

**TAMPA-HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY
EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY**

Letter of Clarification No. 1

FOR

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

SOUTH SELMON SAFETY

RFP No. O-00518

Letter of Clarification No. 1 ~ RFP No. O-00518

Date of Letter of Clarification: August 10, 2018

To all prospective respondents:

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

Question 1:	May we request any existing R/W information THEA may have, especially at the northern end of the project near the Willow Ave area?
Response 1:	Provided to each firm via THEA file sharing.
Question 2:	Will the median barriers be single slope barriers or “F”-shaped barriers?
Response 2:	Single slope
Question 3:	Will the traffic monitoring sites and detection require replacement?
Response 3:	Yes
Question 4:	For the segments where speed is (equal or greater than) 55 MPH the maximum spread width cannot exceed the shoulder width. What should be considered the minimum shoulder width for the spread analysis in the superelevated sections?
Response 4:	Shoulder width for spread calculations in the superelevated sections is 6 feet.
Question 5:	Should the design criteria be based on the PPM as shown in the scope or the FDM which is currently being used by FDOT?
Response 5:	Use the current FDM
Question 6:	Will cross slope correction be required for the entire limits of the project?
Response 6:	No

Question 7:	<p>RFP, V.B Innovative Aspects, Page 19 of 58; The RFP indicates no reduction in design speed is allowed. However, no Design Speed is specified. Is existing Design Speed of 50 mph to be maintained? Please clarify Design Speed.</p>
Response 7:	<p>Maintain the existing Design Speed.</p>
Question 8:	<p>RFP, VI.E.3 Drainage Analysis, Page 40 of 58; The RFP states that ‘The Design-Build Firm shall verify that all existing cross drains and storm sewers that are to remain have adequate hydraulic capacity and design life. Flood flow requirements will be determined in accordance with the Department’s procedures. If any of these existing cross drains or storm sewers are found to be hydraulically inadequate or found to have insufficient design life, they must be replaced or supplemented in accordance with the drainage requirements of this RFP’.</p> <p>The Authority has advised Design-Build Teams that they will not be providing any inspection results for the existing cross drains and storm sewers to allow for evaluation of any potential repair or replacement costs for the existing system. The requirements in the RFP (especially those underlined above) create significant risks for the Design-Build Teams in developing responsible Bid Proposals and schedules for this project. Can the Authority please address this matter and provide guidance on how to allow for any repair or replacement work required due to insufficient design life of the existing system?</p> <p>We offer the following suggestions on how to handle this matter:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Authority provide inspection reports of the existing cross drains and storm sewer to the Design-Build Team so we can evaluate any work required to provide the required design life for the drainage system. b. Include an allowance for any required repair work (repair or replacement) on the Bid Form for this project. c. Handle any repair or replacement work due to insufficient design life of the existing drainage system as extra work.
Response 8:	<p>The Authority plans to conduct a detailed video inspection of the existing cross drains and storm sewers in the future as part of the PD&E Study on future roadway capacity improvements. For this South Selmon Safety Project, it is anticipated that the Design-Build Firm will perform its due diligence to determine the hydraulic and structural suitability of those existing pipes that the Design-Build Firm intends to utilize as part of its proposed drainage system, and to address as necessary.</p>

Question 9:	<i>RFP Reference Documents Page 4 of 58</i> <i>Please provide traffic data and crash data for use in a lane closure analysis.</i>
Response 9:	Provided to each firm via THEA file sharing.
Question 10:	<i>RFP, VI.E.3 Drainage Analysis, Page 40 of 58</i> <i>Are there any known flooding issues within the project limits?</i>
Response 10:	THEA does not have a record of known roadway flooding problems on the Selmon Expressway within the project limits.
Question 11:	<i>RFP, VI.E.3 Drainage Analysis, Page 40 of 58</i> <i>The RFP states that ‘The Design-Build Firm shall verify that all existing cross drains and storm sewers that are to remain have adequate hydraulic capacity and design life. Flood flow requirements will be determined in accordance with the Department’s procedures. If any of these existing cross drains or storm sewers are found to be hydraulically inadequate or found to have insufficient design life, they must be replaced or supplemented in accordance with the drainage requirements of this RFP’.</i> <i>From the statement above from the RFP, does the Authority expect the design/build team to add new drainage structures on the outside or is no work expected on the outside portions of the roadway?</i>
Response 11:	The drainage design is the responsibility of the DB Firm. THEA has no “expectations” other than the expectation of a drainage design that adequately drains the roadway, does not cause pavement spread or hydroplaning issues, and is permittable, maintainable and constructable.
Question 12:	<i>RFP Attachments - 005 - Flexible and Rigid Pavement Design Package – FPID 439023-1-52-01.pdf, Page 3 of 58</i> <i>The pavement design provided as Attachment 005 in the RFP indicates friction course. Please confirm if friction course is required within the 38’ median area or if only structural course is required as is the case for a shoulder. The Typical Section provided as Attachment 005 indicates no friction course in the median area. Please clarify.</i>
Response 12:	No friction course is required in the median as per the provided Typical Section.
Question 13:	<i>RFP, I. Description of Work, Page 7 of 58</i> <i>The RFP refers to removing and replacing a truss over the eastbound lanes west of S. Blvd. and removing the truss over the eastbound lanes east of Willow Ave. There is only one sign structure between Willow and S. Blvd. over the eastbound lanes. The existing sign has no sign panels on it. Please clarify what is to be removed or added in this area.</i>

Response 13:	The truss west of South Blvd. with no panels on it is to be removed. The truss west of Willow Ave. at the eastbound off-ramp is to be removed and replaced.
Question 14:	<p><i>RFP, I. Description of Work, Page 7 of 58</i></p> <p><i>The first sign mentioned in the RFP to remove and replace is referred to as a truss over the westbound lanes north of El Prado Blvd. It is actually a cantilever structure with a median support. In addition, the RFC plans for the Selmon West project show this sign structure being replaced by another cantilever, with a median support, 18' south of the existing. Please clarify what is to be done at this location since it appears the adjacent project will be replacing this sign structure.</i></p>
Response 14:	The DB Team for this project will remove the existing structure and replace it with a cantilever structure that will support the signage required for this project and in the future the attached signage for the Selmon West Extension project. This project will construct the cantilever and install the signage required for this project only. The Selmon West Extension project will install the signage they require in the future.
Question 15:	<p><i>RFP, I. Description of Work, Page 7 of 58</i></p> <p><i>The RFC plans for the Selmon West project also install a new cantilever with a median support just north of the Himes Ave. bridge. This sign is not mentioned in the RFP. What work will be required by the DB Team for this sign structure?</i></p>
Response 15:	This project will design and install the cantilever sign structure that will support the signage required for the Selmon West Extension project on the attached drawings. This project will construct the cantilever structure only. The Selmon West Extension project will install the signage they require in the future.
Question 16:	<p>The following list is the reference documents we were unable to find in the information provided for the above referenced project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Roadway <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Roadway as-built plans for the length of the project. b. Roadway Typical Section sheets – Contracts 3 and 4 c. Roadway plan and profile sheets – Contracts 3 and 4 Station range from 210+00 to 255+58 and from 497+56 to 507+00
Response 16:	a. Plans that were provided as Reference Documents are all that THEA has available. There are no “as-built plans for the length of the project.

	<p>b. Roadway Typical Sections for Contract 3 are on Sheet 5 of the Contract 3 PDF Reference Document. Roadway Typical Sections for Contract 4 are on Sheet 6 of the Contract 4 PDF Document.</p> <p>c. Plan/Profile Sheets for 210+00 to 255+58 are on Sheets 11 through 14 of the Contract 4 PDF Document). (Contract 4 Section 1 PDF Sheet 5 shows a Station Equation of “PT Sta 269+38.05 BK = 511+36.69 AH. Station 511+36.69 – Station 497+56 = 1380.69 feet. Subtracting 1380.69 feet from PT Station 269+38.05 gives Station 255+57.36 which is included on Contract 4 Sheet 14. Between Contracts 4 and 5 the Roadway Plan and Profiles appear to be covered.</p>
<p>Question 17:</p>	<p>The following list is the reference documents we were unable to find in the information provided for the above referenced project.</p> <p>Signing and Pavement Markings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Signing Plans and Lighting Plans from Contract 1 (Gandy to Euclid), and b. Lighting Plans from Contract 1 (Gandy to Euclid) c. Lighting Plans from Contact 3 (South of MacDill to south of Watrous) d. Lighting Plans from both Contracts 4 (South View to Willow) e. Lighting Plans 5 (Willow to Bay to Bay).
<p>Response 17:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The plans provided as Reference Documents are all that are available. b. The plans provided as Reference Documents are all that are available. c. The plans provided as Reference Documents are all that are available. d. The plans provided as Reference Documents are all that are available. e. The plans provided as Reference Documents are all that are available.

Question 18:	The following list is the reference documents we were unable to find in the information provided for the above referenced project. Structures. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Howard & Watrous• Morrison• Swann• Willow• South• Hyde Park
Response 18:	Provided to each firm via THEA file sharing once Confidentiality Agreement has been signed.
Question 19:	Wall Plans for: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Willow• South• Hyde Park
Response 19:	The requested Wall Plans are not available.

Respondents MUST acknowledge receipt of this Letter of Clarification by signing, dating and returning the completed Acknowledgement of Receipt of Letter of Clarification/Addendum form with Respondent's proposal.

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

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