

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

RFP FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW

Date Posted: 9/10/2024

Non-Confidential Meeting Date: 9/12/24

							SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation	
1	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-140		Please provide relocation plans and schedule for the City of Columbia 30" Sanitary Sewer Force Main relocation to be completed under a separate contract.	Utilities	Revision	Files associated with the proposed utility relocation will be provided in the Project Information Package with the Final RFP and will be updated as the design is progressed.	
2	Agreement_and_TPs	TP 140 - Utilities	7	TP 140 (140.4.4.1) references the advanced relocation of the City of Columbia 30-inch sanitary sewer forced main, and requires the contractor to design around the proposed force main alignment, as provided in the Project Information Package. Proposed alignment is not available in PIP 140-7. Could available CAD / PDF files be provided showing the relocation alignment?	Utilities	Revision	Files associated with the proposed utility relocation will be provided in the Project Information Package with the Final RFP and will be updated as the design is progressed.	
3	Agreement_and_TPs	TP 140 - Utilities	7	TP 140 (140.4.4.1) - In reference to the advance relocation of the City of Columbia 30-inch sanitary sewer forced main, has the City of Columbia provided any separation values or other construction restrictions around their proposed 30-inch forced main alignment?	Utilities	Revision	Files associated with the proposed utility relocation will be provided in the Project Information Package with the Final RFP and will be updated as the design is progressed.	
4	RFP	3	17	RFP Section 3.13.1 - Please remove submission of Cost Proposals from the requirements to receive a stipend.	PM	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make revisions to this section.	
5	RFP	5		Please provide a list of items that SCDOT values for awarding Quality Credits and the associated quantity of quality credits for each item.	PM	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make revisions to this section.	
6	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-100		Please provide milestones dates for the projects listed in TP Table 100-2	PM	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make revisions to this section. Proposer to reference the SCDOT DB website and specific DB project website for applicable updates (for specific projects).	
7	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-700		The criteria for reinforced concrete walls states that retaining wall footings must be stepped when there is a change in grade. Please confirm this requirement does not apply to concrete median barriers and concrete roadside barriers where footings are traditionally sloped to follow the grade of the roadway.	Structures	No_Revision	This requirement does not apply to median barrier with grade separation or roadside barriers supported by moment slabs.	



							SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation	
8	TPAs	Structures		What AASHTO Ground Surface Roughness and Wind Exposure Category (B, C or D) are required to be used for the design of noise barrier O?	Structures	No_Revision	The EOR shall be responsible for determining this requirement.	
9	Agreement_and_TPs	TP 140 - Utilities	8	TP 140 (140.4.5) References a SCDOA fiber and the potential for relocation on this project. The SCDOA fiber needing relocation exists from near the intersection of Bush River Road and Bush River Road Ramp F Sta. 26+25 Rt to an existing handhole at approximate Station 4113+25 Lt along Bush River Road Ramp F per the PIP. This fiber appears to be outside of the project area based on this description of location and the representation of this fiber on U-Sheets. Since this fiber is outside of the limits of Phase 3C, please confirm that this fiber relocation is a requirement of this contract.	Utilities	No_Revision	Relocation of the SCDOA line is only required if the Contractor's design impacts the line. If impacted, SCDOA will be an in-contract utility.	
10	Agreement_and_TPs	TP 200 - Roadway	2	TP 200.3.3 section A specifies the I-20 outside shoulders carry a 12 ft paved and 2 ft earth shoulder, however a 12 ft total shoulder width is specified in section 100.3 "Basic Configuration". Please clarify the outside shoulder width is 12 ft paved and 2 ft earth (total 14') to use for this section of I-20.	Roadway	No_Revision	Outside shoulders shall be in accordance with TP 200.3.3 and TP 100.3. Additionally, see response to #21.	
11	Agreement_and_TPs	TP 200 - Roadway	4	TP 200.3.9 Clear Zones states "For those areas where no guardrail currently exists and no additional lane or adjacent ramps are proposed, design fill and cut slopes to obtain clear zones and avoid the need for protection." Has SCDOT identified specific areas outside of the proposed ultimate configuration that have clear zone concerns where improvements are needed? For example, does the area along I-20 WB between the project termini and US 378 need to be evaluated for clear zone requirements?	Roadway	No_Revision	Project termini should not be extended to solely address clear zone conditions.	
12	Agreement_and_TPs	TP 200 - Roadway	8	TP 200.6.1 states "Where tie-in locations are within 1,000 feet of other proposed roadway re-alignment, intersection improvements, or other work along the same road, resurface the existing roadway between the tie in and other proposed improvements to create uniform rideability and appearance". Recent imagery shows no active work currently occurring within 1,000 ft of the project limits. Has SCDOT identified any future projects that would be in construction during the work on phase 3C outside of the projects listed in TP Table 100-2?	Roadway	No_Revision	Currently, there are no proposed adjacent projects outside of those reflected in TP Table 100-2.	
13	Agreement_and_TPs	TP 700 - Structures	17	TP 700.4.1.3 - Will longitudinal (not transverse) grooving still be acceptable for stage constructed bridges?	Structures	No_Revision	Longitudinal grooving is allowed on staged constructed bridges on a case by case basis, with approval from the CCR Construction Manager.	



						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
14	RFP	3	PDF pg. 11	RFP, page 6 of 47, Is there a risk register developed by SCDOT or the prep team? Can this be shared?	PM	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to provide this information to Proposers.
15	RFP	3	PDF pg. 19	Does Section 3.10.5 preclude all VE from the project?	PM	No_Revision	No.
16	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement	PDF pg. 190	In addition, under 15.1.6 any SCDOT directive change needs to be mutually agreed.	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make revisions to this section.
17	RFP	4	PDF pg. 28	RFP, page 23 of 47, Can bridge construction access plan areas be shown on MOT drawings?	PM	No_Revision	Requirements for showing bridge construction access in the Conceptual Bridge Plans will remain. However, these areas can also be depicted in the MOT plans and reference can be made to the MOT plans from the bridge plans.
18	RFP	5	PDF pg. 34	RFP, page 29 of 47: Can SCDOT consider providing a breakdown of the QCM Score?	PM	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to provide this information to Proposers.
19	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement	PDF pg. 69	Section 1.5.3 states "Contractor shall promptly notify SCDOT". Promptly is defined as 2 business days. Can this be lengthened to five (5) business days?	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make revisions to this section.
20	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement	PDF pg. 99	Article 5.9.1 - Why a 6-month delay for RR ROW hold-offs?	Legal	No_Revision	The 6-month hold-off is the anticipated maximum period of time, following SCDOT's approval of ROW Plans and resolution of all CSX comments, for SCDOT to negotiate and execute a Construction Agreement with CSX RR for the applicable ROW associated with the rail crossing of I-20.
21	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement	PDF pg. 192 & 194	Article 16.3.1 and 16.5 - Is the 2.25M cost associated with only I-20 over CSX RR?	Legal	No_Revision	Yes.



						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
22	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement	PDF pg 193	Article 16.4.2.3 - This is not a condition that we can agree to, can it be removed from the RFP?	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make revisions to this section.
23	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-150	PDF pg. 434	TP 150 - 150.3 Is single span required?	Railroad	No_Revision	The bridge must span the entire railroad right of way. The bridge is not required to be a single span.
24	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-150	PDF pg. 434	Article 150.3 Is RR access road required under I-20 bridge? 1 side? both sides?	Railroad	No_Revision	Proposer to reference the CSX Public Policy Manual for required accommodations.
25	TPAs	Railroad		Will CSX Preliminary Engineering Agreement be revised for only the I-20 bridges?	Railroad	No_Revision	No.
26	PIP	Railroad		Construction Agreement with CSX references 1,958,393.00 reimbursable costs. Is this for I-20 over CSX, or all RR crossings in CCR?	Railroad	No_Revision	The cost referenced in the CSX Construction Agreement is specific to CCR Phase 1. This document is for information only.
27	RFP	4	PDF pg. 26	Will SCDOT reconsider using 11x17 plan and profile sheets or roll plot plan and profile sheets and not both for Appendix A.1 Conceptual Roadway Plans?	PM	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make revisions to this section.
28	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement	PDF pg. 192	Railroad coordination - Proposer has sole responsibility for RR coordination - any ability to change?	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make revisions to this section.
29	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement	PDF pg. 203	Bonding 18.2.4 - "demand upon and enforce any bond" - the use of "demand" in context of bond is a concern	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make revisions to this section.



						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
30	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement	PDF pg. 209	Any Cap on LDs? 19.1.2 references potential actual damages available to SCDOT, can LDs be capped at 10% of contract value	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make revisions to this section.
31	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement	PDF pg. 210	Article 19 (19.3.1.3). We disagree with attaching LDs to DBE performance, subcontractor payrolls, and OJT goals. This is a condition we have never seen before. Often times these shortcomings are outside the contractor's control.	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make revisions to this section. See Section 17.2.1(l) regarding Good Faith Efforts to meet the DBE goals. Also see Section 18.6.
32	Agreement_and_TPs	General		The RFP substantively differs from prior SCDOT RFPs, for example CCR2 and I-26/I-95, and seems aimed at the larger cancelled CCR procurement. Would SCDOT consider adjusting requirements more in line with the recent procurements? As written the requirements are out of scale for a project in the region of 175M-225M and will be disproportionately expensive, and this will be reflected in the Lump Sum Price.	PM	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make revisions per this request.
33	Agreement_and_TPs	Exhibit 6		Can a copy of the warranty bond form be provided?	Legal	No_Revision	A copy of the form is available on SCDOT's website.
34	Agreement_and_TPs	Utilities	PDF pg.428	When will the existing 30" sanitary sewer relocation be completed?	Utilities	No_Revision	See Design Build Agreement Section 5.16.12.
35	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement	PDF pg. 172	Section 14.2.3, bullets a-b, Why is PSPL required for contractor and subcontractors, these policies bring little value to SCDOT at cost premium? Also, JVs have to purchase project-specific policies at considerable cost vs, single proposer who is capable of using their corporate blanket policy, putting two of the shortlisted teams at a disadvantage in terms of cost competitiveness	Legal	No_Revision	JV members may use their own separate corporate insurance policies so long as the available coverage adds up to the amounts required by Exhibit 7, Section 1.F.1 and sufficient reserves exist to provide coverage for the Project. Designer professional liability insurance does not need to be project specific.
36	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement	PDF pg. 172	Section 14.2.3, bullet c, Is this calculation intended to reflect job site overhead during the 'design phase' of the contract?	Construction	No_Revision	No. The reason for extended jobsite overhead during the noted duration is to capture additional costs at contractor's peak production.
37	TPAs	Environmental	TPA 160-5 64 of 151	What are the construction access methods that are approved for use in the Saluda River?	Environmental	No_Revision	This question is not within the scope of SCDOT authority to determine. Contractor is responsible for making this determination in coordination with applicable regulatory agencies.



Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	SCDOT	
						Response	Explanation
38	TPAs	Environmental	TPA 160-5 65 of 151	Please provide insight into why wetland 9 is permitted to be filled but the approved impact for Tributary 27 is pipe 'extension' and armoring? Can we assume that this stream can be diverted to the toe of slope and filled and that not be considered 'greater impact' than a pipe 'extension'?	Environmental	No_Revision	This question is not within the scope of SCDOT authority to determine. Contractor is responsible for making this determination in coordination with applicable regulatory agencies.
39	TPAs	General		On previous SCDOT D-B projects, SCDOT provided supplemental design criteria and data under Attachment B which were used as part of the basis of design (survey, geotechnical data, lead/aesbestos report, etc). Will SCDOT provide clarification on what data/information is considered supplemental project design critia (Attachment B) and what is considered "Project Information Package" (for information only)?	PM	No_Revision	Proposer should reference the Instructions to Proposers (Section 2.3) and Design-Build Agreement (Sections 1.2.1 and 1.6).
40	Agreement_and _TPs	Agreement	PDF pg. 88	Section 4.2.2 Site Conditions, Pg 26 of DBA- Section provides the following - Contractor shall bear the risk of changes in surface topography, variations in subsurface moisture content, subsurface conditions, and variations in groundwater levels. Please delete this and allow same to be considered a DCS	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make revisions to this section.
41	Agreement_and _TPs	Agreement	PDF pg. 89	Section 4.3.5 (c) and (d) Governmental Approvals, Pg 27 of DBA - Section provides that contractor risk include the following (c) Obtaining, maintaining, and complying with all necessary new Governmental Approvals; (d) Obtaining, maintaining, and complying with all necessary modifications, renewals and extensions of the NEPA Approval or other existing Governmental Approvals These are risk best carried by SCDOPT and not Contractor and should be deleted	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make revisions to this section.
42	Agreement_and _TPs	Agreement	PDF pg. 90	Section 4.3.10 Environmental approvals, Page 28 of DBA - Section 4.3.10.1, Section 4.3.10.2, and Section 4.3.10.3.section is Litigation involving Environmental Approvals and provides that Contractor is obligated to pay legal fees and cost in regards to such litigation even if such is not due to its action or omissions. This should be a SCDOT cost and should be deleted.	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make revisions to this section.



Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	SCDOT	
						Response	Explanation
43	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement	PDF pg. 160	Section 12.5 (c) No Limitation of Liability or Remedies, page 98 of DBA - Section provides that Warranties Do not constitute a contractual or other limitation or repose period on any 26 Claims, rights or remedies available to SCDOT for patent or latent Errors, Defects or deficiencies in design, construction or other Work of Contractor, which Claims, rights and remedies are 28 subject only to applicable statutes of limitation and statutes of repose Please delete the provision for Patent errors, etc. to be consistent with SC law.	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make revisions to this section.
44	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement	PDF pg. 173	Section 14.1.1.3 (a) Relief Event Claim process, page 111 of DBA - Section provides - If the occurrence of one or more Force Majeure Events causes a substantial price escalation of materials, commodities, or supplies necessary for the completion 9 of the Project, SCDOT will evaluate the cause of the price escalation, its duration, its impact on 10 the Project, the availability of alternative materials or designs, and other related to factors to determine within its sole discretion, whether to make an adjustment to the Contract Price for the affected materials, commodities or supplies. Whether a price increase of an affected material, commodity or supply is "substantial" is also within SCDOT's sole discretion. These should not be subject to sole discretion a of SCDOT so as to be subject to the Dispute resolution provisions.	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make revisions to this section.
45	Agreement_and_TPs	Exhibit 1	PDF pg. 263	Exhibit 1, page 14 of exhibit 1 - Definition excludes - (c) Variations in subsurface moisture content and variations in the water table; This should be included as a DSC , please revise	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make revisions to this section.
46	Agreement_and_TPs	Exhibit 1	PDF pg. 271	Exhibit 1, page 22 of exhibit 1 - Definition of Governmental Rules" or "Law" excludes those by SCDOT within the scope of its administration of the Contract Documents); These should be included within the definition . Please revise	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make revisions to this section.
47	Agreement_and_TPs	Exhibit 1	PDF pg. 274	Exhibit 1, page 25 of exhibit 1 -definition of Known or Suspected Haz Mat includes (d)asbestos located in any building remaining in the Project ROW at the time the corresponding parcel is turned over to Contractor This should be excluded and made subject of a Relief Event.	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make revisions to this section.



Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	SCDOT	
						Response	Explanation
48	Agreement_and_TPs	Exhibit 1	PDF pg. 276	Exhibit 1, page 27 of exhibit 1 -Definition of "No Prior Rights Arrangements" provides that Contractor has no Claim, or basis for Claim, for additional time or compensation arising out of or relating to Delays or additional costs incurred relating to No Prior Rights Arrangement Utility Adjustments. Since SCDOT has senior rights to those of the utilities , this is a risk that SCDOT can mitigate and Contractor should not have to bear the risk. Please allow recovery as a Relief event.	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make revisions to this section.
49	Agreement_and_TPs	Exhibit 1	PDF pg. 281	Exhibit 1, page 32 of exhibit 1 - Treatment of Additional Right of Way under the definition - issues found orliacted [sic] on Additional Right of Way should be treated similar to Project ROW for Relieve Event purposes as its necessary for the approved design.	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make revisions to this section.
50	Agreement_and_TPs	Exhibit 1	PDF pg 283	Exhibit 1, page 34 of exhibit 1 - Definition provides that means a Delay to a Controlling Work Item, after consumption of all Float available pursuant to Section 7.10.2 of the Agreement, as a direct result of a Relief Event that could not be avoided by Contractor; provided, however, such Delay excludes Delay due to Loss, damage or destruction described in Section 11.3.2 of the Agreement. This is vague and hard to understand. Please delete this exclusion.	Legal	No_Revision	SCDOT declines to make revisions to this section.
51	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement	PDF pg. 143	Is the reference to "proposal due date" applicable to the technical proposal (2/25/25) or the price proposal (4/17/25)?	Legal	Revision	This reference would be applicable to the Cost Proposal date as this is when the entire Proposal will have been submitted. To further clarify, the definition of 'Proposal' will be revised to specify its inclusions. Additionally, other references to the term 'Proposal Due Date' within the Contract Documents will be evaluated for applicable revisions to clarify intent specific to the Technical Proposal or Cost Proposal.
52	Agreement_and_TPs	Exhibit 1	PDF pg 257	Exhibit 1, page 8 of exhibit 1 - Term Change in law excludes - Any change in, or new, Law of the State that also constitutes or causes a change in, or new, Utility Adjustment Standards; This should be a change to which Contractor has the right to a Relief Event so please delete	Legal		No response at this time. Comment is under review by SCDOT and will be answered at a later date.
53	RFP	3		Please consider increasing the number of PATCs to 25 and the number of FATCs to 15.	PM	Revision	Contract Documents will be revised to increase the number of PATCs to 25 and FATCs to 15.



Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	SCDOT	
						Response	Explanation
54	RFP	3	PDF pg. 14	Will SCDOT allow us to submit 20 final ATCs?	PM	Revision	See response to comment #1.
55	RFP	4	PDF pg. 29	Appendix A.4 on page 29 of the RFP and Appendix B section I on page 30 both require a CPM schedule. Can SCDOT explain the difference in what they would like to see or is there a preferred place SCDOT would like to see the CPM schedule?	PM	Revision	The CPM Schedule shall be submitted as reflected in Appendix A.4. The submittal of CPM Schedule in Appendix B will be removed.
56	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement	PDF pg. 209	LDs at \$60,000 per day seems excessive, would SCDOT consider reducing the LDs to a \$/day commensurate to the value of the project (\$175M-\$225M), larger LDs drives up the contingency added to the price.	Legal	Revision	Contract documents will be revised to reflect a reduced Liquidated Damages value of \$10,000/day for delay beyond the Substantial Completion Deadline.
57	Agreement_and_TPs	Exhibit 5	PDF pg. 315	What is the key personnel Liquidated damages? The RFP refers to the SCDOT being able to withhold a % of progress payments, this reads as a temp measure until a vacant position is filled. Are these withholdings deemed as LDs or otherwise permanent	Legal	Revision	Key Personnel Liquidated Damages will be removed from the Contract Documents.
58	Agreement_and_TPs	Exhibit 1	PDF pg. 268	Exhibit 1, Page 19 of exhibit 1 - Definition includes - (b) =A Change in Law or regulation after the Effective Date directly and substantially affecting performance of the Project; Change in Law should not be a Force Majeure Event but a stand alone relief r=event [sic] as it is also defined as a Relief Event under that definition. Please revise	Legal	Revision	Change in Law to be removed from the definition of Force Majeure.
59	RFP	4	26	RFP Section 4.3 states that if a Proposer elects to waive the stipend a redacted copy can be submitted, however RFP Section 4.4 requires Proposers to submit a redacted copy even in the absence of confidential information.	PM	Revision	Contract Documents will be revised to clarify these requirements.
60	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-900		TP 900 is listed in the index but not provided. Please provide or remove from Index.	PM	Revision	Contract Documents will be revised to include TP 900.



						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
61	PIP	General		The current PIP number 100-1 is named CCR Phase 3C Ultimate Conditions but the schematic is for the Interim Condition. Similarly, PIP number 100-2 is named CCR Phase 3C Interim Conditions but the schematic is for the Ultimate Condition.	PM	Revision	Contract Documents will be revised per this comment.
62	TPAs	General		AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 8th Edition (2017) is referenced in TPA 100-1. However, recently released DM0224 requires new SCDOT projects to be designed using the 9th Edition (2020). Please clarify which specification should be used for this project.	Structures	Revision	Confirmed. This project is updated to the 9th edition based on the design memo. Contract documents will be revised accordingly.
63	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-1000		Special Provision 65 Noise Barrier Walls: Item B paragraph 4, On the top panel on the interstate side, please allow a "smooth" finish on the top two feet of the panel to provide the appearance of a concrete coping.	Structures	Revision	Smooth finish is allowed on the top two feet of the panel. Contract documents to be revised accordingly.
64	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-1000		The Full Depth Patching Special Provision is not included in TP 1000	Pavement	Revision	Contract Documents will be revised per this comment.
65	Agreement_and_TPs	TP 100 - General	8	TP 100.5.3.4 - Managers meetings indicate the attendance of the safety manager, which is no longer a named position in the SOQ. Confirm need for safety manager in Executive Management Meetings.	PM	Revision	Contract Documents will be revised per this comment.
66	Agreement_and_TPs	TP 100 - General	10	TP 100.5.3.11 - Given the size of 3C phase, confirm need for weekly materials meetings.	PM	Revision	Contract Documents will be revised per this comment.
67	Agreement_and_TPs	TP 140 - Utilities	7	TP 140 (140.4.4.1), in reference to the advance relocation of the City of Columbia 30-inch sanitary sewer forced main, will the existing forced main and casing be removed as part of the advanced relocation near the railroad bridge?	Utilities	Revision	No, the work to abandon will be included in the Phase 3C contractor's scope of work and will be updated in the contract documents.



Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	SCDOT	
						Response	Explanation
68	Agreement_and_TPs	TP 200 - Roadway	2	Can SCDOT clarify if 12ft or 14ft width shoulders are required in front of roadside rigid barriers?	Roadway	Revision	A minimum of 12' paved shoulders is required in front of rigid barrier.
69	Agreement_and_TPs	TP 700 - Structures	14	TP 700.3.3.1 Two paragraphs reference barrier stability analysis, one references the use of TL 4 impact forces (54kips), the other indicates the use of 10kips. Can SCDOT clarify the use of the two forces?	Structures	Revision	A 10-kip force is to be used for stability analysis of barrier and TL-4 (54-kip) force is to be used for design of structural elements. Contract documents will be revised accordingly.
70	Agreement_and_TPs	TP 700 - Structures	16	TP 700.4.1.2 - Given that the two structures in this project are over a river and a railroad, confirm the intent to require final finish on beams and substructures.	Structures	Revision	The I-20 railroad bridge will require final surface treatment as required by Item A only, and the I-20 bridge over the Saluda River will require treatment as required by Items A through C. Contract documents will be revised accordingly.
71	Agreement_and_TPs	TP 714 - Hydraulics	4	TP Table 714-1 lists pre-post requirements for RD S-31. This location appears to be outside of the limits of Phase 3C. Please confirm if analysis of this outfall is required for this project.	Hydrology	Revision	The analysis of this outfall along Road S-31 is not required for this project; contract documents will be revised accordingly.
72	Agreement_and_TPs	TP 714 - Hydraulics	12	TP 714 states "In addition to the 1-D modeling required for the Saluda River, perform hydraulic studies for new and existing bridge structures located along the Saluda River using an approved 2-D modeling software." What design criteria will the results of the 2-D model be used for?	Hydrology	Revision	Additional information will be provided in TP 714 regarding the 2D hydraulic analysis for the Saluda River.
73	Agreement_and_TPs	TP 714 - Hydraulics	13	TP 714.3.3 says the Project falls within FEMA FIRMs 45079C0236L for Richland County and 45063C0161J for Lexington County. Phase 3C limits appear to only span 45063C0144J and 45063C0163J for Lexington County. Please confirm 4507C0236L and 45063C061J are not required.	Hydrology	Revision	The references to FEMA floodplain mapping will be revised in TP Section 714.3.3.
74	Agreement_and_TPs	TP 714 - Hydraulics	13	TP 714.3.3 states "The Project will cross the special flood hazard area associated with Stoop Creek." This crossing appears to be outside of Phase 3C limits. Please confirm no work is required for this crossing as a part of this project.	Hydrology	Revision	No work is required in the vicinity of Stoop Creek. TP Section 714.3.3 will be revised.



							SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation	
75	Agreement_and_TPs	TP 714 - Hydraulics	13	TP 714.3.3 states "The Project will cross the special flood hazard area associated with Senn Branch." This crossing appears to be outside of Phase 3C limits. Please confirm no work is required for this crossing as a part of this project.	Hydrology	Revision	No work is required in the vicinity of Senn Branch. TP Section 714.3.3 will be revised.	
76	TPAs	Signing	650-1	Conceptual signing plan appears to have comments that do not appear addressed in the concept layout. Can SCDOT provide the completed signing concept plan?	Traffic	Revision	TPA has been updated with the correct file.	
77	Agreement_and_TPs	5	PDF pg. 546	Section 714.3.2.1 states to use the USGS gage at Riverbanks Zoo as the minimum downstream limit for the analysis. This is approximately 7000 ft downstream from the I-26 bridge. Will we be provided with the proposed bridge/bridges configuration for I-26 to incorporate in our hydraulic model?	Hydrology	Revision	The hydraulic modeling for Phase 3C should reflect conditions at the completion of Phase 1 as the existing conditions. Design data for Phase 1 will be included in the Project Information Package.	
78	Agreement_and_TPs	Roadway	PDF pg. 462	TP 200-Page 11 Line 36 states that "All design files will be developed using Microstation and Geopak software." Will Openroads Designer be allowed for use on the project?	Roadway	Revision	OpenRoads Designer may be utilized for design but Microstation and Geopak files shall be submitted for deliverables, in addition to the OpenRoads files. Contract Documents will be revised accordingly.	
79	Agreement_and_TPs	TP 100 - General	PDF pg. 330	TP 100.3, Items D.1.a and D.1.b appear to contradict each other. For I-20 Westbound, please clarify where to begin the 12' permanent inside shoulder width, and where the department prefers to tie-in to the existing inside shoulder width.	PM	Revision	Contract Documents will be revised per this comment.	

