

**TAMPA-HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY
EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY**

Letter of Clarification No. 1

FOR

Request for Proposals

**East Selmon Slip Ramps
Design-Build**

RFP O-02520

Letter of Clarification No. 1 ~ RFO No. O-02520

Date of Letter of Clarification: December 17, 2020

To all prospective respondents:

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

Question 1:	Page 2 of the Notice to Contractors (Project Advertisement), last paragraph on the page, states “the LOI is limited to five (10) 8 1/2” x 11” pages”. Please clarify if the page limit is five or ten.
Response 1:	LOI is limited to five (5) pages.
Question 2:	On page 3 of the Notice to Contractors, the instructions say to provide one page resumes for each of the following nine (9) key staff positions, but there are only eight (8) positions listed. Are there eight (8) or nine (9) key staff positions?
Response 2:	There are nine (9) key staff positions. Utilities Coordinator is the 9th position. This was inadvertently left out.
Question 3:	Will there be any ELOI format and/or content requirements provided similar to the notice provided for the South Selmon Safety LOI O-00518?
Response 3:	The ELOI format, content requirements, and evaluation criteria are contained within the Project Advertisement (Attachment A_001). The Advertisement has been revised to clarify the number of required pages for the ELOI and will be submitted under Addendum #2.
Question 4:	REL Slip Ramp at Ramp 3 – Please clarify scope intent with regards to concrete pavement located WB from the I-75 bridge to Falkenberg Road Bridge and on the I-75 Connector Ramp. Will this pavement be retained or replaced. What means of pavement widening is required, asphalt or concrete?
Response 4:	The intent is for the existing concrete pavement on the WB Selmon through lanes to be retained. Pavement type selection for Ramp 3 will be left to the Design Build firms as part of their proposals.

<p>Question 5:</p>	<p>Please clarify the scope discrepancy between RFP Page 1 of 58 “Add a new egress ramp (15 feet wide lane) onto the westbound Local Lanes from the REL east of the I-4 Connector, ending at the CSX overpass bridge (#100447). This work is referred to as Ramp 2.” And the Proposed Concept Plan for Ramp 2 which extends past the CSX bridge and to Ramp E2.</p>
<p>Response 5:</p>	<p>The intent of the scope is to fully encompass the CSX bridge as depicted in the Concept Plan. This statement has been clarified in the RFP, Page 1 of 58, and is to be issued under Addendum #2.</p>
<p>Question 6:</p>	<p>Conceptual Typical Sections (Ramp 2) – Clarify if bridge typical section at 34th Street is the intent of the concept design as it was not included in the Slip Ramps Typical Section Package.</p>
<p>Response 6:</p>	<p>This bridge typical represents the intent of the concept design.</p>
<p>Question 7:</p>	<p>RFP - Page 1 of 58 – “Match existing vertical profile grades and horizontal curvature.” – Please clarify and/or provide context as the concepts provided do not adhere to this statement.</p>
<p>Response 7:</p>	<p>This statement is intended to be applied to any necessary widening of the Selmon Local Lanes or the Reversible Elevated Lanes (REL) and does not apply to Ramps 2 and 3. This statement has been clarified in the RFP, and is to be issued under Addendum #2.</p>
<p>Question 8:</p>	<p>RFP - Page 1 of 58 – Based upon the reply to question 2 above, please amend the following statement in the RFP as necessary. “Mill and resurface full width mainline. Extend full width mill and resurface limits to provide for pavement restoration of all areas subjected to striping alterations during construction and within the project limits in order to restore a clean final appearance at project completion.”</p>
<p>Response 8:</p>	<p>Eradication of all conflicting pavement markings (including those temporary markings applied during traffic control phases) and any repair of existing pavement that might be damaged during the construction operation will be handled via milling and resurfacing. All Design Build firms shall include these details within their proposals, including their proposal for pavement type selection.</p>

Question 9:	We respectfully request for all applicable forms noted in the RFP.
Response 9:	These will be provided via the shared drive link and is to be updated under Addendum #2.
Question 10:	We respectfully request all CSX RR agreements that apply to this project.
Response 10:	THEA has not coordinated this project with CSX. The Design Build firms are responsible for securing any agreements directly with CSX.
Question 11:	Has THEA performed any asphalt pavement cores within the proposed limits of work and if so will they be made available?
Response 11:	A pavement evaluation with core data has been conducted as part of the East Selmon PD&E Study. This document will be provided and added to the Geotechnical folder, as part of issuance of Addendum #2
Question 12:	If one member of the design-build team DOES have performance history working with the Authority, but the other member (contractor or design consultant) DOES NOT have performance history working with the Authority in the past 5 years, is the design-build team permitted to submit three pages of past performance information?
Response 12:	Similar FDOT performance history can be substituted for Authority performance history for either team member.
Question 13:	Page 3 of the Advertisement states "Resumes may be separately submitted." Should resumes be submitted in the same PDF as the LOI? Or a separate PDF?
Response 13:	Within the same PDF if within the file size limitation, otherwise one (1) separate PDF file with all resumes is acceptable.

<p>Question 14:</p>	<p>The conceptual typical section included in the reference documents include details for the 100447 and 100449 bridge widening but do not appear to include information on the 100490 bridge. Is it the intent for the design build firm to follow the concept typical as shown or can these vary? If required to follow could an additional section be provided for the 100490 bridge work</p>
<p>Response 14:</p>	<p>Proposed concepts may vary, provided the concepts comply with the RFP.</p>
<p>Question 15:</p>	<p>Will THEA be providing a time for a site visit to the CSX bridge crossing. If not is it acceptable to reachout to CSX to coordinate a visit?</p>
<p>Response 15:</p>	<p>The Authority owns aerial rights over CSX at this location. It is the Design Build team’s responsibility to coordinate and secure railroad permits.</p>
<p>Question 16:</p>	<p>The RFP states that a flagman will be required for 20 or more days was this 20 day assumption made prior to determining the widening will be required at this location? Also could this be setup as an allowance for days required?</p>
<p>Response 16:</p>	<p>This 20 day or more assumption takes into account the proposed widening. It is anticipated that the coordination can be accommodated within the advertised contract time, and there is no additional time allowance granted.</p>
<p>Question 17:</p>	<p>Please confirm who is the owner of the area below the 100449 bridge. Has coordination take please with this owner to discuss access to perform this widening work?</p>
<p>Response 17:</p>	<p>It is understood that the Right-of-Way under Bridge No. 100449 is owned by the City of Tampa. Coordination specific to this proposed widening has not occurred.</p>
<p>Question 18:</p>	<p>Please provide a copy of the Stipend Agreement.</p>
<p>Response 18:</p>	<p>The Stipend Agreement will be provided for the shortlisted firms.</p>

Question 19:	Are records of train time under the 100447 bridge available?
Response 19:	Time records for trains under Bridge 100447 are not available at this time.
Question 20:	Can THEA provide a status update on the SWFWMD Permit?
Response 20:	Per the RFP, “The Design-Build Firm shall be responsible for obtaining SWFWMD permits for this project.”
Question 21:	Are there any unresolved Right-of-Way issues with the project?
Response 21:	No
Question 22:	Can THEA provide an update on the status of the CSX agreement?
Response 22:	THEA has not coordinated this project with CSX. The Design Build firms are responsible for securing any agreements directly with CSX.

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 Respondent’s proposal**.

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.

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]