

**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS**  
**Carolina Crossroads Phase 3C --- I-20 Widening and Saluda River and CSX Bridge Replacements Design-Build Project**  
**Project ID P043325 - Lexington County**

**FINAL RFP - ROUND 2**

Date Posted: 12/17/2024

Non-Confidential Meeting Date: 12/19/2024

							SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation	
1	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-700	714.3.1.1 p. 2	Can existing 15" RCP drainage systems be retained for areas outside of median barrier replacement if hydraulic capacity is sufficient.	Hydrology	No_Revision	All 15-inch pipes are to be replaced per the RFP, regardless of hydraulic capacity of existing pipes.	
2	PIP	Roadway		In PIP/CCR Phase 3 Proposer Files.zip, no MicroStation files of the design were provided. Will these files be provided?	Roadway	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to provide these files.	
3	RFP	4	4.1	Are the technical proposal deliverables listed in Item 3e required since the same information will be provided in Item 3b?	Roadway	No_Revision	Yes, all items in both Sections 3b and 3e are required as separate deliverables as part of the Technical Proposal.	
4	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-140	FM Plans	Could SCDOT please share any meeting notes and provide a synopsis of additional private easement needed for the City of Columbia's force main relocation. Will SCDOT procure the ROW and who is responsible for the cost? If additional easement/ROW is required beyond what is shown in the draft plans or SCDOT's right-of-way, who is responsible for the acquisition and cost.	Utilities	Revision	The City of Columbia has acquired the easement needed for the alignment shown in the draft force main plans. This easement will be provided in a future addendum. Any additional easement needed will be the responsibility of the Contractor. No new ROW has been obtained for the force main relocation, and any ROW needed will be considered Additional ROW.	
5	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-140	Design Criteria	Does SCDOT have a memorandum of understanding with the City of Columbia to "pick up" where the review process was completed to date, or does the contractor assume that a new review of the design will be initiated as a new and separate project requiring standard review periods with the City of Columbia owner's representative reviewer? (I.e. Will the design-build team have to go through 30%, 60%, 100%, and RFC in-contract review submittal process?)	Utilities	Revision	There is no MOU executed with the City of Columbia regarding this relocation.  Additional information on the status of the review process with the City of Columbia will be provided in a future addendum.	



Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	SCDOT	
						Response	Explanation
6	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-140	Design Criteria	What coordination has been performed with CSX railroad in regards to the FM relocation, and have they been given notice regarding the change in schedule? Does SCDOT have an MOU with CSX stating that if no change to the design is made, re-initiating review is not required?	Utilities	No_Revision	CSX is aware of the work, and informal discussions on access have occurred, but no formal coordination or agreements are in place.
7	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-140	Design Criteria	As currently designed, the City's proposed relocation looks to be "near" bridge elements. Both SCDOT's UAM and the City's design criteria state their facilities should not be "near" bridge elements (foundations, fill, wall, etc.) Could you please clarify the clearance requirement needed or provide any correspondence the City's acceptance of the proposed location versus the bridge elements.	Utilities	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to provide a specific offset regarding the word "near" in the two documents referred to in the question.
8	Agreement_and_TPs	TP 140	8	It is stated in the RFP that utility adjustment work to existing City of Columbia facilities beyond the project limits shall be carried out through a Utility Agreement in accordance with Agreement Article 5. The City of Columbia Utility Relocation Design Criteria R2 states that the 30-inch force main is thought to be brittle if disturbed in any way and cautions that any work near this line could cause a fracture and a major sewer spill. With the brittle nature of this sewer line, it could be likely that the contractor will need to chase the relocation tie point back along the sewer line until suitable tie point is established. Could the SCDOT confirm the financial responsibility of any extended sewer bypass, extended sewer relocations and/or environmental cleanup that may be necessary in the event extended relocations are needed for the 30-inch forced main?	Utilities	No_Revision	Contractor shall follow the requirements of the Contract Documents in relation to this force main relocation.



						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
9	Agreement_and _TPs	TP 140	8	Could the SCDOT provide the status of any easement and permit acquisition that may have been started during development of the City of Columbia 30-inch Forced Sewer Main conceptual plans?	Utilities	Revision	SCDOT will provide the signed easement obtained by the City of Columbia in a future addendum. All necessary permits will be the responsibility of the contractor to complete alongside finalizing the 30-inch force main plans.

