

CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Request for Information: Question and Response Form

PROJECT NAME: Stamford Parking Garage

PROJECT No.: 0301-0047

TOWN/CITY: Stamford, Connecticut

DATE UPDATED: Wednesday, May 13, 2020

STATUS: A - Addendum Forthcoming F - Finalized Addendum R - Revised W - Written Response No Addendum

No.	QUESTION DETAILS		STATUS	ADD. No.
1	Question:	On the bottom of Page #2 on both the Form C255 and the Form D255, it states that "Key personnel resumes should be attached (see RFQ for further information)". Section 3.2.1 of the RFQ contains the submission requirements for the Statement of Qualifications. In the bulletized list, the C255 and D255 Forms comprise the first bullet and the 10 Key Personnel resumes comprise the second bullet. Will CTDOT allow for all ten (10) resumes to be submitted together in one batch and located behind a separate divider in the SOQ submission (in the order demonstrated in the bulletized list in Section 3.2.1) rather than being attached to Forms C255 and D255 separately?	W	
	Response:	Resumes are to be included in the SOQ as listed in Section 3.2.1 of the RFQ. Only one copy is required. They do not need to be attached to the C255 or D255 forms.		
2	Question:	RFQ, Section 3.1 Submission Requirements: The first sentence of the fourth paragraph of this section states the following: "One (1) original and five (5) copies of the submittal, individually securely bound (spiral, comb, or other secure binding technique), must be received by the date and time specified in the Schedule of Events above." Considering the stay-at-home orders established in Connecticut due to the COVID pandemic presents logistical challenges for printing and binding physical copies of the proposal submission, so would CTDOT consider receiving the Statements of Qualifications electronically either by mailed thumb drives or via electronic transmission such as DropBox or GoogleDrive?	F	1
	Response:	The CTDOT will accept digitally signed, .PDF, Statement of Qualification (SOQ) documents in place of the paper original and copies outlined in Section 3.1 of the RFQ if the entire submittal is electronic. Paper documents signed and scanned are not acceptable as an original of the SOQ. If the Proposer chooses to submit a .PDF electronic document using a digital signature, the digital signature must meet the digital signature requirement of the certifying signature and associated digital certificate stated in CTDOT's "Digital Project Development Manual version 5.01", Section 5, which can be found on CTDOT's website, or that of DocuSign (DocuSign, Inc. San Francisco, California). The submittal must still meet all other requirements of Section 3.1 and other sections of the RFQ. The electronic submittal will be accepted via USB flash drive delivered to the location specified in Section 3.1 of the RFQ or sent via email to the Contact Person listed in Section 3.1 of the RFQ. The due date shall remain as stated in Section 2.2 of the RFQ. If the Proposer chooses to produce the original document as a paper document, one paper original and an electronic copy of the original are still required as outlined in section 3.1 of the RFQ. Section 3.1 of the RFQ will be revised to reflect this change in a forthcoming addendum.		
3	Question:	Reference SOQ D255-F, Experience and Qualifications. Can we submit a project that is under construction with a known completion date?	W	
	Response:	Yes.		
4	Question:	Reference SOQ D255-I, CADD. Is the department requiring the design team to use Bentley Microstation, or is the team allowed to translate from one platform (i.e. Revit to Bentley)?	W	
	Response:	Translation from one platform to another is acceptable, as long as it can be guaranteed that data will be translated without any issues into Microstation. All submissions shall conform to the requirements of the Request for Proposals and Contract Documents. The Contractor will be required to perform quality control for all design and other documents they produce. This includes Microstation.		
5	Question:	Reference SOQ 2.6.1, Opportunities for comment. The draft reference documents appear to be fairly well developed in terms of functional layout, exterior aesthetic design direction (façade). Will the agency be looking for alternative design concepts or is it the agency's intent to implement this concept (potentially with minor modifications)?	W	
	Response:	Alternative Technical Concepts (ATCs) will be explained in the Request for Proposals (RFP), which will be issued to the shortlisted Proposers. It is anticipated that ATCs that may not be entertained for certain aspects of the project including the facade due to extensive public outreach already completed. For future comments related to the draft Base Technical Concept (BTC), as stated in Section 2.6 of the RFQ, "CTDOT invites the Proposers to comment on the draft documents by email to: CTDOT.Design.Build@ct.gov."		

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: Stamford Parking Garage

PROJECT No.: 0301-0047

TOWN/CITY: Stamford, Connecticut

DATE UPDATED: Wednesday, May 13, 2020

STATUS: A - Addendum Forthcoming F - Finalized Addendum R - Revised W - Written Response No Addendum

No.	QUESTION DETAILS	STATUS	ADD. No.
6	<p>Question: Page 18 (3.1) of the RFQ says that 1 original and 5 copies of the submittal should be individually securely bound (spiral, comb or other secure binding technique). Are 3-ring binders an acceptable secure binding technique?</p> <p>Response: 3-ring binders are not an acceptable binding technique for the SOQ.</p>	W	
7	<p>Question: Page 19 (3.2.1) of the RFQ says all supporting documents, with the exception of resumes, shall be written in Times New Roman 11 point, single spaced. Are the forms provided in the RFQ considered supporting documents, and therefore are required to be filled in using Times New Roman 11 point, single spaced? Or should the forms be filled in using the font style and point size of the original forms as provided by CTDOT?</p> <p>Response: Fillable PDF forms supplied by the CTDOT may be filled out in the font that automatically appears in the field within the form.</p>	W	
8	<p>Question: May photos of relevant projects be allowed on the front cover of the submission?</p> <p>Response: Photos of relevant projects will be allowed on the front cover.</p>	W	
9	<p>Question: Will the project Stamford Station Garage project briefing link scheduled to be posted on the DAS website this afternoon be a live presentation or a recording?</p> <p>Response: The Pre-SOQ Briefing for this project is presented as a pre-recorded PowerPoint presentation with voice-overs. A notice containing links to the video file of the presentation was uploaded to the State of Connecticut Contracting Portal on April 30, 2020.</p>	W	
10	<p>Question: See Contractor Form SOQ C255 Section C Project Staffing. Can the Lead Construction Firm identify other Project Staffing categories such as Safety Managers, IT Technicians, etc.. in Section C in the blank spaces provided?</p> <p>Response: The Lead Construction Firm may use the blank spaces in Section C for other project staffing as they see fit.</p>	W	
11	<p>Question: Could you please provide an indication on the RFP Schedule as it relates to when it will be issued; duration of ATC period; expected time frame between RFP due date and Award/NTP; and the overall duration of the RFP period?</p> <p>Response: Related to the RFP schedule, please refer to updates on the CTDOT Design-Build Website. Dates related to the ATC process will be specified when the RFP is issued. The ATC period is typically two months in duration. Award is anticipated to be in Spring of 2021. Contractually CTDOT has 45 Calendar Days after Award to issue the NTP.</p>	W	
12	<p>Question: Could you please provide an indication on the approximate NTP date?</p> <p>Response: The NTP is anticipated to be in Spring of 2021.</p>	W	
13	<p>Question: Could you please provide an indication on how the scoring criteria for selection of best value proposed on RFP would look like? What would be the Price scoring component compared to the technical scoring component look like (ie. 50-50; 70-30; 80-20)?</p> <p>Response: Currently it is anticipated that the Price Score may have greater weight as compared to the Technical Score but we have not finalized the weight factors. This information will be released with the RFP to the shortlisted Proposers.</p>	W	
14	<p>Question: RFQ, Section 4.2: Qualifications Scoring Criteria (pages 28-29) & Section 3.2.1: Submission Documents Selection Criteria S2 and S4 in Section 4.2 each refer to the inclusion of "Recommendations written by the owner's representatives." These recommendation letters are not mentioned in the Proposal Submission Requirements in Section 3.2.1. Can CTDOT please clarify where these Reference Letters should be located within the Statement of Qualifications Package? For example, should they have their own tab or be located behind the C255/D255 Forms noted in Appendix B or some other location?</p> <p>Response: Proposers may use up to five pages per section to supplement SOQ C255 Section G and SOQ D255 Section H with written recommendations from the referenced persons or other owners of projects with similar complexity. 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. Section 3.2.1 of the RFQ will be updated to reflect this clarification in a forthcoming addendum.</p>	F	1

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: Stamford Parking Garage

PROJECT No.: 0301-0047

TOWN/CITY: Stamford, Connecticut

DATE UPDATED: Wednesday, May 13, 2020

STATUS: A - Addendum Forthcoming F - Finalized Addendum R - Revised W - Written Response No Addendum

No.	QUESTION DETAILS	STATUS	ADD. No.
15	<p>Question: RFQ, Section 4.2: Qualifications Scoring Criteria (pages 28-29) & Section 3.2.1: Submission Documents Selection Criteria S2 and S4 in Section 4.2 each refer to the inclusion of "Recommendations written by the owner's representatives." These recommendation letters are not mentioned in the Proposal Submission Requirements in Section 3.2.1.</p> <p>If the Owner's representative on a relevant past project is now retired from that Owner or is currently working for another entity, would a letter from this individual (former employee of the Owner) be acceptable to CTDOT?</p>	F	1
	<p>Response: Yes. Section 3.2.1 of the RFQ will be updated to reflect this clarification in a forthcoming addendum.</p>		
16	<p>Question: RFQ, Section 3.2.1 Submission Documents, Page 19: In Section 3.2.1 a part of this section states that proposal pages "shall be 8 1/2" x 11" in size..."</p> <p>Would CTDOT consider permitting 11" x 17" sized pages (Z-folded) for the Organizational Chart(s) required per Section 3.2.5 as this page size increase will allow Proposers the space required to demonstrate the fully integrated design-build team organization while maintaining the font size requirements for this submission?</p>	F	1
	<p>Response: Yes. Only the organizational chart may be on one 11"x17" single-sided sheet. Section 3.2.5 of the RFQ will be updated to reflect this change in a forthcoming addendum.</p>		
17	<p>Question: RFQ, Section 3.2.1: Submission Documents Section 3.2.1 states in part that "Alternative Contracting Statement of Work Under Contract form for proposed Contractor (joint ventures must submit separate forms for each member)."</p> <p>Can CTDOT please confirm that only the Contractor/Design-Builder and not any construction subcontractors or design firms are required to complete this form.</p>	W	
	<p>Response: Only the construction contractor is required to fill out the form "Alternative Contracting Statement of Work Under Contract".</p>		
18	<p>Question: RFQ, Section 3.2.1: Submission Documents Section 3.2.1. states in part that "Printed copies of the SOQ shall have sections separated by labeled tabs."</p> <p>Can CTDOT please specify the quantity and section titles/tab names that should be assigned to each tab, along with a list of which proposal requirements belong in each section, or alternately should the Proposers make their own determination regarding tab section names based upon the Submissions Documents requirements in Section 3.2.1?</p>	W	
	<p>Response: Proposers may make their own determination regarding tab section names. Section numbers are not necessary. The purpose tabs is to help differentiate between different sections of the SOQ, to assist during the review cycle.</p>		
19	<p>Question: RFQ, Section 3.8.1 Conflict of Interest and Unfair Competitive Advantage Certifications Section 3.8.1 states in part that "Proposers should evaluate for itself, and the Proposer's key personnel, its subcontractors and any other individuals associated with their Proposal should evaluate for themselves whether they have a conflict situation. Thereafter, the Proposer (each respective participant, as described in Section 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."</p> <p>Can CTDOT confirm that this form needs to be filled out by only the following parties: 1) the Contractor 2) the Lead Design Firm and 3) the 10 Individual Key Personnel, and therefore that design subconsultants and construction subcontractors do not need to complete this form?</p>	W	
	<p>Response: The Proposer (prime contractor), the prime designer, Key Personnel must fill out a "Conflict of Interest and Unfair Competitive Advantage Form" as described in Section 3.8.1. Proposers are required that their design consultants and construction subcontractors self-evaluate if there is an existing or potential conflict situation and shall complete a "Conflict of Interest and Unfair Competitive Advantage Form".</p>		
20	<p>Question: RFQ, Appendix B.05, Certificate of Authority (Sample) is written as if it is intended for Joint Ventures. RFQ, Section 3.2.1, it states, "A Certificate of Authority naming the individual empowered to bind the Contractor and execute documents on its behalf (the Project Executive). This individual shall certify the forms for the SOQ. If the proposer is a joint venture, a separate Certificate of Authority from each of the members of the JV must be submitted identifying this individual".</p> <p>Are we correct to assume that the Contractor is still required to provide a Certificate of Authority, even if it is not a Joint Venture?</p>	W	
	<p>Response: Correct, the Proposer shall provide a Certificate of Authority regardless of JV or not.</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: Stamford Parking Garage

PROJECT No.: 0301-0047

TOWN/CITY: Stamford, Connecticut

DATE UPDATED: Wednesday, May 13, 2020

STATUS: A - Addendum Forthcoming F - Finalized Addendum R - Revised W - Written Response No Addendum

No.	QUESTION DETAILS	STATUS	ADD. No.
21	<p>Question: RFQ, Appendix B.05, Certificate of Authority (Sample) is written as if it is intended for Joint Ventures. RFQ, Section 3.2.1, it states, "A Certificate of Authority naming the individual empowered to bind the Contractor and execute documents on its behalf (the Project Executive). This individual shall certify the forms for the SOQ. If the proposer is a joint venture, a separate Certificate of Authority from each of the members of the JV must be submitted identifying this individual".</p> <p>If CTDOT's response to Question A is yes, then can CTDOT confirm that the Contractor is permitted to alter the language of the Sample Certificate of Authority provided in Appendix B to apply to a Prime Proposer?</p>	W	
	<p>Response: Yes.</p>		
22	<p>Question: RFQ, Section 2.2 Schedule of Events: Section 2.2 contains upcoming dates related to the RFQ submission. Can CTDOT provide the anticipated schedule for the Release of the RFP to the short-listed Teams, and the Anticipated Notice of Award date?</p>	W	
	<p>Response: Refer to updates on the CTDOT Design-Build Website for RFP anticipated issuance. Award is anticipated to be in Spring of 2021.</p>		
23	<p>Question: Appendix B, Submission Forms: C255 & D255 Are photos permitted to be included in the C255 and D255 forms?</p>	W	
	<p>Response: Proposers can use the required space as they wish.</p>		
24	<p>Question: RFQ, Sections 3.2.2-3.2.4 Sections 3.2.2 through 3.2.4 provide the requirements for Key Personnel Are copies of licenses required to be submitted for the Key Personnel?</p>	W	
	<p>Response: Proposers may submit documentation as they see fit.</p>		
25	<p>Question: Appendix B.06_Alternative Contracting Statement of Work Under Contract: Appendix B.06 contains 11 tabs in the workbook. The first tab is a summary page, and the remaining tabs include "List of Outstanding Work", numbered 1-10. It appears the "List of Outstanding Work" tabs are duplications of the same content.</p> <p>Are we correct to assume that the Proposer only needs to fill out as many "List of Outstanding Work" tabs as are needed to list the firms current backlog of work and may therefore provide fewer pages than are shown in the Excel file?</p>	W	
	<p>Response: Yes. Blank pages may be omitted.</p>		
26	<p>Question: Would you please confirm whether the maximum 10 resumes are the total maximum for the combined Design/Build team, or if it is a maximum 10 resumes for the design team and a maximum 10 resumes for the contractor (20 total)?</p>	W	
	<p>Response: As stated in the RFQ, Section 3.2.1, "A maximum of ten (10) resumes, which are limited to two (2) pages each."</p>		
27	<p>Question: The RFP states "All supporting documents, with the exception of resumes (see above for resume page limit), shall be written in Times New Roman, 11 point, single spaced. The pages shall be 8½" x 11" in size with 0.75" margins on all edges". Does this apply to all sections of the CSO forms as well?</p>	W	
	<p>Response: The font and paper size requirements of the SOQ, as stated in the RFQ, applies to all documents in the SOQ with the exceptions of A.) the Organizational Chart which may be on one single-sided 11"x17" sheet and B.) fillable PDF forms supplied by the CTDOT may be filled out in the font that automatically appears in the field within the form. In addition, please note that "CSO forms" are not to be used for the SOQ. RFQ Appendix B contains the forms to be used in the SOQ.</p>		
28	<p>Question: RFQ, Form C255 and Form D255 Forms C255 and D555 are PDF files that have fillable form fields for the firms to fill in. The fillable areas are not currently set to the RFQ-required font type and size (Times New Roman, 11 point). As provided, the fonts throughout the two forms vary in font size and type.</p> <p>Can CTDOT please confirm that it is acceptable for the Proposers to adjust the fillable fields on the C255 and D255 Forms such that they are set to display the required font type and size consistently throughout the forms?</p>	W	
	<p>Response: Fillable PDF forms supplied by the CTDOT may be filled out in the font that automatically appears in the field within the form.</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: Stamford Parking Garage

PROJECT No.: 0301-0047

TOWN/CITY: Stamford, Connecticut

DATE UPDATED: Wednesday, May 13, 2020

STATUS: A - Addendum Forthcoming F - Finalized Addendum R - Revised W - Written Response No Addendum

No.	QUESTION DETAILS	STATUS	ADD. No.
29	<p>RFQ, Appendix B & Project Question/Answer #2: Two forms in Appendix B require notarization in addition to the Project Executive's signature: the Certificate of Authority & the Alternative Contracting Statement of Work. In CTDOT's response to Question #2, permission was granted to the Proposer to respond to the Request for Qualifications electronically, and provide resources for ensuring that the originals signatures that are required as part of the submission are executed to the satisfaction of CTDOT in accordance with the CTDOT's "Digital Project Development Manual version 5.01", Section 5. In the response to Question #2, DocuSign, Inc. San Francisco, California was one of the options provided for the execution of electronic signatures for this submission.</p> <p>REF: State of Connecticut Executive Order #7K, State of New York Executive Order #202.6 (Note that this Proposer is including reference to New York, because we are located in New York. Since both Executive Orders are essentially identical, by following New York's Executive Order, we are also in compliance with Connecticut's Executive Order.)</p> <p>The governors of both Connecticut and New York have issued Executive Orders which permit notarial acts to be completed remotely using audio/video technology as long as the following protocols are followed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Signatory must identify themselves by showing evidence of identification - The Communication technology must be capable of recording the video interaction which will remain on file with the notary - The Signatory must affirm their location (NY, CT, etc.) - The Signatory must transmit the signed document to the Notary electronically or by fax - The notary must notarize the document and transmit it back to the signatory electronically or by fax. <p>With electronic signatures and electronic submissions now being permitted by the CTDOT, and with the Governors of CT and NY both issuing Executive Orders permitting remote notarial acts utilizing video conferencing technology, can CTDOT please confirm that Proposers may handle the notarial acts by following the procedure outlined above utilizing DocuSign as the method of transmitting the files and obtaining the electronic signatures, as this is in line with both CTDOT's response to Question #2 as well as NY and CT Executive Orders?</p>	W	
	<p>Response: CTDOT will accept Notary Public notarized forms that comply with New York and Connecticut laws and executive orders. DocuSign does not seem to satisfy the signature requirement in the statute. Ultimately it is up to the Notary Public to comply with the Laws and Regulations governing notarization.</p>		
30	<p>RFQ, Section 2.2 Schedule of Events, Table 1: Schedule of Events - RFQ Process The RFQ schedule reflected in Section 2.2 does not establish a date for the Proposers to receive responses from CTDOT to questions submitted by the Proposers or the anticipated date(s) for addenda. In a previous Q&A issuance by CTDOT it was stated that a future addendum would be forthcoming. Additionally, the Question deadline from Proposer is currently May 7, 2020 which may generate the need for additional responses/clarifications.</p> <p>Given COVID-19 challenges and remote working arrangements there is concern that not enough time will be available for the Proposers to review/consider Q&As/Addendums and revise their proposals accordingly.</p> <p>Can the Department consider making the Final Date to issue Final Addendum and/or answers to Proposer questions by May 15th to ensure time is provided to the Proposers to incorporate the answers into our proposal by the current due date of May 21st?</p>	W	
	<p>Response: CTDOT will take this request under advisement and will make every effort to answer questions and issue the final addendum as soon as possible.</p>		
31	<p>Response from CTDOT to Question #2: The Department has permitted electronic submissions through Question #2 as one of the options for delivering the SOQ. A part of the answer states "Paper documents signed and scanned are not acceptable as an original of the SOQ." As part of the SOQ, recommendations written by Owner representatives are welcomed in the proposal. These letters will be written by parties outside of the Proposer's organization and team.</p> <p>If the Team intends to include reference letters from past Owners, are we correct to assume signed and scanned originals will be acceptable as part of the electronic submission, since these letters are not executed by the Proposer's team but rather by a Owner's representative and are outside of and beyond the required Cover Letter, Evidence of Authority and binding forms that require original signatures by the Proposers?</p>	W	
	<p>Response: Regarding reference letters, a signed and scanned original will be acceptable.</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: Stamford Parking Garage

PROJECT No.: 0301-0047

TOWN/CITY: Stamford, Connecticut

DATE UPDATED: Wednesday, May 13, 2020

STATUS: A - Addendum Forthcoming F - Finalized Addendum R - Revised W - Written Response No Addendum

No.	QUESTION DETAILS	STATUS	ADD. No.
32	<p>Question: RFQ, Section 4.2: Qualifications Scoring Criteria (pages 28-29): Selection Criteria S2 and S4 in Section 4.2 each refer to the inclusion of "Recommendations written by the owner's representatives." Are we correct to assume that an "Owner's representative" may include representatives from consulting firms who were employed by the consulting firm, and working on behalf of, and representing the Owner throughout the course of the past project?</p>	W	
	<p>Response: If a firm has been designated to represent a particular owner, then CTDOT would accept that as a reference.</p>		
33	<p>Question: RFQ, Appendix B, Certificate of Authority. The Certificate of Authority requires a signature by the Project Executive. The Certificate of Authority is essentially a Power of Attorney Letter. Additionally, the Project Executive may not necessarily be the Owner or CEO of the Proposer. May the Proposer provide an additional Power of Attorney Letter, whereby the CEO of the Proposer grants Power of Attorney to the Project Executive for all documentation related to this Project?</p>	W	
	<p>Response: The Project Executive is not intended to be the individual signing the Certificate of Authority. The Certificate of Authority is signed by a duly authorized representative of the entity assigning authority to the Project Executive (see sample in the RFQ Appendix B). A Power of Attorney Letter shall not substitute the Certificate of Authority.</p>		
34	<p>Question: The PPT rendering (Public Information & Scoping Meeting, dated October 24, 2018, page 50 of 67) shows the full landscaping of the east bank of the Rippowam River, while the BTC site plans CIV-001 & CIV-002 show a fill line (assumed to be limit of work) at the existing top of bank. Should we assume the BTC site plan limit of work supersedes the rendering on the PPT rendering with regards to the limits of sitework adjacent to the river?</p>	W	
	<p>Response: This will be addressed/answered during the final development of the Request for Proposal (RFP) and the final Base Technical Concept (BTC) which will be issued to the shortlisted Proposers.</p>		
35	<p>Question: Reference BTC Existing Rights-of-Way Plan EXT-003: This sheet appears to indicate that South State Street between Greenwich Ave. and Washington Blvd. is owned by the "State of Connecticut (DOT)". Please confirm if it is CT DOT or City of Stamford.</p>	W	
	<p>Response: The pedestrian bridge, intersection improvements and parking garage are located within existing State of Connecticut rights-of-way, including Washington Boulevard (SR 493) and South State Street (SR 790); no additional rights are anticipated for the permanent condition as shown in the BTC plans. Easements and other permissions to construct the Project outside of the CTDOT right-of-way will be addressed in the RFP.</p>		
36	<p>Question: Reference BTC Existing Rights-of-Way Plan EXT-003: This sheet does not indicate the ownership of Washington Boulevard south of the Non-Access Highway Line for I-95. South of Station Place there are lines indicating "Approx. Street Line" which would imply City ownership. Is it the City of Stamford or CT DOT?</p>	W	
	<p>Response: Washington Boulevard is SR 493 within the project limits and is a City street south of Station Place.</p>		
37	<p>Question: Reference BTC Existing Rights-of-Way Plan EXT-003: Portions of the work (e.g., the pedestrian bridge, intersection improvements) appear to extend into and/or over the City street layouts. What is the status of the DOT obtaining easements or other permissions to construct the project over or within City street layouts?</p>	W	
	<p>Response: The pedestrian bridge, intersection improvements and parking garage are located within existing State of Connecticut rights-of-way, including Washington Boulevard (SR 493) and South State Street (SR 790); no additional rights are anticipated for the permanent condition as shown in the BTC plans. Easements and other permissions to construct the Project outside of the CTDOT right-of-way will be addressed in the RFP.</p>		
38	<p>Question: The Scope of Services does not indicate that the D/B Team is responsible for obtaining rights or easements for the pedestrian bridge and other project elements in or over the City of Stamford street layouts. Will CT DOT handle that?</p>	W	
	<p>Response: The pedestrian bridge, intersection improvements and parking garage are located within existing State of Connecticut rights-of-way, including Washington Boulevard (SR 493) and South State Street (SR 790); no additional rights are anticipated for the permanent condition as shown in the BTC plans. Easements and other permissions to construct the Project outside of the CTDOT right-of-way will be addressed in the RFP.</p>		
39	<p>Question: Reference SOQ-D255-F, Experience and Qualifications Can the narrative for the projects be referenced to an attachment and can we include project photos?</p>	W	
	<p>Response: The Project Qualifications Summation Section K of SOQ Form D255 allows the Proposer to expand on any other section. Project photos are permitted.</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: Stamford Parking Garage

PROJECT No.: 0301-0047

TOWN/CITY: Stamford, Connecticut

DATE UPDATED: Wednesday, May 13, 2020

STATUS: A - Addendum Forthcoming F - Finalized Addendum R - Revised W - Written Response No Addendum

No.	QUESTION DETAILS	STATUS	ADD. No.
40	<p>Question: Reference SOQ-2.3.1 for guidance related to the content to supplement this section. The RFQ does not contain a section labeled 2.3.1. Please advise which section of the RFQ we should refer to for more guidance.</p> <p>Response: Section 2.3.1 does not exist within the RFQ. We are unable to verify the reference stated in your question. We believe you mean 3.2.1.</p>	W	
41	<p>Question: Please explain the process of becoming pre-qualified for the CTDOT Stamford Garage project. Based on the RFQ on page 8 & 9 it states "Construction Contractors seeking prequalification specifically for this project shall include in this submission, a cover letter directed to the Manager of Contracts stating the following: "Prequalification submission for the Design-Build Project No. 0301- 0047, Stamford Parking Garage Project". Construction Contractors should also be aware that the prequalification process will establish their current bid capacity as a Proposer. A Proposer will not receive an award of the Contract if the amount of their Price Proposal for the Project should exceed their bid capacity." Can you please confirm to become pre-qualified we only need to submit a letter and no other documentation?</p> <p>Response: The cover letter you are referencing shall accompany the prequalification submission that is directed to the Manager of Contracts. Section 1.3.2 will be updated for clarification in a forthcoming addendum. Here is a link for prequalification information: https://portal.ct.gov/DOT/Business/Contractor-Information/CONTRACTOR-PREQUALIFICATION-INFORMATION</p>	F	1
42	<p>Question: Since it is a State project/property, is the project excused from local Zoning permitting?</p> <p>Response: Yes.</p>	W	
43	<p>Question: Is there any expectation on scope for permitting beyond building permit?</p> <p>Response: At this time, it is expected that environmental permits for the BTC will be obtained by CTDOT.</p>	W	
44	<p>Question: Will State ensure coordinated access and effort with utility companies? Or is this expected of design team?</p> <p>Response: The Contractor (DB) is responsible for coordinating with CTDOT and utility owners for the required utility relocations and new service installations.</p>	W	
45	<p>Question: Has a geotechnical report been prepared for the project, including subsurface explorations and observation wells, from which the concept design shown on the drawings was developed? If so, can this report (or report be provided?</p> <p>Response: Subsurface explorations including soil and rock borings and observation wells were performed for the parking garage site; historic boring logs are also available near I-95 and in the area of the Station. This information will be included in the geotechnical documents to be provided with the RFP; these geotechnical documents include: Geotechnical Data Report, Geotechnical Baseline Report, and Geotechnical Design Memoranda.</p>	W	
46	<p>Question: Have any environmental studies in regards to soil and groundwater environmental quality, including soil and groundwater chemical testing, been conducted? If so, can these report(s) be provided?</p> <p>Response: Task 120 and Task 210 studies have been completed; these documents will be included as appendices to the Technical Provisions of the RFP. Task 310 plans and specifications will be included in the Technical Provisions of the RFP.</p>	W	
47	<p>Question: The retaining wall cross sections indicate that tiebacks, if employed, would extend below the railway ROW and possibly below the I-95 ROW. Has approval from MetroNorth (and other applicable railway entities) and CTDOT been secured for such installations below the respective ROWs?</p> <p>Response: All permanent works, including potential tie-backs, can be completed within existing State of Connecticut rights-of-way. Additionally, the BTC plans and Technical Provisions relating to work adjacent to the railroad have been reviewed by Metro-North Railroad; work adjacent to I-95 has been reviewed by CTDOT.</p>	W	
48	<p>Question: Are there any special approvals, permits, or training required by entities (including abutters) having jurisdiction over the project relative to conducting subsurface explorations?</p> <p>Response: Any work, including subsurface explorations, that will be conducted in railroad territory must meet Metro-North Railroad's requirements specific to insurance coverages, safety training, railroad protective services, among other requirements that will be fully defined in the Technical Provisions of the RFP.</p>	W	
49	<p>Question: What is the largest email file size DOT can accommodate for our response?</p> <p>Response: It is recommended that submissions larger than 35 megabytes be submitted via USB flash drive.</p>	F	1
End of RFQ Questions and Responses.			

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.