

Addendum No. 4 Memorandum

DATE: December 14, 2018
 TO: District Contracts / Final Plans
 FROM: Vanita Saini, Project Manager 
 COPIES: File **4**
 SUBJECT: Addendum Number 3 - Letting (mo./yr.) 3/2019
 Financial Project ID 433109-5-52-01 (Lead number only)
 Proposal/Contract ID E4T19
 Federal Funds: No Yes Federal Aid No. 0951-695-I
 County: Palm Beach State Road No. 9

Concurred by:  Date: 12-14-18
 Signature of Alternate Contracting Coordinator (John Olson (primary) / Robert Bostian (alternate)) or Designee

Legal Approval Date: DR 12/14/2018
 (Dawn Raduano)

Central Office Approval Date: _____
 (State Construction Office – Larry Ritchie)

FHWA Concurrence Date: MC 1/7/18
 (FHWA Florida Division Office – Mark Glasgens)

CONTRACT TIME REVISED: No Yes (If yes, _____ Calendar Days)

<u>Page No(s).</u>	<u>Rev. Date</u>	<u>Description</u>
RFP, pg. 3	12/14/18	Updated the Attachments listing as follows: H. Division I Design-Build Specifications, which includes the following incorporated Special Provisions <u>(Updated)</u> (Draft) :
RFP, pg. 7	12/14/18	Updated the Reference Documents listing as follows: 1. <u>Right of Way and Survey</u> Survey CADD Files <u>(updated)</u>
RFP, pg. 9	12/14/18	Section I.1 – Right of Way Furnished by the Department has been revised as follows All Design-Build Firms who intend to submit proposals on the Project are restricted from discussing right of way acquisition with

owners of private property to be acquired by the Department. The limits of all anticipated right of way acquisitions and easements required for the Project are provided as part of the Reference Documents. The Department will have all right of way for the Project acquired and ready for construction (cleared) by July 31, 2019. All parcels that are acquired by the Department that have irrigation within the acquired right of way will be required to be cut and capped. Additionally, any wood post advertisement and real estate signs located within the acquired right of way should be removed.

RFP, pg. 13 12/14/18 Section I – Description of Work has been revised as follows

- Replacement of lighting along I-95 and I-95 ramps from south of Glades Road to south of Linton Boulevard.

RFP, pg. 17 12/14/18 Section I.C Bid Alternatives has been revised as follows

The Department has established ~~four (4)~~three (3) priorities in the form of bid alternatives to implement the I-95 Express, 3B-2 project. These alternatives begin with base project as Bid Alternative 1, as described in the RFP and RFP Attachments, and increase in scope until the maximum scope is achieved, as described below, with Bid Alternative ~~43~~3. The alternatives in priority order are Bid Alternative 1 as being the lowest priority and Bid Alternative ~~43~~3 as being the highest priority.

RFP, pg. 19-20 12/14/18 Section II – Schedule of Events has been revised as follows

<u>December 3, 2018</u>	<u>Deadline for Design-Build Firm to request participation in One-on-One Alternative Technical Concept Discussion Meeting No. 5</u>
<u>December 5, 2018</u>	<u>One-on-One Alternative Technical Concept Discussion Meeting No. 5 90 Minutes will be allotted for this Meeting. This ATC meeting is for continuing discussion on ATCs submitted prior to November 13, 2018 for which the Department requested additional information and were not approved or for new ATCs that are a direct response to an Addendum issued on or after November 26, 2018. No other new ATC submittals will be accepted after December 4, 2018 deadline.</u>
<u>December 712, 2018</u>	<u>Deadline for submittal of Alternative Technical Concept Proposals for which the Department requested additional information and were not approved or for new ATCs that are a direct response to an Addendum issued on or after November 26, 2018. Deadline is 5:00 pm local time.</u>
<u>December 1219, 2018</u>	<u>DDE completes review of ATCs and notifies Design-Build Firms</u>
<u>December 1421, 2018</u>	<u>Deadline for submittal of questions, for which a response is assured, prior to the submission of the Technical Proposal. All questions shall be submitted to the Pre-Bid Q&A website.</u>
<u>December 1928, 2018</u>	<u>Deadline for the Department to post responses to the Pre-Bid Q&A website for questions submitted by the Design-Build Firms prior to the submittal of the Technical Proposal.</u>
<u>January 1717, 2019</u>	<u>Technical Proposals due in District Office by 12:00<u>00</u> p.m. local time</u>

January 1417 , 2019	Deadline for Design-Build Firm to "opt out" of Technical Proposal Page Turn meeting.
January 2224 , 2019	Technical Proposal Page Turn Meeting. Times will be assigned during the Pre-Proposal Meeting. 30 Minutes will be allotted for this Meeting.

RFP, pg. 58-59 12/14/18

Section V.V – Testing has been revised as follows

~~The Contractor will use an FC-5 mix design with a verified will require a minimum Mean Texture Depth value of 0.08 inches (Mean Profile Depth (MPD) of 0.064 inches) minimum Mean Profile Depth (MPD) of 0.054 inches.~~ Testing will be completed using the following requirements.

- Verification Testing method
 - Verification Testing must be done by an independent testing company approved by FDOT or the FDOT's State Materials Office.
 - Testing procedure must be done using laser measurements of MPD meeting ASTM E1845.
 - Testing equipment must be calibrated per ASTM E1845 and approved by FDOT ~~District 4 materials testing office.~~
- FC-5 mix designs must be verified to meet the minimum MPD prior to any use on this project.
- Mix designs may be approved based on their historical performance on previous FDOT projects.
- Mix designs may be approved based on their current performance on other projects when verified in accordance with this specification.
- Any change requested in the previously verified FC-5 mix design or change to a different mix design during construction will require the revised mix or new mix to be verified to meet the minimum MPD requirement prior to use on the project. A 500 foot, sacrificial test section may be used on the current project under these circumstances. If the test section fails to meet the minimum required MPD, the entire length and width of the test section will be removed and replaced at no cost to the Department.
- Testing Locations and frequency
 - Testing is required on all travel lanes
 - Exceeding 36 feet in one direction for normal crown.
 - All lanes super-elevated curves including transitions.
 - Testing will be required every 500 feet at a location determined using the Random Number Generator approved by the Department.
 - Testing will be conducted after rolling is completed.
 - Testing location must be marked by GPS location.

- Failing Test Remedies

- o Failed locations may be retested at a minimum of 100 foot intervals until limits of unsuitable conditions have been identified.
- o Failed test locations must also collect data on pavement slopes in longitudinal and transverse directions every 50-ft throughout the limits of unsuitable conditions.
- o Failed FC that does not meet the requirements described in "Section V. Project Requirements and Provisions for Work – Subsection V. Testing" must be replaced and retested 50 feet before and after the limits of the failed HP sections.
- o Failed locations can remain if "HP Calculations Methods" confirm adequate conditions are met as described below.

- HP Calculation Methods

- o HP calculation method must follow the FDOT Design Guidance: Hydroplaning Risk Analysis.
- o MTD to MPD is converted using the following formula ($MTD = 1.526 \times MPD - 0.065$ with $R^2 = 0.958$. Where the unit for both MTD and MPD is mm.)
- o HP speeds do not exceed the allowable HP speed by more than 1.0 mph.

- Payment

- o Replacement of FC that does not meet testing requirements is incidental to the overall construction and will not be otherwise compensated. Cost of testing and complying with the provisions in this section is to be included in the bid price.

RFP, pg. 120 12/14/18

Section VI.R – Lighting Plans has been revised as follows

The existing light pole foundations shall be completely removed. The limits of removal of the existing lighting system and the proposed new lighting along I-95 shall extend from south of Glades Road (approximate Sta. 3190+00) to north of Glades Road (approximate Sta. 3286+00), and from south of Clint Moore Road (approximate Sta. 3380+00) to south of Linton Boulevard (approximate Sta. 3488+00). ~~The existing lighting system from north of Glades Road (approximate Sta. 3286+00) to south of Clint Moore Road (approximate Sta. 3380+00) may remain in place.~~ The existing openings in the median barrier wall where existing light poles will be removed shall be eliminated by construction of new concrete median barrier wall segments at each of the existing openings.

RFP, pg. 137 12/14/18

Section VII.C – Evaluation Criteria has been revised as follows

The Department shall evaluate the written Technical Proposal by each Design-Build Firm. The Technical Proposal will be evaluated on Bid Alternative ~~4~~3 as described in the RFP and RFP Attachments.

RFP, pg. 141 12/14/18 Section VII.D – Final Selection Formula has been revised as follows

The Bid Alternative priorities are as follows:

Bid Alternative	Priority
1	4 <u>3</u>
2	3 <u>2</u>
3	2 <u>1</u>
4	1

The Department intends to award the contract to the responsive Design-Build Firm with the lowest adjusted score for the highest priority bid alternative below the established funding limits. The funding for the Project is established at ~~\$129~~137,000,000. If the Design-Build Firm with the lowest adjusted score for the highest priority Bid Alternative with a Bid Price Proposal below ~~\$129~~137,000,000 is the same firm for the next highest priority Bid Alternative above the established funding, the Department has the option of allocating additional funds and accepting the next highest Bid Alternative. In the event that all Bid Price Proposals for Bid Alternative 2 and Bid Alternative 3 exceed the established funding amount, the Department reserves the right (based on the availability of additional funds) to consider the Bid Price Proposals for Bid Alternative 2 and Bid Alternative 3 and factor the Adjusted Scores based on those Bid Price Proposals.

RFP, pg. 143 12/14/18 Section VIII.A – Bid Price Proposal has been revised as follows

The Department has established ~~four (4)~~three (3) priorities in the form of bid alternatives to implement the I-95 Express, 3B-2 project. These alternatives begin with base project as Bid Alternative 1, as described in the RFP and RFP Attachments, and increase in scope until the maximum scope is achieved, as described below, with Bid Alternative ~~4~~3. The alternatives in priority order are Bid Alternative 1 as being the lowest priority and Bid Alternative ~~4~~3 as being the highest priority.

Attachment B 12/14/18 Updated Division I Design-Build Specifications

Ref. Doc. 6 12/14/18 Updated Survey CADD Files