

C-470 Owner Representation RFP Questions & Answers

C-470 Owner Representation RFP Questions & Answers

1. Please clarify the statement within the second paragraph in the Introduction section:
“One contract is expected to delineate both the services required of the retained procurement consultant and the services required as stated in this Scope of Work.”

Will the retained procurement consultant hold the ‘one contract’ such that the consultant selected to provide the ‘Design-Build Owner Representation Services’ will become a sub-consultant to the retained procurement consultant?

Retained consultant will become sub. Services performed by retained could be delineated via this master contract or the one already in place for Design-Build Procurement.

2. Who is the retained procurement consultant? Is this company or are any members of their team precluded from pursuing this contract?

Wilson is precluded.

3. The term ‘assessor’ and ‘assessors’ are used throughout the Scope of Work. Please clarify if one assessor or multiple assessors will be required. If multiple assessors are required, please provide an estimate of how many may be required. This information was provided for design oversight/verification, not for assessors.

Proposer needs to propose a plan.

4. CDOT does not have prequalification Design-Build Project Management or Owner Verification Testing as described in the advertisement for this project. The prequalification form #1048 does provide a line item for contract administration (Engineering Management (Contract Administration) – MA) and Construction Management (Engineering Management (Construction) (MC)).

Please clarify the prequalification requirements for this project. Invitation/advertisement states: “Design-Build Project Management and Construction Management Owner Representation Services: Owner Verification Testing (OVT) and Contract Administration”.

Please use this opportunity to demonstrate your advanced knowledge of what it means to be an Owner Rep. on a design-build project and how you plan to meet CDOT's needs.

5. We have been contacted by multiple firms currently committed to a Contractor’s Design-Build team that have submitted an SOQ. These firms are interpreting the right to participate on this PS CM RFP, if they have less than 20% final design work for the contractor. Could there be a conflict of interest as a given firm could represent the owner with assistance in development of the DB RFP, and represent the contractor in pursuit of the DB RFP? Could this conflict be exacerbated following award, by a given consultant providing oversight on their own work?

Yes, this could be a conflict depending on who's selected and the same firm cannot be an owner rep. and a design-builder rep.

C-470 Owner Representation RFP Questions & Answers

6. Please confirm if MT – Materials Testing or MC – Engineering Management (Construction) capacity should be provided for Owner Verifications and Testing (OVT) as required for this RFP?

Yes, while there will be a completely separate Independent Assurance Testing (IAT) contract there will be MT audits part of the OVT effort as is the case on typical design-build projects.

7. Our interpretation of this RFP is that the actual database and document control system be provided by the current procurement consultant. Is the intent of this RFP for the responder to provide technical staff to utilize the provided system?

The document control system will be provided by the owner, ability to use said system is not anticipated to be a huge differentiator.

8. The confusion under the first bullet below is with the following statement under the invitation for consultant services:

Firms that provide 20% or more Design ineligible for Construction Management

NOTE: For this Project Specific Construction Management agreement, any consultants or sub consultants having more than a 20% share in the final design portion of this project shall not be able to compete for the construction management services contained in this advertisement.

This statement appears in the invitation for construction services on traditional jobs when final design is completed by the consultant directly under contract with CDOT and CM services are also directly with CDOT.

However, we continue to receive phone calls from consultants on Contractor DB teams, that are interpreting this statement to mean that they can be currently on a DB team that has submitted an SOQ to CDOT, and pursue this RFP. This could result in a direct conflict of interest if the given consultant was successful on both fronts.

It seems that this should be clarified with an addendum to the Invitation to Consultant Services.

The 20% rule is taken from Policy Memo 23, please [click here](#) for more details on that policy.

9. The requested disciplines for pre-qualification in the Revised Invitation for Consultant Services are not standard CDOT Pre-Qualification categories. Can CDOT provide some guidance on how consultants should respond to this request?

The prequalification codes are not the same as showing capacity in various disciplines. Show the Panelists what you are prequalified for, as well as what disciplines your team can provide based upon the disciplines requested. You can show this however you think best illustrates your abilities and capacity as a team. The codes are not as important as your ability to demonstrate the disciplines of your team, in general.

10. What document control system will be used on C-470?

C-470 will likely have access to Aconex via a contract through OMPD