

**TAMPA-HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY
EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY**

Letter of Clarification No. 1

FOR

REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS

Design-Build Selmon West Extension

RFP No. O-00217

Letter of Clarification No. 1 ~ RFP No. O-00217
Date of Letter of Clarification: March 21, 2017

The following responds to questions received on the solicitation reference above:

Question 1:	<u>Page 14 - Technical Proposal Page Turn Meeting:</u> Will the Authority consider extending the meeting to 60 or 90 minutes in lieu of 30 minutes?
Response 1:	Length of Page Turn Meeting will be 60 minutes for each DB Team.
Question 2:	<u>Page 15 – Question and Answer Session:</u> Will the Authority adjust the delivery of questions for the Q&A session to each Design-Build Firm from approximately 24 hours to approximately 72 hours? This will allow each Design-Build Firm more opportunity to properly research and adequately address the questions during the recorded Q&A session which becomes part of the Contract Documents.
Response 2:	THEA will provide questions to each Team approximately 72 hours in advance, however, THEA reserves the right to ask additional questions at each Q&A session.
Question 3:	<u>Page 26 – Geotechnical Services:</u> What is the procedure Design-Build Firms must follow to perform additional field exploration and testing on site during this proposal phase?
Response 3:	Submit boring plan and applicable FDOT permit requests to FDOT District 7 and copy THEA to receive approval.
Question 4:	<u>Page 30 – Railroad Coordination:</u> The Design-Build Firm is required to carry all costs associated with railroad protective services. Please provide the Railroad Reimbursement Agreements so these costs can be considered in the Price Proposal?
Response 4:	Information will be provided when the Railroad Agreement is finalized.
Question 5:	<u>Page 35 – Project Schedule:</u> Currently, the RFP states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ "...allow for up to fifteen (15) calendar days (excluding weekends and Authority observed holidays review time for Authority’s review of all submittals with exception of Category 2 structures submittals.” ○ "...Category 2 structures submittals requires FDOT Central Office involvement and the Schedule shall allow for up to twenty (20) calendar days...”

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “The Design-Build Firm shall allow 45 calendar days for shop drawing reviews and 30 calendar days for shop drawing resubmittals.” <p>Will the Authority and/or the Department consider a departure from standard review periods and provide any reduction to any of the durations illustrated above (particularly, Bullet 3, shop drawing reviews and resubmittals)?</p>
Response 5:	<p>FDOT will not reduce the RFP review times, however, THEA will commit to expediting the reviews as much as possible and work with FDOT to accomplish this.</p>
Question 6:	<p><u>Pages 35/68 – Project Schedule/Temporary Traffic Control Plan:</u> Will the Authority adjust the notice requirement from 24 hours to 72 hours concerning the ten (10) days arbitrarily directed by the Authority when no lane closures or detours will be permitted. This will allow the Proposer more opportunity to mitigate its cost impact of deploying alternative plans.</p>
Response 6:	<p>These 10 days are for unanticipated events that require closures and/or detours to not occur, Therefore, THEA may be unable to provide more than 24 hours’ notice. However, THEA will provide notice to the Contractor as soon as possible if these events do occur.</p>
Question 7:	<p><u>Page 44 - Vibration and Settlement Monitoring:</u> The Design-Build Firm is required to set maximum settlement and vibration thresholds for all construction activities, including vibratory compaction operations and excavations, equivalent to or lower than the Authority Specification requirements. Please provide the Authority’s Specification requirements.</p>
Response 7:	<p>THEA follows FDOT requirements.</p>
Question 8:	<p><u>Page 60 – Structure Plans, Item 1. Bridge Design Analysis:</u> The Design-Build Firm is required to set maximum settlement and vibration thresholds for all construction activities, including vibratory compaction operations and excavations, equivalent to or lower than the Authority Specification requirements. Please provide the Authority’s Specification requirements.</p>
Response 8:	<p>THEA follows FDOT requirements.</p>

Question 9:	<p>Page 79 – Lighting Plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Calls for continuous LED lighting embedded in the barrier wall of the viaduct structure. If embedded LEDs alone are unable to meet Department illumination criteria, is conventional lighting on the viaduct permissible? ○ States the project intent is to have the existing lighting system along Gandy Blvd remain. Are the existing high pressure sodium luminaries to remain? ○ Is it the responsibility of the Design-Build Firm to provide the associated crash test documentation for the embedded barrier wall led lights? ○ Is replacement of the existing lighting along the Selmon Expressway from the Gandy interchange north to Himes Ave. required?
Response 9:	<p>Additional lighting information will be provided at a later date.</p>
Question 10:	<p>Page 80/81 – Signalization/ITS: These sections mention “City Criteria”. Can the criteria be provided?</p>
Response 10:	<p>Contact Vik Bhide, Chief Traffic Management Engineer, City of Tampa Transportation & Stormwater Services, 1104 East Twiggs Street, Suite 200, Tampa, FL 33602, 813 363 4651 (c) 813 274 8066 (o) 813 274 8513 (f), for any City specific criteria beyond FDOT requirements.</p>
Question 11:	<p>Page 90 – Section 2, Plans and Technical Special Provisions: Will the Authority accept a roll plot plan submittal for drainage maps and temporary traffic control plans?</p>
Response 11:	<p>Yes</p>
Question 12:	<p>Page 96 -Final Selection Process: How does the Authority intend to announce the Technical Score of each Proposer prior to opening the Proposer’s sealed Bid Price Proposal, as stated in paragraph D. Final Selection Process, when the Technical Score contains components (schedule and price) submitted only in the sealed Bid Price Proposal?</p>
Response 12:	<p>The Sealed Bid Price Proposal containing cost and schedule will be submitted. The TRC members will subsequently meet and complete their scores for Design, Construction and Maintenance of Traffic. Then the Sealed Bid Price Proposals will be opened and the Cost and Schedule scores determined. Then the Expanded Letter of Interest scores will be added to the Design, Construction and Maintenance of Traffic, Cost and Schedule scores to obtain the total score.</p>

Question 13:	Page 96 -Final Selection Process: The last sentence states in pertinent part “. . . the contract will be awarded to the Proposer determined by the Selection Committee to have the lowest adjusted score.” How will this lowest adjusted score be calculated?
Response 13:	The language in the RFP will be corrected, the contract will be awarded to the Proposer having the highest total score as noted in the above response.
Question 14:	Reference Documents: Please provide the ICPR model used for stormwater management design and permitting.
Response 14:	Will be provided once obtained from Conceptual Plans EOR.
Question 15:	Section VI. Page 79 of 96. Paragraph P (Discipline ~ Other): Please clarify the required lighting on the elevated viaduct structure. Per the RFP, “the Design-Build Firm shall provide continuous LED lighting embedded in the barrier wall.” By continuous, is this a continuous strip of lighting or is the roadway lighting system continuous in that it provides illumination levels continuously throughout the project? Is the luminaire itself required to be embedded in the barrier wall or are only portions of the lighting system, such as conduit, conductors, pull boxes, etc. required to be embedded? If the latter, then is it acceptable to mount the luminaire on top of or above the wall? Is pole mounted lighting acceptable if the mounting height is limited to 30 feet or less, with house-side shields? Per the RFP, “the lighting design for this continuous lighting system shall meet illumination levels, voltage drop, and all other applicable design criteria.” Is the applicable lighting design criteria (including veiling luminance ratio) the same as FDOT’s requirements?
Response 15:	Additional lighting information will be provided at a later date.
Question 16:	Section V. Page 23 of 96. Paragraph B.1 (Discipline ~ Structures): The concept plans and RFP do not appear to explicitly state the required minimum vertical clearance for the Selmon West Extension (SWE). The RFP refers to the SEIR, within which there is language that mentions a “...a 30-foot bridge....” And has a Recommended Bridge Typical Section which states “vertical clearance = 30’ in most cases; minimum required = 16.5’ “ Page 23 of the RFP states that an addendum to the RFP will not be issued for an ATC for “...deviations to vertical alignments (more than 2’) from those depicted in the Concept Plans.”. Please clarify the vertical clearance requirement for the SWE.

Response 16:	<p>The Mainline Viaduct within the median of Gandy Blvd shall have a minimum 30 foot clearance to the bottom of the superstructure above the roadway below. As it is ascending or descending on each end' it should have a minimum 16.5 foot clearance above all roadways. Additionally, the bottom of the superstructure shall meet the minimum vertical clearance requirements from CSX as included in Attachment 11 (CSX Railroad Exhibit). In all cases, if the proposers vertical alignment deviates more than 2 feet from the profile in the conceptual plans the proposer shall submit the vertical geometry for approval as an ATC.</p>
Question 17:	<p><u>Section III. Page 14 of 96. Paragraph F (Discipline ~ Legal):</u> The second paragraph indicates that we are to submit the Viaduct Erection Plan package as "Noted in the procurement schedule." However, we have been unable to locate the specific required submission date in the Schedule of Events. Please clarify the deadline for submission of the plan.</p>
Response 17:	<p>The Viaduct Erection Plan package will be submit with the ATC package for ATC Meetings #1 & #2, and then presented in conjunction with the ATC meetings on April 12th/13th and May 3rd/4th.</p>
Question 18:	<p><u>Section IV. Page 68 of 96. Paragraph M.3 (Discipline ~ Traffic):</u> The second paragraph precludes Median Turn Lane Closures outside of the allowable night time windows allowing closures only from 9 pm to 6 am. As many foundations and footings extend into the turn lanes please confirm that closing a portion of a Median Turn Lane does not constitute a "closure" and that this partial closure may remain in place beyond the allowable time window.</p>
Response 18:	<p>A portion of turn lanes may need to be closed for an extended period outside of the allowable closure windows. However, the remainder of the turn lane adjacent to the median opening along with the median opening itself shall remain open to not constitute a median closure. Once foundation and pier construction is completed the entire turn lane should be opened as soon as possible.</p>
Question 19:	<p><u>Section B.1.ATCs. Page 21 of 85. 3.Submittal of ATC Proposals (Discipline ~ Other):</u> The RFP states that "<i>All ATC submittals are required to be on plan sheets or on roll plots no wider than 36" and no longer than 8', and shall be sequentially numbered and include the following information and discussions: ...</i>". Is this requirement intended only for ATC Plans Exhibits or for all documentation, including the ATC Proposal report and ATC Presentation slides?</p>

Response 19:	This applies to plan exhibits only
Question 20:	<u>Section B.1.ATCs. Page 79 of 96. Paragraph P (Discipline ~ Other):</u> The Authority will review and approve the aesthetic lighting system for the viaduct piers and superstructure. Review includes selection of arm length, fixture locations, fixture angles, shielding adjustments, color lenses, etc. Based on potential significant variation in final scope, would Authority consider adding an allowance for this scope of work?
Response 20:	No, the proposers shall determine their system and cost for it
Question 21:	<u>Section B.1.ATCs. Page 79 of 96. Paragraph P (Discipline ~ Structures):</u> The Authority is requiring continuous LED lighting embedded in the barrier wall on the elevated viaduct section. Will the Authority take responsibility for the cost of any crash testing that might be required due to embedding the LED lighting in the barrier wall?
Response 21:	Additional information on the lighting will be provided at a later date
Question 22:	<u>Section B.1.ATCs. Page 81 of 96. Paragraph Q (Discipline ~ Roadway):</u> If existing signal components have to be temporarily removed due to conflicts with construction of the viaduct, will any upgrades of the signals be required, or will we be able to reinstall the original components?
Response 22:	Reinstall existing components
Question 23:	<u>Section B.1.ATCs. Page 82 of 96. Paragraph R.2 (Discipline ~ Other):</u> The third bullet states in part 'ITS control equipment and CCTV cameras to ensure 100%' This sentence seems incomplete. Can you please clarify the 100% requirement?
Response 23:	100% coverage of existing Gandy Blvd.
Question 24:	<u>Section B.1.ATCs. Page 82 of 96. Paragraph R.2 (Discipline ~ Other):</u> The fifth bullet gives instructions for orienting lowering devices for cameras. Are lowering devices required for every camera?
Response 24:	Yes, lowering devices are required for every camera
Question 25:	<u>Section B.1.ATCs. Page 84 of 96. Paragraph S (Discipline ~ Other):</u> Can you please confirm that the \$2 million allowance for landscaping includes costs for i) Protecting, relocating or replacing existing trees, and ii) Removal of exotic plants?

Response 25:	<u>Yes, it includes protecting, relocating or replacing existing trees within the median of Gandy Blvd. No, it does not include the removal of exotic plants within the median of Gandy Blvd.</u>
Question 26:	<u>Section B.1.ATCs. Page 87 of 96. Paragraph T.2 (Discipline ~ Other):</u> Can you please confirm that the 96 count fiber optic cable referenced in this section is the same fiber optic cable listed on page 82 of 96, Section R Intelligent Transportation System?
Response 26:	<u>Yes, they are the same</u>

All other items, conditions, and specifications in the RFP document not specifically changed by this document remain unchanged.

Please send all questions to THEA's Procurement Manager, Man Le, via email at Man.Le@tampa-xway.com.