

RFQ QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
I-64 SOUTHSIDE WIDENING AND HIGH RISE BRIDGE, PHASE 1 VDOT
PROJECT: 0064-131-811, P101, R201, C501, B662-B669, D637, D638

Update September 30, 2016

(Answer to Question #19 updated)

-
- 1) If a proposed key personnel is not currently a licensed Professional Engineer (PE) in the Commonwealth of Virginia, but is a licensed PE in another state, will a copy of the PE reciprocity application to Virginia be sufficient to serve as proof to satisfy this requirement?

VDOT Response: Key Personnel including the Responsible Charge Engineer, Quality Assurance Manager, Design Manager, and Lead Structural Engineer are required to be a registered, licensed, Professional Engineer in the Commonwealth of Virginia at the time of the Statement of Qualification (SOQ) submission. A copy of the PE reciprocity application to Virginia will not be sufficient to serve as proof to satisfy this requirement.

- 2) The RFQ asks the Offeror to provide a list of assignments and the anticipated duration of each assignment for all projects in which the QAM is currently obligated.
- a. Does VDOT plan on scoring this at all?
 - b. Does VDOT plan on scoring this negatively if there is an overlap?
 - c. If it is scored, will VDOT accept and not apply deductions to an Offerors plan to alleviate the overlap and ensure the QAM will be available at the start of construction?

VDOT Response:

a) As part of the evaluation of the Offeror's team VDOT will take into consideration the current list of assignments, role, and the anticipated duration of each assignment. VDOT expects all Key Personnel to be available for the performance of the work consistent with the RFQ requirements for the duration of the procurement process and, if the Offeror is awarded the Design-Build Contract, the duration of the Design-Build Contract.

b) & c) The VDOT Evaluation Team will evaluate any overlap based on the merits of the information presented in the SOQ. It will be up to the Evaluation Team's discretion to determine the merits of such information during the evaluation.

- 3) The industry has a shortage of qualified managers (i.e. PM, CM, QAM) and is unable to supply the needs due to the volume of work VDOT is intending to put on the street. Is it fair that firms are able to propose the same A+ staff/key personnel on multiple pursuits with the ability to win both pursuits inherently creating conflicts? With the High Rise bridge award date being approximately one year away, and VDOT advertising multiple projects within that period, how will VDOT ensure Key Personnel do not get in conflict with other pursuits during the High Rise selection process? Is it fair to say that conflicts are inevitable and can only be managed? Below are just a handful of project in the District to be let:
- a. Air Terminal Interchange Project
 - b. I-264/Witchduck Road Interchange and Ramp Extension
 - c. Interstate 64 Capacity Improvements – Segment III
 - d. Route 35 Bridge Replacement over Tarrara Creek
 - e. Route 642 Reconstruction
 - f. Witchduck Road – Phase II

VDOT Response: It is the Offeror's responsibility to anticipate and plan for any conflicts with other pursuits during the High Rise selection process.

- 4) RFQ Section 5.2.2 indicates that we may use 10-point font for tables and charts. Please confirm that we may also use 10 point font for graphics.

VDOT Response: Text that is part of a graphic can be modified within reason. All text that is part of a graphic should be readable and should be no smaller than Times New Roman 10 point. Larger text can be used as well.

- 5) May we provide tables on 11 X 17 paper? If so, please confirm that this counts as two pages.

VDOT Response: Tables may not be prepared on 11" x 17" paper.

- 6) It appears the Preliminary Public Notice issued by the United States Coast Guard was not included in the Federal Register. Since the Elizabeth River and AIWW is utilized by entities outside of the primary project area and maintained by the Corps of Engineers, was a project specific notice published on either the Corps website or the federal register where non-local users could review and comment?

VDOT Response: The public notice was not placed in the Federal Register. It was placed on www.navcen.uscg.gov, where non-local users can review and respond. On this web site, the public notice can be accessed using the "Public Notices for Bridges" link under "Current Operational/Safety Information".

- 7) RFQ Section 2.1 includes a projected cost of \$480M. Does VDOT anticipate that this project will not be treated as a "major project" by FHWA?

VDOT Response: Whether the Project is treated as a “major project” or not has no bearing on the Design-Builder’s scope of work. The Design-Builder will be responsible for the scope of work and requirements stipulated in the RFP.

- 8) RFQ Section 2.3 indicates that the DVP overhead transmission lines near the east end of the existing High Rise Bridge will be relocated early and will not be included in the scope of this project. Is relocation of the transmission lines that cross I-64 approximately 800' west of the existing High Rise Bridge included in the scope of this project, or will they also be relocated in advance?

VDOT Response: The transmission line located near the east end of the existing High Rise Bridge is the only utility that will be relocated by VDOT in advance. Any work related to the transmission line 800' west of the High Rise Bridge and all other utility work including all items necessary to perform any relocation, adjustments and coordination will be the responsibility of the Design-Builder.

- 9) Will the RFP include infrastructure requirements to accommodate future systems for managed lanes? Or, will the design-builder be responsible for system layout and design, necessary to accommodate equipment to be procured separately by VDOT?

VDOT Response: The RFP will provide a general layout of the civil infrastructure components that will be associated with the managed lane system, such as gantries, signs, and foundations for control/junction boxes. The RFP technical requirements will provide direction to the Design-Builder regarding the detailed design requirements and construction specifications for these civil infrastructure components.

- 10) Attachment 3.3.1(a) contains a second page that is label Key Personal Reference Form Attachment 3.3.1(b). There is also a separate file for Attachment 3.3.1(b). Both Attachments 3.3.1(b)'s contain different information. Please confirm which file we are supposed to complete and submit.

VDOT Response: Please use Attachment 3.3.1 (b) for the Key Personnel Reference Form. The second page of Attachment 3.3.1(a) will be deleted. An updated Key Personal Reference Form will be included in RFQ Addendum No. 1.

- 11) Page 31 of the RFQ lists three (3) companies who are conflicted out of working on this project (in any capacity) given a real or perceived conflict of interest. Please confirm that these are the ONLY firms with such a conflict, and that any subconsultant(s) to those firms for that same work are free and clear to work on the I-64 High Rise project.

VDOT Response: In addition to the three companies currently listed in the RFQ, CES Consulting will also not be allowed to participate as a Design-Build team member due to a conflict of interest (COI). This addition will be included in RFQ Addendum No. 1. All other inquiries related to conflict of interest will be evaluated and enforced in accordance with VDOT' s IIM-APD-2(Organizational Conflict of Interest Guidelines for Design-Build Procurements.

It's each firm's responsibility to review VDOT work assignments and obtain formal COI determination in advance of the SOQ submittal. Discovery of COI during the procurement process may result in disqualification of the whole team.

- 12) Is there any exclusivity condition with regard to the ROW Contracting Consultants? Are they allowed to be part of more than one Offeror Team?

VDOT Response: There is no exclusivity condition with regard to the ROW Contracting Consultants.

- 13) Will the Department be entering into the Railroad Agreements before the Proposal due date? This would be very beneficial for both the Department and Design-Builder and would mitigate risk for both parties.

VDOT Response: It is the Department's intention to secure the Railroad Agreements during the RFP phase of the procurement.

- 14) Which is the anticipated timeline for the Department to complete the overhead transmission lines and tower relocation? Will this relocation work be completed before the Project Award?

VDOT Response: The final completion date for the DVP transmission line relocation near the east end of the existing High Rise Bridge will be stipulated in the RFP. As of today, the relocation is anticipated to be completed by June 1, 2018.

- 15) The last paragraph of Section 2.5 states:

"Offerors are on notice that VDOT may, in its sole discretion, negotiate and award a design-build contract to an Offeror if, upon a written determination, VDOT determines that such Offeror is the only Offeror fully qualified to perform the proposed design-build contract, or that such Offeror is clearly more highly qualified than the others under consideration."

On which grounds will the Department determine an Offeror to be "clearly more highly qualified than the others"?

VDOT Response: This passage in Section 2.5 is in reference to the second phase of the selection process (RFP phase) which will entail the submission of Technical Proposals and Sealed Price Proposals from each short-listed Offeror. It has no bearing on the RFQ phase of the procurement. VDOT can exercise this right at its sole discretion. However, to date VDOT has not exercised this right and it is highly unlikely that it will be necessary on this Project.

- 16) Which will be the background of the Evaluation Team members appointed by the Department to score and rate the SOQs?

VDOT Response: The Evaluation Team will be VDOT employees and appointed in accordance with VDOT's Design-Build Evaluation Guidelines, revised May 2014.

- 17) Please provide additional information about the scope of work regarding the High-Rise Bridge Submarine Cable Location.

VDOT Response: The Design-Builder's scope will include the removal of the existing fender system and the installation of a new fender system that extends across the existing and proposed High Rise bridges (as shown on the RFQ conceptual plans). VDOT will provide an accurate as-built location survey of the existing submarine cables as part of the RFP. The Design-Builder will be required to accommodate the existing cables relative to their design and construction of the new fender system.

PLEASE NOTE that VDOT has determined that the proposed submarine cable layout shown in the drawing that was included in the RFQ information package was a preliminary concept and not representative of the final construction. The final design and construction of the submarine cable actually installed the cable on the south side of the existing bridge instead of the north side. Also, there are additional submarine cables installed during the original bridge construction that are located along the centerline of the existing bridge and that are not shown in the RFQ drawing.

- 18) Will spiral binding be permissible to securely bind the ten (10) abbreviated SOQ copies?

VDOT Response: Yes, spiral binding is permissible to securely bind the ten (10) abbreviated SOQ copies.

- 19) We believe that the anticipated stipend of \$250,000 is much lower than industry standards for projects of this size and scope and will place significant additional financial burden on the proposers. Will the Department please consider a stipend of \$1,000,000 which is more in line with what is seen across the Design-Build industry?

VDOT Response: ~~VDOT is in the process of considering this request. A determination will be made prior to the release of the RFP.~~ VDOT has made the determination that the stipend amount will remain at \$250,000.

- 20) Does the Department anticipate any SWaM goal for this Contract?

VDOT Response: A DBE participation goal of eight percent (8%) has been set for this Project. A SWaM percentage has not been set however Offerors are encouraged to take all necessary and reasonable steps to ensure that SWaM firms have the maximum opportunity to compete for and perform services for this Project.