

UniversityCity Prosperity Project BT-904

Request for Design-Build Proposals

Addendum 6

July 8, 2015

Notice is hereby given to Short-Listed Design-Build Firms of the following changes to the above-referenced BID/RFP:

You attention is called to this written addendum dated July 8, 2015 which makes the changes indicated to previously issued documents, drawings, criteria, exhibits and other components of the request for proposals..

Information in this addendum supersedes any information previously given, including earlier addenda, that may be in conflict.

Bidders/Proposers must acknowledge receipt of this Addendum by completing and returning to the Procurement Office, by no later than the time and date of the bid/proposal opening. **Failure to do so may subject the bidder/proposer to disqualification.**

_____ Bidder/Proposer

_____ Address

_____ Submitted by (Signature)

NOTICE: Pursuant to Florida Board of Governors Rule 14.023, any qualified applicant who is adversely affected by the university's decision may file a written notice of protest within 72 hours after receipt of this notice. Failure to file a notice of protest within the time prescribed in Florida Board of Governors Regulation 14.023 shall constitute a waiver of the right to protest proceedings.

Item 1 – Requests for Design Variations and Design Exceptions Received June 12, 2015

Comment/Request 1. “The Design Builder requests the following Design Variation Requests from the Design Criteria package. The criteria are based on the bridge shown in the criteria package. We wish to harmonize our hardscape design to our team’s bridge design in order to meet the intent and needs of the Owner. The Design Builder has no objection to meeting the general criteria, but would like the ability to determine the appropriate size and quantities of materials. Below are specific criteria from which we request the ability to vary either size, quantity, or material to correspond with our design and the available construction budget:”

“Criteria 1-1a. Minimum width of sidewalk”

Response to 1-1a – *Minimum width of sidewalk must be maintained*

“Criteria 1-1b. Minimum width of bike lanes”

Response to 1-1b – *Minimum width of bike lanes must be maintained*

“Criteria 1-1c. Minimum width of paver bands”

Response to 1-1c – *Minimum width of paver band could vary. Proposed width of paver bands will be evaluated by the Selection Committee.*

“Criteria 1-1d. Minimum length of seating walls”

Response to 1-1d – *Minimum length of seating walls may vary. Proposed length of seating walls will be evaluated by the Selection Committee.*

“Criteria 1-1e. Minimum amount of site furnishings (benches, trash receptacles)”

Response to 1-1e – *Minimum amount of site furnishings may vary. Proposed number of site furnishings will be evaluated by the Selection Committee.*

“Criteria 1-1f. Minimum number of light fixtures based on consultants light studies”

Response to 1-1f – *Minimum number of light fixtures may vary based upon design-builders light studies. Proposed lighting will be evaluated by the Selection Committee.*

“Criteria 1-1g. Type of paving and planting materials selections”

Response 1-1g – *Types of paving and planting material may vary and will be evaluated by the Selection Committee.*

“Criteria 1-1h. Shape of paving materials”

Response 1-1h – *Shape of paving materials in the hardscape may vary and will be evaluated by the Selection Committee.*

Comment/Request 1-2. “The use of Silva Cells is specified under the hardscape areas where planting is specified. The Design Builder requests the ability to use Silva Cell at their discretion since it is a very costly solution to fit within the context of this team’s design solution.”

Response to Comment/Request 1-2 – *Request granted. Demonstrate to Selection Committee the alternative measures the Design-Build Firm intends to take to promote natural root growth for the street trees in Sweetwater along 109th Avenue.*

Comment/Request 1-3 – “On Sheet No. 19 of the revised conceptual plans, the Driveway Curb & Gutter Detail calls for 3 - #4 reinforcement bars. This is not an FDOT standard. The Design Builder therefore requests/proposes that the Driveway Curb and Gutter is designed and constructed in accordance with the FDOT Standard.”

Response to Comment/Request 1-3 – *Curb and Gutter across driveways shall be reinforced per the design criteria, curb and gutter beyond the driveway shall be per FDOT standards.*

Comment/Request 1-4 - "On Sheet No. S-1 of the revised conceptual plans, the crosswalk is shown in the same location as a catch basin at the low point in the pavement. The Design Builder proposes relocating or omitting the crosswalk and ADA ramps in this area."

Response to Comment/Request 1-4 - *The design builder may propose an alternative location for the crosswalk or propose relocation of the catch basin, but an east-west crosswalk for the bus stop is essential for this section of the project and cannot be omitted.*

Comment/Request 1-5 - "The Design Builder proposes a variable width bridge that will be less than 20 ft. wide over some areas of the roadway and canal. The bridge width will comply with FWHA's requirements found in Section 14.6 of the Best Practices Design Guide. Areas of the bridge outside of the limits of the roadway and canal will be wider creating plazas for seating with shading and plantings in addition to meeting the Owners plans for an 'urban social space.' The narrower width in the roadway and canal areas will minimize gatherings that distract drivers. Overhead distractions slow travel speeds as well as cause accidents and congestion."

Response to Comment/Request 1-5 - *A 20ft. minimum width is essential to the overall functional concept of the design criteria as directed by the Steering Committee. The Design-Builder may propose a narrower section at limited pinch point(s) across the bridge for structural or architectural reasons; however the intent is to maintain a 20' minimum usable width across the entire bridge.*

Item 2 – Requests for Information Received June 12, 2015

Question 2-1 – "Please confirm that the minimum distance between the existing S.W. 109th Ave. bridge and the proposed bridge is 50 ft."

Response to Comment/Request 2-1 - *The minimum width between the existing SW 109th Avenue vehicular bridge and the proposed pedestrian bridge shall be 50ft minimum between any vertical element (ie. walls, stairs, tower, etc.).*

Question 2-2 - "Section 1.2.1 'Description of Bridge Requirements' found on page 5 of the April 2015 Revision of the Design Criteria does not include any requirements for a pre-engineered bridge. Will a pre-engineered bridge with added non-structured aesthetic features be accepted by the Owner?"

Response to Question 2-2 - *A pre-engineered bridge that meets the aesthetic and functional intent of the design criteria, including widths, lengths, and architectural excellence, will be acceptable to the owner.*

Question 2-3 – "The 'Traffic Control Restrictions' found on page 37 of the RFP do not discuss the requirements for a full street closure. We anticipate the need for full closures and detours during some of the erection activities. Will a full roadway closure be allowed during non-peak hours and over approved weekends?"

Response to Question 2-3 - *The Design Builder will have to secure permits from the affected agencies including FDOT, Miami Dade County, FIU and Sweetwater as part of the contract. It is the design-builder's responsibility to ensure that a full closure is feasible during erection activities.*

Question 2-4. "Section 6.2 of the April 2015 Revision of the Design Criteria discusses the structural steel requirements. There is no mention of the use of a coating system for the structural steel. Is the Design Builder required to utilize Weathering Steel for this bridge?"

Response to Question 2-4 - *Weathering Steel is not acceptable for this project. Section 6.2 of the Design Criteria shall be amended to include a coating requirement. The following criterion is hereby to Section 6.2 added – "All Structural Steel shall be painted in accordance with Section 560 and 975 of the FDOT Standard Specifications. Paint all Structural Steel with a high performance top coat system."*

Question 2-5 - "Sheet No. 13 states the City of Sweetwater will provide bricks for the intersection of 109th Avenue and 7th Terrace. Is the City paying the cost of the bricks and delivery to the site? Is this the intent for the other intersections within the City of Sweetwater?"

Response to Question 2-5 - *The bricks that are currently in the area east of 109th Avenue in the existing plaza will be removed by the City prior to construction of this project and be provided to the design-builder for use in only this intersection.*

Item 3 – Requests for Information Received June 17, 2015

Question 3a. – "Does the Owner have additional documentation from SFWMD saying that they will approve the Petition for Waiver? If so, please provide such information to the Design- Build Firms?"

Response to Question 3a - *The owner does not have any further documentation from SFWMD staff. It should be noted that SFWMD is well aware of the scope and intent of this project and they have been active stakeholders in the design criteria process. With that said, the SFWMD cannot issue a permit or any stronger language accepting a design concept with the current level of design. It is the responsibility of the Design-Builder to submit final design drawings to the SFWMD for approval and/or a Petition for Waiver. It is also the responsibility of the Design-Builder to perform their due diligence during the bidding phase to determine the level of risk to time or cost with respect to this matter. SFWMD has informed us that they are available to meet with the Design-Build proposers, this is highly encouraged.*

Question 3b. – "Will the Owner reimburse the Design-Build Firm for any cost or time impacts if SFWMD does not approve the Petition for Waiver?"

Response to Question 3b - *No. See response to Question 3a.*

Question 3c. - "Will the Owner consider reimbursing the Design-Build Firms for cost and time impacts if the approval process exceeds 90 days?"

Response to Question 3c - *No. See response to Question 3a.*

Question 3d. – "Will the Owner consider submitting their own Petition for Waiver Form prior to award of the contract to expedite the permitting process and reduce risk for the Design-Build Firms?"

Response to Question 3d - *No. See response to Question 3a.*

Question 3e. – "Please provide direction on where the north landing/termination of the bridge is to be located."

Response to Question 3e - *See revised plans in Addendum #4.*

Question 3f. – "Reference SFWMD's November 6, 2015 letter, page #1 and page #2. The letter discusses the criteria for the cross section of the canal and determining if excavation is required. Has the Owner acquired any canal cross sections for this area? Also, has the Owner conducted any geotechnical investigations along the bank of the canal? If so, could they be made available to the Design-Build Firms?"

Response to Question 3f – *FIU will post a survey indicating some canal depths and geotechnical information that was prepared for the Brothers to The Rescue Memorial Plaza – not for this UniversityCity Prosperity Project. Design-Build firms shall make their own assessment of the relevance of this information. The information will be posted on the Project Website here: <http://facilities.fiu.edu/projects/BT-904.htm> as Items "G." and "H." under the heading "For Reference Only."*