

**TAMPA-HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY  
EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY**

**Letter of Clarification No. 5**

**FOR**

**REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS**

**Design-Build Selmon West Extension**

**RFP No. O-00217**

**Letter of Clarification No. 5 ~ RFP No. O-00217**

**Date of Letter of Clarification: April 19, 2017**

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

Question 1:	Per the RFP, VII. Technical Proposal Requirements, B. Submittal Requirements, Section 2: Plans and Technical Special Provisions, page 90 (3rd bullet): "The master signing plan (MSP) shall be submitted in roll-plot format. The maximum width of the roll-plots shall be 36" at 1"=200' scale. The maximum length of each roll-plot shall be 8'." Since the concept plan roll plots were provided at 1" = 100', are we permitted to use the 100 scale instead?
Response 1:	<b>100 scale roll plots are acceptable also.</b>
Question 2:	It does not appear that the RFP has any requirements related to the removal, relocation or replacement of existing DMS. The Conceptual Signing Plan indicates 3 DMS as "to be removed". Is it a requirement to: a) remove the 3 DMS, or b) remove and replace one or more of the 3 DMS, or c) replace them only if they are impacted by construction? If either a or b above, are there required locations for the DMS? In any case, is there a requirement for the DB firm to deliver the removed DMS somewhere or does it become the property of the DB firm?
Response 2:	<b>The 3 DMS signs should not be impacted by the final structure. If the DB Team's design impacts a DMS sign it will need to be relocated or replaced.</b>
Question 3:	Section VI.R of the RFP, ITS (pg 83) requires a 96-fiber backbone cable to be installed from the future tolling sites to the existing THEA fiber optic cable near the intersection of Selmon Expressway and Mississippi Avenue. Section VI.T of the RFP, Tolling (pg 87) requires a 96-fiber cable to be installed from the limits of construction to the existing THEA fiber optic cable near the intersection of Selmon Expressway and Mississippi Avenue. The RFP section VI.T, Tolling (pg 88) requires the DB firm to "Extend 96 strand count single mode backbone fiber from Selmon Expressway along West Bay to Bay Boulevard to the tolling sites." Please clarify what is anticipated for the limits of the proposed 96-fiber Backbone cable.

Response 3:	<b>The 96-fiber limits are from the toll gantries at the west end to the existing THEA 96-fiber box near Mississippi Avenue and the Selmon Expressway on the east end.</b>
Question 4:	<p>Section VI.R.1 of the RFP (pg 82) states that a CCTV subsystem is required to provide 100% video coverage of the project corridor's general purpose lanes, shoulders, exit/entrance ramps, master hubs, tolling facilities, ITS cabinets and other field devices. Does this requirement only pertain to the proposed elevated expressway, or will this requirement need to be met for at-grade portions of Gandy Blvd. as well? It is likely that the new elevated expressway will obstruct the view of Gandy Blvd. from the existing CCTV cameras along Gandy Blvd. Is it acceptable to use the existing cameras along Gandy Blvd to monitor traffic on the elevated expressway and install separate CCTV cameras elsewhere to monitor traffic on Gandy Blvd?</p> <p>Are there any institutional barriers that would prevent shared use of the video from the existing CCTV cameras between THEA and the City/maintaining agency?</p>
Response 4:	<b>It is the intent that by installing an additional CCTV camera at the same location as the existing cameras on the opposite side of Gandy Blvd. at the same height that adequate coverage of both Gandy Blvd. and the Selmon West Extension elevated structure will be attained. The City of Tampa TMC staff currently view both THEA and City of Tampa cameras from the THEA TMC.</b>
Question 5:	<p>Section VI.R.2 of the RFP (pg 82) states that a CCTV camera's lowering devices shall be oriented perpendicular to the roadway and shall be located on the same side of the pole as the handhole access point. Is it a requirement to provide a lowering device for each new CCTV camera pole?</p>
Response 5:	<b>Yes, a lowering device is required at each CCTV pole location.</b>
Question 6:	<p>Section VI.R.3 of the RFP (pg 83) states that the Design-Build Firm shall be responsible for all ITS construction and integration services relating to the installation of the 2 cameras installed on this Project. Is it the intent of the RFP to require 100% coverage or just 2 cameras with the expectation of obtaining 100% coverage?</p>
Response 6:	<b>It is the intent to provide the 2 additional cameras unless the DB Team's design negatively impacts the existing view from additional existing CCTV cameras in the project area, then additional cameras will need to be installed.</b>

Question 7:	<p>With respect to the Reference Documents this paragraph instructs that "...All information contained in these reference documents must be verified by a proper factual investigation. The bidder agrees that by accepting copies of the documents, any and all claims for damages, time or any other impacts based on the documents are expressly waived." Much of the information provided in these reference documents is essential in the proper evaluation of the project and is of a nature that is either impractical or impossible to independently verify prior to preparation of a proposal. As such this provision places significant and potentially unquantifiable risk on the DB proposer. We respectfully request that several of these documents be re-categorized at Attachments or that the information contained within these documents be deemed reliable.</p>
Response 7:	<p><b>All documents are being reviewed and several documents that have been finalized since the original RFP was released are being re-categorized as Attachments for the upcoming RFP Addendum.</b></p>
Question 8:	<p><b>Page 35 - Section K. Project Schedule:</b> The RFP states, "the DB Firm shall provide a submittal schedule a minimum of 60 calendar days prior to Authority's receipt of the first submittal. Can we provide the submittal schedule as part of our project schedule in the proposal to satisfy this requirement in order for us to submit our first submittal directly after contract award?"</p>
Response 8:	<p><b>Yes</b></p>
Question 9:	<p><b>Page 79 – Lighting Plans: Previous Question (Response: Additional lighting information will be provided at a later date). Please provide information to the following questions.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• States the project intent is to have the existing lighting system along Gandy Blvd remain. Are the existing high pressure sodium luminaries to remain?</li> <li>• Is it the responsibility of the Design-Build Firm to provide the associated crash test documentation for the embedded barrier wall led lights?</li> <li>• Is replacement of the existing lighting along the Selmon Expressway from the Gandy interchange north to Himes Ave. required?</li> </ul>

Response 9:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The firms shall provide lighting in compliance with FDOT standards for the viaduct and ramps. Viaduct lighting shall be justified by a lighting report to FDOT standards indicating the need for and the amount of illumination required. LED barrier wall lighting in both the median and outside barrier wall is the initial preference for the Authority but it is acknowledged that conventional lighting may be required. If conventional lighting is chosen by the design build firm it shall be of the low level type typically used near airport approaches and shall be installed on the median barrier. Proposals to use outside barriers for conventional lighting will require submission of an ATC to document the aesthetic impact of the light fixtures and their effectiveness.</li> <li>• Yes</li> <li>• Yes, if a system is proposed that has not previously been tested and approved. If LED lighting embedded to the barrier wall is selected, the barrier wall must be crash tested or have the same cross section as the standard crash tested barriers. If LED lighting fastened to the barrier wall is selected, the barrier wall must have the same cross section as standard crash tested barriers. The LED barrier wall lighting design shall minimize the concern of the visibility of the lights in motorists rear view mirrors causing distraction to the drivers. LED lighting designs that have not been previously approved by FDOT will require FDOT and THEA approval prior to implementation.</li> <li>• Yes</li></ul>
Question 10:	<p><b>Page 79 – Lighting Plans:</b> Please clarify the required lighting on the elevated viaduct structure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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?</li> <li>• 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?</li></ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the latter, then is it acceptable to mount the luminaire on top of or above the wall?</li> <li>• Is pole mounted lighting acceptable if the mounting height is limited to 30 feet or less, with house-side shields?</li> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>
Response 10:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Continuous in that it provides illumination levels continuously throughout the project.</b></li> <li>• <b>All items should be embedded, however, if the DB Team proposes for the luminaire to be attached to the barrier wall it must meet crash requirements and be aesthetically acceptable.</b></li> <li>• <b>Yes, but it must meet crash requirements and be aesthetically acceptable as previously stated.</b></li> <li>• <b>It shall be of the low level type typically used near airport approaches and shall be installed on the median barrier.</b></li> <li>• <b>Yes</b></li> </ul>
Question 11:	<p><b>Page 79 – Lighting Plans:</b> 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?</p>
Response 11:	<p><b>No, if a system is proposed that has not previously been tested and approved it shall be the DB Team’s responsibility.</b></p>
Question 12:	<p><b>Pg. 84; Bullet Item No. 9 - Chapter VI; Section S – Landscape &amp; Irrigation Plans:</b> Per RFP, areas with existing large trees are to be repurposed into drainage ponds, requiring the removal of such trees. Some of these larger sizes are not available in tree nurseries typically. Please clarify size replacement requirement?</p>
Response 12:	<p><b>This requirement only applies to areas within the Gandy Blvd roadway Right-of-Way, not retention pond areas.</b></p>

Question 13:	<b>Page 86 - Section T. Tolling Requirements:</b> The RFP states that toll gantry locations “shall not change unless the roadway layouts are modified by the Design-Build Firm through approved ATCs” However, the RFP’s recommended toll gantry sites for SB Ramp and Ramp F are located on a curve that does not meet the 3,000’ radius limit listed in section 3.2.2 of the Authority’s GTR. Will the Authority’s GTR be modified to meet the recommended locations discussed in section T.1 of the RFP?
Response 13:	<b>The RFP takes precedent over the GTR and denotes the recommended gantry locations. The GTR provides guidance, but this project’s specific layout requires the gantry to be on a curve with a lower radius. Any changes in location by the DB Team will require an ATC.</b>
Question 14:	Receipt of THEA General Tolling Requirements did not include appendices. Please provide the appendices.
Response 14:	<b>See attached (will be available via THEA’s file sharing).</b>
Question 15:	Would THEA release the all proposals submitted for the CEI contract? <u>LOI-LOR O-00616-0-2017/ML</u> Letter of Response Construction Engineering & Inspection services for the Selmon West Extension.
Response 15:	<b>Yes. See attached (will be available via THEA’s file sharing).</b>

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](mailto:Man.Le@tampa-xway.com).