

Questions – 3/2/2023:

1. How does the Authority define “loss of toll revenue” defined in accordance with Attachment A_002.03? Do “actions of the Contractor” include actions contemplated by the RFP, such as special detours, etc. as it applies to the special provision?

Answer: Loss of toll revenue includes, but is not limited to, damage to the toll equipment or an unapproved closure or detour of the toll road. Closures or detours by the Contractor, if approved by the Authority, would not be considered lost toll revenue unless the closure or detour were not in compliance with the approved MOT plans and schedule.

2. Can the Authority provide the most current set of roadway, temporary traffic control, and S&PM plans for the East Selmon/REL Slip Ramps project referenced on RFP Page 4, 35, and 36?

Answer: Current Ramp 2 RFC and RFC revised roadway, temporary traffic control, and S&PM plans for the East Selmon/REL Slip Ramps project are being provided as Reference Document R_08 - EastSelmon_REL_SlipRampPlans.zip. Proposers are advised that since the Slip Ramps project is a Design-Build project, and the project is still under construction, these plans are preliminary and subject to change. The plans will be shared via a OneDrive File Share or by in-person pickup of a flash drive at the THEA Headquarters office. Please contact the Procurement Office at procurement@tampa-xway.com to request your link or flash drive.

3. In RFP Section V.A., the Governing Regulations reference the 2012 amendment to the MUTCD. Why is the Authority specifically not requiring the application of MUTCD Revision 3, incorporated July 2022?

Answer: THEA/FDOT have not adopted Revision 3. To our knowledge, the major provisions of the regulatory action regarding revision 3 is the establishment of minimum maintained retroreflectivity levels for longitudinal pavement markings on all roads open to public travel with speed limits of 35 mph or greater. And since THEA/FDOT already meets or exceed this standard, i.e: **THEA/FDOT** 350 mcd/lx·m² vs. **MUTCD** 50 mcd/m²/lx, the need to adopt the new revision has not been pursued.

4. Do all pavement markings within the milepost/station limits of the resurfacing areas need to be replaced?

Answer: Only pavement markings impact by the milling and resurfacing within the milepost/station limits of the resurfacing areas need to be replaced. RFP will be revised by amendment.

5. What is the milling and resurfacing pavement design for the shoulders within the resurfacing areas?

Answer: The milling and resurfacing pavement design for the shoulders within the resurfacing areas is consistent with the mainline. Where no FC-5 overlap is required, the milling shall be 2” and the resurfacing Structural Course 2.0 inches with Traffic Level C, SP 12.5 with hi-polymer additive.

6. RFP Page 36 references high polymer mix specifications using “(HP)” but is also refers to “hi-polymer additive”. Please clarify if both of these references mean “High Polymer” binder mixtures in accordance with the FDOT asphalt specifications.

Answer: Yes, both of these references mean “High Polymer” binder mixtures in accordance with the FDOT asphalt specifications 916.

7. RFP Page 36 requires FC-5 (HP) in one pavement design, and it requires FC-5 (PG76-22) in a separate high polymer asphalt pavement design. Do the Authority’s specifications allow the Contractor to substitute PG76-22 for HP in the FC-5?

Answer: HP shall not be used in any FC-5 on the project. PG76-22 shall be used in all FC-5. RFP will be revised by amendment.

8. Is there an example available of a Project specific Partnering Agreement, referenced on RFP Page 34?

Answer: There is no Project specific Partnering Agreement for this project. Resolution of issues will be processed as described in the second paragraph of Section V.Q. on Page 34 of the RFP.

9. Does the Authority maintain its own material certification databases in accordance with Specification Section 105 (RFP Page 32) and will access be provided to the Contractor?

Answer: No, THEA does not. Per the RFP, the sampling, testing and reporting of all materials used shall be in compliance with the Sampling, Testing and Reporting Guide (STRG) developed by the Design-Build Firm and submitted to the Authority for review and approval.

10. Will the Authority provide an example job guide schedule for use on this project that complies with Authority requirements and Specification Section 105?

Answer: No, the design-build firm shall develop its own based on the materials utilized. RFP will be revised by amendment.

11. RFP Section VI is missing subsections VI.C, VI.D, VI.E, VI.F, and VI.O. Please confirm these sections were intentionally not used in the RFP.

Answer: VI.C is located on page 35, Section Roadway Plans. VI.G, Geometric should be VI.D; VI.H, Design Documentation, Calculations and Computations should be VI.E and so on.