

Questions as of: 12/4/24

Answers Posted: 12/18/24

1. RFP Section 4.B, page 18, states the ELOI is limited to seven (7) pages. Section IV.D.2, last sentence, states "The additional three (3) pages will also not count toward the five (5) page limitation of the ELOI." What is the correct ELOI page limit, seven (7) pages or five (5) pages?

Answer: The correct ELOI page limit is seven (7) pages. Section IV.D.2 will be corrected in Addendum 1.

2. The end of RFP Section IV.D.3, page 23, requests identification of recent, current, and project workload. This information may be a lengthy list, please confirm this information is only needed for the design builder, may be placed after the 7-page ELOI, and will not count towards the page count.

Answer: Addendum 1 will revise this request to be specific to the "Availability of Key Personnel" which is to be provided on up to two (2) pages, which are excluded from the seven (7) page limit.

3. RFP Section VIII.D, last sentence of the section, page 38, states that if the Authority rescinds the Notice of Intent to Award the Authorities only liability is to return the Proposal Guaranty. If the project is not awarded will the stipend be paid to each response proposer?

Answer: The Design-Build Stipend Agreement (Attachment A_00X.06) provides details on payment of stipends in cases where the project is not awarded.

4. The RFP specifies Independent Peer Review. Is this for all design work or only Category II structures, and if all structures, is a 3rd party firm required for independence or can staff from the lead designer or subconsultants be used who are not directly involved with the design?

Answer: Independent Peer Review (IPR) responsibilities are for Category 2 Structures as defined by FDM121, FDM 121.3.2 and as identified in the RFP. Per FDM 121.12, the designated IPR firm will have no involvement with the project other than conducting the IPR and is required to be pre-qualified in accordance with Rule 14-75 of the Florida Administrative Code.

5. Performance History with the Authority or other State or Local Government Agencies. We kindly request your confirmation regarding the allowance of a maximum of three pages dedicated to detailing the Performance History with the Authority or other State or Local Government Agencies, and that this section do not contribute to the overall limit of seven pages the (7) to describe Performance History with the Authority or other State or Local Government Agencies.

Answer: Confirmed per RFP Section IV.B.

6. We kindly seek clarification regarding of “at least three (3) projects of similar scope” in the Performance History with the Authority or other State or Local Government Agencies section. Are the three (3) project sheet counted towards the 3-page limit of the Performance History with the Authority or other State or Local Government Agencies section? If the project sheets are not counted toward the page limit, can the Proposer present more than three projects (and related project sheets)?

Answer: The performance history narrative on a minimum of three (3) projects is limited to three (3) pages that are not counted against the seven (7) page limit. More than three (3) projects may be included.

7. Proposed Design-Build Firm Staffing and Organization Plan. Please confirm that the short narrative to be provided within these sections to describe the staffing plan and coordination plan for the Project counts toward the 7-page limit.

Answer: Confirmed per RFP Section IV.D.3.

8. Key Personnel. Are there specific requirements in terms of minimum qualifications and years of experience?

Answer: Per RFP Section X.K, the Design-Build Firm’s professional staff shall meet the minimum training and experience set forth in Florida Statute Chapter 455.

9. Key Personnel. Could you please provide the minimum qualifications and experience for the Project Superintendent role?

Answer: Per RFP Section X.K, the Design-Build Firm’s professional staff shall meet the minimum training and experience set forth in Florida Statute Chapter 455.

10. Key Personnel. Could you please provide the minimum qualifications and experience for the Construction Superintendent role?

Answer: Per RFP Section X.K, the Design-Build Firm’s professional staff shall meet the minimum training and experience set forth in Florida Statute Chapter 455.

11. Section D. Phase 1- The ELOI Scored Criteria Item 4 Design-Build Project Requirements. Can you address the MOT requirements in the surface streets such as W Euclid Ave; W El Prado Blvd.: W Bay to Bay Blvd. W Mississippi Ave etc.... And all the rest up to Hillsborough River and S. Franklin Street?

Answer: Overhead bridge work will require full nighttime closures of local roadways. The Concept Plans include detour routes which have been approved in concept by the City of Tampa. Per RFP Section XII.O, “Modifications to local streets and traffic patterns will need to be clearly identified in the TTCP. Modifications to traffic patterns to local streets will need to be

approved by the local maintaining agency and will be the responsibility of the Design-Build Firm to obtain such approvals.”

12. Can you Clarify whether all paved approaches to bridges behind the barrier rail and cross hatched are paved with a full section?

Answer: The question is unclear and lacks specific reference to the RFP or Concept Plans. Per RFP Section XII.F, “All proposed shoulder pavement shall match mainline pavement design.”

13. Can you please clarify how will ASAP impact the overall schedule since it is indicated in Section IX Part B. **Initiation of the ASAP**. Will be after the execution of the Design –Build Contract and if the good faith effort does not result in a Notice to Proceed?

Answer: It is anticipated that the design of the base contract scope and any Scope Augmentations proceed concurrently, excepting that portion of the base project scope that may be affected by the Scope Augmentation under consideration. Please see answer to Question 31...

14. Will the Authority be providing a laydown area (s) within the vicinity and along the trajectory of the project?

Answer: Addendum 1 will clarify that all Authority owned right-of-way within the project limits will be available to the Design-Build Firm. Per project commitments (see No. 15), the Design-Build firm shall notify the Authority of parking lot closures in advance so that the Authority can provide 30-day notice to parking lot users.

15. Section D.Phase 1- The ELOI Scored Criteria. Kindly replace the “The additional three (3) pages will also not count toward the five (5) page limitation of the ELOI” with: “The additional three (3) pages will also not count toward the seven (7) page limitation of the ELOI”. In addition clarify that this section shall NOT count toward the seven pages.

Answer: The ELOI is limited to seven (7) pages. Section D.Phase 1 will be corrected in Addendum 1.

16. Section V.D, Item 7, states “Broadening the extend of the Value-Added features of this RFP while maintaining existing F”. It is understood that it is a typo and the sentence is unfinished. Please clarify.

Answer: Addendum 1 will delete this entire incomplete sentence.

17. Section IX, Item B.1, states “The Authority will identify the Scope Augmentations to be developed by the Design-Build Firm”. Although the Authority will be the one identifying which ones to develop, could the DB Firm propose any Scope Augmentations to the Authority (for it to decide if further development is required)?

Answer: Yes, the Authority intends to collaborate with the selected Design-Build Firm prior to identifying Scope Augmentations to be developed.

18. Section X, E (Railroad Coordination), states "CSXT protective services shall be paid by the Design-Build Firm through monthly and final estimate deductions based on actual (documented) protective services costs provided by CSXT. Payment to CSXT will then be made by the Authority per terms of the Railroad Reimbursement Agreement." Please clarify which one is responsible for payments to CSXT, the Authority or the DB Firm.

Answer: Per the first sentence, the Design-Build Firm is responsible for CSXT protective services costs through invoice deductions. Per the second sentence, the Authority will make payments to CSXT.

19. Section X, H (Submittals), Item 4, states “All changes made subsequent to the “Released for Construction” Plans shall be signed/sealed by the EOR”. Could the Authority confirm if it refers to the original EOR, or if it could be one EOR different than the original one?

Answer: The Authority is referring to the original EOR. In the instance of a Successor Engineer, please refer to Florida Administrative Code Chapter 61G15 - 27 Procedures for the Adoption of Another’s Work.

20. Could you please provide clarification regarding the platform you have utilized in the past for your Asset Information Model (AIM)? Additionally, do you have an established baseline to which our information will be incorporated following the as-built phase, or are we required to initiate a new AIM?

Answer: The Authority’s Asset Information Model (AIM) is GIS-based. The Design-Build Firm will not be responsible to initiate a new AIM, but will be required to provide the as-built project data in a GIS format allowing the Authority to import into its existing model.

21. Please clarify the scope/roles/quals for the 3 BIM Key Personnel listed in the RFP.

Answer: The roles and responsibilities of the 3 BIM Key Personnel listed in the RFP are documented in Attachment A_007_BIM_Requirements.

22. Will THEA retain an Independent Cost Estimator (ICE) for the ASAP phase/ GMP review?

Answer: The Authority will have cost estimates independently developed during the ASAP phase.

23. Kindly clarify if the Independent Peer Review firm can also act as the Lead Design Firm for any of the competitor teams submitting an ELOI.

Answer: An Independent Peer Review (IPR) firm can be on multiple teams performing other roles. However, the IPR firm on the submitting team will have no involvement with the project for that team other than conducting the IPR.

24. Section IV. Phase 1 Procurement Process, Subsection D. Phase 1 - The ELOI Scored Criteria, Subpart 2) Past Performance History and Similar Project Experience (15 points) states, "The additional three 9s) pages will also not count toward the five (5) page limitation of the ELOI." This contrary to Subsection B. Phase 1 – Submittal Procedure which states, "The ELOI shall be limited to seven (7) 8 ½"x11" pages with a minimum font size of ten (10). Please confirm seven (7) is the maximum number of pages, other than those that are not counted towards the maximum.

Answer: Confirmed, the ELOI is a maximum of seven (7) pages. The correction will be included in Addendum 1.

25. Do tabs count towards the page limit?

Answer: No, tabs are not included in page count limit.

26. Please confirm that the submittal preference for this ELOI is email.

Answer: Confirmed

27. Section I. *Introduction*, Subsection A. *Project Delivery Goals*, Item 4 states "establish equitable risk sharing" and "minimizing unanticipated risk to design, construction approach, schedule, or budget. Will there be a risk register and risk reserve, accessible by the selected Design-Build Firm to offset cost overruns incurred as part of risk sharing? Will risk be discussed, quantified, and tracked during the ASAP process as well as during the construction phase of the project?"

Answer: No and no. The Authority has made a significant investment to share some of the risk in this project, including the right-to-rely on Authority provided survey and geotechnical data. Furthermore, the Authority is in the process of advancing utility relocations prior to construction.

28. Section IV, D Phase 1 – The ELOI Scored Criteria, part 3 of the RFP states that the “Proposer shall include Organization Charts and Resumes for Key Personnel.” It continues to state that “An organization chart shall be provided for the delivery of the Work, and *each* shall not exceed one (1) 11”x17” page and is excluded from the seven (7) page limitation.” The emphasis to the word each was added. Please clarify how many organization charts are required and if more than one, what content is to be represented in each. Also, if more than one, do the pages of the additional organization charts count against the page limit?

Answer: Addendum 1 will remove the word “each” from the noted paragraph. One (1) 11”x17” page organization chart shall be provided.

29. No bridge typical sections were provided for SR 618 over Morrison Ave. and W. Platt St. in the Structures Concept Plans. Please provide these missing typical sections.

Answer: On the Structures Concept Plans, see Note 2 on sheets B-3 and B-9. These typical sections are applicable to Morrison Ave and W. Platt St sites.

30. Does the Authority anticipate having any permits on hand, or submitted to review agencies, prior to the Technical Proposal due date?

Answer: Yes, the Authority intends to submit the permit applications listed in RFP Section XII.P prior to the Technical Proposal due date. Addenda will be issued as permits are received by the Authority.

31. Section I. Introduction, Subsection G. Scope of Design Build Firm’s Responsibilities in General states the following:

- “The Design-Build Firm will not be compensated for any additional costs or time associated with Re-evaluation(s) resulting from proposed design changes.”
- “The Design-Build Firm will not be compensated for any additional costs or time resulting from proposed changes.”

Should an innovation/design change developed during the ASAP portion of the project result in a significant construction cost savings, but would require additional Contract Time, would the Design-Build Firm not be granted additional Contract Time?

Answer: The impact to schedule is one of the considerations when evaluating a potential Scope Augmentation (see RFP Section IX.C.5). An approved Scope Augmentation may result in the Authority including additional contract time in the Design-Build Amendment (see RFP Section IX.G.3).

32. Section I. Introduction, Subsection H. Project Information; Investigations, states that “Drawings, CADD files, reports and other documents provided by the Authority other than those provided as Attachment documents are provided for information only to the Proposer and the Proposer is solely responsible for determining the existing site conditions. The Authority makes no guarantee of the accuracy or completeness of such information that is not included in the Attachment documents.” However, in Section I. Introduction, Subsection G. Scope of Design Build Firm’s Responsibilities in General states that “the Design-Build Firm shall be responsible for reviewing the approved PD&E Study Project Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) and supporting documents and complying with the requirements and commitments therein. Since the DB Firms have to comply with the commitments within the PD&E Study, shouldn’t the study be an Attachment, instead of a Reference Document? Would THEA adopt FDOT’s new design-build specifications that gives the Design-Build Firm the right to rely on all RFP documents, including reference documents?”

Answer: The PD&E Study refers to an Ultimate solution, not the current (interim) scope of work, therefore, to avoid confusion it will remain a Reference Document.

33. Please provide a definition for the Construction Superintendent role, defined as a Key Personnel, and how this role is different from the Project Superintendent role.

Answer: The Project Superintendent is the Design Build Firm’s authorized representative in responsible charge of the Work, as well as overseeing the Design-Build Firm’s participation in the ASAP, and has overall authority and accountability for delivery of the Project.

The Construction Superintendent is the Design Build Firm’s authorized representative in responsible charge of the Work related specifically to construction, and reports to the Project Superintendent.

34. The Notice to Proceed date is not defined in the schedule shown in the RFP. Please provide the anticipated NTP.

Answer: NTP is anticipated by November 3, 2025

35. Section III. Procurement-Related Meetings, Details, Notices, and Other Important Information and Requirements, Subsection H. Authority’s Responsibilities, states “The Authority does not guarantee the details pertaining to borings, as shown on any documents supplied by the Authority, to be more than a general indication of the materials likely to be found adjacent to holes bored at the site of the work, approximately at the locations indicated.” Can we rely upon the geotechnical borings provided as Attachments to the RFP?

Answer: The quoted paragraph will be removed in Addendum 1. Design-Build Firms have the right to rely upon the Authority provided geotechnical borings.

36. Section V. Phase 2 – Technical Proposals, Subsection C. Technical Proposal – Minimum Information Required, Section 1: Project Approach states, “11”x17” sheets are prohibited”. Would THEA consider allowing 11”x17” sheets and counting them as two (2) pages?

Answer: Addendum 1 will include revision to allow use of 11”x17” sheets, which will be counted as two (2) pages.

37. Section V. Phase 2 – Technical Proposals, Subsection C. Technical Proposal – Minimum Information Required, Section 1: Project Approach states, “11”x17” sheets are prohibited”. Would THEA consider allowing 11”x17” pages for Bar/Gantt charts included as an Appendix to the Technical Proposal?

Answer: Addendum 1 will specify that either 8.5”x11” or 11”x17” page sizes are acceptable for Bar/Gantt chart included in the Appendix.

38. Section IV. *Innovative Aspects for Technical Proposal*, Subsection A. *General*, Item 1) states, “All innovative aspects shall be identified separately as an Alternative Technical Concept (ATC) in the Technical Proposal. An innovative aspect does not include revisions to specifications, standards or established Authority policies. Innovation should be limited to the Proposer’s means and methods, roadway alignments, approach to Project, etc.” Then Section IV. *Innovative Aspects for Technical Proposal*, Subsection B. *Alternative Technical Concept Proposals* states, “Any deviation from the RFP that the Proposer seeks to obtain approval to utilize prior to Technical Proposal submission is, by definition, an ATC and therefore must be discussed and submitted to the Authority for consideration through the ATC process.” Please confirm innovations, involving means and methods, roadway alignments, and project approach that do not deviate from the RFP are **not** by definition ATCs and required to be submitted as such.

Answer: This question is related to Section VI, not IV. Section VI.B states that “Modifications to the horizontal and/or vertical geometry of greater than 2-feet require and ATC submittal.” Innovations related to means and methods and project approach that do not deviate from the RFP and Attachments are not ATCs requiring submission.

39. Section IX. *Accelerated Scope Augmentation Phase*, Subsection C. *Accelerated Scope Augmentation Phase Tasks/Deliverables* defines numerous deliverables to be provided as part of this phase of the project. Many of these deliverables appear to be for project wide matters such as develop and implement a safety plan, quality plan, project management plan, hurricane preparedness plan, stakeholder engagement plan, etc. Please confirm that these items as well as all of the other items listed in this section are to be developed and provided as part of the ASAP and should not be included in the Design-Build Firm’s lump sum price for the base project scope.

Answer: Correct, the Design Build Firm’s lump sum proposal should be in accordance with the requirements of the RFP and contract documents (i.e. Design Build Division I Specifications), excluding potential ASAP phase requirements. All specific requirements and deliverables related

to the ASAP, as well as Design-Build Firm compensation, will be defined in a Task Work Order to be issued by the Authority.

40. The RFP requires monthly aerial photographs of the entire project to show the progress of the work. Is the use of drones allowed given the proximity of Macdill AFB?

Answer: The selected Design-Build Firm will be required to obtain FAA approval for every drone flight and should assume FAA approval of drone flights under 200 feet for obtaining aerial photography.

41. Does the coastal/hydraulic analysis have to be updated to include the data from Hurricanes Helene and Milton?

Answer: No. The Authority conducted underwater inspections at the Hillsborough River bridge following the 2024 hurricanes and found no evidence of recent scour.

42. Section X. *Project Requirements and Provisions for Work*, Subsection C. *Project Commitments*, Item 2 states “ground disturbance that goes beyond the depth of one meter (3.3 ft) shall be monitored by a qualified archaeologist.” Is the Design-Build Firm to include the cost of the archaeologist in its lump sum proposal?

Answer: Coordination with SHPO is underway and the potential need for an on-site archeologist will be determined and included in a future Addendum.

43. Section X, Subpart C, Project Commitments, Commitment #6 requires at least 60” between piles to allow for manatee movement and if 60” cannot be provided, further coordination will be conducted with USFWS. Since the existing bridge piers have less than 60” spacing, is this still required?

Answer: The existing bridge and Concept Plans consist of mudline footings which satisfy Commitment #6. Commitment #6 is still required and must be considered for any potential ATC. The 60” spacing would also apply to the spacing between columns that are submerged.

44. Section X, Subpart C, Project Commitments, Commitment #8 states that the allowed hydroacoustic impacts for different pile types and sizes is currently unknown. Often the number of piles that can be installed per day is restricted due to limitation on hydroacoustic impacts, which could greatly affect the schedule. Will this information be available prior to submitting the technical proposal?

Answer: The USACE permit will be submitted based on the Concept Plans use of drilled shafts. Should the Design-Build Firm choose to use pile foundations, they will be subject to the USACE Jacksonville District Biological Opinion (JaxBO) requirements (also see answer to Question 45).

45. Section X. *Project Requirements and Provisions for Work*, Subsection C. *Project Commitments*, Item 8 states “The size/style of piles, quantity of piles, number of piles driven per day, number of strikes per pile, and other information needed to determine potential hydroacoustic impacts to marine wildlife is currently unknown.” Is it the Design-Build Firm’s responsibility to perform a pile driving noise monitoring study to determine potential hydroacoustic impacts to marine wildlife? Is the Design-Build Firm expected to include the cost of the study and any resulting requirements, such as the implementation of bubble curtains, in its lump sum cost proposal?

Answer: The USACE permit will be submitted based on the Concept Plans use of drilled shafts. Underwater noise associated with auguring is below the behavioral and injury thresholds used in the USACE Jacksonville District Biological Opinion (JaxBO) and is discountable. Should the Design-Build Firm choose to use pile foundations, they will be subject to the JaxBo requirements (see [USACE Jacksonville JaxBo Source Book](#)).

Under JaxBo this project location is considered a confined space (i.e. shorelines, or seawalls within 150 feet of pile installation). To comply with JaxBo for impact pile driving in a confined space and avoid the need to utilize bubble curtains, the following project design criteria (PDCs) need to be adhered to:

- Concrete piles need to be 24-in in diameter/width (JaxBo allows smaller piles, but the aggressive environment requires a minimum 24-in diameter/width)
- All work must be occur during daylight hours only
- All construction personnel are responsible for observing water-related activities to detect the presence of protected species and avoid them.
- Limit maximum number of piles installed per day to no more than 5 piles per day.

46. Section X. *Project Requirements and Provisions for Work*, Subsection E. *Railroad Coordination*, please confirm all CSXT protect services cost shall be included in the Design-Build Firm’s lump sum cost proposal. Also, please provide answers to the following railroad coordination related questions:

- When will the Railroad Reimbursement Agreements between CSXT and the Authority be provided to the Proposers?
- Who is responsible for delays and costs if CSXT is unable to provide protective services when required by the Project Schedule or in the amount to adequately support the Design-Build Firm’s construction progress?

Answer: The Railroad Reimbursement Agreements will be made available in a future Addendum, as will a clarification on the liability for delay and cost if CSXT is unable to perform protective services per the Design-Build Firm’s schedule.

47. Section X. *Project Requirements and Provisions for Work*, Subsections P. Liaison Office, and Subsection O. Field Office. Can the liaison office and the field office be the same?

Answer: Addendum 1 will revise “Liaison Office” to “CEI/Engineer’s Field Office”. The CEI and the Design-Build Firm shall have separate field offices.

48. Should the Design-Build Firm include cost in its lump sum cost proposal for toll assessments associated with construction related vehicles accessing the Selmon Expressway facility throughout the course of the project? If so, what tolling rate should be assumed? Will THEA provide a change order for toll rate increases made effective after the notice-to-proceed?

Answer: Yes, the Design-Build Firm should include cost in its lump sum cost proposal for toll assessments associated with construction related vehicles accessing the Selmon Expressway facility throughout the course of the project. The Authority's toll rates increase 2.5% annually at the beginning of each fiscal year (July 1st).

49. Section XI. *Detailed Scope*, Subsection I. *Project Augmentations*, please confirm the five (5) listed items are the only innovation topics that should not be included in the Design-Build Firms' Technical Proposal. Confirm all other innovative topics may be submitted as an ATC or included in the Technical Proposal if not defined as an ATC.

Answer: The potential list of Scope Augmentations to be considered in the ASAP Phase is intended to broadly inform proposers of the Authority's intent and priorities. The RFP specifies that signature aesthetic feature enhancements at the Hillsborough River bridge and noise wall aesthetics are to be included in the Technical Proposal. Per RFP Section VI.E, proposers are free to submit ATCs that improve safety and operations. Concepts that provide safety or operational improvements that are not incorporated into the selected Design-Build Firms Technical Proposal may be considered in the ASAP Phase.

50. Regarding the West Riverwalk project being delivered by the City of Tampa, this RFP requires that the portion of that project which is located under and immediately south of the Selmon Expressway. Attachment A-12, which defines the construction criteria, includes a concept level plan of the project we are responsible for. The final plans (designed by others) will come after award and therefore after our price. How will the Authority address any changes to this concept after award? Will the DB-Firm be able to participate in design development and reviews leading up to the final plans for this scope of work?

Answer: It is anticipated that the City of Tampa's Design-Build Firm will provide 90% plans by March 2025 which will be incorporated via Addendum. These plans will be the basis of bid and any changes following award would be subject to a change order (not anticipated). Design-Build Firms will not have ability to participate in design development/reviews as this work is being completed by the City of Tampa's Design-Build Firm.

51. Page 84 (PDF page 93) of the RFP states that “UAO’s within the Authorities R/W are not eligible for reimbursement by the Authority if relocation is required and approved by THEA”, however on under the Compensability Determination section on page 85 (PDF page 94), states that the “DB Firm may request the utility to be relocated to accommodate proposed changes from the Concept Plans, however these relocations require the Authority’s approval, and the Authority will not compensate the UAO or the DB firm for the utility relocation work, unless otherwise approved.” Are some utilities being reimbursed? Are the UAO’s performing the relocations, or does the DB Firm have to perform the relocations?

Answer: The statement on RFP page 84 will be removed in Addendum 1. Addendum 1 will also specify that the City of Tampa water relocations are to be performed (designed and constructed) by the Design-Build firm via Utility Work by Highway Contractor Agreement between the Authority and the City of Tampa. Other than City of Tampa water relocations, all other utility relocations will be performed by the UAO’s.

As noted in RFP Section XII.D. Utility Work Schedules, it is the Authority’s intention to compensate UAO’s for advanced relocation based on impacts identified in the Concept Plans. An additional forthcoming Addendum will include UAO Utility Work Schedules for utility relocations needed to address Concept Plan conflicts.

52. Please provide the permitting agencies and the railroad’s maximum submittal review time.

Answer: Coordination with permitting agencies and CSXT and a forthcoming Addendum will address the review times.

53. Will THEA please confirm that the RFP Concept does not require any design re-evaluations.

Answer: The Authority will perform a Design Re-evaluation on the selected Design-Build Firms plans, inclusive of any approved ATC’s and Scope Augmentations. The Design-Build Firms will be responsible for provision of concept plans and design files to facilitate the Re-evaluation by others. Minor coordination efforts should be anticipated.

54. Will THEA please confirm that CSX is aware of the proposed MSE wall as indicated in the RFP Concept Plans (adjacent to CSX tracks) and that the MSE wall in this location has been conceptually approved.

Answer: The Authority is in the process of scheduling a meeting with CSXT to discuss the retaining wall.

55. Page 23 RFP - References Design Landscape Architect or Architect of Record, however during design forum it was said there would be no L/A services required. Please advise.

Answer: Per XI.G Aesthetics- “The design of aesthetic elements must be led by an Architect or Landscape Architect with demonstratable experience designing custom features on the scale of this project.” There is no landscaping scope included in the project.

56. Page 22 RFP - Please confirm reference to 5 pages under Past Performance should be 7 pages to match other references to ELOI maximum page count.

Answer: Yes, confirmed- seven (7) pages. See Addendum 1.

57. Structures Plans (Page 16 of 23) note "existing fender to remain" where RFP (Page 105) calls for replacement. We recognize the Structures Plans is a reference document, however, please clarify that the fender system is to be replaced per the RFP language.

Answer: The Structures Concept Plans (sheet B-16) labels 30'-0" (Approx) of new fender in the median along with the existing fender to remain. The RFP states to provide new fender system for fender portions removed for construction, impacted by new structures, or other similar conditions. The RFP and Structures Concept Plans are consistent.

58. RFP Pages 22-23 list resumes for key personnel. Included in those are "Project Superintendent" and "Construction Superintendent". Could THEA elaborate on the difference between these positions, as they appear to be the same thing?

Answer: The Project Superintendent is the Design Build Firm's authorized representative in responsible charge of the Work, as well as overseeing the Design-Build Firm's participation in the ASAP, and has overall authority and accountability for delivery of the Project.

The Construction Superintendent is the Design Build Firm's authorized representative in responsible charge of the Work related specifically to construction, and reports to the Project Superintendent.

59. Are there any pavement coring and pavement condition survey available, side streets included? And if so, will THEA please share that information?

Answer: The South Selmon Safety Project Geotechnical Data Report and an additional pavement coring report will be issued with Addendum 1. No pavement coring information or pavement condition survey has been conducted for local roadways.

60. Are there resilient modulus test results or falling weight deflectometer data reports for the pavement?

Answer: The South Selmon Safety Project Geotechnical Data Report, which includes resilient modulus test results for the project, will be provided in Addendum 1.

61. There is a reference in RFP to 55 mph speed to be maintained within limits of work zone. We acknowledge that concept plans are a reference document, however there is a TTCP Design Criteria table that references a design speed of 50 mph. Will THEA please confirm which design speed will be required.

Answer: The TTCP Design Criteria located in the Concept Plans will be revised in Addendum 1 to match the 55 mph regulatory speed in the RFP.

62. Please confirm that per Section B on Page 68 of the RFP that THEA is in the process of obtaining the Water Management District Permit for the Concept Plan Design.



O-2225 Resolicitation of South Selmon Capacity Project

Answer: Yes, confirmed.