

# 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:** Wednesday, May 28, 2014

No.	QUESTION DETAILS		STATUS	ADD. No.
1	<b>Question:</b>	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?	F	
	<b>Response:</b>	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		
2	<b>Question:</b>	Are there any special forms that the JV must submit prior to submission of the SOQ?	F	1
	<b>Response:</b>	The sections of the RFQ regarding pre-qualification and submission requirements for Joint Ventures was revised and provided as part of Addendum No. 1.		
3	<b>Question:</b>	Does the Joint Venture just submit the letter described in the Bid Manual with the SOQ?	F	1
	<b>Response:</b>	The sections of the RFQ regarding pre-qualification and submission requirements for Joint Ventures was revised and provided as part of Addendum No. 1.		
4	<b>Question:</b>	Does the JV need to submit a Power of Attorney Form prior to or with the SOQ, or not at all?	F	1
	<b>Response:</b>	The sections of the RFQ regarding pre-qualification and submission requirements for Joint Ventures was revised and provided as part of Addendum No. 1.		
5	<b>Question:</b>	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.	F	1
	<b>Response:</b>	No. The PDF form contained a mistake that produced this error. The Form was updated and included in Addendum No. 1.		
6	<b>Question:</b>	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?	F	
	<b>Response:</b>	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".		
7	<b>Question:</b>	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?	F	
	<b>Response:</b>	Not necessarily. This person can be a separate contact person designated by the proposer. The signatory in section "J" is the "Project Executive".		

**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:** Wednesday, May 28, 2014

No.	QUESTION DETAILS		STATUS	ADD. No.
8	<b>Question:</b>	Would the Department consider eliminating the requirement to list <b>all proposed subcontractors</b> 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"?	F	1
	<b>Response:</b>	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 was revised and provided as part of Addendum No. 1.		
9	<b>Question:</b>	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?	F	1
	<b>Response:</b>	See response to question number 8.		
10	<b>Question:</b>	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.	F	1
	<b>Response:</b>	This section of the RFQ was revised as part of Addendum No. 1 to remove the reference to "Major Participants".		
11	<b>Question:</b>	Designers are prohibited from providing CT DOT employees as references for Section H of the 255 form. Does the same restriction apply to Contractors?	F	
	<b>Response:</b>	This rule relates to Consultant Selections. The Consultant Selection Office rules do not apply for the Design-Build pilot project. The Department expects to evaluate the full range of the Proposer's qualifications, experience and past performance as indicated by the qualitative rating criteria in the RFQ. Proposers should select references which best illustrate their range of capabilities.		
12	<b>Question:</b>	Section 2.3.2 Key Personnel states that the Construction Manager may be the same person as the Construction Superintendent. Considering a project of this size and complexity, we propose to combine management functions and have one person act as both the Project Manager and Construction Manager, and assign a separate Construction Superintendent. Is this substitution acceptable?	F	2
	<b>Response:</b>	This section of the RFQ regarding Key Personnel was revised as part of Addendum No. 2 to address this question.		
13	<b>Question:</b>	Will the Department allow the Contractor to print the Organization Chart on 11 x 17 paper?	F	
	<b>Response:</b>	Yes, however it must be folded to fit within the footprint of the other submittal documents.		
14	<b>Question:</b>	Section 2.9.1 Conflict of Interest and Unfair Competitive Advantage Certification states: "...the Proposer (each respective participant, as described in Chapter 1) shall complete and submit a Conflict of Interest and Unfair Competitive Advantage Certification (Certification Form) for itself, and a separate set of forms for each of its key personnel." Please confirm that the intent is to have the Proposing Firm complete a form on behalf of the firm, and also have each Key Personnel listed in Section 2.3.2 complete a form.	F	
	<b>Response:</b>	The Conflict of Interest and Unfair Competitive Advantage Certification form must be completed and signed by the Proposer, its Key Personnel, and any member of the Proposer's team that is aware of a conflict of interest or unfair competitive advantage.		

**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:** Wednesday, May 28, 2014

No.	QUESTION DETAILS	STATUS	ADD. No.
15	<b>Question:</b> The SOQ instructions that follow page 29 of the RFQ state that "Section K of each form can be used to expand on the requested information." For form C255 it appears Section I is intended for this information. Please confirm.	F	2
	<b>Response:</b> This is correct. The Instructions for SOQ Forms D255 and C255 have been updated as part of Addendum No. 2.		
16	<b>Question:</b> In reference to SOQ forms C255/D255, please clarify if respondents are restricted to the page limits implied by the RFQ blank forms. Specifically, are the eight (8) projects required for Section F restricted to fit 2 pages or can these be modified to fit the requested information (e.g. one project per page)? Similarly, in reference to SOQ form D255 Section G, are respondents limited to fitting the space provided, or can the form be expanded to fit the requested information?	F	2
	<b>Response:</b> The SOQ forms are not to be altered in any way. Section K of the D255 form and section I of the C255 form may be utilized as instructed in those sections to provide additional information to the page limit allowed. Clarification has been added to the SOQ instructions as part of Addendum No. 2.		
17	<b>Question:</b> In reference to SOQ form D255 Section G, are respondents limited to 3 projects?	F	2
	<b>Response:</b> The SOQ forms are not to be altered in any way. Section K of the D255 form and section I of the C255 form may be utilized as instructed in those sections to provide additional information to the page limit allowed. Clarification has been added to the SOQ instructions as part of Addendum No. 2.		
18	<b>Question:</b> We are experiencing a problem typing information into Form: SOQ C255 and Form: SOQ D255. Specifically, sections D, H and I in Form: SOQ C255; and sections D and K in Form: SOQ D255. When typing info into those sections one line of text will only be visible. Please advise.	F	2
	<b>Response:</b> We are aware of the issue and have revised the forms as part of Addendum No. 2.		
19	<b>Question:</b> Section 2.3.1 states that with its "Declaration of Joint Venture" the joint venture Proposer must identify which parts of the work each firm which compose the joint venture is responsible. The purpose of a joint venture is to synthesize the strengths of each partner into an integral whole. The different aspects of work required on this project will be carried out by a combined effort of both joint venture partners and do not lend themselves to subdivision. Please reconsider this requirement for the Statement of Qualifications.	F	2
	<b>Response:</b> The language of that section asks for an explanation of the work each firm will do. If more than one JV partner intends to perform a given item, multiple firms may be indicated. If it is in fact a synthesis of effort, then the Proposer should have a Declaration of Joint Venture and an explanation, that clearly explains this and how it relates to their shares and responsibility for the work. Proposers are cautioned however that vague proposals will not receive, favorable ratings. This section was updated as part of Addendum No. 2.		
20	<b>Question:</b> Due to the scope of this project falling in the \$30,000,000 to \$40,000,000 range, can the Project Executive also serve as the Project Manager?	F	2
	<b>Response:</b> This question has been addressed in Section 2.3.2 of the RFQ as part of Addendum No. 2.		

**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:** Wednesday, May 28, 2014

No.	QUESTION DETAILS	STATUS	ADD. No.
21	<p><b>Question:</b> Section F of forms D255 and C255 limit the projects to be listed to the past 5 years. Can this period be extended to the past 10 years to more completely encompass the experience of the Proposers?</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The Department has revised the timeframe to 10 years. This is reflected in the SOQ forms revised by Addendum No. 2.</p>	F	2
22	<p><b>Question:</b> The Statement of Work Under Contract form page 2 (Addendum #1, RFQ Pages 48-49), states, "Contact the Contracts Unit if you need more space in the document." Additional space is required. Could this form be re-issued as an excel file similar to the standard DOT Part C form which is provided in Excel format?</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The PDF form has been revised to contain additional pages as part of Addendum No. 2. Please see the new form for instructions.</p>	F	2
23	<p><b>Question:</b> Would you please clarify some information on Project No. 15-363, Bridgeport Route 8 Bridges RFQ (CSO #2226). According to the RFQ documents, I believe you are seeking RFQ's now for Design Build teams, and RFP's to short list are targeted around August. The Scheduled for Advertising DOT list <a href="http://www.ct.gov/dot/lib/dot/documents/dfiscalprojects/advschedule.pdf">http://www.ct.gov/dot/lib/dot/documents/dfiscalprojects/advschedule.pdf</a> has this project targeted for October??? There seems to be a conflict of info, and I just want to be sure to provide the correct dates and status to our customers.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The RFQ advertised at "<a href="http://www.biznet.ct.gov/scp_search/BidResults.aspx?groupid=64">http://www.biznet.ct.gov/scp_search/BidResults.aspx?groupid=64</a>" or the CT DAS Contracting portal for Department of Transportation Bids and RFPs Solicitation # 2226 contains the schedule for the Qualifications phase of this project. The RFP will be given to the shortlisted firms after the Qualifications phase. Please visit that site and review the RFQ documents for the RFQ phase.</p>	F	
24	<p><b>Question:</b> Page 1 of the RFQ defines the "Proposer" as a contractor. Page 12 of the RFQ states that "the proposer must demonstrate combined design and construction qualifications to be considered for this procurement. As a result, the Proposer must satisfy both the Department's engineering and construction qualifications." Please clarify if the "Proposer" refers to the contractor or to all firms that make up the <u>proposing team</u>.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The Proposer does refer to a contractor, however the intent is that the proposer demonstrate either on its own or through its team the qualifications necessary. This does not however alleviate the prequalification requirements and the general requirement in Part 3 of the RFP that the Prime Contractor perform 50% of the work with its own forces. The definition of Proposer was updated as part of Addendum No. 3.</p>	F	3
25	<p><b>Question:</b> In the Project Qualifications Summation sections of SOQ Forms D255 and C255, are responses limited to the space allotted on the form <u>and</u> 5 additional pages, or are responses limited to 5 pages <u>total</u>?</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The space provided in Section "K" of form D255 and Section "I" of form C255 may be utilized along with 5 additional pages attached to each of the forms that expand the above noted sections or other pertinent information the proposer deems necessary. Please note that Forms C255 and D255 were revised as part of Addendum No 2 and No 3. Please make sure you are utilizing the latest forms.</p>	F	

**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:** Wednesday, May 28, 2014

No.	QUESTION DETAILS		STATUS	ADD. No.
26	<b>Question:</b>	Page 17 of the RFQ states "Proposers and lead design firms should consider that conflicts may arise during and after the BVDB procurement that may preclude firms from pursuing Department work on which other participants in the design-build proposal are already under contract with the Department." Could you please clarify this statement and provide an example of a situation in which a firm may be precluded on this basis?	F	
	<b>Response:</b>	There are three examples listed in Section 2.9 of the RFQ (Page 20 of Addendum #2). The second of the three examples in Section 2.9 under Conflict of Interest, prevents a firm from representing the Department as a CE&I consultant and then teaming with the same Prime Contractor as part of a D-B proposal. If a firm has a situation where they are unsure if there is a conflict they should bring the situation to the attention of the Department by utilizing the COI form provided or simply asking a confidential question. A confidential question may be asked by sending an email to the CTDOT.Design.Build email and adding "Confidential" to the other required information. The answer of whether there is a conflict or not depends on the contracting relationships.		
27	<b>Question:</b>	Will the Department release the CADD files of their Preliminary Design?	F	
	<b>Response:</b>	In Section 2.5 "Reference Documents and Standards Applicable to the Design of the Project" of part 1 of the Draft RFP, "The Department will electronically provide to each proposer that requests them Project-specific reference documents. The partial Project-related plans (the "BTC") included in those documents will be for the proposers' reference use only." These requests will only be accepted from Short Listed Proposers. There are PDF copies of the BTC on the RT8Bridgeport.com website.		
28	<b>Question:</b>	It seems that there is an issue with the page numbering for Addendum # 2. Page # 21-24 seem out of order.	F	3
	<b>Response:</b>	Yes, there was an issue with the page order during the conversion to PDF. The page numbers on each sheet are correct however they are out of order in the PDF. All the content is correct. This issue was corrected as part of Addendum No. 3.		
29	<b>Question:</b>	Within the Project Executive description on page 13, it states "This person must have the ability to be on site within twenty four (24) hours for the duration of the Project." Does this mean that throughout the duration of the project, if a project issue arises, the Project Executive needs to be on site within 24 hours? Or does this mean that within 24 hours notice, the Project Executive needs to have the ability to be on site and remain on site full time for the duration of the project?	F	3
	<b>Response:</b>	If a project issue arises, the Project Executive needs to be on site within 24 hours. The requirements were updated as part of Addendum No. 3.		
30	<b>Question:</b>	For Key Personnel, if a proposed person for a specific Key Personnel position does not meet the minimum required 10 years of experience, will they be rejected? Your evaluation criteria states that "if the qualification fails to meet the stated requirements and objectives they are susceptible to correction through oral presentations". Can the original score given for failing to meet the qualification be increased from minimally acceptable or unsatisfactory to exceptional based on the performance in the interview.	F	3
	<b>Response:</b>	There is no direct rating for the Key Personnel as the ratings are spread among several rating factors. The experience requirements for Key Personnel are not absolute requirements, but rather indicate a strong preference by the Department. Proposers are cautioned that less experienced personnel may be rated poorly. It is not expected that interview performance will dramatically impact ratings, unless previously submitted information was misunderstood or overlooked. The experience requirements for Key Personnel were updated in a as part of Addendum No. 3.		

**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:** Wednesday, May 28, 2014

No.	QUESTION DETAILS	STATUS	ADD. No.
31	<b>Question:</b> In regards to Key Personnel, given that the construction manager is to be on site full time is it necessary to have the Project manager on site full time as well?	F	3
	<b>Response:</b> The proximity requirements for the Project Manager under Key Personnel have been revised. The revision was included in Addendum No. 3.		
32	<b>Question:</b> The "Sample Certificate of Authority" is written for a Joint Venture. If the Proposer is not a Joint Venture, which Certificate of Authority form should be used?	F	
	<b>Response:</b> The sample Certificate of Authority provided in the appendix of the RFQ is a sample of an acceptable submission. Though written describing a joint venture relationship, "corporation" may be substituted for "joint venture".		
33	<b>Question:</b> RFQ Section 2.3.2 states that the Project Executive must be an officer of the lead company. Is it possible for our Board of Directors to appoint a Project Executive with the authority to confer on all contractual issues in compliance with your requirements rather than it being an officer?	F	
	<b>Response:</b> That would be acceptable if the person meets the other requirements of the Project Executive.		
34	<b>Question:</b> Form SOQ D255, page 1 requires signature of the Proposed Project Executive which confirms "the information herein is a statement of facts". This form D255 is completed by the design consultant. The Project Executive is from the Proposer's company and cannot confirm or deny what the consultant states as accurate about that company. Please consider revising this form to eliminate the Project Executive signature	F	
	<b>Response:</b> The basis of design build is one of teaming and trust relationships. The Project executive should be familiar enough with his/her team that they are comfortable with signing the form.		
35	<b>Question:</b> SOQ Form C255, Section F, Experiences and Qualifications, Firm's Portion. Please confirm that if the contractor was the Prime Contractor for the project that the value of the Firm's Portion should be the same as the Project value.	F	
	<b>Response:</b> The intent of the section is for the Proposer to identify their involvement in previous projects and the extent of their involvement, therefore, if the Proposer was the "Prime" Contractor, its responsibility for the project is the Contract Amount.		
36	<b>Question:</b> Section G of the Designer Form: SOQ D255 requests that a narrative including project description and firm's responsibilities be provided for the current Department's and CT State agencies or CT municipalities projects. The form does not have a space for this request.	F	3
	<b>Response:</b> The form was updated to reflect the addition of fields to provide this information. It was added as part of Addendum No. 3.		
37	<b>Question:</b> The SOQ submittal requires six individually bound copies. Will each copy need to be an original, or is one original and five copies the intent?	F	
	<b>Response:</b> The intent is for the Proposer to submit one (1) original and five (5) bound copies of the SOQ submission documents. Please note that Forms SOQ C255 and SOQ D255 were revised as part of Addendum No 2 and No 3. Please make sure you are utilizing the latest forms.		

**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.