

Oregon Department of Transportation

RFQ for MRG Proposer's Question Request and Response

Item	RFQ Section No. or Appendix	Question	Reserved for Agency Response
1	4.3.2.4 – Past Performance	Appendix C contains Form MWESB, Record of MWESB Past Performance. This form is not shown to be required to be submitted by Section 4.3.2.4 in the RFQ. Please verify that Form MWESB is not to be included with the SOQ.	Form MWESB will be deleted by an Addendum.
2	Appendix A	Since ODOT has already had the detour structure built at the McKenzie River crossing it would seem there should be some concept plans complete for how ODOT planned on replacing these structures. Is there any information available?	The Agency is developing certain concept plans for this project. Those concept plans that are formulated, along with the other existing information will be provided in the RFP.
3	Appendix A	Bridges 08178 N & S and 08870 call for repair. The Engineering Baseline Reports for these structures called for replacement. What will be included in repairs for these structures?	All information, including the anticipated scope of the repairs, will be provided in the RFP.
4	Appendix A	Bridges 07732B, 07732A, OM207, 06836A are all integral parts of the Goshen Interchange which contains some substandard geometric elements. Are there any concept plans for improvement of this interchange other than the Engineering Baseline Reports such that the design would not preclude those improvements?	The Agency is developing certain concept plans for this project. Those concept plans that are formulated, along with the other existing information will be provided in the RFP.
5	RFQ, COI Guidelines	Please instruct where in the SOQ the COI Exhibit A document should be submitted.	The COI Exhibit A should be submitted with the SOQ, but not physically bound to the SOQ.

Oregon Department of Transportation

RFQ for MRG Proposer's Question Request and Response

6	App. B, Pg.B-1, 5 th paragraph	Please clarify the Agency's requirements for binding of the SOQ. Appendix B instructs the proposers not to bind the six sections of the proposal but then appears to contradict itself stating that we shall staple or use drilled hole, spiral or combed bindings. Is it acceptable to bind the entire SOQ together as one document? Is it acceptable to use 3-ring binders as we have in previous SOQs?	The entire SOQ should be bound together. 3-ring binders are acceptable. These changes will be made in an Addendum.
---	--	---	--

Oregon Department of Transportation

RFQ for MRG Proposer’s Question Request and Response

7	RFQ Section 1.1.2 Definitions, Page 3 and 4 Appendix C	<p>Please clarify whether the intent of the definition of the “Principal Participant” refers to an individual or entity owning a 15 percent or greater share of the Design Builder firm, or a firm delivering a 15 percent or greater share of the Project.</p> <p>If it is the Agency’s intent for the term “Principal Participant” to refer to an individual or entity owning a portion of a Design Builder firm, then subsequent references to “Principal Participant” throughout the RFQ, including Section 3.3.2.A), Section 3.3.2.B), and Section 3.3.2.C) on Page 15; Section 4.3.1, Cover letter on Page 18; Section 4.3.2.1. on Page 18 and 19; Section 4.3.2.2 on Page 19; Appendix B; and Forms B (Pages 1 and 2), DBE, E-1, L-1, L-2, R, and Workforce Diversity must be revised to reflect the Agency’s intent.</p>	<p>The definition of Principal Participant found in Section 1.1.2 will be changed to read as follows: “Principal Participant” means any of the following entities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) The Design Builder (or Proposer); B) An individual firm, all general partners, or JV member of the Design Builder (or Proposer); or C) An entity holding (directly or indirectly) a major interest in the Design Builder (or Proposer). <p>The intent is that Proposers describe to the Agency: themselves, their partners or JV members, and other entities with “major” ownership, all of whom are known as Principal Participants. The specific information being asked for in the referenced sections of the RFQ are completely appropriate regardless of whether the Principal Participant is a major player on the Project or simply holds a substantial financial interest in the Design Builder or one of its constituent firms.</p>
8	RFQ Section 1.9, Page 7	What is the intent of the section outlining the Quality Assurance/Quality Control items that will be required in a future RFP? Is anything required for this item in the SOQ?	This section is included as information for the Proposers. Refer to Sections 3.3 and 4.3 of the RFQ Text for requirements for the SOQ.

Oregon Department of Transportation

RFQ for MRG Proposer's Question Request and Response

9	RFQ Section 1.10, Page 7 and 8	What is the intent of the section outlining the Insurance, Bonding, Licensing, and Securities items that will be required in a future RFP? Is anything required for this item in the SOQ?	This section is included as information for the Proposers. Requirements for this item for the RFQ are contained in Section 4.3.2.2 of the RFQ.
10	1.18.1	In order to comply with the COI provisions, can you please provide a list of all firms that ODOT utilized in the preparation of the SOQ or RFQ.	It is the Proposers responsibility to become informed as to who may have a conflict of interest with regards to the RFQ.
11	1.19	Please clarify whether the Agency receives rights and ownership to a Proposal if it does not pay a stipend because the of failing to achieve the required scores or if the proposer rejects the stipend.	This question is still under advisement, a response will be forthcoming
12	1.21	Has the Director of the Oregon Department of Transportation in fact granted the exemption for the project?	No. The process to receive the exemption is continuing. The exemption will be granted prior to release of the RFP.
13	RFQ Section 3.3.2.A), Page 15	This paragraph indicates that the evaluation of the SOQ Experience section is based on the "Demonstrated experience...of the Principal Participants, Designer, QC Engineer, Environmental Compliance Manger (sic) and other subcontractors." The Environmental Compliance Manager is not a required Key Personnel for this Project. The RFQ does not require the Proposer to submit qualifications for the position. Delete this reference to evaluating the qualifications of the Environmental Compliance Manager.	Environmental Compliance Manager will be removed from this section. This change will be made in an Addendum.
14	RFQ Section 3.3.2.E), Page 15, Line 1	Clarify that the evaluation is based on review of the SOQ and not the "Proposal," as the Proposal is not being submitted at this time.	"Proposal" will be corrected to read "SOQ" in Section. 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 E). This change will be made in an Addendum.
15	RFQ Section 3.3.2., Page 16	The capitalized term "Selection Team" is not defined. Please provide the make up and role of this Selection Team.	The wording will be corrected in an Addendum.
16	RFQ Section 3.5, Page 17	The capitalized term "Evaluation Team" is not defined. Please provide the make up and role of this Evaluation Team.	The wording will be corrected in an Addendum.

Oregon Department of Transportation

RFQ for MRG Proposer's Question Request and Response

17	Exhibit A – Proposer's Declaration	<p>For any firm of any significant size, there is no way to answer with any degree of certainty whether any employees have ever worked for ODOT or if they have relatives that have. As a result, it will be impossible to answer this question with any degree of certainty. In addition, there is no time limit on when the employment with ODOT occurred.</p> <p>Please identify the selection team in order for firms to determine whether they have any conflicts with members of the selection team.</p>	The language in Exhibit A: Proposer's Declaration - Conflict of Interest will not be changed.
18	RFQ Section Appendix C Form MWESB	Form MWESB is included in Appendix C, but not required by RFQ Appendix B. Delete this form.	See answer to question #1.