

**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
Cross Island Parkway - Project ID P040119 - Beaufort County**

RFP FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW

Date Received: 8/9/2021

Meeting Date: 8/30/2021

				SCDOT		
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Response	Explanation
1	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	2	Is it the intent of the RFP to replace all guardrail with MASH guardrail with non-mow strip? Please define or provide locations of what the RFP considers substandard guardrail. See exhibit 4a section 2.8.	Revision	No, the intent of the RFP is not to replace all guardrail with MASH guardrail with non-mow strip. Will revise RFP to replace the word "substandard" with "defective." Guardrail will not need to be replaced/upgraded if the only issue is MASH compliance. Resetting guardrail with the same undamage hardware is acceptable in accordance with RFP special provision, SCDOT Standard Drawings and SCDOT Qualified Products Listings.
2	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	36	Special Provision 43 specifies a six (6) inch full depth asphalt patch in section A and a 8 inch full depth asphalt patch in section B. Please clarify.	Revision	Both sections are intended to say 8 inch full depth asphalt patch. This will be revised.
3	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	2	Please provide the original roadway drainage report and design files.	No_Revision	No drainage report or design files available. Plan sheets are in Plans Library.
4	Attach_A	Exhibit 4z	6	If the project can be constructed without any new right of way are proposers required to submit a right of way submittal package?	No_Revision	No. But in the event the DB Team's design requires R/W then it would be required.
5	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 2	3	Are lane closures allowed during the Heritage Golf Tourney?	Revision	No. A Revision will be made to clarify specific restrictions.
6	Attach_B			Please provide copies of all maintenance records for the roadway and bridges.	No_Revision	We have records of routine maintance (sign replacement, mowing, tree trimming, ditching, pothole patching, litter control) that can be provided for information only, but we do not see a benefit to the teams in providing this information. Please clarify reason for this request. No bridge maintenance or rehab work, except for deck sweeping, has been performed on the bridges.
7	Attach_B	Hazmat		Is the Department going to provide any hazardous materials reports?	Revision	Yes, Department will provide hazmat reports.
8	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	pg 4 (pg 177 of pdf)	Will the contractor be responsible for the maintenance of water quality structures located within the corridor during the duration of the contract? Also, could SCDOT provide maintenance records for any water quality devices within the project limits.	Revision	No known maintenance records of Water Quality Devices within the project limits. Maintenance should be performed in accordance with current SCDOT Standard Specifications for Highway Construction section 104.
9	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	pg 15 (pg 209 of pdf)	Is SCDOT aware of any locations within the corridor that vibration monitoring will be required?	No_Revision	No.
10	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	pg 84 (pg 278 of pdf)	Is SCDOT aware of any lead based coating system within the project limits where demolition is required? For example, bridges, toll booth facilities, etc..	Revision	No, testing will be performed for the toll booth, but not for the bridges.



11	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	pg 4 (pg 154 of pdf)	Can the SCDOT provide more information regarding their expectations of the construction of the bicycle path from Marshland Road to the Broad Creek Bridge? For example provide a typical section, materials, pavement markings, etc..	Revision	A typical section for the bike path will not be provided. However, bike path is marked and signed as a one-way path on each end of the bridge over Broad Creek as well as each side of US 278. Use a consistent bike path width that matches the existing path width (see independent alignment portions of the path for example). Use shoulder widths and cross slopes that comply with the Bike Guide. Provide grass buffer between bike path and ramp (west of US 278) in accordance with the Bike Guide. RFP will be revised to help clarify the bike path both east and west of US 278. Replace bike path pavement markings in kind.
12	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	pg 2 (pg 321 of pdf)	Please clarify the specific limits required for the necessity of double row of silt fence. Also, Section 806 in the RFP states that double row silt fence or "other means of double perimeter control as approved by RCE" are allowed on this project. Please clarify what other measures would be approved by the RCE.	No_Revision	Double rows of silt fence are required around jurisdictional waters of the US or environmentally sensitive areas. Please clarify what other measures you are proposing.
13	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	pg 2 (pg 321 of pdf)	RFP Exhibit 6 bullet 2 states that double row silt fence is required along construction limits adjacent to actual or "potential" jurisdictional features not authorized for impacts. Please clarify what constitutes as a "potential" jurisdictional feature.	No_Revision	No features have been submitted to DHEC-OCRM or the USACE for determination of jurisdiction. Features that may be present within the project footprint would be "potentially" jurisdictional until officially determined. Submitting a determination request will be the Contractor's responsibility.
14	Attach_A	Agreement	pg 25 of 90 (75 of pdf)	Given the amount of time for submittal review and extra time that may be required for variable scope items, would SCDOT be favorable to extending the overall project duration?	Revision	Its SCDOT goal to hold the date in the contract, but we are open for discussion with the teams on this matter.
15	RFP	2	pg 2 of 44 (pg 7 of pdf)	Section 2.3: Can the Department accommodate the opportunity to physically view the tunnel during site visits?	No_Revision	This is possible, SCDOT will facilitate this tour for the contractors. Tour will be Thursday 9/2/2021 at 10:30AM. Each team is allowed 2 people in attendance.
16	RFP	8	Pg 35 of 44 (pg 40 of pdf)	The schedule states that formal ATC response from Department occurs on October 13, 2021 and the technical proposals are due October 20, 2021. Considering this allows only 7 days to adapt to the final ATC ruling (favorable or unfavorable), would SCDOT consider altering the milestone schedule to allow more time between the formal ATC ruling and submission of the technical proposal by either moving the ATC process earlier in the schedule or adding more time between ATC's and technical proposal submission? We would suggest a minimum 10-15 day duration.	No_Revision	No change, Responses will be returned as soon as possible.
17	RFP	3	pg 14 of 44 (pg 19 of pdf)	Would SCDOT consider increasing the stipend?	No_Revision	Stipend will not be increased.
18	Attach_A	Agreement	pg 10 of 90 (pg 60 of pdf)	Section 6 defines submittal review times of 15 business days for initial review, followed by subsequent 5-day comment and response periods. Given that this project is not the "normal" road and bridge design type project requiring more lengthy reviews, and to accommodate the short construction duration, would SCDOT consider and commit to a 5-day initial review period followed by subsequent 5-day comment and response periods for remaining open comments?	Revision	Will revise to 10 day review with 5 day comment and respond period.



19	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	pg 19 (pg 212 of pdf)	Item (24), Section 107 states "Contractor shall include in their Total Cost to Complete, all costs associated with their involvement in the Community and Public Relations Plan". Since this section states "The minimum public information requirements.....shall include, but not be limited to the following" and contains the ambiguous statement "If Beginning of Construction meeting for area businesses and residents is held, Contractor shall attend and prepared to speak at this event", would SCDOT consider providing more clarity about exact Contractor expectations? for example will there be community and public relations efforts required of the contractor with the Town of Hilton Head and other stakeholders and if so please provide a definition of those expectations.	Revision	Will revise to clarify items needed for public relations.
20	Attach_A	Exhibit 4d_Pt 2	pg 4 (pg 171 of pdf)	Please provide defined times for hourly lane closure restrictions.	No_Revision	Follow the 2019 lane closure restrictions published on SCDOT's website. Specific restrictions are 6-9AM and 3-7PM seven days a week, in addition to restrictions per the SCDOT Standard Specifications for Construction.
21	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	pg 1 (pg 156 of pdf)	Section 2.1.2 states: "sever connections between the tunnel and the building basement for HVAC, power, lighting, drainage, and plumbing systems and make adjustments...". Can SCDOT provide clarity on what constitutes acceptable "severing" of these utilities for the final condition the Contractor must leave them in?	No_Revision	All utility systems shall be disconnected at the tunnel/building interface, leaving the systems servicing the building in tact and operational per the International Building Code (current edition). The building is in process of being deeded over to Hilton Head in accordance with Title 57, to be completed after the end of construction activities. There is no intention of allowing the use of this building as a construction office.
22	RFP	2	pg 3 of 44 (pg 8 of pdf)	Section 2.7: Could the Department provide what portion of the Interim Completion Time was allocated for Design Submission, Review and Approval? Would the Department consider beginning the Interim Completion Time upon commencement of construction activity?	No_Revision	No Revision
23	Attach_A	Exhibit 5	pg 33 (pg 227 of pdf)	Section (38): SECTION 401 ASPHALT BINDER ADJUSTMENT INDEX Earlier communications regarding this project suggested that an asphalt adjustment would be included within the contract language. Can an asphalt adjustment be included?	Revision	Adding Binder Adjustment Index to this project and the applicable pay items.
24	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	pg 2 (pg 161 of pdf)	2.2 Mainline Cross Island Parkway (Base Scope) •Approach Slab Areas (Patching is referenced as 10" depth) 2.3 Ramps (Base Scope) (Patching is referenced as 8" depth) 2.4 Pavement Safety and Patching (as outlined in Exhibit 5) 2.6 Mainline Cross Island Parkway (Variable Scope) •Approach Slab Areas (Patching is referenced as 10" depth) 2.7 Sol Blatt Jr. Parkway (Variable Scope) (Patching is referenced as 8" depth) SP 43 SECTION 401 FULL DEPTH ASPHALT PAVEMENT PATCHING Description contains references to 6" depth patching Construction Process contains references to 8" depth patching Please provide clarification as to how full depth patching will be determined, defined and paid to avoid any confusion regarding the above scopes and patching requirements.	Revision	Special Provision will be corrected to say 8 inch patching in both places. Exhibit 4c will be revised to say 10" "mill and fill" instead of "patching". All other patching references in Exhibit 4c will be paid for through the Special Provision.
25	Attach_A	Agreement	pg 48 of 90 (pg 98 of pdf)	Has the portion of the toll facility to be demolished been tested for asbestos or other hazardous materials? If not, will the Department be testing these facilities and providing results prior to Notice to Proceed?	Revision	No, the facility has not been tested, but the Department will provide testing and hazmat reports.



26	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	pg 2 (pg 157 of pdf)	2.1.4 Existing Lighting states "remove and dispose of all roadway lighting, including lighting on the Broad Creed Bridge, in the vicinity of the toll plaza...Remove a portion of the existing light post foundations at the direction of the RCE." Please identify the limits of lighting removal, what foundations will require removal and clearly state SCDOT's definition of "partial removal."	Revision	Ground-mounted concrete light post foundations will be required to be removed 18 inches below grade. Limits of lighting removal will be clarified. All ground-mounted light posts in between the Broad Creek Bridge and the Marshland Road interchange will be removed, with the exception of the four light posts that illuminate the administration building parking lot.
27	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	pg 3 (pg 176 of pdf)	Section 2.1: Roadway Drainage "Replace all 15" pipes with minimum 18" pipes at all locations where design warrants retaining 15" pipes, to include driveways." Would SCDOT consider leaving the 15" pipes in place in areas where only pavement replacement is required? As the intent is just to replace the pavement structure through most of the project.	Revision	Follow Requirements for Hydraulic Design Studies
28	Attach_A	Exhibit 4e	pg 3 (pg 176 of pdf)	Section 2.1 Roadway Drainage "Repair or Replace damaged drainage structures." Please provide a list of structures (including location on the project), deficiencies/damages that require repair for each identified structure.	Revision	eliminated this requirement- no damaged structures are known
29	Attach_A	Agreement	pg 16 of 90 (pg 66 of pdf)	Item 18 in "Section J. Contract Deliverables" refers to Railroad Coordination Documents as a required deliverable. Please consider removing it for them list as not applicable.	No_Revision	No railroad coordination will be required for this project.
30	RFP	4	pg 18 of 44 (pg 23 of pdf)	Conceptual roadway plans for the technical proposal phase seem more stringent than the final deliverable strip maps for the majority of the project. Will strip maps be appropriate for the conceptual roadway plans in the technical proposal.	Revision	RFP will be revised to clarify. Required items indicated for technical proposal on page 18 of 44 (page 23 of PDF) are all applicable to the final deliverable for roadway realignment. Strip map plans for pavement reconstruction are not required as a part of the technical proposal.
31	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	pg 2 (pg 152 of pdf)	Exhibit states "Where existing fill and cut slopes are presently protected by guardrail and no rigid barrier is proposed, replace damaged and/or substandard guardrail and extend/install new guardrail at locations that do not meet current standard." Other sections in the RFP indicate newly installed guardrail is to be MASH compliant. Please clarify the Department's definition of substandard guardrail and should it be replaced with MASH, or should the RFP special provisions allowing for replacement of same type of guardrail be used? Does SCDOT intend to replace guardrail in areas where only pavement replacement is required and shoulder conditions will remain unchanged?	Revision	The intent of the RFP is not to replace all guardrail with MASH guardrail with non-mow strip. Will revise RFP to replace the word "substandard" with "defective." Guardrail will not need to be replaced/upgraded if the only issue is MASH compliance. Resetting guardrail with the same undamaged hardware is acceptable in accordance with RFP special provision, SCDOT Standard Drawings and SCDOT Qualified Products Listings. SCDOT does not intend to replace guardrail in areas where only pavement replacement is required and shoulder conditions will remain unchanged, unless damaged or defective.
32	Attach_B	Survey	Mobile LiDAR Data	Upon downloading the Mobile LiDAR Data zip files, it appears to us that some folders are empty. Could SCDOT provide the data?	No_Revision	Zip files will be available through ProjectWise for download.
33	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	pg 2 (pg 321 of pdf)	Please identify with a digital closed polygon file the area within which the Dept desires the Contractor to delineate and stake out potential jurisdictional areas with temporary barrier fence.	No_Revision	No features were delineated within the project boundary. No polygons available. Identification and delineation of features is the responsibility of the Contractor.
34	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	pg 2 (pg 321 of pdf)	How did the Dept determine there were WOUS in the 'project study area'? Did you delineate any areas? If so, please provide digital files. How did you determine they would be avoided? How close are WOUS to anticipated disturbance areas?	No_Revision	Aerial and NWI reviews. No delineations. Due to the nature of the work, it was not anticipated features would be impacted since work is limited to existing pavement sections and median and no new right of way acquisitions. Adjacent to right of way.



35	Attach_A	Exhibit 6	pg 2 (pg 321 of pdf)	In the event that federal and state permits are required for unavoidable alterations to wetlands, are HHI approvals also required for wetlands alterations, including PRM wetlands mitigation on HHI?	No_Revision	No additional approvals known to be required at this time.
36	Attach_A	Agreement	pg 16 of 90 (pg 66 of pdf)	Does Wetland and Stream Mitigation need to remain a contract deliverable? If so, will it be rendered N/A if there are no wetland or stream impacts?	No_Revision	Should remain. Yes would be NA with no impacts.
37	Attach_A	Agreement	pg 46 of 90 (pg 96 of pdf)	Please clarify what environmental commitments and environmental documents are applicable to this project. Exhibit 6 says no NEPA, but 'environmental commitments' and 'environmental document' are referenced throughout the RFP.	No_Revision	follow the commitments provided in Exhibit 6
38	Attach_B	Pavement	PG 1 of PDF	Would SCDOT consider increasing the RAP content of conventional hot mix asphalt base, intermediate, or surface mixes beyond the current specifications limits?	No_Revision	No. RAP content should follow the spec limits based on SC-M-407.
39	Attach_B	Pavement	PG 1 of PDF	Will SCDOT consider the use of an increased structural layer coefficient for modified asphalt?	No_Revision	Coefficient for modified asphalt will not be increased.
40	Attach_B	Pavement	PG 1 of PDF	Will SCDOT consider the use of an alternative pavement design theory that results in a structure less than what is given in the RFP?	No_Revision	No. Reduction in design structure number is not allowed as specified in the requirements for pavement ATC submittal.
41	RFP	3	PG 13 and 15 of PDF	Could the Department consider allowing an increase to the allowable number of ATCs? For instance 8 preliminary and 6 final ATC's?	Revision	SCDOT will revise to allow 6 Preliminary and 4 Final ATCs
42	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	PG 152 of PDF	Can the Department clarify the paragraph 2.7 Cross Slope requirement contained in Exhibit 4a, specifically with reference to cross slope corrections?	Revision	Cross slope verification per SCDOT's special provision is not a requirement of this project and is not SCDOT's intent. "Matching existing" pavement cross slopes is acceptable where practical. Any cross slope transitions shall occur using the appropriate longitudinal grade. Cross slope adjustment across bridges is not a requirement of this project. In areas where pavement is reconstructed and there is no pavement to match, provide 50:1 cross slopes. RFP Revision will be included to help clarify.
43	RFP	8	PG 40 of PDF	Can the Department look into creating more time between ATC submission and response to allow teams to react prior to proposal?	Revision	Revised milestone schedule
44						
45						
46						
47						
48						
49						
50						
51						
52						
53						



54						
55						
56						
57						
58						
59						
60						
61						
62						
63						
64						
65						
66						
67						
68						
69						
70						
71						
72						
73						
74						
75						
76						
77						
78						
79						
80						

