

## REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP 06-12)

**Questions and Answers:** (Posted 09-19-06)  
(Updated 9-20-06, starting with question 3)  
(Updated 9-22-06, starting with question 4)  
(Updated 9-26-06, starting with question 6)

The questions and answers contained in this document reflect only those inquiries received, as of the date of posting. Future questions may be submitted to [contractsrfp@indot.in.gov](mailto:contractsrfp@indot.in.gov), by noon on October 2, 2006.

1. The required prequalification categories listed for “Item # 15 Open End Shop Plan Review” for the Office of Structural Services are: 3.2 – Complex or Major Analysis and 9.1 – Level 1 Bridge Design. Please note that Category 3.2 is for the analysis of Highway Traffic Capacity and Operation. Is this correct or it should have been Category 14.5 “Bridge Analysis”?

Response: Item 15 has been revised. 9.1 is the only prequalification requirement for this item, 3.2 is not required.

2. Why would a consultant need to be prequalified in 3.2 Complex Or Major Analysis to perform item 15 ----- "Bridge Shop Drawings"? 3.2 COMPLEX OR MAJOR ANALYSIS deals with Highway traffic capacity and operations analysis of large scale & highly complex road projects.

Response: Please refer to the response in #1 above.

3. Item #16: Is there any way to understand what the projected budget is for this item?

Response: The contract will be negotiated, based on the needed services.

4. Item #10: One of the pre-qual categories for Item 10 is 5.12 - Karst Studies. However, the location of this project (Johnson County) is not in a Karst area, thus projects in Johnson County typically do not require this specialty service. Could you confirm with the Environmental section that they will require Karst study at this location?

Response: 5.12 – Karst Studies will not be required for this item.

5. Item #5: Item #5 is a long complex project that we understand involves, among other environmental issues, wetland impacts. The prequalification Categories do not include any of the typical Environmental Mitigation categories, similar to those listed in Item #6. Is this correct?

Response: Additional prequalification categories are required for this item, as follows: 5.5 Wetland Mitigation; 5.6 Waterway Permits; 5.9 Archaeological Investigations; 5.11 ESA Screening, Phase I and Phase II, Remedial Design;

6. Item #17 & 18: In going over RFP 06-12, I did not notice any requirement to provide a cost proposal. I would like to confirm that a cost proposal is or is not a necessary provision for Items 17 and 18.

Response: Cost proposals should not be submitted with LoI submittals.

7. Item #14 & 16: Item # 14 and Item # 16 from INDOT RFP 06-12 states that the prime consultant and any sub-consultants must have a "General Prequalification" status to be eligible to submit on these items. This is the first time I have heard of these. We are prequalified in many individual work categories, does this mean that we qualify for a General Prequalification" or is there another category that I have missed somewhere?

Response: Any firm that is prequalified with INDOT is also eligible to submit a LoI for items with “General Prequalification” requirements.

8. Item #18: Our consultant team has significant experience with statewide coordination plans for human service and public transportation. Our assessment is that producing locally-derived plans for Indiana's 74 rural counties, and including these in a statewide coordination plan, is beyond the ability of a single firm or team to provide within the time frame specified. A two-part question: 1. Does INDOT anticipate the possibility of multiple awards, such that portions of the work would be assigned to multiple consultant teams, or: 2. Is there flexibility with regard to the deliverable due dates?

Response: 1. No, we do not anticipate multiple awards; 2. Yes, there is flexibility in the due dates.

9. Items 17 & 18: In putting together our Letters of Interest for the above items, we came across the following statement on page 4 of the RFP: **“DBE/MBE/WBE subcontracting goals apply to all prime submitting consultants, regardless of the prime’s status of DBE/MBE/WBE.”** Both Items 17 and 18 list a DBE goal of 3%. Our firm is a certified DBE with the State of Indiana Department of Administration, Minority & Women’s Enterprises Division, so the total DBE percentage of our proposal would be 100%. Does the above statement from page 4 of the RFP imply that regardless of our DBE status, we would need to involve a subcontractor with at least 3% DBE status?

Response: Yes, you would need to involve a subconsultant with at least 3% DBE status, or provide documentation of your good faith efforts.

10. Item 18: We currently are providing LaPorte County with a county-wide coordination plan for human-service and public transportation. What we are providing for the LaPorte project is beyond the level of effort which is envisioned for the individual county plans in this RFP. Can you provide any guidance regarding the desired format, length, and content of these 74 county-wide plans, and/or estimates of man-hours per plan?

Response: We don’t anticipate the level of effort to be beyond a basic Inventory, Assessment, and list of Strategies (potential projects for Sections 5310, 5316, or 5317 funding) for the three target groups.

11. Item 17 & 18: Is it necessary for the subcontractor with at least 3% DBE status to also be on the prequalified consultants list on INDOT’s website?

Response: All subconsultants must be prequalified with INDOT.

12. Item #12: The notes from the Engineering Assessment Field Check stated that an Interchange Justification report may be required due to the addition of lanes on the ramps, but may not be required if the work is done for safety reasons. The report did not seem to include a final determination on the need for the Interchange Report.

Response: The need for the Interchange Justification Report should be determined during the Environmental Document Preparation process.