



Florida Department of Transportation

RON DESANTIS
GOVERNOR

605 Suwannee Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450

JARED W. PERDUE, P. E.
SECRETARY

May 4, 2022

ADDENDUM NO. 10

To: ALL DESIGN BUILD FIRMS

FINANCIAL ITEM NUMBER: 415474-2-52-01, 415474-2-52-02, and 415474-2-56-01
CONTRACT NUMBER: E3U76
DESCRIPTION: Design Build for SR 30 (US 98) Brooks Bridge No. 570034

PROPOSALS TO BE RECEIVED: May 6, 2022 (as per this Addendum)

This is your authorization to make the following changes to the Request for Proposal package you now have for the subject project:

Due to a technical issue with the Bid Question and Answer website on Wednesday, May 4, 2022, the following bid questions responses were unable to be posted. The Department's responses are included for your use in preparing bid proposals.

Question 38303 - Does the existing fender system contain any hazardous materials such as lead paint, asbestos, etc.?

Response to Question 38303 - We are not aware of any contamination in fender system elements. It does not appear that testing was performed on the fender system.

Question 38304 - Do the existing main span steel girders contain lead paint?

Response to Question 38304 - In 2011 all steel components in spans 7 through 9 were painted. The bridge rehab painting plans detailed that paint materials could not contain lead or chromium.

Question 38312 - SDG 3.14.2D requires the RFP to define the fender system materials. Such definition is not provided by the RFP. Can FDOT confirm if the required fender system materials will follow SDG 3.14.3 and which material type will be allowed for each fender system element?

Response to Question 38312 - The Design Build Firm shall provide a fender system design that meets the requirements of the Contract Documents.

Question 38320 - When selecting optimal solutions for a DB pursuit, teams must weigh the impacts of adding cost against the potential for higher scoring. It is these optimal solutions that are presented in the Technical Proposal (TP). The new railing and lighting requirements were introduced after TPs were submitted. Teams that presented cost effective solutions that met the prior RFP requirements may receive lower aesthetics scoring versus those that presented more costly solutions. The response to 38184 indicates that scoring will be based on what was presented in the TP yet pricing must now include an allowance for higher cost elements that may be selected by the public. Will the Department reconsider an allowance bid item for railing and lighting or the elimination of lighting and railing from the

scoring evaluations to maintain each team's strategic approach to balancing the solutions presented in their TPs to the cost of the items proposed?

Response to Question 38320 - An allowance will not be utilized due to the elements being scored in the Technical Proposal evaluation. Higher priced rail/lighting options are not a requirement. The requirement is to provide three options (including the one shown in your technical) and accommodate any of the three options being selected in your bid.

Please use this information when preparing your proposal.

All PROPOSAL HOLDERS please acknowledge receipt of the addendum on the Design Build Proposal of form (form no. 375-020-12), in the space provided.

Sincerely,

Ranae Dodson
Procurement Manager

cc: Kerrie Harrell, Alaina Webb, File

Please sign below to acknowledge receipt of Addendum No. 10.

Acknowledged by: _____