

Questions – 4/7/2023:

1. It is currently our understanding per FL Statute 337.403 that conflicts with utilities in THEA right of way and the construction of this project, the cost of these relocations will be borne by the Utility Owner. This is true for Third Party Private Utility Owners. For City of Tampa Utilities please confirm, that no utility relocation costs need to be included / anticipated for this Project. Q&A response dated 1/19/23 stated that "RFP Section X. D _ Utility Coordination (page 74 of 111) identifies the Utility Agency/Owners (UA/O's)UA/O that may be impacted by this project and require relocation or protection. The RFP states that THEA will determine whether UA/O or Design-Build Firm will be responsible for performing the utility work and associated costs. Please provide this determination. ANSWER: Yes, that will be included in an upcoming RFP Amendment" This has not been received to date. Question #2 from February 20 as well.

Answer: THEA has not determined that any Utility Owners are compensable for relocations required by this project's roadway improvements. Therefore, no utility relocation costs need to be included / anticipated for this Project.

2. RFP Concept plans include additional foundations on the south side of the alignment adjacent to the Convention Center, and show LA R/W Line parallel to the EB THEA alignment. City & County GIS shows that a portion of this property is owned by the COT. Please confirm the Right of Way in this area, in order to properly locate the new foundations and improvements.

Answer: Limited Access Right of Way Lines as shown in RFP information RWDTRD01.dgn are correct per the South Crosstown Express Right-Of-Way Map Section 10002-2506. Consultant should validate property lines in the field by locating property corners prior to construction.

3. City of Tampa Wastewater Green Lines dated 1/6/23, states that the 54" force main adjacent to the Tampa Convention center is to remain. There is a clear conflict with the RFP Structures Concepts drawing widening the Hillsborough bridge to the south with additional foundations at this location. Has there been any preliminary conversations / feasibility reviews with the COT for the relocation of this sanitary line?

Answer: There has been no discussions with COT wastewater on this subject and based on the concept plan roll plots, the City feels they have no conflicts at this location. As plans are further developed, all efforts need to be made to avoid any conflicts with their 54" force main and it is the responsibility of the selected DB team to identify and mitigate utility conflicts as plans are further developed.

4. Our review of the RFP (X.C.,Geotechnical Services, Page 70 of 111), Volume 1 of the FDOT Structures Manual (Structures Design Guidelines 3.6.10, Non-Redundant Drilled Shaft Bridge Foundations, Page 3-29), Volume 2 of the FDOT Structures Manual (Structural Detailing Manual), FDOT Design Manual (Section 260 Bridge Structures), the FDOT Soils and Foundation Handbook and AASHTO LRFD Design Specifications does not preclude the use of non-redundant drilled shafts. In accordance with the manuals noted above, non-redundant (single shafts) should also be designed with demand load factors noted in AASHTO LRFD Section 1.3.4 and geotechnical resistance factors noted in the FDOT SDG

Table 3.6.4-1. This RFI is to request confirmation that non-redundant drilled shafts (single drilled shafts at pier locations) are acceptable for the bridges to be widened on this project.

Answer: Non-redundant drilled shafts or piles are not acceptable to THEA. An amendment will be issued on this.

5. Based on our field investigation, there are 57 utility conflicts that are not captured in the provided RGB plans. 36 of the identified utility conflicts shown as Greenline and 21 of them are not even shown the existence of the lines in the provided RGB plans. Some of these relocations could impact the project construction schedule. Can THEA provide direction on how DBs should consider these long lead utility relocation schedules in project schedule? Here are list of the identified long lead utility relocations: 1-Bridge attached Spectrum, Frontier and Fiberlight conduits crossing Hillsborough River 2-Underground Lumen cable crossing Hillsborough River 3-Communication lines underneath of CSX Property crossing intersections 4-54" FM Sanitary Sewer in front of the convention center 5-60" Gravity Sanitary Sewer line crossing Ashley Drive 6-Overhead TECO Distribution Line Between Himes Ave and Euclid Ave

Answers:

1. Utility owners attached to existing bridge are not anticipated to be relocated and they are currently attached to the bridge beams and the beams are to remain.
2. Coordination will be required with CenturyLink to accurately determine if there is a conflict based on their actual location in the river.
3. Communications lines located within CSX railroad should not be affected by this project as there are no improvements located within the CSX right of way.
4. Based on the concept plan roll plots, the City feels they have no conflicts at this location. As plans are further developed, all efforts need to be made to avoid any conflicts with their 54" force main and it is the responsibility of the selected DB team to identify and mitigate utility conflicts as plans are further developed.
5. Based on the concept plan roll plots, the City feels they have no conflicts at this location. As plans are further developed, all efforts need to be made to avoid any conflicts with their 54" force main and it is the responsibility of the selected DB team to identify and mitigate utility conflicts as plans are further developed.
6. This area has been reviewed and determined that TECO has approx. 10' plus from any roadway improvements.