

CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

PROJECT NAME: REHABILITATION OF BRIDGES 03761, 03762, 03764, 03765 IN BRIDGEPORT

PROJECT No.: 0015-0363

TOWN/CITY: BRIDGEPORT, CT

DATE UPDATED: Friday, April 25, 2014

No.	QUESTION DETAILS	STATUS	ADD. No.
1	<p>Question: Section 2.2.2, page 11 of the RFQ states the requirement for prequalification in Work Classifications No. 7 (Road Construction and Rehabilitation) and 10 (Major Bridges). Similar to the allowance for joint venture partners – If a construction contractor is prequalified in only one of these classifications and has a major subcontractor prequalified in the other, may these individual pre-qualifications be combined to satisfy this requirement?</p> <p>Response: No. The qualification requirements for this project require the Construction Contractor to be pre-qualified in the classifications of work required for the project. Contractors may combine pre-qualifications by the formation of Joint Ventures. Sub-Contractors may not be used to fulfill these requirements</p>	I	
2	<p>Question: Are there any special forms that the JV must submit prior to submission of the SOQ?</p> <p>Response: The sections of the RFQ regarding pre-qualification and submission requirements for Joint Ventures have been revised and will be provided as part of Addendum No. 1</p>	I	1
3	<p>Question: Does the Joint Venture just submit the letter described in the Bid Manual with the SOQ?</p> <p>Response: The sections of the RFQ regarding pre-qualification and submission requirements for Joint Ventures have been revised and will be provided as part of Addendum No. 1</p>	I	1
4	<p>Question: Does the JV need to submit a Power of Attorney Form prior to or with the SOQ, or not at all?</p> <p>Response: The sections of the RFQ regarding pre-qualification and submission requirements for Joint Ventures have been revised and will be provided as part of Addendum No. 1</p>	I	1
5	<p>Question: Was it intended to link the first three fields under section A of Form SOQ-C255? When text is entered into any one of those fields, it duplicates that text in the other two. It appears these should be three distinct responses.</p> <p>Response: No. The PDF form contained a mistake that produced this error. The Form has been updated and has been included in Addendum No. 1</p>	I	1
6	<p>Question: Was it intended to have the "Proposed Project Manager" (rather than the Construction Manager) sign underneath the "Proposed Project Executive" in the Form SOQ-C255?</p> <p>Response: No. According to the definitions of "Key Personnel" stated in the RFQ, the "Project Executive" is the individual empowered to bind the Proposer and execute documents on its behalf for this project. The only instance where that scenario would be accurate is in the event the "Proposed Project Manager" or "Construction Manager" is also the "Project Executive"</p>	I	
7	<p>Question: Was it intended to have the Proposed Project Executive under Section A of form SOQ-C255, be the Contact under section B, as well as the signatory under Section J?</p> <p>Response: Not necessarily. This person can be a separate contact person designated by the proposer. The signatory in section "J" is the "Project Executive"</p>	I	
8	<p>Question: Would the Department consider eliminating the requirement to list <u>all proposed subcontractors</u> in the Form SOQ-C255, as it creates a less competitive environment for general contractors to receive pricing and select subcontractors due to the fact that the project design has not yet been fully developed by the "Proposers Engineer of Record"?</p> <p>Response: The intent of this section is not to list subcontractors for contracting purposes, but rather give the Proposer an opportunity to be able to use the experience and qualifications of proposed subcontractors to showcase the strength of its team. It also allows the Proposer to identify any "Key Personnel" employed by a proposed subcontractor. The form will be updated to clarify this section</p>	I	1

STATUS: F-Final R-Revised I-Information Only

Disclaimer:

The availability of the Questions and Responses does not relieve prospective proposers of their obligation to review and become familiar with the RFQ and other relevant project and bidding requirements. The RFQ and addenda issued by the Department take precedence over and supersede all other information posted on Web sites.

CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

PROJECT NAME: REHABILITATION OF BRIDGES 03761, 03762, 03764, 03765 IN BRIDGEPORT

PROJECT No.: 0015-0363

TOWN/CITY: BRIDGEPORT, CT

DATE UPDATED: Friday, April 25, 2014

No.	QUESTION DETAILS	STATUS	ADD. No.
9	Question: Would the Department consider limiting the subcontractor listing to only major subcontractors with scopes in excess of \$1 Million dollars, with the listing of multiple subcontractors occurring in the RFP phase not the SOQ phase?	I	1
	Response: See response to question number 8		
10	Question: Page 15 of the RFQ, Section 2.3.3. Organization Chart states "Identify the Proposer and all Major Participants in the chart(s)." Please provide a definition of the term Major Participant.		
	Response: This section of the RFQ will be revised in Addendum No. 1 to remove the reference to "Major Participants"		
	Question:		
	Response:		
	Question:		
	Response:		
STATUS: F-Final R-Revised I-Information Only			

Disclaimer:

The availability of the Questions and Responses does not relieve prospective proposers of their obligation to review and become familiar with the RFQ and other relevant project and bidding requirements. The RFQ and addenda issued by the Department take precedence over and supersede all other information posted on Web sites.