

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

**FINAL RFP - ROUND 2 // UPDATED**

Date Received: 5/31/2024

Non-Confidential Meeting Date: 6/10/2024

						SCDOT	
Question No.	Category	Section	Page / Doc No.	Question/Comment	Discipline	Response	Explanation
1				Please provide the dgn file showing the limits of disturbance used in the approved USACE permit.	Environmental	Revision	This file has been provided on our website.
2				The impacts shown in the SCDOT concept roadway plans to the jurisdictional tributary (Tributary 54) along I-77 Northbound between approximate Sta. 1765 to Sta. 1770 were not included in the environmental permit. Will SCDOT modify the permit to include these impacts or is this a requirement of the Design-Build team?	Environmental	No_Revision	The Contractor will be responsible for preparing the modification as per the RFP. SCDOT is investigating available credits to make a determination on any additional participation or modifications.
3	PIP	Geotechnical	Roadway GBR	Boring C-14 data appears to be incorrect. The existing ground elevation depicted in the boring logs is about 25-ft higher than the actual existing ground at that location. Can SCDOT please verify the data in Boring C-14?	Geotechnical	Revision	S&ME and their surveyor have reviewed and the current elevation shown for boring C-14 is incorrect. The elevation should be approximately 395 ft. The reports and gINT file will be corrected and provided with the next revision of the RFP.
4				Several of the existing drainage pipes at the US 21 and I-77 interchange (south end of project) are included in the Pipe Inspection Report Summary recommending replacement or slip-lining. The additional turn lane and median work along US 21 will require some drainage work to connect to the existing systems, but overall will have limited impact on the system hydraulics. Is SCDOT looking to have the downstream systems replaced/rehabbed per the Pipe Inspection Report Summary or would these be considered outside the project scope if they meet all hydraulic criteria in a post-construction configuration?	Hydrology	No_Revision	Follow recommendations per Pipe Inspection Report unless noted in RFP. (Example: Line 45 of Pipe Inspection Report is called out in RFP Exhibit 4e.)
5	Attach_B	Pavement	Concrete Pavement Repair Recommendations	Is there a maximum allowable width for transverse cracks and wheel path cracks before a full-depth repair is required?	Pavement	Revision	Follow concrete repair recommendations. RCE will identify locations for both patching and sealing per specification and recommendations. Additionally exhibit 5 is being revised to include crack sealing quantity and unit cost.
6	Attach_B	Pavement	Concrete Pavement Repair Recommendations	Is there a minimum allowable width for transverse cracks and wheel path cracks in which NO repair is required?	Pavement	Revision	Follow concrete repair recommendations. RCE will identify locations for both patching and sealing per specification and recommendations. Additionally exhibit 5 is being revised to include crack sealing quantity and unit cost.



7	Attach_B	Pavement	Concrete Pavement Repair Recommendations	How are the existing saw cuts from prior concrete pavement repairs classified in the Concrete Pavement Repair Recommendations table?	Pavement	Revision	Follow concrete repair recommendations. RCE will identify locations for both patching and sealing per specification and recommendations. Additionally exhibit 5 is being revised to include crack sealing quantity and unit cost.
8	Attach_B	Pavement	Concrete Pavement Repair Recommendations	Is there a distance range from the lane or edge line that can be used to classify a wheel path crack?	Pavement	Revision	Follow concrete repair recommendations. RCE will identify locations for both patching and sealing per specification and recommendations. Additionally exhibit 5 is being revised to include crack sealing quantity and unit cost.
9	Attach_B	Pavement	Concrete Pavement Repair Recommendations	Based on preliminary field investigations by our team, there appears to be a significant quantity of cracks that fall into the random crack category as specified in the Concrete Pavement Repair Recommendations of Attachment B. Would the Department re-consider providing a pay item and quantity for random crack sealing to help reduce this risk to all teams?	Pavement	Revision	Follow concrete repair recommendations. RCE will identify locations for both patching and sealing per specification and recommendations. Additionally exhibit 5 is being revised to include crack sealing quantity and unit cost.
10	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	Section 2.5 pdf Page 192	Will SCDOT provide the backup data/calculations for the Mainline Temporary Pavement design?	Pavement	No_Revision	No. SCDOT will not provide temp. design inputs
11	RFP	8	Section 2.1 pdf Page 389	What advanced warning devices will be installed for the at-grade rail crossing on US-21 by NSRR?	Railroad	No_Revision	The temp at-grade is expected to have gates and advanced signs and markings to be done by NSRR. These will not be the responsibility of the DB contractor.
12	RFP	8	Section 2.1 pdf Page 389	Please clarify the limits, for the at the at-grade rail crossing on US-21 being installed by NSRR, that the contractor will be required to demo the existing pavement and grade to drain.	Railroad	No_Revision	NSRR is expected to remove all existing US-21 pavement out to about five feet from the rails. DB contractor to remove the remainder per the scope.
13	RFP	8	Section 2.1 pdf Page 389	Please provide the proposed plans for the at-grade rail crossing on US-21 being installed by NSRR.	Railroad	No_Revision	Please indicate if the documents in the railroad sections of Attachment B and the PIP on the website do not address the concern.
14				Is cable median barrier included in the project scope of services? If so, please provide the median width criteria that requires cable barrier or the limits where cable barrier is to be provided.	Roadway	Revision	Yes, it is being added. Please see RFP for further guidance.
15	Attach_A	Exhibit_4a	Section 2.4	Please define the limits "within interchange ramp intersections" where a design speed of 25 mph should be used to calculate the Horizontal Sight Offset clearance requirements.	Roadway	Revision	Exhibit 4a has been updated to clarify this requirement. This was meant to apply to the sight distance at the concrete railings only at the intersection of Scout Motors Drive and I-77 ramps. HSO was used incorrectly.



16	PIP	Roadway	Conceptual Design Plans	Please provide the latest proposed roadway plans (PDF and CADD) for the Community Road widening projects undertaken by Richland County. Please also provide any information related to culvert extensions that are planned as part of the Community Road widening projects.	Roadway	No_Revision	These plans are still in the design phase & are not available.
17	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	Section 2.2 Page 188 of 390	For the rehabilitation portion of the project on the northbound lanes (defined as MM 21.43 to MM 24.9 in the Project Description), what is SCDOT anticipating for design/plans for both the Technical Proposal and Project Deliverables? Since this area only requires a surface course of 200 psy which results in minimal shoulder work, does SCDOT want plans/construction that include plan sheets, profile sheets, grades, cross sections, new guardrail, etc. or is the goal to just overlay and fix cross slopes with minimal additional construction?	Roadway	Revision	Updates will be provided in the RFP to clarify the requirements. Plans for the rehabilitation will not be required as part of the technical proposal plans. Strip maps may be used for the rehabilitation plans and shall be incorporated into the final RFC plans.
18	PIP	Roadway	Conceptual Design Plans	Based on the conceptual design plans, it does not appear that the required vertical clearance is met for Community Rd. under Scouts Motor Dr. Should the Teams meet the required clearance or has an exception been obtained for less clearance?	Roadway	No_Revision	Please clarify which vertical clearance you are referencing. All vertical clearance requirements based on RDM Figure 6.6A have been met in the PIP plans. No exceptions will be allowed.
19	RFP	4	Page 20 of 47	Please provide the backstory for the Addendum #3 revision for improvements to remain within the existing C/A limits on I77 Southbound from the new Railroad bridge to Wilson Blvd so that proposers can better understand the requirement. Also please provide the widening design for Community Road in this area. It would appear combining drainage for Community Road and I-77 southbound could have benefits for both facilities and optimize future maintenance.	Roadway	No_Revision	The C/A limits are to ensure the two projects do not overlap & the boundary was set to reduce risk of any conflicting design elements. A design is not available at this time. Combining the drainage for I-77 & Community Road is not anticipated to be necessary at this time.
20	Attach_A	Exhibit_4c	6	Please define the wheel path spacing/areas that should be used when evaluating temporary alignments.	Traffic	No_Revision	Need info. Crown point/joint/etc in wheel path should be avoided.
21	Attach_A	Exhibit 7	Section 2.1	Please provide the existing utility agreement for Dominion Energy Gas.	Utilities	No_Revision	No.
22	PIP	Utilities		Please clarify who is responsible for permanent relocation of power at RR Bridge over I-77. Noted as "Proposed U/G Electric. Temp for RR Bridge. DB to Relocate permanently." In Utility PIP document named "Prep_057.006_P042443_I77Exit26RFP_UtilityExhibit".  Based on other notes in this exhibit it is assumed that this is Dominion Energy's responsibility and should be noted as "DE" and not "DB".	Utilities	Revision	Bid-build project will install a temporary underground relocation of the Dominion distribution in order to get the new RR bridge constructed. This is expected to occur within the month of June 2024. The DB team will be required to coordinate with Dominion on a second (final) relocation due to significant grading needed. Further revisions to the RFP are expected.

**Additional Questions from Open-Forum Below**



23				Per discussions in the 6/10/2024 open forum meeting, it is understood that access driveways to Santee Cooper's transmission easement will be the responsibility of Santee Cooper and not the Design Build team. Please confirm.	Utilities	Revision	Confirmed. The RFP will be revised to clarify.
24	Attach_B	ROW	Hold-Off Letter	In the Right of Way Certification with Construction Holdoffs letter, it indicates all parcels that have not been acquired will be acquired by 8/1/24. In the RFP, VIII. Right of Way Acquisition, it notes the area bounded by I-77 east to US 21 SCDOT will acquire right of way based on the Contractor's design. SCDOT will not have the design in time to have the parcels by 8/1/24. What time frame for this area should Teams anticipate for ROW Acquisition to be complete?	ROW	No_Revision	Once right of way plans are developed by Contractor and approved by SCDOT, the landowner shall execute a right of entry to allow construction activities on tract 3. This process typically takes less than two weeks.
25	Attach_A	Agreement	pdf Page 96 of 390	In the RFP, VIII. Right of Way Acquisition, it notes the area in the Scout ROW Limits diagram the Teams should not go outside of those limits. For the area west of Community Rd./Scout Motors Dr., will Teams have access immediately to work, will the ROW acquisition be acquired by 8/1/24, or is there some other date when this area is available?	ROW	No_Revision	Once right of way plans are developed by Contractor and approved by SCDOT, the landowner shall execute a right of entry to allow construction activities on tract 3. This process typically takes less than two weeks.
26	Attach_A	Agreement	pdf Page 96 of 390	In the RFP, VIII. Right of Way Acquisition, it notes the area in the Scout ROW Limits diagram the Teams should not go outside of those limits. For the area west of along US 21/Farrow Rd. will Teams have access immediately to work, will the ROW acquisition be acquired by 8/1/24, or is there some other date when this area is available?	ROW	No_Revision	Once right of way plans are developed by Contractor and approved by SCDOT, the landowner shall execute a right of entry to allow construction activities on tract 3. This process typically takes less than two weeks.
27	RFP	3	Section 3.11 pdf Page 21 of 391	Will the department provide their comments and questions relating to the CPM Schedule and Narrative to Teams prior to their Confidential Meetings? This would be beneficial in providing teams the opportunity to prepare responses ahead of the meeting.	PM	No_Revision	SCDOT will plan to release comments and questions on the CPM schedule the week of July 4th.

