

**TAMPA-HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY  
EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY**

**Letter of Clarification No. 4**

**FOR**

**Request for Proposals**

**East Selmon Slip Ramps  
Design-Build**

**RFP O-02520**

**Letter of Clarification No. 4 ~ RFO No. O-02520**

Date of Letter of Clarification: **March 11, 2021**

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

<p>Question 1:</p>	<p>RFP Section V.B – Innovative Aspects indicates that failure to install wrong-way driving security features including gates and other features used on the REL will not be permitted. The RFP Master Signing Plan (MSP), Reference Document R02, does not differentiate between gate types (e.g., barrier or breakaway). The gates and DMS that are shown on the MSP include the disclaimer: SHOWN FOR ILLUSTRATION PURPOSES ONLY. The list of documents provided within RFP Section V.A - Governing Regulations does not include NCHRP 835 or other publications that include design guidelines for wrong-way security features. A review of several reversible lane facilities in the US revealed that device type and placement varies greatly, and there is some variation in the layout of existing devices on the Selmon Expressway. Is the expectation that the proposed design will follow the layout of existing wrong-way security devices on THEA facilities, or will information be provided to define the minimum requirements for these features?</p>
<p>Response 1:</p>	<p><b>The intent of the project is to match the existing WWD features currently installed along the Selmon Expressway REL. At each ramp where WWD features are needed, the following minimums are required:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>One lift barrier gate intended to be physical prevention of a vehicle from entering the Selmon Expressway REL. This lift barrier gate should match the existing installations which have been successfully implemented on the Selmon Expressway and shall be located at the same location as the overhead DMS sign structure. The current lift barrier gate installations are sacrificial and must be replaced when deployed by an errant vehicle.</b></li><li>• <b>One DMS sign structure indicating CLOSED when applicable, and a permanent DO NOT ENTER sign to match other installations</b></li><li>• <b>One overhead sign structure at the painted gore, including a DMS plaque to indicate when the exit is CLOSED. Required details are depicted in the master signing plan.</b></li><li>• <b>Four rotating frangible warning gate arms placed at sufficient distances to alert drivers they are making an errant maneuver. The final number and configuration of these gate arms are based on the EOR and installer recommendations.</b></li><li>• <b>Specialty gore striping to match the existing Selmon Expressway REL gores.</b></li></ul>

<p>Question 2:</p>	<p>In Attachment A-010 (pipes to be lined) there are notes, blue highlighted clouds, and red clouding, to identify pipes/systems to be lined. The various identification techniques create ambiguity with regard to identifying the “pipes required to be lined”. In Attachment A-010 (pipes to be lined) which pipes should be considered for lining; the blue highlighted clouded system, the red clouded systems, those with notes only, or all of them? We respectfully request THEA/The Department to re-issue Attachment A-010 (pipes to be lined) to clarify the required pipes to be lined so this effort can be accurately bid.</p>
<p>Response 2:</p>	<p><b>Attachment A-010 has been revised to more clearly identify the pipes that are to be lined.</b></p>
<p>Question 3:</p>	<p>Would existing storm drain pipes, not identified in Attachment A-010 (pipes to be lined), that are part of a storm drain system associated with Slip Ramp improvements, require inspection for structural integrity. For example, if there is a part of a storm drain system that is not impacted by the improvements, but is part of a larger storm drain system that is being modified/used in the design for the slip ramp improvements, would the part not being impacted still require video inspection and/or repair recommendations? See the RFP language on Page 11, the last paragraph and Page 12, Paragraph 2.</p>
<p>Response 3:</p>	<p><b>Attachment A-010 has been revised to more clearly identify the pipes that are to be lined. The Design-Build Firm shall also desilt, <i>video inspect</i>, and <i>investigate all other</i> existing pipes and structures within the project limits and shall make recommendations to the Authority for repairs. The Design-Build Firm shall provide the recommendations to the Authority <i>prior to beginning construction</i> and in sufficient time for the Authority to decide if the repair work will be added to the project. Pipe inspections and investigations should extend as a minimum to the first existing drainage structure outside of the longitudinal or lateral project limits.</b></p>

<p>Question 4:</p>	<p>Please clarify the design and bid requirements for the 8' x 8' concrete box culvert cross drain (CD-05) listed in the RFP as there appears to be conflicting language regarding this culvert.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. The RFP language on Page 11, in the last paragraph reads: " The Design-Build Firm shall perform the investigation necessary and provide the engineering analysis required to determine whether existing drainage features to remain are hydraulically adequate and retain at least a 75-year design life. Flood flow Requirements will be determined in accordance with the Department's procedures. If any of these existing cross drains (CD-03 and CD-05) 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. This implies analysis during the technical proposal and should be included in the bid. Attachment A-010 (pipes to be lined) appears to identify CD-05 to be lined.</li><li>b. On RFP Page 12, Paragraph 2 it reads: "The Design-Build Firm shall desilt and investigate the existing 8' x 8' concrete box culvert cross drain CD-05 at Station 714+00 as well as other existing pipes and structures within the project limits and shall make recommendations to the Authority for repairs. The Design-Build Firm shall provide the recommendations to the Authority in sufficient time for the Authority to decide if the repair work will be added to the project." This implies the work effort will be added after the project is awarded. Attachment A-010 (pipes to be lined) appears to identify CD-05 to be lined.</li></ul>
<p>Response 4:</p>	<p><b>The Design-Build Firm shall desilt, video inspect, and investigate the existing 8'x8' concrete box culvert cross drain CD-05 at Station 714+00, as well as all other existing pipes and structures not previously identified as to be lined within the project limits and shall make recommendations to the Authority for repairs. The Design-Build Firm shall provide the recommendations to the Authority prior to beginning construction and in sufficient time for the Authority to decide if the repair work will be added to the project. Pipe inspections and investigations should extend as a minimum to the first existing drainage structure outside of the longitudinal or lateral project limits. Language in the RFP will be revised.</b></p>
<p>Question 5:</p>	<p>Would THEA consider allowing DB teams to review the video inspections, reports, and repair recommendations to assess if there is a different repair method (i.e. chemical grout injection) that could possibly provide an "equal to or better than" repair procedure for pipe deficiencies?</p>

<p>Response 5:</p>	<p><b>Liners shall be utilized for those identified pipes per the RFP. For pipes other than those previously identified to be lined, spot repair methods such as chemical grout injection will not be considered unless they can be manually performed from inside the pipe. Approval from the Authority will be required for all proposed pipe repairs.</b></p>
<p>Question 6:</p>	<p>Does the ELOI also need to be added in the appendix for the technical proposal or included in the electronic UBS submission? Addendum No. 9 PDF page 14: Submit 1 Original, seven (7) Flash Drives containing the Letter of Interest in PDF format, and seven (7) collated, complete sets of hard copies</p>
<p>Response 6:</p>	<p><b>The Letter of Interest does not need to be submitted with the technical proposal. The reference included in the question from Slide 27 of the Pre-Bid Meeting Presentation is a typographical error.</b></p>
<p>Question 7:</p>	<p>Can charts, graphics, and tables be a smaller font than 10 point as long as its readable?</p>
<p>Response 7:</p>	<p><b>No. In accordance with RFP Section VII.B., all text shall be 10 point font size minimum. Text embedded within graphics shall not be smaller than 10 point font.</b></p>
<p>Question 8:</p>	<p>Please confirm that covers, tabs, and a table of contents are not included in the page count?</p>
<p>Response 8:</p>	<p><b>Confirmed. However, if the Authority deems a sheet to contain texts, graphics, tables, charts, or photographs related to the project approach section of the technical proposal it will be included in the page count. Cover pages only containing unique graphics or photographs will not be included in the page count.</b></p>
<p>Question 9:</p>	<p>Please confirm that the Authority wants both a written narrative for the schedule and a bar/gantt chart? Also, if a bar/gantt chart is required, please allow it to be on a 11x17 single sheet of paper not within page count.</p>

<p>Response 9:</p>	<p><b>The written schedule narrative is part of the project approach and is confined to an 8.5"x11" sheet. Bar/gantt charts are considered graphics in Section 1 of the technical proposal and will count toward the page limit. Bar/gantt charts shall not be included in Section 2 of the technical proposal.</b></p>
<p>Question 10:</p>	<p>Please clarify from Letter of Clarification No. 3 that the technical proposal Section 2: Plan Set is allowed to have roll plots and the following question (Question 6) was intended for the ATCs only?          Question 6: Can the Authority please confirm whether or not Roll Plots are allowed or if all plans are to be 11x17?          Response 6: No roll plots. All 11x17.</p>
<p>Response 10:</p>	<p><b>In accordance with RFP Addendum 9, technical proposal plans for the proposed improvements shall be submitted on 11"x17" sheets.</b></p>
<p>Question 11:</p>	<p>In Addendum 9 RFP page 15 of 18 requires the submittal of a schedule narrative as part of our project approach. Attached to addendum 9 is the power point presentation from January that mentions a bar chart will be submitted with the schedule narrative. Please confirm that a schedule bar chart is required to be submitted with our technical proposal?</p>
<p>Response 11:</p>	<p><b>Yes, a bar chart needs to be submitted with the schedule narrative to support the schedule narrative being reasonable and realistic.</b></p>
<p>Question 12:</p>	<p>Preliminary analysis indicates that existing bridge piers supporting the N. 34th St. and Falkenburg Rd. bridge structures do not meet FDM <a href="#">215.5.4.5</a> vehicular impact criteria. Will the Design/Build firm be required to provide pier protection barriers or pier strengthening in accordance with the FDM and SDG for any existing piers on this project?</p>
<p>Response 12:</p>	<p><b>For all bridges that are widened or modified, the substructure shall meet the requirements of FDM 215.4.5.4.</b></p>

<p>Question 13:</p>	<p>Please clarify what the schedule bar charts showing critical path duration w/no work at risk, that are required to be submitted with the technical proposal, will be used for. While there is no Technical Proposal scoring component for schedule duration a team submitting a bar chart schedule with a completion date ahead of the RFP stipulated 800 days could create an unintended bias that is reflected within the available scoring criteria, regardless of whether the shortened schedule is realistic. We request that THEA require all submitted schedules to have a completion date no earlier than 800 days.</p>
<p>Response 13:</p>	<p><b>THEA requested both the schedule bar charts showing critical path duration w/no work at risk along with the schedule narrative to support that the proposed schedule is reasonable and realistic. This will be considered in the construction scoring. THEA will not set a minimum schedule length as the proposal will need to support the validity of the proposed schedule length.</b></p>
<p>Question 14:</p>	<p>RFP Addendum 10 Section 2.E requires extremely aggressive environmental classification for all bridge sites within the project. The existing bridge plans for Bridge 100490 (Falkenburg Rd) state that the existing structure has been designed for moderately aggressive substructure and slightly aggressive superstructure. What is the environmental classification for the existing superstructure and substructure for Bridge 100490?</p>
<p>Response 14:</p>	<p><b>The existing bridge was designed as stated in the existing plans. As per the RFP addendum, all proposed bridge construction shall be designed for extremely aggressive environmental classification.</b></p>

**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.

All other items, conditions, and specifications in the procurement 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](mailto:Man.Le@tampa-xway.com).

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT OF ADDENDUM and/or LETTER OF CLARIFICATION**

Were Addenda issued on this Solicitation?

Yes

No

Were Letter of Clarification issued on this Solicitation?

Yes

No

I (We) hereby acknowledge receipt of the following Addendum/Addenda issued in reference to this solicitation by listing the Addenda by number, date and signing the form:

Addendum \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Addendum \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Letter of Clarification \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Letter of Clarification \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**BIDDER:**

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Authorized Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Signer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title of Signer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date Signed

**[END OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT FORM]**