

**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DESIGN-BUILD QUESTIONS
I-77 Exit 26 Interchange - P042443 - Richland County**

RFP FOR INDUSTRY REVIEW 3

| Question No. | Category | Section | Page / Doc No. | Question/Comment | Discipline | SCDOT | |
|--------------|----------|------------|----------------|---|--------------|-------------|---|
| | | | | | | Response | Explanation |
| 1 | Attach_B | | Construction | IR RFP # 2, Question 4 Follow Up: Please provide the date of availability of the Scout Site Development fill located within the project limits. Additionally please provide information regarding settlement monitoring and associated settlement waiting periods that Proposers should include within the CPM Schedule? | Construction | Revision | RFP will be revised to provide anticipated scout site grading completion date. To our knowledge, settlement monitoring is only being conducted in significantly deep fills on the Scout site in existing wetland areas. We understand settlement monitoring is not being conducted in the vicinity of the proposed interchange and are not aware of any significant settlement waiting periods. |
| 2 | Attach_B | Hydraulics | | Can SCDOT provide any supporting calculations or model files for the proposed detention basin between STA 125+00 to 127+00 LT (inside horseshoe) along Connector Rd as shown in the provided Scout Development grading file? | Hydrology | No_Revision | Requesting info from T&H |
| 3 | Attach_B | | Construction | IR RFP # 2, Question 4 Follow Up: Please provide the SWPPP and the SCDHEC NOI for the grading to be completed within the proposed SCDOT ROW by the Scout Site Developer. | Hydrology | No_Revision | Requesting info from T&H |
| 4 | Attach_B | Hydraulics | Page 6 of 2109 | Line number 24 of the pipe inspection report lists a 409 ft long 84"x84" box at I-77 Station 1660+00. This pipe does not appear in the survey nor is it visible on the plans as reference. Please confirm this box is in place and the size is correct. Please provide updated survey file with box shown. | Hydrology | Revision | Pipe Inspection Report will be revised. The correct box size is 96 by 84 and is at station 1653+00. |
| 5 | Attach_A | Exhibit 5 | 346 | Exhibit 5 Section 714 states that pipes should be replaced or removed based on Pipe Inspection Report included in Attachment B. Pipes that are not recommended to be replaced in the Inspection Report can be replaced but will be at no cost the SCDOT. However who is responsible for the cost if pipe is deemed hydraulically deficient and needs to be replaced, the department or THE CONTRACTOR? | Hydrology | Revision | Revise to clarify exhibit 5 to state that contractor is responsible for costs if existing pipe is determined to be hydraulically deficient by their design. |
| 6 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4e | | Section 2.1.19 - Cross-line pipes within the project limits which have not been inspected shall be replaced when needed for proposed design. Only Pipes or culverts required for final design within the base scope of work (exhibit 3) and project limits excluding rehab limits are required to be repaired or replaced. Will repairs to existing box culverts, that have not been inspected but are hydraulically sufficient for the proposed design, be paid for as extra work? | Hydrology | Revision | Yes if work is required on drainage features (pipes/culverts) not inspected, the work would require a change order. |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------|------------|--------------------------------------|--|-----------|-------------|---|
| 7 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4e | | Section 2.1.17 States "Work on structures is not prescribed unless a proposers design impacts the structure.". Please define/clarify "impacts". Does impact include adding additional runoff to a structure? What if additional runoff doesn't impact the size of the structure? | Hydrology | Revision | The structure may remain if it has adequate capacity. |
| 8 | | | | Can SCDOT identify where the new concrete pavement for ramps will begin and terminate (ie. Gore to crossing route)? | Pavement | Revision | RFP will be revised to define the ramp limits. |
| 9 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4c | Page 187 of 396 | Section 2.1.1 recommends that the existing concrete shall be untied to new concrete. Could SCDOT consider having those tied in order to prevent vertical cracking in the pavement due to poor drainage? | Pavement | No_Revision | No. The existing CRC pavement and the new JPCP will behave differently, which could develop sympathy cracks. Having these risks is more critical as compared to having wider joints based on previous experiences on I-77 projects. |
| 10 | Attach_A | Exhibit 5 | | Please confirm full depth patching quantities in Sections 401 (2,000 SY page 33) and 502 (6,000 SY page 59) are correct. For example 6,000 square yards of concrete patching correlates to 4500 LF of a single 12' lane. Please identify where the anticipated areas of required patching are generally located. There's a significant cost difference for time, MOT setup and saw cutting depending on whether or not these patching areas are continuous or hop scotch pattern | Pavement | No_Revision | The patching quantities in the RFP were conservatively estimated based on a very brief visual observation of the existing pavements. The teams should make their own assessments based on the repair procedures provided in Attachment B. |
| 11 | Attach_B | | Construction | IR RFP # 2, Question 5 Follow Up: There are three runs of pipe that cross between Scout property and proposed SCDOT ROW in the Scout Site Grading Model and the conceptual roadway plans. Also there is a detention pond shown in the Scout Site Grading model. Please provide a detailed scope list of all work the Scout Site developer will complete within the proposed SCDOT ROW and associated design and calculations for any of these elements. | PM | No_Revision | SCDOT does not have any calculations associated with the Scout Site Grading model. Drainage encroachment for the scout project will be addressed through encroachment permits. |
| 12 | | | | SCDOT has responded to previous questions regarding SCDHEC NOI reviews that this is a "High priority project for the state. We do not anticipate any issues or delays". Unfortunately this has not been the case for several other "high priority" projects within the state. Can SCDOT confirm that the 42 day review duration in the RFP is the review period required by all teams in their proposal CPM Schedules? | PM | No_Revision | No, This information is available on the SCDHEC website and will be removed from the PIP. The 42 days is provided from SCDHEC as an approximation of the duration of reviews for all teams. |
| 13 | RFP | 8 | Milestone Schedule Page 45 of 398 | Please confirm that CPM schedule and Narrative referenced for submittal on June 25, 2024, and for discussion on July 3, 2024 are both DRAFT, not final. Please clarify by adding DRAFT to the Milestone Schedule. | PM | Revision | Milestone Schedule will be updated in Final RFP. |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------|-----------|--------------------------------------|--|----------|-------------|--|
| 14 | RFP | 8 | Milestone Schedule Page 45 of 398 | Please consider moving the submittal of the CPM Schedule & Narrative to a June 11, 2024 submittal, and a June 19, 2024 One-on-One Meeting, to allow more time to address questions/comments prior to technical submittal. This will provide 4 weeks between meeting and final submittal with Technical Proposal. | PM | No_Revision | This could hinder the teams ability to include approved ATCs in the CPM Schedule and Narrative. |
| 15 | Attach_A | Agreement | Section IV.B. Page 85 of 398 | In a previous Open Forum, SCDOT indicated that third party coordination conflicts would be addressed in a subsequent RFP. Those items have not been addressed to date. Please include a prioritization list for third party conflicts during construction between SCOUT, NSRR, Richland County, and Utility Companies who will all be working in the same areas. Please add third part coordination delays to the Time Extension section in the Agreement under Section IV.B. | PM | No_Revision | SCDOT is looking into revising this language. |
| 16 | RFP | 3 | Section 3.8.1 / Page 13 of 398 | Section 3.8.1 lists several scenarios pertaining to whether or not an ATC needs to be submitted. To be more clear, section 3.8.1.b specifies that an ATC is required when design extends beyond the study area, and 3.8.1.c specifies that an ATC is required if impacts are increased or if design extends beyond the proposed right of way. The inclusion of the toe-ditch detail will extend construction limits beyond the proposed right of way along US 21 and Scout Motors Drive (Connector Road) in multiple areas. Is the design provided in the PIP a "preferred alternative" as defined above? Please confirm whether or not an ATC will be required for any design east of I-77 that extends beyond the proposed right of way shown in Roadway Figure 2 of Attachment B. | PM | Revision | An ATC is not required for a shift to the alignment on the East side of I-77. Any shift in alignment should minimize environmental impacts. SCDOT will further clarify in final RFP. |
| 17 | PIP | Railroad | Page 105 of 113 | The 75% plans show proposed dual 42" steel crossline pipe under the proposed NSRR spur line at approx. station 28+00. Will the roadway drainage from the southern end of US 21 (currently proposed outfalling to NSRR ROW) be allowed to utilize the dual 42" pipes? Will design build team be required to coordinate their drainage calculations with NSRR and if it is determined the dual 42" pipes need to be upsized, who is responsible for the additional costs? | Railroad | No_Revision | Yes, roadway drainage must convey through the dual 42" pipes. These pipes cannot be upsized. |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------|-----------|-----------------------------------|--|----------|-------------|--|
| 18 | Attach_A | Agreement | Section VII.B Page 94 of 398 | In the response to Question 30 in the "IR2_Non-Confidential Question and Answers-R1", SCDOT indicated that "NSRR'S full time inspector is being provided by NSRR at their cost... and their duties include coordination with SCDOT for construction of the US-21 Reloc bridge." Section VII.B.4 of the RFP still indicates that the "CONTRACTOR shall be responsible for all costs to the Railroad Company or Companies for services provided by the Railroad or the Railroad's Agent... This includes all expenses such as railroad flagging operations." Please revise Section VII.B to clarify that these costs will be born by NSRR as noted in the question response. | Railroad | No_Revision | Article VII.B was revised last round that the provisions of that article apply only where a contractor conducts an action on NSRR ROW (i.e. the existing track east side of US-21 should a contractor propose to) where formal coordination and agreements would be required by NSRR. Exhibit 7 states that NSRR will be under the relocated US-21 bridge by encroachment. |
| 19 | Attach_A | Agreement | Section VII.B Page 94 of 398 | In the response to Question 29 in the "IR2_Non-Confidential Question and Answers-R1" regarding the estimated total cost to include in the bid for services provided by the Railroad or their agent, SCDOT indicated that "Per NSRR, the spur is not an in-service rail". Please revise Section VII.B to clarify that the contractor will not be responsible for costs related to impacting the railroad spur if it is not in service. | Railroad | No_Revision | Neither SCDOT nor Contractor will be invoiced for this inspector. Flagging, insurance, or other typical RR Agreements or costs do not apply to the spur crossing. |
| 20 | PIP | Roadway | | Are there any updates regarding question 102 from the RFP for IR? The NSRR 75% ROW plans are not clear about an outfall into NSRR. | Roadway | No_Revision | NSRR confirmed dual 42" steel pipes will be installed & will accomodate SCDOT's roadway drainage as shown in the PIP roadway plans. |
| 21 | Attach_A | Exhibit_3 | Page 152 of 398 | Please confirm the NSRR spur track at-grade crossing for US21 and the relocation of the Boomer Road crossing are to be constructed prior to the relocation of US21 as indicated in the RFP for Interim Condition 2. | Railroad | No_Revision | The at-grade crossing on US-21 and the Boomer Road Relocation are scheduled to occur in spring of 2025. |
| 22 | Attach_A | Exhibit 8 | Section 2.6 / Page 398 of 398 | Please confirm that is SCDOT's intention to abandon the existing ROW, from the Future Track Spur (US21 Sta. 699+75) to the Proposed Track Spur at-grade crossing (approx. sta 717+00) with the Removal of Pavement in that segment as it pertains "to any permanent improvement of the Project that encroaches on Railroad's property". | Railroad | No_Revision | It is NOT SCDOT's intention to abandon the existing ROW as part of this project. NSRR is expected to remove pavement out to approximately 5 feet from their rails when traffic is removed from the existing US-21 roadway. Contractor will remove all other existing pavement along existing US-21 per the scope when traffic is shifted to the relocated US-21 roadway. |
| 23 | Attach_A | Agreement | Section VII.B / Page 93 of 398 | Please provide the number of trains per 24 hour period and the maximum authorized speed for the main track that runs parallel to US 21. | Railroad | No_Revision | This information is available on the NSRR website. |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------|------------|-------------------------------------|--|----------|-------------|--|
| 24 | Attach_A | Agreement | Section VII.B.4 / Page 93 of 398 | Please an estimated total cost to include in the bids for services provided by the Railroad or the Railroad's agent as described in Section VII.B.4, for work near the main track that runs parallel to US 21. | Railroad | No_Revision | NSRR has indicated that the scope of work in the RFP does not require an Agreement with NSRR. SCDOT's intent for this project is to avoid work with NSRR ROW. |
| 25 | Attach_A | Exhibit 8 | Section 2.4 / Page 395 of 398 | Which party shall bear cost for NSRR full time inspector for work near the main track that runs parallel to US 21? | Railroad | No_Revision | Should the contractor choose to do work within the NSRR ROW where costs and agreements are required, it would be on the contractor per the current RFP language. NSRR and SCDOT have been in agreement through preparation work that the scope of work in the RFP does not require work within NSRR ROW. NSRR has, to date, and as they stated in the open forum meeting, indicated that no agreements with them are required to do the scope of work in the RFP. |
| 26 | Attach_A | Exhibit_3 | | For interim condition 1, please clarify the station limits in the first bullet for Community Road. Should Scout Motors Drive be included in IC #1? Should the intersection of Community Road and Scout Motors Drive be included in IC #1? | Roadway | Revision | See Attachment B - Community Road Tie-In Points for extent of IC #1. Will clarify description in Scope of Work. |
| 27 | Attach_A | Exhibit_4a | | Section 2.3 - please clarify if the full paved outside shoulder width of 12' or 14' is required when adjacent to concrete barrier and/or guardrail. Conceptual roadway plans show outside 12' PS adjacent to concrete barrier (example Scout Motors Drive over I-77 and Ramp BA over I-77) and 10' inside PS adjacent to guardrail. | Roadway | Revision | PIP Conceptual Roadway plans are for information only. RDM Section 17.4.2.3 states "The minimum lateral clearance from the edge of the traveled way to the face of the protective barrier should be the normal shoulder width". Required total shoulder widths can be found in Exhibit 4a & the roadway typical sections. Full depth paving to barrier face is required, will update Exhibit 4a to clarify, and non-mow strip paving is required from the face of guardrail to 1' offset from the shoulder/fill slope hinge point. Also see Attachment B detail for requirements of non-mow strip. |
| 28 | Attach_B | Roadway | | Please update Non mow strip details for this project - these appear to be for another DB procurement | Roadway | Revision | Will update detail to remove shoulder widths shown to clarify. |
| 29 | Attach_A | Agreement | Section VIII.E Page 99 of 398 | The agreement indicates the Contractor is responsible for CONTRACTOR-Designated Right of Way and Additional Right of Way and defines the cost responsibilities. In previous Non-Confidential Question Responses it has been noted there are current items in the provided plans that will necessitate additional right of way. These items include the ditch on US 21 at the RR overpass and the toe ditch detail not being incorporated on the preferred design among others. Another question asked if the Additional Right of Way could be SCDOT's responsibility and the answer indicated certain tracts would be the Contractor's responsibility and other tracts would be bought based on the proposer's design. As this section currently reads, there is not a distinction between the two types of tracts. Can the RFP be updated to note the cost responsibility is dictated by the ROW Graphic or specific tracts listed defining responsibilities? | ROW | Revision | Final RFP will be updated to clarify. |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------|-----------------|--|---|-----------|-------------|--|
| 30 | Attach_B | Traffic | | IR RFP # 2, Question 39 Follow Up: In addition to directions within the RFP for modeling of driveways outside of the project area, please also provide modeling files for these driveways within Attachment B to ensure all Proposers are modeling/evaluating the same traffic impact from these driveways. | Traffic | Revision | This will be revised in the Final RFP. |
| 31 | | | | IR RFP #2, Question 39 Follow Up: Please confirm that if a modification to the IJR is required, the next adjacent intersections would only be included. Provided there is an intersection between the Scout entrance intersection and the interchange, the Scout entrance intersection would not be included in the IJR modification. | Traffic | No_Revision | A modification to the IJR should include the next adjacent intersection only as shown in the approved IJR. |
| 32 | Attach_A | Exhibit 4d_Pt 4 | | Exhibit 4d- Part 6, Section 3.1.5 WZITS Liquidated Damages. Please add an exclusion for conditions beyond control of THE CONTRACTOR. For example, if the mobile/cellular network goes down due to fault of the service provider then LDs should not be assessed against THE CONTRACTOR. Also since SCDOT is severing the ITS fiber connections within the project limits, please remove reference "effect any other SCDOT ITS components". | Traffic | No_Revision | This example would be covered by other contractual terms. |
| 33 | Attach_A | Exhibit_3 | | Second paragraph - Please clarify/define the queing length required for the future dual left turns and interim single lane left turn from US 21 Southbound. | Traffic | No_Revision | Refer to the traffic volumes provided in the IJR for the design of this left turn. SCDOT intent is to not modify the number of lanes on the I-77 southbound on-ramp as part of this project. |
| 34 | PIP | Utilities | | Has SCDOT received acceptance from Santee Cooper for encroachment within 50 feet of transmission line poles in the area of relocated Community Road (Scout Motors Drive)? | Utilities | No_Revision | SCDOT is evaluating this issue. |
| 35 | PIP | Utilities | | There appears to be potential conflicts and or less than desirable cover for the following utilities that have not been addressed as impacted within the Preliminary Utility Report. Will SCDOT be working with Utility Owners to relocate these utilities or will Proposers be required to include mitigation strategies to avoid impacted these utilities? - 48" Waterline crossing I-77 near power transmission easement - 20" Sewer Force Main crossing I-77 near power transmission easement Waterline Crossing I-77 at approximate station 1672+00 | Utilities | No_Revision | SCDOT is evaluating this issue. |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------|-----------|-----------------------------------|---|-----------|-------------|---|
| 36 | PIP | Utilities | | There are several potential point conflicts between drainage systems, pavement structure, excessive fill, and retaining walls with the 4" plastic gas line that currently runs parallel to Community Rd. The preliminary utility report and RFP language says the CONTRACTOR shall allow this line to remain in place. However if CONTRACOR determines the gas main is in direct conflict or there are other construction activities that reduce cover or cause the CONTRACTOR to work in close proximity increasing the likelihood of damage or raise safety concerns, can the CONTRACTOR enforce SCDOT's rights and require the utility to relocate at their own cost? | Utilities | No_Revision | SCDOT is evaluating this issue. |
| 37 | Attach_A | Exhibit 7 | | As the RFP states there is not any in-contract utility work anticipated, however if there are impacts that could cause relocation, or at minimum, to perform protect in place measures to the City of Columbia's facilities (typically at their expense), who will be responsible for Act 36 of 2019 MOA coordination and execution? Will this work be processed as change order after project award? | Utilities | No_Revision | SCDOT is evaluating this issue. |
| 38 | PIP | Utilities | | If fill slopes impact an existing transmission poles concrete foundation, will retaining walls be needed to mitigate for this impact? | Utilities | No_Revision | Construction limits should not show impacts to existing pole foundations. |
| 39 | PIP | Utilities | Page 10 of 42 | The preliminary utility report mentions retention of distribution and transmission poles from 686+00 to 727+50 along US 21 and does not mention the transmission lines along Farrow Road. Conceptual plans and design show the roadway limits extending the project to station 686+00 along US 21 impacting multiple transmission and distribution lines (stations 680+00 (LT), 681+40 (LT) 681+50 (RT), 683+25 (LT), 684+10 (RT), 685+60 (RT)) and does not include the impacts to the transmission pole along Farrow Road, station 358+75 (RT). Who is responsible for relocating these transmission lines? If the poles are left in place there is concern protection of these poles will result in the removal of access for adjacent landowners. | Utilities | No_Revision | SCDOT is evaluating this issue. |
| 40 | Attach_B | Utilities | Prelim UC Report Page 19 of 42 | There is an existing 24" DIP Sanitary Force Main (SFM) owned and maintained by Southwest Water Company along the west side of Farrow Road as well as the East side of US 21. The Preliminary Utility Coordination Report notes this as a "potential conflict", but then specifies that "Valve cover not traffic rated" and "depth of cover not suitable for retention". The relocations for both roads will impact this SFM. Will this utility be relocated in advance of construction? | Utilities | No_Revision | Yes, this relocation is planned to be complete by Fall 2024. |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------|-----------|-----------------------------|--|-----------|-------------|--|
| 41 | Attach_B | Utilities | Prelim UC Report Appendix B | Are the proposed locations of the new Dominion transmission line poles locked in both horizontally AND vertically, or is there flexibility to change the elevations of the proposed poles / wires in the vicinity of the proposed work? | Utilities | No_Revision | There is no flexibility in the location of the Dominion transmission line poles. |
| 42 | PIP | Utilities | Page 7 of 42 | Per the preliminary utility report, Dominion and Santee Cooper state to ensure protection of the existing poles with varying clearances or they will accept roadways closer with the incorporation of alternative protective measures. Please define what other alternative protective measures are considered acceptable. | Utilities | No_Revision | RFP compliant roadside barriers are considered acceptable. |

