

Questions – 4/19/2023:

1. Please confirm it is THEA's intent that the Design Build firm must make the improvements to the existing Granada outfall as directed in the RFP Section X.F.3 Drainage Analysis and in reference to the Granada Outfall Drainage Technical Memo (12/13/2021) despite the fact that the same desired attenuation needs of this basin could be accomplished by providing underground storage under the bridges between S. MacDill Avenue and Bay-to-Bay Boulevard as discussed in the pond citing report, Reference Document R-13.06.

Answer: It is the Authority's intent to make improvements to the existing Granada outfall. THEA has other plans for the area under the bridges at MacDill Avenue and Bay-to-Bay Boulevard and there are concerns regarding the required depth of excavation adjacent to the existing bridge foundations to provide the required underground storage volume with that alternative.

2. Section X. D _ Utility Coordination (page 73 of 111) - Please clarify if the existing utilities in conflict can be abandoned and remain in place after relocation or need to be removed. Also, who will be the responsible party for the cost of removal?

Answer: Per the RFP - Out of Service Left in Place Facilities: Any UAO who wants to leave out of service facilities within the Selmon Expressway Corridor, must first provide a letter to the Authority's Construction Manager to obtain approval from the Authority. The Design-Build firm will assist the UAO in the coordination of this effort with the Authority. The responsible party for the cost of the removal will be the UAO unless the relocation work is considered reimbursable.

3. Section X.F.3. page 80 of 111 - The RFP states "The Design-Build Firm shall repair/refurbish or replace the existing pump station with a pump of similar capacity...Design water stages in the South Albany pond shall be developed to provide as much capacity for Selmon Expressway runoff as possible and to reduce the local street flooding." This does not provide a clear criteria for the pond analysis. Please provide direction what is the desired capacity of the South Albany Pond in the interim conditions until the Howard Avenue Outfall is available, and what is the allowable flooding depth in the local streets during interim conditions?

Answer: The Design-Firm shall base their drainage design on the premise that the Howard Outfall will be available. The RFP Amendments posted 4/10/23 removed the requirements for the Pump Station to be repaired/refurbished or replaced. The City's South Howard Outfall improvement will be in place for the proposed new gravity outfall structure from the South Albany Pond to connect to.

4. In response to Question 6 in Q&A dated 01/19/23, THEA provided the City of Tampa's (COT) "General Information package for Traffic Signal" and indicated that the D-B Firm needs to coordinate with the COT for their latest standards as they have an ongoing ATMS project to obtain their latest requirements.

a. In accordance with THEA direction, we approached COT and obtained the following requirements:

- i. Econolite NEMA TS-2, Type 1 or Transportation Control Specialists (TCS) NEMA TS-2, Type 1 controller cabinet assembly; Econolite Cobalt ATC controller with EOS Software, TS-2 Type 1 model; Wavetronix SmartSensor Matrix w/ Click! 650 in-cabinet processor;

Siemens RST916C managed field Ethernet switch; Myers Powerback UPS Battery Backup System w/ "piggyback" ancillary cabinet; internally illuminated street name signs; spare high-voltage and low-voltage conduit for all roadway crossings.

b. To ensure that all proposers are using the same assumptions to develop the bid price, please confirm that these are the requirements to be followed and that there are no additional requirements from COT regarding traffic signals.

Answer: Yes. Follow the requirements provided by the COT. As per RFP, Section X.R. "All Signalization work shall be coordinated with City of Tampa and the Authority. All signalization equipment shall be compatible and interchangeable with existing infrastructure and comply with all City of Tampa and the Authority design requirements."

5. Section I. A - Description of Work, page 3 of 111 - The RFP states "Upgrade signals at the intersections of W. Brorein Street and S. Plant Avenue and E. Brorein Street and S. Morgan Street." Please note that the upgrades to these intersections are not identified in the Signalization Concept Development Plans (R_07.03). Please confirm that the intent for the upgrades is related only to the necessary improvements resulting from roadway work on the adjacent on/off ramps.

Answer: The anticipated work is only adjustments to existing signal timings. Additional work required due to changes in ramp configurations at the intersections by the Design-Build Firms will also be their responsibility.

6. Page 4 of 111 (Section I - A.) - The RFP states that the DB firms are to match the vertical profile grade for widening at ramps. (Pg 4 of 111). In order to improve ramp safety and harmonize ramp gore details, will a variance for ramp profile slopes be granted?

Answer: Yes, or the ramp profile can be adjusted to meet design standards provided TTCP and tolling requirements can be adequately designed.

7. Page 37 of 111 (Section VI - 1.) - Is it THEA's intent that the Platt Street and Willow Street Bridges be widened to their ultimate configuration, or should they be widened to agree with the configurations depicted on the RFP concept plans?

Answer: As stated in the RFP, whenever the bridges are widened to the outside or inside, that widening shall be to the ultimate required width. THEA does not want to have to come back at a later date and widen a bridge further on a side already widened in this project.

8. Page 37 of 111 (Section VI - 1.) - Is it THEA's intent to provide a single lane off-ramp at the Platt Street exit in the ultimate configuration instead of the dual ramp off-ramp identified in the RFP concept plans?

Answer: No.

9. VI.2 (Pg 38 of 111) - Pg 38 of 111 of the RFP states: "Modifications to the horizontal and/or vertical geometry requiring an ATC submittal as described in Section VI.F of this RFP" This section (VI.F) is not included in the RFP. Please provide the information noted.

Answer: As previously answered on the 12/15/22 Questions-

Q 13: Page 38 of 111 – has bullet at bottom of page which reads: “Modifications to the horizontal and/or vertical geometry requiring an ATC submittal as described in Section VI.F of this RFP.” Section VI.F does not appear to be part of the current RFP. Will THEA please provide clarification?

Answer- The portion of the RFP Section VI.2 will be revised to “Modifications to the horizontal and/or vertical geometry requiring an ATC submittal as described in Section VI.1.B of this RFP”.

An amendment will be issued revising the RFP.

10. ITS Concept Development Plans (R_07.05) - ITS Concept Development Plans identify a minimum 100' spacing between fiber optic pull boxes separating Tolls and ITS fiber, as well as spare conduit. Is it acceptable to install fiber optic pull boxes at the same location (i.e., concrete pad) and provide clearly differentiated stamped lids "THEA ITS FIBER", "THEA TOLL FIBER", "THEA CONDUIT"?

Answer: No. Fiber optic pull boxes shall be spaced a minimum of 100' from each other unless installed in the barrier wall. As identified in O-0622-SSC_Amendments-3.7.23 – Amendment X.I.2.gg Design and Construction Criteria, Structure Plan, Page 92 (Page 12 of 14 of document), “Three 2-in. diameter conduits in accordance with Standard Plans Index 630-010 shall be installed in all new concrete traffic railings/barriers mounted on bridges and retaining walls (3 allowed in junction slab per Index 521-610).”

11. RFP Section X. D _ Utility Coordination; page 74 of 111 Pre-Bid Utility Meeting December 1, 2022 - The RFP page 74 identifies 24 public and private utilities that have facilities within the project corridor that may be impacted by the scope of this contract and require relocation. Please note that utility conflicts could have a significant impact on the design solutions for highway widening, bridge foundations, construction cost and schedule. At the pre-bid Utility Meeting on December 1, 2022, THEA indicated that existing utility information will be provided in the future Amendments. Two Amendments with existing utility information were issued in January (01/19/23 and 01/30/23), but they do not include all impacted utilities listed in the RFP. In particular, some major utilities such as TECO power/transmission lines and City of Tampa Water were not included in these Amendments. We have the following questions: A. Considering that the technical submission is due in two months, please indicate when the remaining existing utility information will be available to the bidders to provide sufficient time for impact evaluation, schedule development and pricing. B. Please confirm that the information provided in the Amendments on 01/19/23 and 01/30/23 is complete for the utilities addressed in those Amendments and the facilities shown on the existing utility plans provided by THEA are the only utilities to be considered in utility impact evaluation, schedule development and pricing.

Answer: A. All UAO’s that are present on the Sunshine 811 design ticket for the limits of the project have provided markups to THEA. City of Tampa Water Dept has only provided greenline markups but has not provided a no conflict response. THEA is continuing to meet with the City’s Water Dept to point out potential conflicts and obtain RGB markups and a draft plan for relocations.

B. All UAO deliverables based on the concept plans have been provided to the Design-Build Firms. Final decisions will be made when the selected team provides their final design plans to the utilities.

12. RFP Section X. D _ Utility Coordination; page 74 of 111 Pre-Bid Utility Meeting December 1, 2022 - RFP page 74 identifies a significant number public and private utilities that may be impacted by the project and may require relocation. It also indicates that determination has been 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." However, the RFP does not include any information regarding the division of responsibilities for the utility relocation. At the pre-bid Utility Meeting on December 1, 2022, THEA indicated that this information will be provided in an Amendment, but it has not been provided to date. Please note that the division of responsibilities for utility relocation could have a significant impact on the project cost and schedule. Considering that the technical submission is due in two months, please clarify who will be responsible for the utility relocation (Design-Builder or the Utility Owner) to provide adequate basis to the proposers for the development of the construction schedule and pricing.

Answer: Design-Build Firms shall avoid utility conflicts with their design wherever possible, but if the conflict is unavoidable, the cost of utility relocation, adjustment and protection of their utilities are in conflict with the proposed improvements within THEA ROW are not eligible for reimbursement and the UAO's will be responsible for the relocation and the costs. The Design-Build Firms will only be responsible for utility relocation costs if their design is different than the concept plans and creates additional utility conflicts. An amendment will be issued revising the RFP.

13. In response to Question 2 in Q&A dated 12/15/2022 regarding utility agreements, THEA indicated that no agreements were in place at that time, but the Authority has been working with the identified utilities and will provide agreements when they are received. Since no utility agreements have been provided by THEA to date, please clarify if any utility agreements will be provided prior to the Technical Submission to allow the proposers to determine who is responsible for relocation of the impacted utilities and provide adequate basis for the development of construction schedule and pricing

Answer: No utilities have requested for their relocations to be performed by a highway contractor. Draft utility work schedules will be provided when they are received from the utilities that have provided RGBs with relocations.

14. 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 MOT Plans and/or roll plots as this is a systemwide design component that can be better represented in a larger scale.

Answer: A 1" = 100' scale can be used for MOT Plans and/or roll plots for the Technical Proposal.

15. Section X., N, Page 96 of 111 – RFP – The RFP states "All temporary detours, diversions, or lane shifts shall provide at least one 12-foot wide lane". However, as shown in R_07.02-Preliminary Structure Concept Plans, sheets B-36 and B-37 for the Willow Ave. and Platt St. Phase 3 structure details all travel lanes are shown at 11 feet. Please confirm if the 4 – 11 foot travel lanes, two in each direction will be accepted through the Willow/Platt street diversion.

Answer: The RFP overrides the concept plans as they are a reference document, the shoulder widths shall be reduced to provide a 12' lane in each direction.

16. Section X., N, Page 96 of 111 - The RFP states "The regulatory speed of 55 mph along Selmon Expressway and the REL will be uniformly maintained within the limits of the work zone for each area". However, as shown in R_07.01 Preliminary Roadway Concept Plans_080522, Roll Plot Sheet 17, TTCP General Notes: states "THE TYPICAL WORK ZONE REGULATORY SPEED LIMITS DURING CONSTRUCTION ARE:

- a. 50 MPH (HIMES AVE., MACDILL AVE., MISSISSIPPI AVE.)
- b. 40 MPH (PLATT ST.)
- c. Please confirm if the reduced posted speed limit as stated in the R_07.01 Preliminary Roadway Concept Plans_080522, TTCP General Notes is acceptable.

Answer: The regulatory speed to be maintained during construction on the Selmon Mainline is 55MPH. However, as noted in the Roadway Concept Plans, that speed cannot be maintained for the transitions required bridge construction phasing over several roadways. These lower allowable regulatory speeds will be added by amendment to the RFP.

17. Are there any existing agreements between CSX and THEA...utility, drainage, etc.?

Answer: No.

18. The CSX Public Project Manual states that an initial and final plans will be submitted to "CSX or designated GEC for review." Will this be the CSX review schedule, or will CSX need to be provided copies of the design at each Phase (Preliminary, 90 and Final) if so can this happen concurrently with THEA review of the same submittal?

Answer: CSX will need to be provided copies of the design plans at a minimum for the Preliminary and Final submittals concurrently with the THEA review to obtain the required CSX approvals and permits.

19. Will the siding between W. Platt St. (MP 883.85) and W. Swann Ave. (MP 884.23) be removed?

Answer: As was previously provided with the Answers to Questions on 3/14/23:

As a follow-up to a previous question regarding the CSX Runaround Track from approximately Sta. 241+50 to Sta. 250+00. The runaround track will be removed by CSX prior to January 1, 2024.

20. Will CSX require crashwalls to be installed on existing columns located less than 25' from the centerline of track?

Answer: No improvements will be required on existing columns.

21. Will CSX allow MSE walls at distances greater than 25' from the centerline of track if the wall is not located on CSX property?

Answer: That depends on several factors such as the height of the wall and whether CSX determines if there was a wall failure if it would fall on their ROW. The selected Design-Build Firm will have to submit their design to CSX for approval and construction permits.

22. During construction such as pile driving, settlement of track ballast may occur. What amount of settlement will CSX allow before CSX Maintenance Forces have to relevel or smooth the track?

Answer: Design-Builds shall assume no settlement is allowable.

23. Currently at the Euclid and McDill Avenue Crossings over CSX the vertical clearance does not meet CSX's min of 23'-0". If THEA is only replacing the decks, will CSX require these bridges to be raised?

Answer: As THEA is only replacing the decks, no changes will be required to the bridge clearance.

24. Please confirm the intent of RFP Section X.I.1.c is to follow FDOT Structures Design Guidelines Figure 7.1.1-1 (Load Rating Flow Chart) and use the LFR methodology to achieve inventory rating factors greater than or equal to 1.0 for the entire bridge when the same cannot be achieved use LRFR methodology. This logic is consistent with the approach used in the existing bridge load rating reports provided with the RFP documents.

Answer: The intent is to follow the methodology defined in the Bridge Load Rating Manual Chapter 2 – Procedure, Widening Rehabilitation & New Structures. This procedure is consistent with the provided load ratings.

25. The RFP states "The PD&E Study has identified certain drainage basins, outfalls, stormwater facilities, etc...However, the Design-Build Firm is advised that the exact number and size of drainage basins, outfalls and water management facilities...for this project will be the Design-Build Firm's responsibility." The PD&E Study includes the Meridian R.R. stormwater facility which is not shown in the Preliminary Roadway Concept Plans. Please confirm the Meridian R.R stormwater facility is not a part of this project scope.

Answer: The Meridian R.R stormwater facility is not a part of this project.

26. Will CSX allow a deviation for the ditch size as shown in CSX Standard 2601 as long as calculations show the ditch size is adequately sized to carry the drainage without ponding of water against the roadbed for a 100 year storm?

Answer: The selected Design-Build Firm will need to get all necessary approvals and permits from CSX for any work within CSX Right-of-way.