

Questions –

1. Section X.I.2. AND R_07.02 - Preliminary Structures Concept Plans, Drawing B-41 - Preliminary Structures Concept Plans, Drawing B-41 shows Vessel Collision Protection Structures on Piers 4, 5, 6, and 7 located within the Hillsborough River. Piers 4 and 7 are away from the navigational channel. Please confirm that Vessel Collision Protection Structures for Piers 4 and 7 are to be designed only for Minimum Vessel Collision Load of 69 kips specified in the RFP. Also, please confirm that the Vessel Collision Protection Structure for Piers 5 and 6 on the opposite side of the navigation channel are to be designed only for Minimum Vessel Collision Load of 69 kips.

ANSWER: The Structures Concept Plans for Vessel Collision Protection Structures and Vessel Collision forces are consistent with the South Selmon PD&E Study - Bridge Report Volume 1 Section 1.5 Vessel Collision which indicates a collision force of 1250 kips for Piers 4 through 7.

2. P. 48 of 48 A_010 - THEA ITS Minimum Technical Requirements_2022_07-019 Appendix - Attachment A states - "The products listed below or approved equal shall be allowed on the project: AXIS Q-6075-E PTZ CCTV Camera; - Wavetronix SmartSensor HD MVDS; TAPCO LED, AC Powered WWVDS; Yunex Roadside Unit 2X." Please confirm the listed equipment are the only proprietary products the Design-Build firm is required to furnish for synchronization with the existing THEA deployment on this project. Is the Design-Build firm permitted to select any available manufacturer and model of equipment not explicitly listed in Attachment A if listed on the FDOT Approved Products List (APL), including but not limited to, dynamic message signs (DMS), uninterruptible power supply (UPS), cabinet assemblies, Ethernet-to-serial device servers, fixed CCTV cameras, remote power management unit (RPMU), fiber optic patch panel?

ANSWER: The products listed in Attachment A are not proprietary. As identified in the narrative in Attachment A, the D-B Firm may provide the products listed or approved equivalent. The other ITS components on the product must be on the FDOT APL.

3. RFP section X. Design and Construction Criteria R. Signalization and Intelligent Transportation System Plans - Please confirm there is no requirement to provide communications master hub on the project.

ANSWER: There is no requirement to provide a communications master hub on the project.

4. RFP section X. Design and Construction Criteria F. Roadway Design 3. Drainage Analysis - Please provide hydraulic models and storm drainage calculations developed in support of the conceptual storm drainage conveyance systems and ponds included in the reference drawings and pond sitting report.

ANSWER: The volumetric calculations used for preliminary sizing of the stormwater ponds by the PD&E Consultant are included in the previously provided Reference Document "R_13.06 - Selmon_PondSitingReport_20210617.pdf". Inlet and storm drain pipe locations shown in the Concept Plans are based on locations of existing drainage structures as well as logical estimates of locations of proposed structures and pipes. No storm drain calculations have been performed. Preliminary ICPR 4 Hydraulic Modeling for the Albany-Swann Ponds (Albany- Ponds (R_27 - Albany-Swann.zip) and the Granada Outfall (R_28 - Granada.zip) were performed by the PD&E Consultant for coordination and alternatives evaluation efforts only and do not necessarily reflect the drainage as shown on the Concept

Plans. These models are preliminary order of magnitude only studies and have NOT been approved by SWFWMD, COT, or THEA. THEA did not provide a complete drainage design with an expectation that the D/B firm provide innovative design approaches.

5. RFP IX E. (Pg 53 of 111), DIV D&B Specs (7-11.4.3, Pg 69 of 110) and THEA Question 5 Answered - Please clarify if in addition to the flagmen and other related CSX Engineering Administrative Costs (As stated on RFI Response No. 5) if THEA will also be reimbursing the Design Build Firm for any CSX costs associated with Right of Entry Permits, Construction Agreements (Includes the costs for any Temporary Easements within CSX ROW), Permanent Utility Crossing Permits for any drainage or utilities that may need to go under CSX tracks, Railroad Signalization relocations or any other costs required by CSX.

ANSWER: THEA will only pay for CSX flagmen and other related CSX Engineering Administrative Costs. All other CSX costs associated with Right of Entry Permits, Construction Agreements (Includes the costs for any Temporary Easements within CSX ROW), Permanent Utility Crossing Permits for any drainage or utilities that may need to go under CSX tracks, Railroad Signalization relocations or any other construction activities shall be the responsibility of the DB Firms.

6. RFP section X. Design and Construction Criteria S. Aesthetics, Public Space, Landscape & Irrigation Plans. Paragraph 3 Page 107 of 111 - The RPF indicates that DB shall provide landscape and irrigation for all underpass areas in coordination with the Authority. Please note that this may be in conflict with the retention facilities (ponds) shown on concept plans at W. Mississippi, W. Euclid, and W. El Prado. Please confirm that landscaping and irrigation are not required at these locations.

ANSWER: The DB Firm shall provide landscape and irrigation for all underpass areas in coordination with the Authority. Available areas around the retention facilities (ponds) proposed as shown on concept plans at W. Mississippi, W. Euclid, and W. El Prado shall be landscaped to the extent possible.

7. RFP section X. Design and Construction Criteria S. Aesthetics, Public Space, Landscape & Irrigation Plans . Paragraph 3 Page 108 of 111 - RFP requires the DB contractor to obtain all maintenance agreements with local entities for the proposed landscape and irrigation improvements. Please confirm if local entities have conceptually agreed to maintain landscape and irrigation improvements at all underpass locations. Please indicate if these entities have any specific design requirements for landscape and irrigation improvements. Since in most cases, the local entity will be the City of Tampa (COT), please provide COT irrigation requirements for the design and maintenance of landscape in the underpasses.

ANSWER: The DB Firms will not be required to obtain any maintenance agreements. That section will be removed from the RFP by an amendment. The designs shall meet FDOT standards.

8. X.I.2.ww (Design and Construction Criteria), Structures Plans, Criteria, Page 93 - The amendment issued on 01/12/23 indicates that the inside shoulder should be 9'-0". Please note that the typical section of the Ultimate Roadway configuration shows a 4'-0" inside shoulder. Please confirm that a 4'-0" insider shoulder is required by the amendment.

ANSWER: The 4'-0" inside shoulder is confirmed. The ultimate four-through lane section in each direction shall have 4'-0" inside shoulders. AMENDMENT X.I.2.ww; DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION CRITERIA, Structure Plans, Criteria; Page 93 will be revised to require an Inside Shoulder of 4'-0".

9. RFP, Section I. A. Description of Work, Page 4 of 111 - RFP Section I, Subsection A - "Upgrade signal at the W. Bay to Bay Boulevard exit ramp. Upgrade signals at the intersections of W. Brorein Street and S. Plant Avenue and E. Brorein Street and S. Morgan Street." Please provide clarity on the necessary upgrades for the signalized intersections at W Bay to Bay off-ramp, W Brorein St at S Plan Avenue, and E Brorein St at S Morgan St. Will the project be required to completely rebuild each signalized intersection? Or, will the project only be required to modify the signalized intersections with respect to the geometric improvements from the project?

ANSWER: The project will only require modifying the signalized intersections at W. Bay to Bay Boulevard exit ramp, W. Brorein Street @ S. Plant Avenue and E. Brorein Street @ S. Morgan Street if impacted by the geometric improvements from the project. The DB Firms need to coordinate with the City of Tampa if the above signals are impacted by the project.

10. Pg 77 of 111, Section F. Roadway – Milling - The design/construction criteria requires that cross slope corrections shall be achieved by milling a minimum of 2.25". The South Selmon Expressway Median Safety Improvements from Himes Ave to Hyde Park Ave completed in 2020 included specific cross slope improvements. As such, it is unclear if additional pavement cross slope corrections will be required with South Selmon Expressway capacity project. Please clarify the need and expectation for cross slope corrections.

ANSWER: A minimum of 2.25" of milling depth is required for any cross slope correction. Cross slope corrections will be as per the FDM requirements for new construction to meet the required typical section.

11. THEA General Tolling Requirements - Section 3.2.13, Page 9 of 35 - Section 3.2.13 of Appendix A_005-THEA General Tolling Requirements (GTR) indicates "Circuits or conductors that operate at high voltage (>600VAC RMC or VDC) shall not be permitted within 200 feet of the toll equipment control cabinet, gantry, and supporting site infrastructure." Was an evaluation performed to determine if any high voltage facilities are within 200 feet of the proposed conceptual toll facility locations shown on Reference Document R_07.05 - ITS Conceptual Development Plan_2022-07-28.pdf?

ANSWER: A utility evaluation was not conducted at the toll sites identified in the concept plans. It is the DB Firm's responsibility to complete an evaluation for all toll sites to ensure that they meet the requirements of the GTR.

12. CSXT Preliminary Engineering Agreement - The Design Build Firm is aware that THEA has executed a Preliminary Engineering Agreement with CSXT and has given the Design Build Firm permission to contact CSXT. Contact with CSXT and their consultant, Alfred Benesch, was made to setup a short meeting with the intentions to 1) explain the project, and 2) get clarifications on design/construction items along the CSXT track that are not included in the CSXT Public Projects Manual. The CSXT Public Projects Manager, Scott Willis, replied promptly with "CSX cannot participate in any discussions until the project has been awarded. You can send any questions through your THEA contact, and they can direct them to us." The process of submitting questions through THEA to CSXT can be time consuming. Should the Design Build Firm proceed to provide a list of questions to THEA that will in turn be sent to CSXT? If so, to whom should the Contractor send the questions to at THEA? Will the questions be kept confidential and shielded from the other shortlisted Design Build Firms?

ANSWER: Provide any questions to THEA Procurement and THEA will try to get a response from CSX. However, all questions and answers will be provided to all three shortlisted DB Firms.

13. RFP, Section X.Q, Page 99 of 111 AND R.08, R.08 Lighting Design Analysis Report (LDAR) South Selmon 07-13-2022, Page 1 - RFP Section X.Q. calls for median-mounted light poles. Reference document R.08 Lighting Design Analysis Report (LDAR) South Selmon 07-13-2022, under I Introduction, states "The recently completed project, the South Selmon Expressway Median Safety Improvements Project (THEA Project # O-00518), constructed 43 new 45-foot light poles on the median barrier wall within the project limits". FDOT Index 715-002 page 2 of 8 and the FDOT Standard Plans Instructions (SPI) for Indexes 715-001, 715-002, and 715-003, state that the nominal mounting height of median-mounted poles shall be 40 feet. Please confirm that the nominal mounting height for the median-mounted light poles for this project shall be 45 feet. Also, please confirm whether the poles shall be oblong at the base.

ANSWER: The nominal mounting height shall match the existing 45-foot poles installed from the THEA Safety Project for aesthetics and appropriate pole spacing anticipated for this project. The pole bases shall also look and be mounted like the existing poles installed from the THEA Safety Project.

14. RFP Section I.A, Page 5 of 111 - RFP, Section I.A. states "Expand or replace the existing aesthetic lighting on the eastbound and westbound Hillsborough River Bridges to illuminate the widened structures similar to the existing structures. Luminaires shall be equivalent to the existing luminaires and compatible with the existing controller." Please provide As-builts of the existing aesthetic lighting and shop drawings of the installed equipment at the Hillsborough River Bridge.

ANSWER: Attached is all information THEA has from the original installation of the aesthetic lights.

15. RFP Section II, B, Page 11 of 111 - RFP requires the submission of requests for Design Exceptions or Design Variations by 02/23/2023. Please confirm that the submission of request for Design Exceptions or Design Variations is limited to the new Design Exceptions or Design Variations due to the proposed ATCs and/or changes to the Concept Plans, and it does not have to include the Exceptions and Variations already identified in the RFP documents.

ANSWER: Only new Design Exceptions or Variations not identified in the PD&E or RFP documents need to be submitted by 2/23/2023.

16. Reference Documents - R_07.02 - Preliminary Structures Concept Plans - Please provide As-built plans for the Tampa convention center foundations, civil/utilities, and MEP including the transformer station under eastbound South Selmon Roadway.

ANSWER: THEA does not have those documents and is trying to obtain them . The DB Firms may also request those documents from the owning entity. Attached are all the documents THEA has obtained to date.

17. RFP Section V.3.Section 2: Plans, Page 31 of 111 - RFP specifies that the roll plots (plan and profile sheets) in the Technical Proposal utilize a maximum horizontal scale of 1" = 50'. Please confirm that a 1" = 100' scale can be used for ITS, Signing and Pavement Markings, Signalization, and Lighting

Plans and/or roll plots as these are systemwide design components that can be better represented in a larger scale.

ANSWER: A 1" = 100' scale is acceptable for ITS, Signing and Pavement Markings, Signalization, and Lighting Plans and/or roll plots.

13. 2022 FDM does not require Landscape Concept Plans as part of a Technical Proposal and therefore does not provide specific submittal requirements for Landscape Concept Plans. RFP Page 32 through 36 of 111 does not make reference to Landscape Plans as part of Technical Proposal evaluation. RFP Page 108 of 111 reads; "The Design-Build Firm shall prepare a plant list to be used for this Project. The plant list shall be provided a part of the landscape concept submitted in the Technical Proposal."

Please confirm if it is THEA's intent to require submittal of Landscape Concept Plans and plant list as part of Technical Proposal.

If it is the intent of THEA to submit Landscape Concept Plans as part of Technical Proposal, please advise on what will be required of the concept plans, how it will be evaluated, and if DLA approval of existing inventory plan is required prior to Technical Proposal submittal, as indicated in the current RFP.

ANSWER: Yes, THEA requires Landscape Concept Plans and a plant list as part of the Technical Proposal as stated on the RFP. The RFP takes precedent over the FDM. Additionally, this is a THEA project, so all submittals go to THEA for approval, not FDOT. As with all other component plans submitted as part of the technical proposal, the Landscape Concept Plans shall convey the magnitude and types of proposed vegetation. The plans will be reviewed similarly as the other component plans. The Landscape portion of the Proposal will be considered in Scoring Criteria Item 1. Design and Aesthetics as well as Item 5, Utilizations of Sustainable, Recycled, and Environmentally Friendly Materials.