

PRECONSTRUCTION DESIGN MEMORANDUM

MEMO: PCDM-07

SUBJECT: PRECONSTRUCITON SUPPORT COMMENT MATRIX

The purpose of this memorandum is to establish a consistent process to manage comments and responses generated by Preconstruction Support during the Preconstruction Quality Assurance Review Process. Comments will be documented by Preconstruction Support using the attached comment matrix. A separate comment matrix will be generated by each design discipline within Preconstruction Support and returned to the appropriate project contact in accordance with PAM 4.

For projects with SCDOT managing the Project Development Process:

After implementation of the review comments, the appropriate project contact will return the comment matrix with responses and the revised plans to the applicable QA unit within Preconstruction Support. The Engineer of Record or his/her designee is responsible for completing the RESPONSE column for each comment. Upon review of the responses and verification of the revised plans, Support personnel will status the comments. Preconstruction Support will initial the plans when all comments are given a status of 4 or 5.

For Encroachment Permit Projects:

No further coordination with Support is required after receiving initial comments. District personnel are encouraged to take ownership of the comments and status the responses they receive based on their local experience and contextual knowledge of the specific site. Support will be available to offer additional guidance when resolving complex comments.

July 14, 2016

James W. Kendall, Jr.
Preconstruction Support Engineer

Effective Date

JWK:afg
Attachment
ec:

Ladd Gibson, Director of Preconstruction
Mike Barbee, Director of Rights of Way
Heather Robbins, Director of Environmental Services
Tony Fallaw, Director of Traffic Engineering
Herbert J. Cooper, Local Program Administrator

Brent Rewis, RP Engineer – Lowcountry
Leah Quattlebaum, RP Engineer - Pee Dee
John Boylston, RP Engineer - Midlands
Julie Barker, RP Engineer - Upstate
Steve Ikerd, FHWA
Tad Kitowicz, FHWA

File:PC/JWK



Preconstruction Support Review Comments



RD. / RTE. NO:		RD. / RTE. NAME:		PROJECT ID:	
COUNTY:		PROJECT DESCRIPTION:			
SUBMITTAL TYPE:		SUBMITTED BY:		RPG/DISTRICT /CONSULTANT	
REVIEWED BY :		REVIEW COMPLETION DATE:			

COMMENT NO.	REFERENCE (SHT NAME, NO., ETC.)	COMMENT	RESPONSE¹	STATUS²

Notes:

- 1. This section is to be completed by the Engineer of Record or his/her designee.*
- 2. The status will be completed by Support personnel.*

Preconstruction Support Review Comments



RD. / RTE. NO:	S-1234	RD. / RTE. NAME:	Generic Rd	PROJECT ID:	0012345
COUNTY:	Generic	PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	Generic Rd Widening Phase 1		
SUBMITTAL TYPE:	R/W	SUBMITTED BY:	Jane Doe (PM, Assistant PM, Design Lead)	RPG/DISTRICT /CONSULTANT	1
REVIEWED BY :	RDS	REVIEW COMPLETION DATE:	12/5/14; 1 st Rev 1/15/15; 2 nd Rev 4/12/15		

COMMENT NO.	REFERENCE (SHT NAME, NO., ETC.)	COMMENT	RESPONSE ¹	STATUS ²
1	??	Status 1 is given the initial time a comment is submitted.		1
2	??	Status 2 is utilized when a set plans or responses come back to the unit and the comment was not addressed in the plans nor was an adequate response provide by the designer.		2
2.1		A status 2 to will include a follow up comment by the reviewer trying to provide further clarification of the initial comment.	Number the 2 nd additional comment if Status is not closed.	
2.2			Number the 3 rd additional comment if Status is not closed	
3	??	Status 3 indicates that the designer has submitted an adequate response to the initial comment, but has not provided plans for the reviewer to verify or the change was not made to the plans that were submitted. Additionally if a comment is pertaining to a violation of one of the controlling criteria and a Design Exception is forth-coming a response may be given a 3.		3
3.1		A status 3 comment will contain a follow up statement indicating the responses appear acceptable pending verification of final plans or Design Exception.		

Comment Status: **1** = Comment Submitted; **2** = Unresolved; **3** = Resolved, Not Yet Implemented; **4** = Resolved as Noted; **5** = Closed

Preconstruction Support Review Comments



COMMENT NO.	REFERENCE (SHT NAME, NO., ETC.)	COMMENT	RESPONSE ¹	STATUS ²
4	??	Status 4 indicates that the reviewer and the designer/PM/DM have come to a crossroads in the review process where a compromise will need to be made in order for the comment to be resolved. There are many reasons why this would be necessary, one example would be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Violation of non-controlling criteria where the engineer of record has made the decision to move forward with a design that may not be consistent with Department's typical practices. 		4
4.1		Another follow up comment may state that the designer/PM/DM is making a decision that is inconsistent with Department practices and should proceed at their own risk/discretion.		
5	??	Status 5 indicates the comment has been resolved through either an adequate response or corrections made to the plans. There will be no follow up response for a status 5 comment.		5

Notes:

1. This section is to be completed by the Engineer of Record or his/her designee.
2. The status will be completed by Support personnel.