to discharge in the easement, this will result in a closed system on the bridge over the spur. Would SCDOT consider not requiring the deck drains because the shoulder will be wide enough until the future widening of US 21? If/When the future widening occurs, deck drains and the closed system could be installed at that time as part of that project.	Structures	Revision	If drains are needed for the future condition only, they may be noted on the plans to be installed in the future widening project.
35				Does SCDOT value Proposers reaching Substantial Completion early? If so, what value would be placed on early completion by 30, 60 and 90 days?	Construction		SCDOT values schedule certainty. Achieving an early substantial completion as defined in the RFP may be awarded an overall value to the project as determined by the evaluation committee.
36				What additional linear footage of stream impacts and/or acreage of wetland impacts would trigger a public review of the USACE permit?	Environmental	No_Revision	The USACE will ultimately determine if a new public notice is required. For purposes of your proposal, impacts over one tenth (0.1) of an acre should be considered as triggering a new public notice.
37				It is our assumption that mitigation strategies to save stream impacts to Tributary 47, which is currently permitted for permanent impacts, cannot be achieved by the DB teams as this stream is being impacted by the widening of existing Community Road north to Blythewood Road and is outside of the DB team's control. Please confirm that any potential stream impact savings by the DB teams for Tributary 47 cannot be considered as reductions to environmental impacts to the DB project.	Environmental	No_Revision	Confirmed. Impact savings from work associated with this contract will not be considered as reductions since the overall project will impact the feature.
38	Attach_A	Exhibit 6		In the second paragraph of Section 3.1 please remove the sentence that states "The SCDOT will not provide any mitigation credits." as it conflicts with the addition from Addendum 5 at the end of this paragraph.	Environmental	Revision	Language corrected.
39	Attach_B	Roadway		Referencing Attachment B- Roadway (5. Sight Distance_Ramp C.pdf) posted on 7/3, WB Scout Motors Drive left turn to I77 SB Entrance ramp (CONRPC) doesn't meet 25 mph SSD requirements included in Exhibit 4b Section 2.4. Please update Attachment B document that meets Exhibit 4b Section 2.4 requirements.	Roadway	Revision	That sight distance graphic is in the PIP & has been provided for information only to clarify how the sight distance should be applied. 25 mph SSD requirement will apply to right turn movements and 15 mph SSD requirement will apply to left turn movements. Exhibit 4a Section 2.4 will be updated to clarify this requirement. Graphics in the PIP has been provided for information only and sight distance should be applied throughout the entirety of the turning movements.
40	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 6		Please clarify if SCDOT will require WZITS to cover Strip Plans scope of work beginning at MM 21.4 to Exit 24 I77 NB?	Traffic	No_Revision	No, the WZITS coverage is intended to be between Exits 24 and 27.

