

# CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

**PROJECT NAME:** Rehabilitation of Bridge Nos. 02366, 02367 & 02369 in East Hartford, CT and Bridge No. 00847 in Willington, CT

**PROJECT No.:** 0171-0431

**TOWN/CITY:** East Hartford & Willington

**DATE UPDATED:** Thursday, October 06, 2016

STATUS: F-Finalized Addendum A-Addendum Forthcoming I-Information Only				
No.	QUESTION DETAILS		STATUS	ADD. No.
1	<p><b>Question:</b> Can you please provide an excel format for the Statement of Work Under Contract Form for the Request for Statement of Qualification for Project No. 171-431?</p>	<p><b>Response:</b> The Department will not be publishing an excel file for this document. However, the Department is revising the existing form to a multipage PDF to provide additional space for the documentation of outstanding private and public projects. The revised form is available in the revised RFQ Appendix B available on the Departments Design-Build Web Page at: <a href="http://www.ct.gov/dot/cwp/view.asp?a=4453&amp;q=534602">http://www.ct.gov/dot/cwp/view.asp?a=4453&amp;q=534602</a>. A note has also been added to the form that instructs proposers to contact the Office of Contracts if the form does not provide adequate space. Addendum 1 has incorporated the revised form to the RFQ and will be posted to the DAS Contracting Portal with the advertised project information.</p>	F	1
2	<p><b>Question:</b> If a contractor is already prequalified and submitted a (Con16) at the time of prequalification, do they have to resubmit a (Con16) for this RFQ (Referring to page 16 2.2.2. Prequalification of Construction Contractors)?</p>	<p><b>Response:</b> If a contractor is currently prequalified and active in the appropriate prequalification categories and approved for the scope code specified in the RFQ, it is not necessary for them to resubmit a Con16. If a contractor is uncertain about their current status, they are encouraged to contact the Department's Office of Contracts for clarification.</p>	I	
3	<p><b>Question:</b> Reference Request for Statement of Qualifications, Form SOQ C255 (Jan 14), Section F – Experience and Qualifications and Form SOQ D255 (Mar '14), Section F – Experience and Qualifications: The first sentence on these forms states "List projects (MAXIMUM OF 8) best illustrating qualifications of firm relevant to this project (past 5 years)." On previous Department Design-Build Request for Statement of Qualification projects, the Department has increased the experience limit from 5 years to 10 years. In an effort for the Contractor and Designer to encompass a desirable amount of relevant projects, will the Department please change the experience limit from "past 5 years" to "past 10 years"?</p>	<p><b>Response:</b> Inadvertently, the old version of these documents were included in the RFQ. The revised forms are available in the revised RFQ Appendix B available on the Departments Design-Build Web Page at: <a href="http://www.ct.gov/dot/cwp/view.asp?a=4453&amp;q=534602">http://www.ct.gov/dot/cwp/view.asp?a=4453&amp;q=534602</a> Addendum 1 has incorporated the latest revised forms into the RFQ for the SOQ C255 and The SOQ D255, which will revise the limit to 10 years.</p>	F	1
4	<p><b>Question:</b> Regarding the conflict of interest certification form, can a list of the names of consultants and/or sub-consultants who assisted the Department in the preparation of RFQ and RFP docs please be provided?</p>	<p><b>Response:</b> The engineering firms of CME Engineering; GEI Consultants, Inc.; HDR, Inc.; and Milone and MacBroom have been advised that their participation on a Proposers team may create a conflict of interest due to their current or future involvement in the Departments Design-Build program. It is up to the Proposer to evaluate and inform the Department of potential conflicts of interest. The RFQ document outlines the process.</p>	I	
5	<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> Question previously asked and answered. Please see question and response Number 3.</p>	I	

# CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

**PROJECT NAME:** Rehabilitation of Bridge Nos. 02366, 02367 & 02369 in East Hartford, CT and Bridge No. 00847 in Willington, CT

**PROJECT No.:** 0171-0431

**TOWN/CITY:** East Hartford & Willington

**DATE UPDATED:** Thursday, October 06, 2016

**STATUS: F-Finalized Addendum A-Addendum Forthcoming I-Information Only**

No.	QUESTION DETAILS	STATUS	ADD. No.
6	<p><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?</p>	F	2
	<p><b>Response:</b> Under Section 2.3.2, via Addendum 2, the following definition will replace the existing definition for the <b>Project Executive:</b> The single point of contact with whom the Department may confer on all contractual issues. This person must be given the authority by the Lead Company or Joint Venture to mobilize resources, decide all matters related to the Project on behalf of the Contractor, as well as be authorized to bind the Contractor on all matter related to this Project. For the duration of the Project, this person must have the ability to be on site within twenty four (24) hours.</p>		
7	<p><b>Question:</b> Please confirm that if a contractor has previously submitted a CON 16 and is prequalified in the Categories of Work No. 9 (Intermediate Bridges) as stated in the RFQ then there is no other prequalification needed before the submission of forms which includes the Statement of Work Under Contract?</p>	F	2
	<p><b>Response:</b> Section 2.2.2 of the RFQ was updated as part of Addendum 2 to clarify.</p>		
8	<p><b>Question:</b> If Proposer's Team has more than one "Designer," which is not a "Subconsultant," is a separate D255 recommended or required?</p>	F	2
	<p><b>Response:</b> The Department intended that there be a prime designer and sub-consultants as part of the Contractor's Team. This is indicated in the, Prequalification of Designers section of the RFQ by, "The Design Teams (including lead Design firm and all sub consultant Designers) shall demonstrate...." and in the, Key Personnel section of the RFQ by the definition of the Design Manager, "...This includes coordination of all design activities, including those of sub-consultants designers." This is also indicated in the Submission Documents section of the RFQ "...SOQ D255 Statement of Qualifications of the Designer", and on the SOQ D255 form Section B, "Lead Design Firm Information." To clarify this intent, the Department will revise the RFQ as part of addendum 2, to state that the Proposer's Team must consist of a Prime Construction Contractor and it's key subcontractors. One of which is a Prime Designer responsible for the overall design (100% of the design work) of the project. The Prime Designer must self-perform the majority of the design work but may subcontract portions of the work not to exceed 49% of the total. Other edits will be made as well to refine the language revising the Lead Designer to state Prime Designer and to require that the Design Manager work for the Prime Designer. With this clarification, there will only be one SOQ D255 form required.</p>		
9	<p><b>Question:</b> Page 15, item 2.1 Submission, Deadline, and Location Instructions of the "Request for Statement of Qualifications" document states the following: "One original and five (5) copies of the submittal, individually spirally bound, must be received by the date and time specified in the Schedule of Events above." Please confirm that it is acceptable to bind the SOQ submittal using a comb binding spine.</p>	F	2
	<p><b>Response:</b> It is acceptable to use a comb binding so long as the document is bound securely and is not at risk for the loss of pages. The Department will not be responsible for lost pages. The RFQ was updated as part of addendum 2 to clarify the binding requirements.</p>		

# CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

**PROJECT NAME:** Rehabilitation of Bridge Nos. 02366, 02367 & 02369 in East Hartford, CT and Bridge No. 00847 in Willington, CT

**PROJECT No.:** 0171-0431

**TOWN/CITY:** East Hartford & Willington

**DATE UPDATED:** Thursday, October 06, 2016

STATUS: F-Finalized Addendum A-Addendum Forthcoming I-Information Only				
No.	QUESTION DETAILS		STATUS	ADD. No.
10	<b>Question:</b>	Pertaining to Form SOQ D255, Section G, Experience and Qualifications - Is this section intended to be representative of the Prime Designer only or should all design subconsultants current projects be included.	F	2
	<b>Response:</b>	Section G of Form D255 pertains to work performed by the Prime Designer only. Subconsultant experience may be listed in Section F if necessary to represent parties key to the qualifications of the proposer. The SOQ D255 was updated as part of addendum 2.		
11	<b>Question:</b>	Pertaining to Form SOQ D255, Section H, References - it states "up to 5 additional pages to supplement this section for owner recommendations/references." Please provide clarification as to what these 5 additional pages should include. Is the intent to provide extra space for additional references listed in the same format as that shown in Form SOQ D255, Section H. Can design sub consultant references be included as well?	F	2
	<b>Response:</b>	Section H of the D255 form only allows for references. The additional 5 pages are intended for written recommendations from the referenced persons or other owners of projects with similar complexity. Section 2.3.1 of the RFQ was revised as part of addendum 2 to clarify this. If recommendations from persons in addition to those listed on the SOQ form are included, the name, affiliation and contact information of that person should be included. The SOQ C255 and D255 forms were updated as part of addendum 2 to clarify the intent of the sections. Subconsultant references should be included if they are a key component of the qualifications.		
12	<b>Question:</b>	Do the resumes need to be in Times New Roman, 11 point font with the .75" margins? Many firms have resumes set up in templates already so would like clarification.	F	2
	<b>Response:</b>	The size and type of fonts and margins were chosen for consistency in length and readability. The Proposer may choose to depart from the font and margin formatting requirements for Resumes, however, if the resumes are not easily read or understood, it might negatively effect the score. The RFQ was revised as part of addendum 2.		
13	<b>Question:</b>	Please confirm that the 5 additional pages of Owner recommendation/references are to be from Owners other than the 3 that are required to be listed in Section G (Form C255) and Section H (Form D255).	F	2
	<b>Response:</b>	The additional 5 pages are intended for written recommendations from the referenced persons or other owners of projects with similar complexity. Section 2.3.1 of the RFQ was revised as part of addendum 2 to clarify this.		

# CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

**PROJECT NAME:** Rehabilitation of Bridge Nos. 02366, 02367 & 02369 in East Hartford, CT and Bridge No. 00847 in Willington, CT

**PROJECT No.:** 0171-0431

**TOWN/CITY:** East Hartford & Willington

**DATE UPDATED:** Thursday, October 06, 2016

STATUS: F-Finalized Addendum A-Addendum Forthcoming I-Information Only				
No.	QUESTION DETAILS		STATUS	ADD. No.
14	<b>Question:</b>	Regarding the 5 additional pages of Owner recommendations/references: Will it be acceptable to submit 5 additional recommendations/references from the same Owner, but from different projects (i.e.. different CT DOT projects and representatives)?	I	
	<b>Response:</b>	The complexity of the project, involves the Design-Build aspect as well as the individual design and construction efforts. The Proposer may utilize the SOQ forms as they see fit as long as they comply with the rules provided.		
15	<b>Question:</b>	Will a recommendation/reference from an Owner's Representative (i.e.. Design Engineer, Inspection Engineer or similar agency) be acceptable?	I	
	<b>Response:</b>	Recommendations/references from an Owner's Representative will be acceptable, however, the person providing the recommendation will be taken into account when evaluating recommendations. Employees of owners are preferred.		
16	<b>Question:</b>	Are letters of reference from current DOT employees permitted to be submitted as owner recommendations as described in Section 2.3.1 and Section G of the C255?	I	
	<b>Response:</b>	Recommendations/references from a Department representative will be acceptable, however, the person providing the recommendation will be taken into account when evaluating recommendations. Employees of owners are preferred.		
17	<b>Question:</b>	Will the Department specify a particular Document Management System to be utilized on this project?	I	
	<b>Response:</b>	The Department is not currently specifying a Document Management System to be used on this project, however, the RFP is in draft form and there is a potential that this aspect may be revised.		
18	<b>Question:</b>	Pg. 20 of RFQ for Project 171-431. The description of the Design Quality Control Manager states that preferred experience includes "Training in QC principles (must meet or exceed the NETTCP QA Technologist Certification)". Since the NETTCP certification is typically required for construction inspection personnel, not design staff, can this qualification be removed?	F	2
	<b>Response:</b>	The experience is preferred, the qualifications of the individual will be evaluated as a whole. The RFQ Section 2.3 was revised with the intent to provide a comparative measure for the minimum expected level of training desired.		
19	<b>Question:</b>	Pg. 20 of RFQ for Project 171-431. The description of the Design Quality Control Manager states that preferred experience includes "Training in QC principles (must meet or exceed the NETTCP QA Technologist Certification)". Prerequisites for the QA Technologist Certification are: high school diploma or GED; prior education and training in quality assurance specifications; and at least three years' experience with transportation specifications. Since the requirements for a Professional Engineer are more rigorous than QA Technologist, would a PE be acceptable?	F	2
	<b>Response:</b>	The experience is preferred, the qualifications of the individual will be evaluated as a whole. The RFQ Section 2.3 was revised with the intent to provide a comparative measure for the minimum expected level of training desired.		

# CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

**PROJECT NAME:** Rehabilitation of Bridge Nos. 02366, 02367 & 02369 in East Hartford, CT and Bridge No. 00847 in Willington, CT

**PROJECT No.:** 0171-0431

**TOWN/CITY:** East Hartford & Willington

**DATE UPDATED:** Thursday, October 06, 2016

STATUS: F-Finalized Addendum A-Addendum Forthcoming I-Information Only				
No.	QUESTION DETAILS		STATUS	ADD. No.
20	<b>Question:</b>	Page 18 of the "Request for Qualifications" document states the following: "The SOQ C255 and SOQ D255 forms are not to be altered in any way." We respectfully request that the Department provide these forms in WORD format for ease of data input and formatting.	I	
	<b>Response:</b>	The Department is not providing this form in word format.		
21	<b>Question:</b>	Please confirm the use of photos within forms SOQ C255 and SOQ D255 Section F (Experience and Qualifications) is acceptable.	I	
	<b>Response:</b>	The Proposer may utilize the SOQ forms as they see fit as long as they comply with the rules provided. The forms are not to be altered in any way. If the proposer is capable of inserting pictures in place of the text in the fields they may do so, however it is the proposer's objective to best represent their qualifications. If the proposer fails to provide adequate information it may negatively effect the score.		
22	<b>Question:</b>	Reference Addendum #2 - Statement of Work Under Contract Form. It appears that this form is not functioning properly. The headers do not appear at the top of the columns, dollar signs (\$) and commas cannot be inserted into column cells and font sizes change with amount of digits entered (appearance of the form is not presentable). Being a "writeable" form, we cannot change the format or formulas in the cells. Can the department please review the functionality of this form, if the Department finds that this form is not functioning correctly, can it please issue a new form that does function properly?	F	3
	<b>Response:</b>	Due to continued technical issues being experienced with the "Statement of Work Under Contract (rev09162016)" PDF form included with the RFQ, a new Excel form will be issued as part of Addendum 3. The new form is entitled, "Alternative Contracting Statement of Work Under Contract." The Proposer May submit either the PDF Statement of Work or the Excel Alternative Contracting Statement of Work Under Contract with the Statement of Qualification (SOQ) packages. This form will be required to be submitted with the paper and electronic SOQ submission forms. The Department will issue Addendum #3 to revise the language of the RFQ document related to this change. The form may be downloaded from the Bizet State Contracting Portal under the project advertisement or the ConnDOT Design-Build Program Webpage ( <a href="http://www.ct.gov/dot/cwp/view.asp?a=4453&amp;q=534602">http://www.ct.gov/dot/cwp/view.asp?a=4453&amp;q=534602</a> ). Links will also be provided in Appendix B of the RFQ Addendum 3 document.		

**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.