

**TAMPA-HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY  
EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY**

**Letter of Clarification No. 6**

**FOR**

**Request for Proposals**

**East Selmon Slip Ramps  
Design-Build**

**RFP O-02520**

**Letter of Clarification No. 6 ~ RFO No. O-02520**

Date of Letter of Clarification: **March 23, 2021**

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

Question 1:	This is a follow up question to the recently issued Q&A response No. 9 regarding the inclusion of the schedule and schedule narrative in Section 1 of the Technical Proposal, and inclusive of the allowed 10 pages. A schedule that provides THEA with a level of detail sufficient to accurately assess the approach to the work and critical path will be at least 1 page and likely 1.5 pages. The Narrative will be about 1 page long. These two items will therefore consume approximately 2.5 pages of the allowed 10 pages, leaving about 7.5 pages to address all remaining items specified in the RFP. Will THEA reconsider the current response and allow the schedule to be included in the Technical Proposal as an attachment?
Response 1:	<b>Schedule will be allowed to be included as an attachment to the Technical Proposal.</b>
Question 2:	Addendum 11 added language to the RFP requiring exposed surfaces of galvanized overhead sign structures, west of I-75, to be painted. Please confirm this only applies to full replacements or added structures, existing sign structures are not affected.
Response 2:	<b>All new sign structures and components shall be painted in accordance with the RFP. Sign structure components currently under the Authority's maintenance program do not require painting unless construction activities damage the existing paint and expose the metal surface.</b>
Question 3:	Per the CSX Public Projects Manual, regarding hoisting equipment with the potential to foul the tracks: "All lifting equipment, rigging devices, and other load bearing elements shall have a rated (safe lifting) capacity that is greater than or equal to 150% of the load it is carrying, as a factor of safety. Supporting calculations shall be furnished to verify the minimum capacity requirement is maintained for the duration of the hoisting operation." Please confirm this and all other hoisting requirements will be in effect for this project.
Response 3:	<b>The CSX Public Projects Manual requirements will apply to the bridge construction over the CSX rail spur. The DB Firm is solely responsible for compliance with the CSX Public Projects Manual.</b>

<p>Question 4:</p>	<p>RFP p. 13 of 58, Section V.B Project Requirements and Provisions for Work - Innovative Aspects indicates that wrong-way driving security features including gates and other features used on the REL are critical elements of this Project and failure to install these features shall not be allowed. The FDOT Design Manual, Section 233.3.9 Emergency Generator Power Systems (Generators) indicates that, "Permanent generators are required for applications that cannot tolerate a short duration outage. Supplement with a UPS or battery system to provide continuous power service during the start-up cycle of the generator". Please confirm if the wrong-way gates are considered to be an application that cannot tolerate a short duration outage and will require an emergency generator, UPS, and associated equipment?</p>
<p>Response 4:</p>	<p><b>Confirmed. Refer to FDM Section 233.3.2 for additional requirements.</b></p>
<p>Question 5:</p>	<p>Addendum No. 11 revised RFP section V.I.3. Aesthetic Guidelines. Item a. requires overhead guide sign structures to be painted. Please clarify if this requirement only applies to new structures, or if it also applies to existing structures.</p>
<p>Response 5:</p>	<p><b>All new sign structures and components shall be painted in accordance with the RFP. Sign structure components currently under the Authority's maintenance program do not require painting unless construction activities damage the existing paint and expose the metal surface.</b></p>
<p>Question 6:</p>	<p>This is a follow-up question regarding the response to provide pier protection barrier or pier strengthening for the bridge piers at the 34th St. and Falkenburg bridge structures. Please clarify if the requirement to meet FDM 215.4.5.4 for vehicular impact criteria applies on to pier columns constructed under this THEA project or if it applies to existing piers which no longer meet current criteria.</p>
<p>Response 6:</p>	<p><b>For all bridges that are widened or modified, the proposed and existing substructure shall meet the requirements of FDM 215.4.5.4.</b></p>
<p>Question 7:</p>	<p>Lighting within areas of milling and paving, outside of the limits of roadway or bridge widening or reconstruction, do not meet criteria for illumination. Does the extend of the lighting analysis and requirement to bring lighting up to current criteria extend to the limits of milling and paving?</p>

<p>Response 7:</p>	<p><b>Lighting analysis shall be performed a minimum of 500' beyond the taper points of the proposed slip ramps and at any existing roadway light fixtures modified by construction. Lighting analysis within these limits shall consider all Selmon Expressway westbound local lanes &amp; shoulders, proposed slip ramps, and the REL lanes &amp; shoulders.</b></p>
<p>Question 8:</p>	<p>Will the Authority please confirm whether crash walls are required to be constructed for the bridge widening over CSX? Does the future CSX RR track need to be considered when evaluating SDG 2.6.7 criteria? If so, will the Authority please provide an alignment for the future track?</p>
<p>Response 8:</p>	<p><b>The requirements of SDG 2.6.7 is to be met for existing RR tracks only.</b></p>
<p>Question 9:</p>	<p>The RFP states: <i>“provided below is a determination made by the Authority as to the eligibility of reimbursement for each UA/O identified herein along with an identification of whether the UA/O or the Design-Build Firm will be responsible for performing the utility work.”</i> However, this information is not provided in the RFP or various Addenda. Will THEA provide a determination for eligibility of reimbursement for each UA/O? Will utility work by UA/O or Design-Build responsibility be identified by THEA?</p>
<p>Response 9:</p>	<p><b>The Design Build teams are responsible for all aspects of the Utility coordination process, as stated in the RFP.</b></p>
<p>Question 10:</p>	<p>Section 1.A of the RFP indicates the Design Builder must comply with the requirements and commitments of the PD&amp;E Environmental Document and the Type I Categorical Exclusion. The presentation from the mandatory preproposal meeting indicates the PD&amp;E is in process. Can this language be removed, or will the requirements and commitments be provided?</p>
<p>Response 10:</p>	<p><b>The approved Type I Categorical Exclusion was provided in Addendum 11. Review the approval document for any necessary requirements and commitments. The PEIR for Ramp 2 is pending completion and will be provided before April 5, 2021.</b></p>

Question 11:	The RFP aesthetic requirements refer to “the aesthetics of the East Selmon Expressway” but no further information is provided in the RFP. Please provide specific cleaning, sealing, coating, and any other aesthetic treatment requirements for the existing bridges that are not being modified and for the existing and proposed portions of the bridges that are being modified.
Response 11:	<b>All available aesthetics details have been provided in the reference documents. The reference RFP Section VI.I. only refers to aesthetic guidelines required for structures plans and is not intended to dictate design details such as cleaning, sealing, coating, and other requirements to produce a Class V finish that complies with all of the RFP requirements.</b>
Question 12:	The Selmon Expressway ITS As-builts reference a “splice book”. Please provide a copy of this document.
Response 12:	<b>Splice books are not currently available, additional information will be provided to the successful DB Team.</b>
Question 13:	We have identified that the pull boxes within the north side shoulder of the REL have electrical conductors occupying the same conduit as fiber optic cable. Will the Authority require this condition be corrected as part of the construction project?
Response 13:	<b>Yes they shall be brought up to code and FDOT specifications which both require separation unless the power conductors are part of a hybrid comm cable like Power over Ethernet (PoE) or hybrid CCTV cable.</b>

<p>Question 14:</p>	<p>There is an ongoing high mast pole and lighting (HML) replacement project on I-75 (428953-1) with construction ending just north of the Selmon interchange. This includes replacing all HML north of the Selmon Expressway with new high mast poles with LED fixtures. The project that would upgrade the HML on the south side of the interchange is not expected to start until 2025. When the slip ramp is analyzed using LED HML on the north side (per 428953-1 plans) and existing HPS HML on the south side, the Selmon Expressway lanes, including proposed Slip Ramp 3 do not meet HML criteria with the mix of the new HML LED and old HPS fixtures. Since the existing lanes of the Selmon Expressway and the proposed slip ramp do/will not meet HML lighting criteria at the time construction is complete for this project, is the Authority expecting conventional lighting to be added to only Slip Ramp 3 so newly constructed areas meet current conventional lighting criteria?</p>
<p>Response 14:</p>	<p><b>The Lighting EOR is responsible for performing a lighting analysis considering the proposed slip ramp improvements and the existing lighting. Any improvements necessary to meet current lighting criteria will be designed and constructed west of the bridge over Falkenburg Road. If the existing FDOT-owned high mast lighting along the Selmon Expressway from Falkenburg Road to I-75 does not meet current criteria in the slip ramp construction area, a design variation will be prepared by the DB Team for THEA's approval to leave the existing high mast lighting in place as is.</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 **with the Respondent's bid package**.

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]**