

**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS  
I-85 at I-385 Interchange Improvement - Project ID P042302 - Greenville County**

**RFP FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW**

Date Received:		3/21/2024					Non-Confidential Meeting Date: 3/28/2024	
SCDOT								
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation	
1	RFP	8	33 of 40	Technical Proposal Presentation Date seems incorrect. Please clarify.	PM	Revision	The date will be corrected in the Final RFP. The date is July 29, 2024.	
2	RFP	3	8 of 40	Per section 3.8, a maximum of 10 formal ATC's may be submitted. If during SCDOT's initial review, one or more of the team's ATC's are deemed not favorable by the Department and the team decides to abandon that ATC, may the team submit a different ATC in its place as part of the final 10 ATC submittal. In this scenario, we understand there is no mechanism at that time for SCDOT to ask clarification questions about the new ATC or the team to revise it in any form.	PM	Revision	We will revise the final RFP to allow teams to replace an ATC in the second submittal that was deemed not favorable by the department in the first submittal. There will be cap on the number that can be resubmitted and this will be adjusted based on the number of ATCs allowed in a given procurement.	
3	RFP	8	33 of 40	According to the milestone schedule, there appears to only be one week between SCDOT initial ATC review response and the final ATC submittal. Knowing that this could require additional documentation/analysis, would it be possible to extend this timeframe by one week? To accommodate this, we would propose SCDOT's final determination of ATC's and the Technical Proposal Submittal date also be extended by one week, but the Submittal of the Cost Proposal date remain unchanged.	PM	Revision	We will look at the schedule and see if there is a way to give more time in the ATC process for this project and give that, if possible.	
4	Attach_A	Exhibit_4b	9	Section 2.2.1 indicates that barrier analysis need not be considered for collision events provided it is backfilled with granular material. What is the expectation of the wall posts/panels mounted above the barrier? Do these elements need to be designed to withstand collision forces consistent with the soundwall criteria in LRFD? Or are collision forces on panel and/or posts to be ignored provided there is similar backfill behind elements?	Structures	Revision	Posts and panels above the barrier are not required to be checked for collision force.	
5	RFP	3	8 of 40	Since each wall has a specific rehab measure described in Exhibit 4b, if the Team proposes a different approach for a wall type, will separate ATC's be required for each wall location? Or will one ATC of details be acceptable for multiple similar walls throughout the project?	Structures	Revision	One ATC for multiple locations is acceptable if the facing concept is the same.	
6	PIP	Traffic	Volumes	Can SCDOT confirm if the provided traffic volumes are per lane or if they are total volumes for the respective facilities? Also, since they are in the PIP, can these volumes be used for teams to determine when lane closures can occur, or is the team responsible for obtaining their own volume numbers for establishing closure windows?	Traffic	Revision	The volumes are total volumes for the facility that the measurement is on. The volumes provided in the PIP can be used and will be moved to Attachment B.	