

CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Request for Information: Question and Response Form

PROJECT NAME: Resurfacing, Bridge Rehabilitation and Safety Improvements on I-691

PROJECT No.: 0079-0244

TOWN/CITY: Town of Cheshire, Town of Middlefield, Town of Southington and City of Meriden

DATE UPDATED: Tuesday, February 11, 2020

STATUS: F-Finalized Addendum A-Addendum Forthcoming I-Information Only				
No.	QUESTION DETAILS		STATUS	ADD. No.
1	<p>Question: Reference Request for Qualifications (RFQ), Appendix B.02 and Appendix B.03, Section "F"-Experience and Qualifications: This Section of the C/D255 requires both the Constructor and Designer to list a maximum of 8 projects best illustrating the firms experience relevant to Project 0079-0244. This section also states the experience must be in the "past 5 years".</p> <p>The same RFQ section of previous CTDOT Design-Build project provided a 10 year window for relevant project experience. Considering the size and scope of project 0079-0244, we feel that a 5 year window limits the contractors ability to present the most relevant and similar projects. Please increase the project history to 10 years consistent with previous RFQs.</p>		F	2
	<p>Response: Consistent with the previous RFQ, the time limitation will be revised to 10 years. Revised SOQ C255 and SOQ D255 forms (Rev. date 1/15/20) will be posted for use as part of Addendum 2 to the RFQ in the near future.</p>			
2	<p>Question: Can we use the DOT as a reference?</p>		I	
	<p>Response: References from CTDOT representative will be acceptable, however, the person providing the recommendation will be taken into account when evaluating recommendations.</p>			
3	<p>Question: What level of information is the DOT looking for regarding SBE's at the SOQ stage? Are you looking for SBE Sub's to be identified by name at this point or just a description of what types of subcontractors will be used to achieve the SBE goals?</p>		I	
	<p>Response: The internet is for the Proposer to provide a statement of how they plan to fulfilled the SBE requirement for the Project. Subcontractor names are not required. The Contractor's plan and types of subcontractors would be adequate. See Section 1.4 of the RFQ for information regarding SBE requirements.</p>			
4	<p>Question: Please provide the missing appendices for the contract technical specs.</p>		I	
	<p>Response: The draft RFP is incomplete and contains language from previous CTDOT Design Build Projects. The draft RFP was posted only for comment by the Proposers in accordance with Section 2.6 of the RFQ document. See Section 2.6 Of the RFQ for instructions for comments related to the draft RFP. The only official information and instructions for submission of statements of qualifications is found in the RFQ document.</p>			
5	<p>Question: What additional information is anticipated to be released after the SOQ versus prior to SOQ being submitted?</p>		I	
	<p>Response: The only information to be released prior to the Statements of Qualifications being due is explained in the latest addendum to RFQ document. The draft RFP documents are incomplete drafts and intended for comment only as described in Section 2.6 of the RFQ document.</p>			

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 CTDOT take precedence over and supersede all other information posted on websites.

CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Request for Information: Question and Response Form

PROJECT NAME: Resurfacing, Bridge Rehabilitation and Safety Improvements on I-691

PROJECT No.: 0079-0244

TOWN/CITY: Town of Cheshire, Town of Middlefield, Town of Southington and City of Meriden

DATE UPDATED: Tuesday, February 11, 2020

STATUS: F-Finalized Addendum A-Addendum Forthcoming I-Information Only				
No.	QUESTION DETAILS		STATUS	ADD. No.
6	Question:	Please clarify the requirement for two specific public information meetings, one in East Hartford and one in Willington... from Section 3.21.1	I	
	Response:	The draft RFP is incomplete and contains language from previous CTDOT Design Build Projects. The draft RFP was posted only for comment by the Proposers in accordance with Section 2.6 of the RFQ document. See Section 2.6 of the RFQ for instructions for comments related to the draft RFP. The only official information and instructions for submission of statements of qualifications is found in the RFQ document.		
7	Question:	Quantity ranges for unknown items are available; however, how will the Department share risk with the D/B team for quantities outside of the ranges provided? Further, how will technical proposals / bids be compared against other D/B teams in the event that each team uses a different value for unknown quantities, ie, one team bids based on the upper end of the range versus another team bidding based on the lower end of the range?	I	
	Response:	The draft RFP is incomplete and contains language from previous CTDOT Design Build Projects. The draft RFP was posted only for comment by the Proposers in accordance with Section 2.6 of the RFQ document. See Section 2.6 of the RFQ for instructions for comments related to the draft RFP. The only official information and instructions for submission of statements of qualifications is found in the RFQ document.		
8	Question:	What level of design will be provided by the DOT to shortlisted firms and what additional level of design needs to be provided by shortlisted firms during the submission of the bid / proposal?	I	
	Response:	The draft RFP is incomplete and contains language from previous CTDOT Design Build Projects. The draft RFP was posted only for comment by the Proposers in accordance with Section 2.6 of the RFQ document. See Section 2.6 of the RFQ for instructions for comments related to the draft RFP. The only official information and instructions for submission of statements of qualifications is found in the RFQ document.		
9	Question:	The C255 and D255 Forms - Section F Experience and Qualifications require relevant experience to be within the past 5 years. We respectfully request that you extend this time parameter to allow older relevant projects.	I	
	Response:	Question previously asked and answered. Please see question 1 and response.		
10	Question:	Can you please provide a list of those firms who attended the pre-proposal meeting?	I	
	Response:	The attendance sheet for the Pre-Proposal Meeting will be posted to The Department of Administrative Services, State Contracting Portal for Department of Transpiration Projects, under this Project.		
11	Question:	Can CTDOT expand on the Environmental Permitting, drainage and key personnel aspects stated within the RFQ?	F	2
	Response:	An Addendum is forthcoming to expand and clarify the Environmental Permitting, drainage and key personnel aspects of the Project.		
12	Question:	Is it acceptable to use up to one page for each relevant project highlighted in the Experience and Qualifications section of the D and C 255 forms?	I	
	Response:	Section F of the C255 form and D255 form do not allow additional pages. Section I of the C255 form and Section K of the D255 form allow up to five additional pages each. If the Proposer completes the Project Qualifications Summation using less than the allowed 5 additional pages, they may use the remaining portion of the 5 additional pages as they see fit to expand on other information requested in other sections of the form.		

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 CTDOT take precedence over and supersede all other information posted on websites.