

I-69 MAJOR MOVES 2020 EXPANSION PROJCT RFQ QUESTION AND ANSWER MATRIX

ISSUED APRIL 8, 2015

#	Question	Response
1	<p>With regards to <u>Sections 2.1.3 and 8.4.1</u> we kindly request that you confirm and/or clarify that in order to be a Qualified Proposer it is not necessary that Proposer and each and every member of the Proposer team possesses all the required INDOT Certificates of Qualification. In other words, if the team in aggregate has all the required INDOT prequalifications (independently on what member/s of the team possess them) the Proposer team complies and therefore it would be considered a Qualified Proposer.</p>	<p>See revisions to <u>Part A, Section 2.1.3</u> in Addendum #1 to the RFQ.</p> <p>In order to be considered a Qualified Proposer:</p> <p>(1) the Proposer or its Equity Members must be prequalified by INDOT for at least \$100 million in the aggregate/Unlimited by INDOT;.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>(2) the Proposer or its Equity Members must be prequalified by INDOT for at least \$50 million in the aggregate in <u>either</u> A(A) Concrete Paving General or B(A) Asphalt Paving;</p> <p>AND</p> <p>(3) the Proposer team in aggregate (one or more of Proposer, Equity Members and Major Participants) must be prequalified by INDOT for <u>both</u> 8.2 Complex Roadway Design <u>and</u> 9.2 Level 2 Bridge Design.</p> <p>As to the items listed in paragraphs (1) and (2), the Proposer or its Equity Members must possess the prequalification. As to the items listed in paragraph (3), any team member can possess the required prequalification.</p>
2	<p><u>Section 2.8</u> on page A-12 – Maintenance During Construction – States that warranty bonds from the design/build contractor may be required to provide a warranty of design and construction work for specified portions of the project for a period specified in the PPA.</p>	<p>The terms and conditions associated with warranties are under consideration. Any such terms and conditions will be outlined in the RFP.</p>

#	Question	Response
	The surety will have concerns if longer term warranties are required (outside of the normal 1-2 year period for workmanship and materials). Is there any indication what these requirements might be at this time?	
3	<u>Section 3.2</u> on page B-5 – Will this project fall under the Little Miller Act for Indiana and will performance and payment bonds be required? Will the bonds be for 100% of the contract amount?	The Little Miller Act does not apply to this procurement. The bond amount is under consideration and additional details shall be set forth in the RFP.
4	<u>Section 3.2</u> on page B-5 – Surety Letter – Attached is a copy of our proposed surety letter that we plan to provide on behalf of our clients. Please provide written feedback to indicate whether this format is acceptable.	IFA will not provide feedback to any Proposer as to whether a specific form of surety letter is acceptable. The requirements for a surety letter are set forth in <u>Part B, Section 3.2</u> .
5	We are just curious why this project is being administered in this fashion? It seems that it is a standard INDOT design/build contract and that funding is being provided by INDOT for the project. We typically think of P3 projects when private financing is involved. Will we continue to see projects come out for bid in this fashion when public funds are involved?	IFA/INDOT wish to avail themselves of the ability to use a best value evaluation due to the nature of the project. Project delivery decisions are undertaken by the agencies on a project by project basis.
6	Can IFA please supply required forms in a Word format?	IFA will make Word versions of the required Forms available.
7	Could the IFA please clarify what form of authorization is required to give the IFA access to our CR-1 form with INDOT or does our submission of an SOQ and the language in Form A automatically grant this authorization?	At this time no other authorizations are anticipated. If additional materials are needed, Proposers will be given adequate time to provide such materials.