

US 160 Elmore's Corner to Dry Creek Design-Build Project

20980 - COMBO

NHPP 1602-157 & FBR 1602-193

RFQ General Questions and Responses

RFQ Question 1. Section 4.2, Submittal Format, states that the maximum file size is 25 MB for the Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) submittals. 25 MB may limit the submitters' ability to include graphics, charts, exhibits, and other illustrative and graphical information. Can the maximum file size be increased or can multiple files be uploaded to increase the submitters' ability to provide the best possible SOQ?

RFQ Response 1. The file limits are going to be revised. The 25 MB was determined to be an error. The maximum file size is 500 MB per file upload. This was reflected in Addendum 1.

RFQ Question 2. The Minimum Requirements for Key Personnel portion of section 3.4 states that the Quality Control Administrator (QCA) shall be employed by the ICQC firm and shall not be an employee of the contractor. Would it be acceptable for the QCA to be an independent third-party consultant that would fulfill all the requirements for the QCA stated in section 3.4?

RFQ Response 2. Yes. RFQ Addendum 1 revised this language to read, "The QCA shall not be employed by the contractor or its subcontractors." QCA is responsible for the overall Project's quality program. Being employed by ICQC firm is not precluded but QCA needs to ensure all aspects of Project's quality.

RFQ Question 3. In the ESB scoring, will there be points awarded for a CDOT mentor protégé partnership?

RFQ Response 3. The RFQ does not have ESB scoring, per se. However, value may be seen in the CDOT mentor protégé partnership as part of the Submitter Organization and Project Management Approach Sections depending upon the presentation of the topic in the sections. Proposal scoring points are being considered for the ESB Performance Plan, currently without specific points assigned for the ESB mentor protege program.

RFQ Question 4. SOQ Section 2, Submitter Organization, Experience and Past Performance, Item 5 is requesting specific, substantiated information to aid CDOT in determining the qualifications of the Submitter's team. Section 2 items 1 through 4 seem to cover the same information that will be included in Item 5. Can clarification be provided that states what information CDOT is looking to be included in this section, or can this section be eliminated due to the potential redundancy of the information that would be included?

RFQ Response 4. Section 2 seeks to understand the Submitter's team and its relevant experience as it pertains to the Project Goals, Values and Work. Section 2 will be scored holistically; the specific bullets will not be scored separately.