

NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS

Carolina Crossroads Phase 2 - Broad River Rd. at I-20 Interchange - Project ID P039719 - Richland County

RFP FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW

Date Received: 10/16/2020

Non-Confidential Meeting Date: 10/30/2020

							SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation	
1	Attach A	Agreement	25 of 101	Can the extended job site overhead be set at 10%?	Construction	No Revision	No	
2	Attach A	Agreement	35 of 101	Can the definition of concurrent delays for utilities be applied to all types of delays?	Construction	No Revision	No. This definition is meant geared toward third party involvement	
3	Attach A	Agreement	63 of 101	How will Force Majeure cover Covid-19 related issues?	Construction	No Revision	Article XIV(11) covers government ordered suspensions and quarantines caused pandemics. Contractor shall bear cost under an appropriate insurance policy as indicated in Article XIV. Contract time will given when event is proven to exist and could not be mitigated without incurring additional cost or delay.	
4	Attach A	Agreement	85 of 101	Please consider reducing the DBE goal from 14% to 10%.	Construction	No Revision	No. This goal was determined in conjunction with the Minority & Small Business Affairs Office based on the anticipated eligible activities. It is SCDOT's expectation that the contractor put forth a good faith effort to reach this goal with input from SCDOT.	
5	Attach A		Exh 8/pg 5	Section 2.10 states that highway traffic noise abatement measures in the form of a barrier will be placed at Noise Sensitive Areas (NSA) O, R and S. Barrier R is documented to be placed on the north side of I-20 from the Broad River Road exit extending approximately 4,550 feet east towards the Broad River. However, the ROD & FEIS Summary (Env. Commitments and p. 48) and the FEIS Appendix J - Noise Technical Report document that Barrier R is not warranted. Is Barrier R warranted? Will additional data be provided?	Environmental	Revision	Yes. Yes, re-evaluation will be provided.	
6	Attach B	Environmental	CCR IP page 64-67 of 78	The approved permit documents a total of 2,295 LF of Tributary 39 will be piped (170 LF) or relocated (2,125 LF). Based on the permit application and provided Impact Mitigation Tracking Spreadsheet, compensatory mitigation was not provided for this impact. Please confirm no mitigation is required for this impact. Will the contractor be responsible for mitigation to Tributary 39 as part of the permit modification process?	Environmental	No Revision	Impact is expected to incur a "no loss of function" assessment and not require mitigation credits. See Exhibit 8 Section 3 Special Condition 3.g (p. 15) for expectations.	



7	RFP	10	56 of 101	The Sustainability Action Plan appears to be named for the CCR Phase 1 project. Does this document also apply to Phase 2?	Environmental	Revision	Yes. Applies to all Phases. File Name will be revised.
8	Attach B	Hydraulics		Should the Toe Ditch Detail be incorporated into the final design of the stream relocation for tributary 39? If so will the Individual Permit have to be revised and by who?	Hydrology	No Revision	Yes, it should. If the final mitigation plan is not adhered to, it is the responsibility of the DBT to revise it.
9	Attach A	Exhibit 4e	Section 2.3/pg5	The RFP states that a 6-inch asphalt curb is required on the low side of the roadway where fill slopes exceed 10 feet in height and are steeper than 3:1. The RFP also requires the use of flumes to drain the gutter line and states "Space flumes a maximum of 100 feet as needed to accommodate drainage for the facility." Is it the SCDOT's intent for this to say minimum spacing of 100 feet rather than maximum?	Hydrology	No Revision	Maximum of 100 feet is correct.
10	Attach A	Exhibit 4e	Section 2.1/pg5	On page 3 of Exhibit 4e the RFP discusses the guidelines for performing field and video inspections on retained cross-lines that have not yet been inspected. Do all these guidelines apply to pipes crossing under Broad River Rd as well as the I-20 mainline and ramps?	Hydrology	No Revision	Yes
11	Attach B	Hydraulics		The Video Inspection Summary - Phase 2 document provided in attachment B states that pipe inspections are pending. When will further pipe inspections be provided as mentioned in the Video Inspection Summary? Will the cutoff date to consider whether or not a cross-line has been inspected by the SCDOT be at the time of award?	Hydrology	No Revision	The pending pipe inspections will be provided by early next year.
12	Attach A	Exhibit 4e	Section 2.1/pg4	On page 4 of Exhibit 4e, 2nd paragraph, the RFP states that the outfalls discharging on tracts 2, 317, and 285 are required to either be equal to or less than pre-construction conditions. If there is no room for mitigation measures to achieve a pre equal to post discharge, is the Department OK with acquiring additional right of way in order to provide mitigation? Is the DBT responsible for the cost of the additional land and reimbursement to the Department for right of way services?	Hydrology	No Revision	Yes, it is ok to acquire additional right-of-way and the cost will be in accordance with the RFP. The Department is purchasing tracts 316 and 187 for detention purposes.
13	Attach B	Hydraulics		Please provide any available drainage CADD files related to CCR Phase 2 or any hydrology/hydraulic data/analysis files used to create the Hydraulics Report.	Hydrology	Revision	This information will be provided with Final RFP.
14	Attach A		2	Past D/B RFPs have specified that design of temporary drainage should be based on 5 yr storm event and spread being restricted to shoulders. Can additional clarification for temporary/MOT drainage design be given to what is currently stated in the RFP which states, "minimizing spread to that of the existing conditions"? Will spread be allowed to encroach within a travel lane during temporary/MOT phase?	Hydrology	Revision	The RFP has been revised to clarify restriction of spread to the shoulder width for interstate routes.



15	Attach B	Hydraulics	7 of 27 pdf	CCR Stormwater Management Design Report - Section 1.3 - Pre vs Post Summary states: "Potential methods for mitigation of increased flows are detailed in Section 4.4." Review of Section 4.4 does not appear to show potential mitigation methods, please clarify.	Hydrology	No Revision	This report is for information only. Methods for mitigating increased flows are the responsibility of the DBT.
16	RFP	8	36	Currently the milestone schedule has the cost proposal due on June 7 (Monday) and the opening on June 8. Please consider revising the due date for the cost proposal to June 8 (Tuesday) allowing the teams the additional day to finalize their cost proposal.	Other	No Revision	The dates will remain as stated in the milestone schedule.
17	Attach A	Agreement	IV.A.1/pg 29	Based on the prescriptive requirements for submittal packages outlined in Exhibit 4z and the permit, design and construction time frames given by the utility owners it will be difficult to complete the project within the allotted days of 1,074 days for substantial completion. We request that the contract time for substantial completion date to be set at 1,260 days (42 months) and an interim contract milestone to be added with its own LD value of 1,080 days (36 months) for the Phase 3 connectivity ramps and other portion of the scope of work in Phase 2.	Other	No Revision	No extension in the contract time.
18	RFP	4	Section 4.1/pg17	The existing 8'x10' pedestrian culvert at approximate station 183+00 (end of Gale Drive) is not accessible (opening is covered with sheet metal). What is the Department's long term plan for this culvert crossing? Will a video inspection be provided for this structure?	Other	Revision	Scope of work will be revised to indicate that this culvert will be filled with flowable fill. Culvert in shoulder can be demolished to limit the amount of flowable fill provided all other requirements are met.
19	Attach A	Exhibit 4z		Exhibit 4z requires the contractor managed utility adjustment plans to be submitted with the roadway submittals. If in a best case scenario, RFC roadway & utility plans were ready for construction, all necessary right-of-way secured, and all appropriate permits in place within 9 months of NTP, and then the joint duct bank was constructed and ready for the communication companies to install cables within 1 month, then it would take AT&T 24 months to complete construction of their facilities. This would total 34 months (1020 days) before the existing bridge attachment would be able to be removed to allow for bridge construction. (The above timeline assumes all other communication companies can work concurrently with AT&T and be completed before them which is not realistic.) Given the 1074 day (35.8 months) requirement to design and construct the entire job, this would only leave 1 month to complete construction. Has the 1074 contract time requirement considered the utility relocation time frames referenced in the utility report? Will SCDOT advance any further duct bank design or provide further information about the feasibility of construction within the given schedule? Will SCDOT consider providing additional time for project completion?	Other	No Revision	The 24 months was based on AT&T self-performing the relocations. With the construction of conduit in contract this time frame should be less. It will be the Contractors responsibility to coordinate with them on the switch over.



20	Attach A	Agreement	41-42	Under section D.6, it states that if the utility owner elects to not be In-contract that the actual cost of the Utility Adjustments will be deducted from the CONTRACTOR's progress payment. Can the CONTRACTOR dispute said payment amount if the CONTRACTOR determines that they could make the utility adjustment for a lesser amount?	Other	No Revision	Any dispute scenario should be worked out through the Utility Coordination process. The cost for any relocation work desired or performed for convenience would be as stated in accordance with Article VII.D.4
21	RFP	3	11 of 44	Can the number of formal ATC's be increased to more than 10?	Other	No Revision	No, 10 ATC is typical and teams need to concentrate on getting 10 really good ATCs.
22	RFP	4	15 of 44	Will the Department consider increasing the stipend to an amount between \$350,000 and \$400,000?	Other	No Revision	Stipend is based on average national averages and then modified looking at cost, complexity, risk, and project size. We feel like what we have is appropriate.
23	RFP	4	20 of 44	Item 3c. Please consider eliminating or modifying the requirement for cross-sections. One option is to require "representative" cross-sections at locations deemed important by the DB Teams.	Other	No Revision	X-sections are need to verify that you have a complete understanding of the RFP requirements so they will not be removed or reduced.
24	RFP	5	26 of 44	Can additional clarification be provided on the Quality Credit Score? How exactly is this score determined?	Other	No Revision	The more quality you provide the higher the score. Can be based on many different factors like cost savings, reduction in future maintenance, lower user cost during construction, reduction in contract time, etc.
25	RFP	5	28 of 44	When will the SOQ score be provided to the shortlisted Teams? RFQ states that it will be prior to release of the Final RFP. The Industry Draft RFP states that it will be upon delivery of the Cost Proposal.	Other	No Revision	Both, we will release before the Final and again when you get all of your scores.
26	Attach A	Agreement	68 of 101	The word "gross" needs to be deleted from Article 3(a) – overly broad and outside industry norm, please consider using the standard used in SCDOT design-bid-build project.	Other	No Revision	"Gross" fits the intent of section.
27	Attach A	Exhibit 4a	Section 2.13/pg7	Please confirm that a Right of Way plan submittal will not be required unless a design change or ATC requires additional right of way.	Roadway	No Revision	Per RFP Exhibit 4a and 4z, Right of Way plans are required.
28	Info Package	Roadway		Please provide all MicroStation and Geopak design files or corridor modeling files at your earliest convenience.	Roadway	Revision	Available files will be included in PIP before Final RFP.



29	Attach A	Exhibit 4a	4	Section 2.4 states, "If the existing vertical clearance at underpass is less than 16 feet improve the existing vertical clearance during construction phases." This statement could be interpreted a number of ways. Is it a requirement to maintain a minimum vertical clearance of 16' during construction if the existing vertical clearance is less than 16'?	Roadway	Revision	Exhibit 4a will be revised to clarify vertical clearances.
30	Attach A	Exhibit 4a	6	Section states to replace existing barrier in areas where Ultimate Design footprint is to be constructed. Since a partial Ultimate Design footprint is being constructed between Sta. 180+35 to 206+20, is it the intention of SCDOT to replace this portion of the median barrier during the CCR Phase 2 project?	Roadway	Revision	Yes, the intent is to replace the barrier between the stations referenced during the CCR Phase 2 project. Exhibit 3 - Scope - page 5 notes for I-20 EB Begin indicate that "the new median barrier and median drainage shall match the limits of the WB construction."
31	Attach B	Roadway		Please provide all available CADD files, cross sections, geopak files, and corridor modeler files for all conditions of CCR Phase 2, including ultimate, interim, temporary, etc.	Roadway	Revision	Available files will be included in PIP before Final RFP.
32	Attach A	Exhibit 4a	Page 9	What is the status of the design exception for substandard inside shoulder widths on I-20 at the US-176 overpass?	Roadway	No Revision	The design exception is currently being reviewed per SCDOT's process but has not be finalized. Once approved, the design exception will be placed in Attachment B.
33	Attach A	Exhibit 4b	8&9	Section 2.1.23 requires the vertical abutment and vertical abutment wing walls to be constructed parallel to the adjacent travel lane passing beneath the bridge "unless otherwise approved in advance by SCDOT." How should this approval be received prior to the submittal of technical proposals?	Structures	No Revision	Non-parallel abutment wall arrangements should be submitted as an ATC.
34	Info Package	Structures		Please provide existing bridge plans.	Structures	No Revision	Existing bridge plans will be provided to shortlisted teams.
35	RFP	4	20 of 44	How much detail is required in Bridge construction access plans?	Structures	Revision	Bridge construction access plan will be removed from required plan contents.
36	Info Package	Traffic		Please provide the latest crash data along I-20 and US-176.	Traffic	No Revision	Crash data provided in the IMR needs to be used.
37	RFP	2	3 of 44	Please clarify traffic disclaimer which states that use of data files may not generate the same output as IMR.	Traffic	No Revision	With the use of models there is a likelihood of a small deviation between runs of a model.
38	Attach A	Exhibit 4d, Pt 1	3	Which version of SIDRA is required for the analysis of roundabouts?	Traffic	No Revision	SCDOT is currently using SIDRA 9.0.3



39	Attach A	Exhibit 4d, Pt 4	5	Page 5 states that vertical clearances for existing sign structures shall be field verified and modifications made as necessary to provide appropriate vertical clearance. Will SCDOT provide plans of record and/or shop drawings for existing overhead sign structures to which sign lighting systems need to be attached?	Traffic	No Revision	SCDOT does not have record drawings for the signs. Per section 2.2.1 Overhead Sign Lighting, existing signs will not require lighting modification.
40	Attach A	Exhibit 4d, Pt 4	6	Are existing plans of record showing sign panel layouts available for design of overlays for existing guide signs?	Traffic	Revision	Existing plans will be provided with the Final RFP.
41	Attach A		Part 5 / pg 5	Will SCDOT provide Synchro files (model) for the existing signal systems for use in developing temporary and permanent coordinated signal timing plans?	Traffic	No Revision	All available Synchro files have been provided.
42	Attach A		Part 7 / pg 2	Is the standard roadway light conventional (with lighting mast arm) or offset (without lighting mast arm)?	Traffic	No Revision	Both light types would be acceptable.
43	Attach A		Part 7	Are AGI32 and Visual Lighting Softwares acceptable to perform the photometric analysis?	Traffic	No Revision	AGI32 software would be acceptable. SCDOT currently uses Visual software to do in house photometric analyses
44	Attach A	Exhibit 4d, Pt 1	Page 1	Section 1.1 states that "Traffic Analyses methodology and results shall be equivalent or better than the modified Selected Alternative as shown in the Approved IMR". When performing traffic analysis, should MOE results be considered for the combined study area covered in the IMR or focus on the individual interchange of Broad River Road at I-20?	Traffic	No Revision	The focus needs to be on Broad River Road at I-20 interchange, but any queue/weave/other traffic condition that crosses over the project boundary into phase 3 shall be identified
45	Attach A	Exhibit 4d, Pt 1	Page 2	Section 2.1 states that "The CONTRACTOR shall not change any other settings or model parameters that would affect the capacity of the model including, but not limited to, driver types, capacity, headways, and gaps." Will these restrictions apply to MOT analysis and what is the proper way to address the need for parameter changes if the need arises?	Traffic	Revision	The restrictions will still apply to MOT analysis. If a change is needed for any parameter change it will be through an ATC.
46	Attach A	Exhibit 4d, Pt 2	Page 2	Section 2.1.1 states that Synchro or similar software shall be used to analyze intersections. If an ATC will require a change in IMR, can TransModeler be used to collect results based on HCM methodology? It appears that the currently approved IMR used TransModeler to evaluate intersection operations.	Traffic	No Revision	Yes, you can use TransModeler for this.
47	Attach A	Agreement	10 of 101	Can traffic data be added to list of items that may be relied upon (in addition to survey and geotechnical information)?	Traffic	Revision	We will add Traffic data to the list of items. This would not include the TransModeler files.
48	Info Package	Utilities		Please provide as-builts for all utilities within project limits.	Utilities	Revision	Any as-builts received will be provided in the PIP.
49	RFP	8	36	With utilities identified as a risk and discussion required in the technical proposal, will SCDOT provide opportunities to meet with utility companies in a confidential setting, starting no later than November 1, 2020?	Utilities	No Revision	All confidential questions should be submitted in writing by teams. SCDOT will coordinate with Utilities to get a response.



50	Attach A		Exh 7	Please provide specifications and requirements for the joint duct bank including but not limited to; location of utilities, lateral locations, spacing requirements, backfill material, sweep radii, conduit specs, clearances, etc.	Utilities	Revision	A joint use duct bank is not a required scope item. Specifications for individual conduits/handholes, and other criteria will be provided for in-contract utilities.
51	Attach A		Exh 7	As the SCDOT is requiring the design and construction of a common ductbank with multiple utility companies who may have different specifications and requirements, please provide guidance regarding order of precedence or a process for resolving conflicting design and construction requirements.	Utilities	No Revision	A joint use duct bank is not a required scope item.
52	Attach A		Exh 7/Table 3.1	Please clarify conduit requirements for MCI (Verizon). i.e. two (2) 4.25-inch "6-way" conduits.	Utilities	Revision	Specifications for in-contract utility work will be provided.
53	Attach B	Utilities	CoC Water & Sewer Design Standards	City of Columbia standards states water mains up to 12-inches shall be at a minimum 7.5' from the right-of-way. The utility relocation typical sections in provided in the U-Sheets do not meet this requirement. Also there are multiple areas along Broad River Rd that a relocation would either have to violate this requirement or SCDOT's UAM to fit within the proposed/existing right-of-way. Has the CCR right-of-way been set to allow for these typicals and CoC requirements? Will the DBT be responsible for obtaining additional right-of-way or private easement to meet this requirement? Are other utilities allowed to be installed within CoC easements? Can partial easements be obtained to meet this requirement?	Utilities	No Revision	The details provided in the project information package are for information only and attachment B criteria shall be met. Due to the urban nature of this project, all of the City of Columbia's facilities shall be relocated within SCDOT right of way or the City of Columbia existing easements. City of Columbia added language to acknowledge deviations for other utilities and under roadways.
54	Attach A	Exhibit 4z	Exh 7	Please clarify if the joint duct bank plans are required to be submitted as 30%, 60%, and 100% as outlined in the contractor managed utility plan submittals in Exhibit 4z.	Utilities	No Revision	A joint use duct bank is not a required scope item. Utility relocation plans shall be submitted in accordance with 4z.



55	Info Package		Utility Report Typical Sections Sheet U3	Is it the intent of SCDOT for the DBT to pay the cost to acquire additional right-of-way in the areas in which the relocation typical options for all utilities do not fit within the provided CCR proposed right-of-way? If the additional right-of-way is required only for utilities, will SCDOT/FHWA allow? If no, is the DBT responsible for obtaining private joint utility easements?	Utilities	No Revision	Utilities that are to be relocated under this contract (i.e. in-contract) are to be relocated within SCDOT right of way or the utility's easement. The typical options are for information only.
56	Attach B	Utilities		Please provide all CAD files and references to recreate U-Sheets. Including but not limited to, SUE file provided does not match SUE shown in base mapping nor utility relocation sheets. (Missing overhead connectivity and gravity systems)	Utilities	Revision	Base mapping has been provided. PDF of U-sheets that were used for discussing relocations with Utility owners can be provided but will need to be recreated using proposer's design and recommendations for where to relocate the in-contract utilities. Due to the amount of utility relocation required some relocations are shown outside of the r/w for clarity, which is misleading since all in-contract relocations shall be relocated within SCDOT r/w or utility easement.
57	Attach A	Agreement	VI.A.8	There are multiple areas in which either existing or proposed utilities parallel existing or soon to be controlled access. Will existing and/or proposed utilities be allowed to remain or be installed within and paralleling controlled access. Please provide guidelines or authorization granting use of controlled access for paralleling utilities and determination of conflicts. If unable to remain/relocate, alternate routes would require extensive relocation and easement acquisition, thus causing delays and increased cost to the project.	Utilities	No Revision	It is the intent to relocate utilities within SCDOT r/w or utility easements. Existing or proposed utilities will be allowed to relocate and be installed paralleling the controlled access. The location of the fence will be determined based on the design of project and may be moved to accommodate utilities as long as the location does not violate another RFP requirement.
58	Attach A	Agreement	36 of 101 5a	Should the first sentence read: completion of Level B and Level C SUE?	Utilities	Revision	Level B will be added to the sentence.
59	Attach A	Agreement	41 of 101 D6	RFP reads: For those utilities that have prior rights, elect not to be In-Contract, and are located inside of the proposed Project Right of Way Limits, SCDOT will be responsible for permanent relocation costs as defined by the federal and state laws and regulations. For all other Utilities that have prior rights, the CONTRACTOR shall be responsible for relocation costs as set forth in the Utility Agreement required in Exhibit 6, Section 2 bullet 2. If an existing utility company with prior rights elects to relocate their facilities outside the SCDOT Right of Way, will the contractor be responsible for that cost?	Utilities	No Revision	When the Contractor's design creates a utility conflict, in accordance with Utilities Accommodations manual, outside of the proposed Project Right of Way limits the cost to relocate the prior rights utility is the Contractors responsibility.
60	Attach A	Agreement	44 of 101 #2	What method will be used to determine when the utility time delay begins? Is there a specific milestone during the utility relocation process that determines the beginning of delays?	Utilities	No Revision	See Article VII of the Agreement.
61	Info Package	Utilities		Are preliminary COC water/sewer and communication conduit plans available?	Utilities	No Revision	City of Columbia does not have plans available.



62	Info Package	Utilities		Is the DB Team allowed to contact the impacted utility companies?	Utilities	No Revision	Yes
63	Attach A	Agreement	35	Please confirm that "In-Contract Utility Work" will be limited to water and sewer only beyond the telecommunications work explicitly stated along Broad River Road in Exhibit 7.	Utilities	No Revision	Confirmed
64	Attach A	Agreement	39	Under section B.3, since the provided SUE mapping is considered materially accurate, please confirm that no additional SUE QL B or QL C work is required on those utilities shown on the provided SUE mapping.	Utilities	No Revision	The SUE provided in Attachment B is as of November 18, 2018. It will be the Proposer's responsibility to verify any new installations in accordance with Exhibit 7.
65	Attach A	Agreement	Page 36 #5a	Should the first sentence read: completion of Level B and Level C SUE?	Utilities	Revision	Level B will be added to the sentence.
66	Attach A	Agreement	Page 41 & 42 #D6	RFP reads: For those utilities that have prior rights, elect not to be In-Contract, and are located inside of the proposed Project Right of Way Limits, SCDOT will be responsible for permanent relocation costs as defined by the federal and state laws and regulations. For all other Utilities that have prior rights, the CONTRACTOR shall be responsible for relocation costs as set forth in the Utility Agreement required in Exhibit 6, Section 2 bullet 2. If an existing utility company with prior rights elects to relocate their facilities outside the SCDOT ROW will the contractor be responsible for that cost?	Utilities	No Revision	When the Contractors design creates a utility conflict in accordance with Utilities Accommodations manual outside of the proposed Project Right of Way limits the cost to relocate the prior rights utility is the Contractors responsibility.
67	Attach A	Agreement	Page 44 #2	What method will be used to determine when the time delay begins?	Utilities	No Revision	See Article VII of the Agreement.
68	Attach A		Exhibit 7 3.1 and 3.2	Are preliminary COC water/sewer and communication conduit plans available?	Utilities	No Revision	City of Columbia does not have plans available.
69	Attach A		Exhibit 7 3.3-3.6	Under Charter Communications, Century Link, Segra, and MCI it states In-Contract Utility Work may be required. Should the Contractor assume this work will be required and add the cost to his bid?	Utilities	No Revision	When the Contractors design creates a utility conflict in accordance with Utilities Accommodations manual the cost to resolve the conflict will be included in the bid.
70	Attach A	Agreement	N/A	Will a joint utility meeting be scheduled prior to the let date?	Utilities	No Revision	No, if teams have confidential questions they should be submitted in writing by teams. SCDOT will coordinate and get response from Utilities.
71	Attach A	Agreement	N/A	Is the DB Team allowed to contact the impacted utility companies?	Utilities	No Revision	Yes



NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
Carolina Crossroads Phase 2 - Broad River Rd. at I-20 Interchange - Project ID P039719 - Richland County

FINAL RFP - ROUND 1							
Date Received: 1/6/2021					Non-Confidential Meeting Date: 1/19/2021		
SCDOT							
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_B	Environmental	CCR Reevaluation	The environmental commitment regarding Bicycle and Pedestrian accommodations states that during construction "SCDOT will accommodate bicycle/pedestrian access" but no specific requirements are provided to the DB Teams. Are there any specific requirements and if so, can they be included in the design criteria in Attachment A?	Environmental	No Revision	The intent of the commitment is that you accommodate pedestrians and bicyclist and let them navigate safely through the corridor during construction.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e		Per the RFP all existing 15-inch pipes must be replaced with a minimum 18-inch diameter piping. The existing I-20 median piping systems are primarily 15-inch piping. Will the department make an exception for retaining the 15-inch median drainage systems if they are video inspected and meet all hydraulic criteria with the proposed design?	Hydrology	No Revision	Due to maintenance concerns of aged pipe and potential for clogging due to debris, all 15" pipes under the interstate shall be upsized to 18" minimum.
3	PIP	Hydraulics		Regarding the 4x4 culvert, EC-4201, and the other cross lines pipes analyzed in the Preliminary Stormwater Management Design Report from HDR, can SCDOT provide any additional supporting calculations, GIS data, or models files (e.g., HEC-HMS) that would support the peak discharges presented in the report? Verifying how peak runoff parameters such as Curve Number and Time of Concentration were calculated will be useful since, the flow rates on the presented cross lines pipes reflect severely undersized conveyances.	Hydrology	Revision	Addition information will be provided in the project information package when available.
4	RFP	4	14	We kindly request that SCDOT increase the Technical Proposal page limit from 10 to 15 given the extent of information and high % of the overall score set aside for Quality Score.	Other	No Revision	No change In the amount of pages for the Technical Proposal narrative.



5	Attach_A	Agreement	11 of 104	Will the Department accept a roadway submittal package and a bridge submittal package on the same day?	Other	No Revision	You can submit a Roadway and Bridge together as one submittal on the same day. If on separate days it shall have the 5 days between them.
6	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c		In order to estimate the scope of work for the cross slope correction on I-20, a detailed pavement scan is required. We would respectfully request for SCDOT to provide this information to all proposers.	Other	No Revision	No additional pavement scans will be completed by SCDOT.
7	Attach_A	Exhibit 7		<p>SCDOT's previous response to this question was "The 24 months was based on AT&T self-performing the relocations. With the construction of conduit in contract this time frame should be less. It will be the Contactors responsibility to coordinate with them on the switch over."</p> <p>Since the AT&T conduit work has been pulled from the RFP, will SCDOT consider providing additional time?</p> <p>Exhibit 4z requires the contractor managed utility adjustment plans to be submitted with the roadway submittals. If in a best case scenario, RFC roadway & utility plans were ready for construction, all necessary right-of-way secured, and all appropriate permits in place within 9 months of NTP, and then the joint duct bank was constructed and ready for the communication companies to install cables within 1 month, then it would take AT&T 24 months to complete construction of their facilities. This would total 34 months (1020 days) before the existing bridge attachment would be able to be removed to allow for bridge construction. (The above timeline assumes all other communication companies can work concurrently with AT&T and be completed before them which is not realistic.) Given the 1074 day (35.8 months) requirement to design and construct the entire job, this would only leave 1 month to complete construction. Has the 1074 contract time requirement considered the utility relocations time frames referenced in the utility report? Will SCDOT advance any further duct bank design or provide further information about the feasibility of construction within the given schedule? Will SCDOT consider providing additional time for project completion?</p>	Other	No Revision	SCDOT will evaluate the 1074 day requirement and any revision would be provided in a future addendum.



8	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c		Please expand Table in Section 2.6 and provide pavement section for all new ramps as well as I-20 WB CD as Section 2.7 only applies to any ramp that remains in its current configuration.	Pavement	No Revision	Please use section 2.3 of exhibit 4c for guidance to determine the ramp/cd system pavement design requirements.
9	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	52	The table in SP (50) provides the option for the SMA Surface of 9.5mm and 12.5mm. Does the proposer have the option to use either mix?	Pavement	Revision	9.5mm will be the required aggregate size for the project.
10	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	Page 6	Please clarify the pavement rehabilitation requirements for Broad River Road noted in Section 2.7.1. As written, it's unclear. Specifically, does it require a total of 4" of milling? And replacement with 200 PSY of Intermediate B and 200 PSY of Surface A?	Pavement	No Revision	Yes the rehab requires a total of 4 inches of milling and filling with 200 psy of intermediate type B and 200 psy of surface type A or more so that the existing elevation is maintained. The 200 psy of intermediate B will be required to be placed in a mill and fill operation due to drop off restrictions and so that we do not place traffic on the pavement with a 4 inch reduction in structure.
11	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a		The speed limit for US 176 is given as 45 MPH. Is that also the design speed for US 176 when travelling through the intersection - between the ramp terminals?	Roadway	No Revision	Yes, unless modified through an approved ATC.
12	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a		What is the minimum separation between the opposing simultaneous traffic on the SPUI?	Roadway	No Revision	Minimum separation between the opposing simultaneous traffic on the SPUI is 10' as indicated in RDM Figure 9.5-P. Minimum separation between opposing traffic on US 176 (at the intersection) along the developed dual lefts is 4'.
13	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a		What is the minimum separation between dual lane ramps traveling through the SPUI core?	Roadway	No Revision	Multi-lane traffic flow would be based on turning templates or the required lane width at a minimum.
14	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b		Please provide additional guidance and design criteria for the proposed I-20 WB CD road - i.e. design speed, SSD, lane width, shoulders, etc.	Roadway	No Revision	Design speed for I-20 WB CD is 45 mph as indicated by "combined ramps" in 4a. RDM Section 10.3.8 provides design guidance for CD roadways.



15	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Pg. 9	Section 3.1.1 states to use Section 4d criteria for shoulder widths between edge of ramp travel lane and the temporary barrier. This is in reference to the temporary ramp tie-in at the western end of the project. Should we assume a minimum shoulder width of 2 feet is acceptable?	Roadway	No Revision	Per SCDOT Standard Drawing 605-415-00, minimum shoulder offset is 2'.
16	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b		It appears Bridge 42 has "excess deck area" which is larger than 1,000 square feet. Per Section 2.1.13, the area beyond barrier must be enclosed by control access fencing that is accessible only by use of security gates, with gate locations as required by SCDOT. Please provide additional guidance with respect to the required treatment for the excess deck areas including "drainage provisions to prevent sheet flow off the edge of deck and facilitate collection of water for point discharge at permissible locations".	Structures	Revision	Section 2.1.13 will be revised to require SCDOT MASH barrier placement at the outside edge of deck for SPUI bridges. Fencing requirements will be removed.
17	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b		Would SCDOT require a Formal ATC for an alternate SPUI Bridge Structure (Bridge 42) by removing the "excess deck" and using an alternate configuration and framing?	Structures	Revision	Section 2.1.13 will be revised to require SCDOT MASH barrier placement at the outside edge of deck for SPUI bridges. Fencing requirements will be removed. An ATC is not required for non-parallel girder framing plans, provided all girder spacing and overhang RFP requirements are met.
18	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b		Does SCDOT require a Formal ATC for alternate jointless bridges involving end abutments?	Structures	No Revision	If the abutments meet the description of integral or semi-integral end bents in the BDM, then a Formal ATC is not required. Otherwise, provide more detail on the "alternate jointless bridge" type being proposed.
19	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a		Would SCDOT allow the removal of the signal on the south terminal on US 176 and allow traffic to have a "Free flow" from I-20 EB ramp onto US 176?	Traffic	No Revision	There are some concerns with the weave from the proposed free flow lane accessing Longcreek Drive. Also, control of access limits along Broad River Road were developed with no free flow lane. Changes based on this question could require additional Contractor Designated Right of Way or Additional Right of Way per Article VIII. This would require an ATC to go to a free flow movement.
20	Attach_B	Traffic	45/1345	It was stated in the IMR that "The freeway, merge and diverge densities for the I-26, I-20 and I-126 segments were obtained from the TransModeler microsimulation output files, which include an average of ten (10) runs." Can the seed numbers be provide for the 10 consecutive runs?	Traffic	Revision	The seed run numbers will be provided in the RFP and are as follows 7,12,17,22,27,32,37,42,47,52.



21	PIP	Traffic		The 2040 volumes used in the provided "Exit 65 Synchro Files" differ from the peak hour volumes reported in Appendix B of the IMR. Can SCDOT please clarify the discrepancy? Also, can SCDOT confirm that we should use the volume data presented in Appendix B of the IMR for any kind of traffic evaluation?	Traffic	Revision	The Synchro analyses were used as a screening tool used early in the analyses to test and compare possible interchange alternative concepts and to review/refine roadway design concepts of selected alternatives at individual interchanges later in the development of the alternatives. The volumes used in the IMR and other analyses of the MSA network were based on the TransModeler dynamic assignment throughout the entire system. Because of this, the Synchro volumes were not expected to match the TransModeler volumes. Revision will require volumes in the IMR to be used in a traffic evaluation.
22	Attach_B	Utilities		The SUE DGN (2. u849pp-2d_STV.dgn) posted on the DB website when compared to the SUE in the PDF (1. Underground and above ground utility map November 15 2018) do not match. The DGN is missing the gravity sewer and overhead connectivity line work. Please provide a complete SUE file.	Utilities	Revision	Updated files will be provided in the project information package.
23				Please provide list of approved construction contractors. Engineering contacts only listed, or are design-build teams automatically pre-qualified to self-perform?	Utilities	Revision	Century Link - Lumen contractor list will be provided in a future addendum. They are currently procuring new contractors. The in-contract telecoms have indicated that their pre-approved firms/contractors will be required and/or they do not have a process for others to become qualified.



24	Attach_B	Utilities		<p>With each communication company having different pre-approved contractors for construction and similar start/stop tie-in points can this work be self-performed by DB Team? Or, is it intended for the DB Teams to use 4-5 different contractors and have them on site simultaneously performing work?</p>	Utilities	No Revision	<p>The intent is for the DB Team to coordinate all utility relocations within their construction schedule based on the information the utility entities have provided for the RFP.</p>
----	----------	-----------	--	---	-----------	-------------	--



NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
Carolina Crossroads Phase 2 - Broad River Rd. at I-20 Interchange - Project ID P039719 - Richland County

FINAL RFP - ROUND 2							
Date Received:		3/8/2021			Non-Confidential Meeting Date:3/22/2021		
SCDOT							
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2.1	The existing 4x4 box culvert at STA 206+30 (EC-4201) has severe scouring issues at the outlet. The outlet side of the culvert is on EB shoulder of the I-20 mainline and does not fall within the proposed footprint of the Phase 2 portion of the project. Is the intention for any remediation to this outlet/outfall to occur during Phase 3 of the project?	Hydrology	Revision	This will be added to the VPI Summary table as scope for remediation for this phase of CCR.
2				If at least some portion of the 4x4 culvert (EP-4201) needs to be replaced, will the replacement in any way change hydraulic design criteria for this pipe, as stated in Exhibit 4e in the latest RFP, particularly Section 2.1 as it applies to this cross line culvert.	Hydrology	No Revision	Exhibit 4e controls all aspects of hydraulic design for the project and any comments in the VPI summary does not relieve the Contractor of complying with the hydraulic design requirements.
3	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2.1	The area purchased for detention on Tract 316 and 187 is a very limited area for detention considering the large offsite area draining through the proposed location of the pond. Can SCDOT provide any calculations on how this area was determined to be sufficient for the required detention considering the offsite flow passing through?	Hydrology	No Revision	This area was purchased during the ROW phase because of negotiations with the property owner. Since this would be excess property it was indicated that it can be used for detention. No calculations we completed to show how much detention it would provide.
4	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	9	Exhibit 4a section 2.14 states that "A design exception is being drafted for substandard shoulder widths on I-20 at the US-176 overpass which do not meet the SCDOT Roadway Design Manual's required minimum of 10 feet. If approved, the shoulder widths may be incorporated into the design at this overpass location as described in the design exception." If the design exception is allowed will it change any of the MSA tie points? For example the I-20 Eastbound MSA Tie Point at 206+20 is very close to the existing offramp and may require a retaining wall to construct. Does the opening beneath the US-176 overpass bridge need to accommodate a future 10' inside shoulder along I-20?	Roadway	No Revision	It is not SCDOT's intent to change any of the MSA tie points. The approved design exception allows for a narrow shoulder in the center of I-20 but does not allow reduced shoulders for ramps or on the outside of I-20 mainline. The intent is to maintain alignments of the lanes and the design exception allows for the barrier protection of the new piers to encroach into the shoulder (i.e. blister). Therefore, the span length can be based on this approved design exception.
5	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Page 9	What is the status of design exception for 10' median shoulders on I-20 at the overpass?	Roadway	Revision	The design exception will be provided in Attachment B in Addendum 2.



6	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	1	For the MSA design what is the operational classification for bridge 42 (US-176 over I-20) since technically it carries I-20 ramp traffic?	Structures	Revision	US 176 over I-20 overpass is Operational Classification II, regardless of whether ramps terminate at the bridge due to its SPUI configuration. This will be clarified in Addendum 2.
7	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	13	Regarding concrete median barriers, the RFP states "Expansion joints in slip formed barriers are only required at the interface with other structures such as Zone of Intrusion barriers or foundations for lights or signs." The RFP also specifies the use of SCDOT Standard Drawings for Condition A. The Standard Drawings specify a maximum distance between expansion joints of 100'. Which is correct?	Structures	Revision	Addendum 2 will clarify that expansion joints are required between each continuous concrete pour and the expansion joint width is required to be 2.5 inches, which is larger than the joint width on the current standard drawings. The 100' maximum distance on the standard drawings does not apply and will be removed on future versions of the standard drawings, currently under development.
8				There are facilities within the project limits labeled DukeNet. Is DukeNet an additional utility within the project limits or is DukeNet owned by Charter?	Utilities	No Revision	Dukenet was acquired by Charter Communications.
9				Who will handle the relocation of the police cameras located along Broad River Rd.?	Utilities	No Revision	Contractor will not be responsible for relocating the police cameras. The owner of the cameras has indicated they will remove the cameras prior to commencement of construction activities.
10				As stated in the last open forum meeting, the Department is working with AT&T to develop a design and location for their proposed duct bank system along Broad River Road. Can The Department provide a date AT&T's conduit will be removed from the Broad River Road bridge?	Utilities	No Revision	Not at this time. If early relocation of AT&T is approved under an encroachment permit, it will be provided in a future addendum.



NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
Carolina Crossroads Phase 2 - Broad River Rd. at I-20 Interchange - Project ID P039719 - Richland County

FINAL RFP - ROUND 3							
Date Received:		5/3/2021			Non-Confidential Meeting Date: 5/17/2021		
SCDOT							
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_B	Hydro		There are several drainage crossing pipes and median pipes shown in the HDR report that are not shown in the survey files. Please provide all available drainage survey information including any available invert information.	Hydrology	No Revision	All survey information has been provided.
2	RFP	4	19 of 45	Storm Drainage is not included in the list of items to be shown in the plan view. Please confirm whether it is required or not.	Hydrology	No Revision	Storm drainage systems is not required to be shown in the technical proposal.
3	Attach_A	Agreement	66 of 108	As currently written, the design component of the Indemnity Section of the agreement is uninsurable through Professional Liability Insurance. Addressing the insurability concerns benefits SCDOT, the Contractor, and the Design Professional and as such, we suggest adding the following to the indemnity provision: "The standard of care for all design professional services performed by the designer of record and its sub-consultants pursuant to this Agreement shall be the care and skill ordinarily used by members of the design profession practicing under similar conditions at the same time and locality of the Project. Further, notwithstanding anything contained herein, the indemnity related to design services shall be limited to the extent of any negligence (acts, errors, or omissions) of the design of the Project or otherwise negligently failing to adhere to the standard of care as defined herein."	Legal	Revision	SCDOT disagrees that the Indemnity section makes the design component uninsurable as written, but SCDOT will re-review the language. The standard of care for design professionals is covered in Article II, Section C of the agreement. However, for the purposes of clarity, SCDOT will add the suggested language as a second paragraph under Article, Section C.
4	Attach_A	Agreement	69 of 108	Please consider removing the word <i>gross</i> from Item 3.a that states "The gross negligence, recklessness, willful misconduct, bad faith, or fraud of the Indemnified Party;	Legal	No Revision	"Gross" fits the intent of section.
5	RFP	4	18	Given the complexity of the requirements and stormwater challenges, please consider adding the requirement for a preliminary drainage design to be included with Appendix A - Conceptual Plans	Other	No Revision	This will not be added as an requirement. However, if it is something you want evaluated, it would need to be included in the poposal.



6	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a		The approved design exception for substandard inside shoulder widths on I-20 at the US 176 Overpass allows for spot locations of the inside shoulders of I-20 to be less than 10' (approximately 9.25') but greater than the existing 4.75'. The 9.25' dimension stated in the design exception is based on a bent having 4' diameter columns constructed in a tangent alignment of the interstate. Given that I-20 is in a horizontal curve at the US 176 Overpass, will it be acceptable to reduce the inside shoulder widths to approximately 9' at the Overpass instead of the 9.25' dimension stated in the design exception? This would allow the US 176 median bent to be constructed along straight chorded segments. Stopping sight distance would still be provided.	Roadway	Revision	The criteria in 4a will be revised to say something like "maximize the inside shoulder width at the US 176 bridge pier, but in no case will the shoulder width be allowed to be less than 8".
7	Attach_B	ROW	Project Right of Way Plans	The new Right of Way shown in the ROW plans along Broad River Road, doesn't appear to encompass the construction required by the Roadway Design Scope / Design Criteria (SB sidewalk, curb & gutter, lane widths). Should the DB Teams modify the typical section to stay within the current ROW limits or provide "Additional Right of Way" (as described in the RFP) where required?	ROW	No Revision	At the project termini road width can be transitioned to match existing conditions.
8	PIP	Traffic		Can Microstation Files be provided for the Conceptual Signing Plans?	Traffic	Revision	Files will be provided.
9	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	9	Synergy's Prior Rights Verification states "Synergy is entering into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with SCDOT..." are the Synergy relocations expected to be performed in-contract? If so, please provide an anticipated date for the release of their design criteria, approved engineers/contractors, and any other supporting documentation.	Utilities	No Revision	SCDOT and Synergy have not come to terms to execute an MOA for this project. Synergy is not listed as an In-Contract Utility in Exhibit 7 section 3 and will be considered Utility Work performed by Utility in Exhibit 7 section 2.



NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
Carolina Crossroads Phase 2 - Broad River Rd. at I-20 Interchange - Project ID P039719 - Richland County

FINAL RFP - ROUND 3							
Date Received:		5/3/2021			Non-Confidential Meeting Date: 5/17/2021		
SCDOT							
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_B	Hydro		There are several drainage crossing pipes and median pipes shown in the HDR report that are not shown in the survey files. Please provide all available drainage survey information including any available invert information.	Hydrology	No Revision	All survey information has been provided.
2	RFP	4	19 of 45	Storm Drainage is not included in the list of items to be shown in the plan view. Please confirm whether it is required or not.	Hydrology	No Revision	Storm drainage systems is not required to be shown in the technical proposal.
3	Attach_A	Agreement	66 of 108	As currently written, the design component of the Indemnity Section of the agreement is uninsurable through Professional Liability Insurance. Addressing the insurability concerns benefits SCDOT, the Contractor, and the Design Professional and as such, we suggest adding the following to the indemnity provision: "The standard of care for all design professional services performed by the designer of record and its sub-consultants pursuant to this Agreement shall be the care and skill ordinarily used by members of the design profession practicing under similar conditions at the same time and locality of the Project. Further, notwithstanding anything contained herein, the indemnity related to design services shall be limited to the extent of any negligence (acts, errors, or omissions) of the design of the Project or otherwise negligently failing to adhere to the standard of care as defined herein."	Legal	Revision	SCDOT disagrees that the Indemnity section makes the design component uninsurable as written, but SCDOT will re-review the language. The standard of care for design professionals is covered in Article II, Section C of the agreement. However, for the purposes of clarity, SCDOT will add the suggested language as a second paragraph under Article, Section C.
4	Attach_A	Agreement	69 of 108	Please consider removing the word <i>gross</i> from Item 3.a that states "The gross negligence, recklessness, willful misconduct, bad faith, or fraud of the Indemnified Party;	Legal	No Revision	"Gross" fits the intent of section.
5	RFP	4	18	Given the complexity of the requirements and stormwater challenges, please consider adding the requirement for a preliminary drainage design to be included with Appendix A - Conceptual Plans	Other	No Revision	This will not be added as an requirement. However, if it is something you want evaluated, it would need to be included in the poposal.



6	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a		The approved design exception for substandard inside shoulder widths on I-20 at the US 176 Overpass allows for spot locations of the inside shoulders of I-20 to be less than 10' (approximately 9.25') but greater than the existing 4.75'. The 9.25' dimension stated in the design exception is based on a bent having 4' diameter columns constructed in a tangent alignment of the interstate. Given that I-20 is in a horizontal curve at the US 176 Overpass, will it be acceptable to reduce the inside shoulder widths to approximately 9' at the Overpass instead of the 9.25' dimension stated in the design exception? This would allow the US 176 median bent to be constructed along straight chorded segments. Stopping sight distance would still be provided.	Roadway	Revision	The criteria in 4a will be revised to say something like "maximize the inside shoulder width at the US 176 bridge pier, but in no case will the shoulder width be allowed to be less than 8'".
7	Attach_B	ROW	Project Right of Way Plans	The new Right of Way shown in the ROW plans along Broad River Road, doesn't appear to encompass the construction required by the Roadway Design Scope / Design Criteria (SB sidewalk, curb & gutter, lane widths). Should the DB Teams modify the typical section to stay within the current ROW limits or provide "Additional Right of Way" (as described in the RFP) where required?	ROW	No Revision	At the project termini road width can be transitioned to match existing conditions.
8	PIP	Traffic		Can Microstation Files be provided for the Conceptual Signing Plans?	Traffic	Revision	Files will be provided.
9	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	9	Synergy's Prior Rights Verification states "Synergy is entering into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with SCDOT..." are the Synergy relocations expected to be performed in-contract? If so, please provide an anticipated date for the release of their design criteria, approved engineers/contractors, and any other supporting documentation.	Utilities	No Revision	SCDOT and Synergy have not come to terms to execute an MOA for this project. Synergy is not listed as an In-Contract Utility in Exhibit 7 section 3 and will be considered Utility Work performed by Utility in Exhibit 7 section 2.
10	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	9	Since Synergy Utilities is not an In-Contract Utility, please provide timeframes for permits, design, procurement/easement acquisition and construction so that we can include this information in our CPM schedule as required in the technical proposal section.	Utilities	No Revision	No additional information will be provided for Synergy Utilities.
11	RFP	8	37 of 45	Can the Technical Proposal submission date be delayed by 1 week to June 9th? The extra week will allow much needed time to address the CPM schedule requirement added in Addendum 4 and revisions anticipated in Addendum 5. And it still provides three weeks for SCDOT and the Teams to prepare for the presentations scheduled for July 1st.	PM	No Revision	Other than the change in Addendum 5 the Milestone schedule will remain the same.

