

NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS

Carolina Crossroads Phase 3—I-20/26/126 System Interchanges Design-Build Project - Project ID P039720 - Richland and Lexington Counties

FINAL RFP - ROUND 5

Date Posted: 9/8/2023

Non-Confidential Meeting Date: 9/11/23

							SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation	
1	TPAs	Utilities	140-2	Based on previous working experience, The City of Columbia Water typically imposes a seasonal restriction of April 1st to October 31st when cutovers of large diameter waterlines cannot occur due to high demand. Please clarify if there will be restrictions on when cutovers for City of Columbia Water can occur.	Utilities	No_Revision	There are no seasonal restrictions contained in the City of Columbia's requirements for this project, per TPA 140-2.	
2	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-110	TP Table 110-2	Being that many of the telecommunication utility companies are critical to the schedule and have a limited number of approved designers and construction contractors, would SCDOT consider removing the requirement for 60% Utility plans for Telecommunication Utility Design Packages? Doing so, would help mitigate the risk of utility caused delays to the project.	Utilities	No_Revision	No change.	
3				The Town of Lexington has an Effluent Discharge Line that runs parallel to I-20 EB West of the Saluda River within the project ROW. Since this relocation would be eligible for Act 36, how would this relocation be handled pre or post award?	Utilities	Revision	Any facilities owned by the Town of Lexington would be considered In-Contract Utility Adjustment Work. The Town of Lexington will be added as a known utility in TP140.	



4	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement	157	19.9.3 - What is the typical review timeline for Enterprise Product Partners, LP to review request to work within their easement? How far in advance of anticipated work should these request be made?	Utilities	No_Revision	It is the Contractor's responsibility to coordinate reviews of Work adjacent to all Utilities. Timeframes for review would be contingent on the adjacent Work proposed.
5	PIP	Utilities		Will MOAs be executed in advance of the setting date so the "utility performed work" durations can be incorporated into the proposal CPM schedule?	Utilities	Revision	See section 5.16.2.1. MOA terms and conditions are established as of the Setting Date. See response to NCQ #6.
6	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement	36	5.16.2.1 - As the Effective Date is defined as the signing of the agreement, which is not until contract is awarded, this paragraph is interpreted to allow SCDOT to continue coordination with utility companies and amend MOAs and any other utility documentation throughout and after the RFP process. How can the Contractor rely on this information and include appropriate pricing and schedule if this information can change after the technical and cost submittals? Above question is #164 from RFP for IR#1. SCDOT answered that "The Contractor can rely upon all information provided as of the Setting Date" however the agreement language was not updated to reflect this response. Please update 5.16.2.1 to replace "Effective Date" with "Setting Date".	Legal	Revision	Section 5.16.2.1 to be revised to reflect 'Setting Date'.
7	TPAs	Utilities	140-2	Follow up to question 28 - Final RFP Round 2 The City of Columbia has typically not allowed variances for installing water mains under slopes steeper than 4:1 or not accessible with a standard 4-wheel drive truck without the use of casings. This requirement will likely require unreasonable lengths of casing along frontage roads where there is limited ROW. Will City of Columbia relax the requirement for 4:1 slopes? If not, how does SCDOT plan to handle this necessary schematic ROW required to accommodate this design criteria?	Utilities	No_Revision	The City of Columbia will review any variance requested by the EOR. Alternative designs that are feasible may be necessary to avoid Necessary Schematic ROW Changes. See Section 14.4.1.1.



8				<p>Based on past project history, AT&T is known for being a great risk to timely project completion. With the late change of AT&T design and construction to be out of contract there is not enough time to design around or resequence MOT to avoid significant schedule impacts. Furthermore this removes the opportunity to include AT&T in a Joint Use Duct Bank which occupies the limited available ROW for relocations to meet all utility and SCDOT clearance requirements, this will now most likely require necessary schematic ROW to accommodate.</p> <p>If AT&T is going to remain out of contract, can SCDOT provide a detailed schedule commitments for all AT&T relocations, so these critical items can be accounted for in the proposal CPM schedule.</p> <p>The schematic U-Sheets appear to assume AT&T would be in a Joint Use Duct Bank. Now that AT&T will be separate and will require additional space to accommodate, will this be considered necessary schematic ROW?</p>	Utilities	No_Revision	SCDOT cannot provide schedule commitments for Work not included in TP Section 140.4.4. It is the Contractor's responsibility to coordinate relocations and schedules for relocations. For all utilities that are not in-contract, their relocations would be subject to the standard encroachment permit process.
9	PIP	Utilities		How will cost and schedule impacts for utility relocations not identified in the MOA tables be handled? For example but not limited to telecommunication facilities along Jamil Road and SEGRA & Lumen at I-20 @ Bush River Road which are currently not included in the MOA tables.	Utilities	No_Revision	Pursuant to Section 5.16.2, Contractor may agree with a Utility Company to perform additional In-Contract Utility Adjustment Work.
10	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement		<p>Follow up to question 32 (Final RFP Round 3).</p> <p>If the MSA concept required a similar relocation, but did not account for the required area for temporary construction easements, will SCDOT consider modifying the cost responsibility associated with the previous response which states these areas are "Additional Areas"?</p>	Utilities	No_Revision	No change. The Contractor would be responsible for obtaining "permission" or securing as Additional Areas.
11	TPAs	Structures		Please provide As-Builts for EC-2101 (Stoop Creek Culvert under St. Andrews and I-26). The original sections built in 1956 cannot be found on the plans library.	Structures	Revision	The following Plans will be provided as a PIP document: ID #32.386, ID #3240.415, ID #32.704.2.



12	PIP	Hydrology	714-1	<p>SCDHEC took an average of 105 days to review and approve NOI applications on CCR1 and CCR2. The CCR3 Clearing and Grubbing NOI prepared by SCDOT took 146 calendar days for SCDHEC to review and approve.</p> <p>PIP 714-1 states 42 calendar days for review of Stormwater Construction Permit for Non-Coastal areas while Section 2.5 of the general permit states the review time as 20 business days.</p> <p>Please provide direction as to what duration should be carried in the technical proposal CPM schedule and provide a corresponding relief event for SCDHEC review in excess of stated review period.</p>	Hydrology	No_Revision	No change.
13	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-700	700.3.2.4	Please revise the criteria for location of fill walls to be the lesser of 1.2 times the wall height or 15 feet from the right of way.	Structures	Revision	For fill walls, TP 700 will be revised to reflect the lesser of 15' minimum offset or 1.2 x wall height, similar to cut walls.
14	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement	p.73	Please define the Final Completion Deadline. We recommend 180 days from Substantial Completion based on the size of this project.	Legal	No_Revision	See Exhibit 1 for the definition of Final Completion Deadline.
15	Agreement_and_TPs	Agreement	p.152	<p>19.1(b) - Being that Partial Acceptance appears to be optional for the Contractor to pursue prior to Substantial Completion and there is no Partial Acceptance deadline defined, please remove the Liquidated Damaged associated with Partial Acceptance.</p> <p>6.6.1.1 of the Agreement is acceptable as-is if no LDs are associated with Partial Acceptance.</p>	Legal		Question is under review and will be responded to in an upcoming posting. If changes are made, they will be reflected in a future addendum.
16	Agreement_and_TPs	Exhibit 1	Page 35	The RFP definition of a "Relief Event" includes: "discovery at, near or on the Project ROW, excluding Contractor Designated ROW and Replacement Utility Property Interests, of any Threatened or Endangered Species (regardless of whether the species is listed as threatened or endangered as of the Setting Date), excluding any such presence of the American Bald Eagle or other species known to Contractor prior to the Setting Date or that would become known to Contractor by undertaking Reasonable Investigation." Are the visual surveys for multiple bat species conducted by SCDOT in July 2023 considered a "Reasonable Investigation" such that discovery of any bats included in that survey would be a Relief Event?	Legal	Revision	The July 2023 assessment performed by SCDOT did not observe/locate any bats. The assessment will be provided as a Technical Provision Attachment in Addendum #11.



17	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-200	200.6.3.K	Per TP 200.6.3.K, pavement design with soil support data, traffic volumes and ESAL is to be provided in a separate electronic deliverable with the Final Roadway design plans. However, TP 400.3, SCDOT has performed existing pavement evaluations and has developed designs for new pavement for this Project. Please confirm no pavement design will be required with the Final Roadway package if RFP pavement designs are utilized.	Roadway	No_Revision	Confirmed. No pavement design will be required with the Final Roadway package where pavement designs from the RFP are utilized.
18	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-900	Page 612	TP 900.1 indicates that SCDOT is pursuing a targeted ENVISION V3 Gold Level of Award verification and INVEST PROGRAM Gold Rating certification for the Project." FHWA's Infrastructure Voluntary Evaluation Sustainability Tool (INVEST), is an online self-evaluation tool, (per FHWA's INVEST website) which "is not based on third-party validation of scores or certifications, scores are not considered recognition by FHWA that a project has met the achievement level of sustainability; but rather recognition that the user has self-evaluated their project and met the indicated achievement level." Confirm the full responsibility for this RFP requirement is the Contractor shall attend the kickoff meeting to discuss INVEST and fill out the online self-evaluation tool."	Environmental	No_Revision	For the INVEST program specifically, Contractor responsibility will be to attend kickoff meeting and provide supporting information, if needed.
19	Agreement_and_TPs	Exhibit 1	Page 8	Change in Law excludes "any change in, or new Law passed or adopted but yet effective as of the setting date." The USFWS expects to list the tricolored bat as endangered on Thursday, Sept 14, 2023 and the setting date for this proposal is Monday, Sept 18, 2023. Please include the uplisting of the tricolored bat as a Change in Law	Legal		Question is under review and will be responded to in an upcoming posting. If changes are made, they will be reflected in a future addendum.
20	TPAs	Right of Way	TPA 809-2	Please provide an updated version of the Moving Items Removal and Disposal Fencing and UST Quantities to reflect the anticipated Removal and Demolition Scopes as of the setting date.	ROW	Revision	An updated version of the Moving Items list will be provided.



21	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-600		The RFP Section 600.5.3 Final Work Zone Traffic Control Plans subsection F. indicates the Contractor is to provide a plan for maintaining positive temporary drainage during stages. Please confirm the temporary drainage deliverables includes plan views of temporary ditches, pipes, inlets and existing and final proposed structures utilized in each stage. Are other deliverables required for temporary drainage for this task?	Hydrology	No_Revision	MOT drainage requirements are provided in Section 714.3.1.6 in the RFP. The RFP provides criteria for the selection of the design frequency and the drainage requirements for the MOT Plans and Traffic Management Plan. Although there are no specific requirements for MOT drainage calculations, the Contractor shall be prepared to provide calculations as verification that the design criteria is satisfied during the design review process.
22	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-714		The RFP Section 714.3.1.6 Temporary Drainage Structures indicates the Contractor is to provide a plan that demonstrates how positive drainage will occur at traffic control staging transition points. Please confirm the temporary drainage deliverables include plan views that demonstrate how positive drainage will occur at traffic control staging transition points and include drainage plans to show locations of temporary drainage networks, outfall locations, and temporary drainage details. Additionally, the Contractor will provide a narrative for any box culvert or pipe construction in which flow must be maintained during installation. Are other deliverables required for temporary drainage to meet this objective?	Hydrology	No_Revision	MOT drainage requirements are provided in Section 714.3.1.6 in the RFP. The RFP provides criteria for the selection of the design frequency and the drainage requirements for the MOT Plans and Traffic Management Plan. Although there are no specific requirements for MOT drainage calculations, the Contractor shall be prepared to provide calculations as verification that the design criteria is satisfied during the design review process.
23	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-110		The TP Table 110-6 Submittal Summary table states that the Recovery Schedule shall be submitted "Within 10 BD of receipt of SCDOT written direction or when any Critical Path item slips by 30 CD days or more." Based on Addendum 6 this was changed from 30 CD to 60 CD, we request this change be reflected in the Summary table.	PM	Revision	Table 110-6 will be updated.
24	TPAs	Project Management	110-2_R2	Per TPA 110-2 Structural and Utility Shop Drawing Review Process, if 10 steel bridges were ready for review, 5 packages would need to be submitted per Column A restrictions. Regarding Column A package restrictions, please remove the cap from number of like items in the package.	PM		Question is under review and will be responded to in an upcoming posting. If changes are made, they will be reflected in a future addendum.
25	TPAs	Project Management	110-2_R2	Per TPA 110-2 Structural and Utility Shop Drawing Review Process, if a submittal rate of 4 packages per week was achieved in project execution, the final submittal would not be required to be returned for 50 days. (15 days initial submittal + (7 EA add'l submittals X 5 days per additional submittal). Please cap the initial submittal review maximum to a maximum of 25 calendar days.	PM		Question is under review and will be responded to in an upcoming posting. If changes are made, they will be reflected in a future addendum.



26	TPAs	Right of Way	809-1	Sheets 76 and 77 are missing for Schematic ROW Plans. This area covers the hotel along St Andrews Rd. In the deed for the hotel it mentions that the whole property has been purchased, but the current right of way file provided still shows a hole in the row/CA.	ROW	No_Revision	No change. SCDOT owns Tract 169.
27	TPAs	Right of Way	809-1	Schematic ROW Plans and other provided materials do not show driveways at all existing locations, particularly along frontage roads. This information is requested.	ROW	No_Revision	It is the Contractor's responsibility to obtain driveway permissions as needed.
28	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-700	TP 700.3.2.4	TP 700.3.2.4 provides criteria for proximity of both fill and cut walls with respect to adjacent ROW. In constrained areas could an 8' minimum offset for maintenance access be provided, independent of height of wall?	Structures	Revision	Will revise fill walls to lesser of 15' minimum offset or 1.2 x wall height, similar to cut walls.
29	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-700		Subsection 702.4.2.5 Mass Concrete Placement of the Supplemental Specifications states that the temperature of all mass concrete shall not exceed 80°F at the point of discharge. Thermal control plans, however, already have requirements associated to maximum temperature that will account for specific concrete and ambient temperatures as well as insulation levels. Thus, thermal analyses could indicate that concrete temperatures exceeding 80 °F (with certain combinations of ambient temperatures and insulation levels) will comply with the rest of the mass concrete criteria. Can the 80 °F mass concrete temperature limit be removed when using a thermal control plan that allows for higher placing temperatures while maintaining the rest of the mass concrete criteria?	Structures	No_Revision	This can be evaluated on a case by case basis with the appropriate supporting calculations and documentation.
30	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-700		Do the requirements of Standard Specifications subsection 712.4.8.3 Construction Casing apply to drilled shafts that are land shafts that do not go through water or need temporary casing? If the casing requirements do not apply, does this mean that mass concrete land shafts are exempt from the 35 °F maximum temperature differential stated in Subsection 702.4.2.5 Mass Concrete Placement of the Supplemental Specifications?	Structures	No_Revision	Steel Casings that are permanent follow the requirements of Section 712.4.8.3 of the Standard Specifications. Per Supplemental Specification 702.4.2.5, drilled shafts with permanent casing are exempt from maintaining a temperature differential of 35F.



31	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-700		Can a Performance-based Temperature Difference Limit (PBTDL) method be used to specify a temperature differential higher than 35 °F as stated in Subsection 702.4.2.5 Mass Concrete Placement of the Supplemental Specifications? ACI 301-20 Specifications for Concrete Construction allows for higher temperature differentials based on PBTDL results, which include maturity testing and thermal analyses.	Structures	No_Revision	Temperature differential will need to follow the specifications.
32	RFP			With the large files expected for the proposal, use of a high-end graphics computer would be ideal. Will SCDOT allow proponents to use their own computers and PDF copies of the proposal for the proposal presentation?	PM	Revision	The RFP will be revised to allow the Proposers to bring their own computers. Additional supporting documentation will not be allowed, per current language.
33	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-690		Per the RFP, the Contractor will acquire new roadway lighting electrical service connections for SCDOT. Please confirm accounts will be created under SCDOT name; and all account maintenance activities and billing from the origination date will be the sole responsibility of SCDOT.	Maintenance	No_Revision	SCDOT's preference is for the Contractor to have the meter can and new infrastructure ready to accept a meter from the service provider. SCDOT will evaluate and apply for the new electrical service, in SCDOT's name using our tax ID and other required customer details. SCDOT would begin receiving power bills for the new meter. This process would establish the new electrical service and billing but would not be an acceptance of the new infrastructure.
34	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-690		If the design builder is responsible for maintaining the new roadway lighting electrical service accounts, at what point in the construction process will they be transferred over to SCDOT?	Maintenance	No_Revision	See response to NCQ #33.
35	TPAs	Right of Way		We understood SCDOT was having an Environmental Study performed on the project and would indicated if hazardous or contaminated materials we contained in or on any bridges or buildings that were scheduled for removal. Has this been completed and when will this information be supplied?	PM	No_Revision	All bridge hazardous material investigations and reports are provided in PIP 160-5. SCDOT anticipates all building demolitions within the Phase 3 project area to be conducted outside of the Proposer's scope of work; therefore, these hazardous material investigations and reports will not be provided.



36	RFP	5	Page 37 of 57	The RFP states "The Committee may prepare Clarification and/or Communication questions and these questions may be sent to the Proposers by the SCDOT POC prior to the presentation." What date will the SCDOT provide those questions to the Proposer?	PM	Revision	The Milestone Schedule within the RFP will be updated to provide this date.
37	Agreement_and_TPs	TP-714		The SCDOT South Carolina Roadway Design Manual, Section 3.10.3.2 Inlet Spacing indicates a maximum spacing of 400 feet. SCDOT Requirements for Hydraulic Design Studies, Section 2.2.4 Inlet Spacing indicates maximum spacing is 900 feet. Please confirm a maximum 900 feet inlet spacing is acceptable.	Hydrology	Revision	The RHDS is the governing criteria. TP 714 will be revised.

