

## VPRA Responses to RFQ Clarifications

Long Bridge South Package  
RFQ No. 01-001-23-0002  
October 6, 2023

| No. | RFP<br>Section No.<br>Or Form | Question  | VPRA Response  |
|-----|-------------------------------|---|--|
| 1.  | NA                            | Is there any geotechnical information that could be made available to the teams as it relates to our quantification of risk for our SOQ?  | VPRA will provide geotechnical information in an addendum.   |
| 2.  | NA                            | Can we obtain copies of VPRA's proposed Design Independent Quality Assurance and Construction Quality Acceptance policies/procedures?   | These procedures will be specified in the Technical Provisions that will be provided to the shortlist as part of the RFP process.  |
| 3.  | 1.1.6                         | Does VPRA have a preliminary list of the "required clearances, licenses, and permits" to be submitted by the Design-Builder in RFP Section 1.1.6 (s) on page 7 of the RFP?  | This information will be provided to the shortlist in the RFP.   |
| 4.  | 9.1                           | RFP Section 9.1 lists one and a half pages of mitigation commitments and various plant inventories and surveys. Can VPRA make these available to the design-build teams?  | VPRA interprets this question as referring to Section 9.1 of the Basis of Design Report. Any further information on these commitments and inventories will be provided in the RFP. |
| 5.  | 3.2.8                         | Section 3.2.8 of the Basis of Design Report allows bridge spans over water to drain directly to the river through downspouts at the piers. In RFP Section 11 on page 70 of the RFP, it mentions potential stream mitigation impacts being required by DOEE for bridge drainage being released into the river. Can any additional information be provided regarding these potential mitigations or restrictions? | VPRA is working to memorialize bridge deck drainage. Additional information will be provided in the RFP.   |
| 6.  | 7.3.2                         | Section 7.3.2 of the Basis of Design Report mentions a potential change in the floodplain regulations being considered by DOEE that would use a 500-year event instead of the current 100-year event. Please confirm that should this change occurs after bids are submitted that it would be treated as a compensable event or would this be a risk for the design builder?                                    | A change of this nature would likely be a compensable Relief Event. The final risk allocation will be specified in the Contract Documents provided to the shortlist in the RFP.    |

|     |                                       |  |  |
|-----|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| 7.  | 5.5                                   | Section 5.5, for the Independent Design Quality Manager Director, does not specify that the IDQM should have any IDQM experience. Please confirm if this is correct.   | Respondents are requested to identify individuals with experience that will enable them to perform the required functions of the role. Respondents have discretion to identify individuals with appropriate experience.  |
| 8.  | 8                                     | Section 8 of the Basis of Design mentions that Dark Fiber may run within the project area, but that no data is currently available. Please confirm that any Dark Fiber discovered during construction would be treated as a compensable event or would this be a risk of the Design builder?   | An event of this nature would likely be a compensable Relief Event. The final risk allocation will be specified in the Contract Documents provided to the shortlist in the RFP.  |
| 9.  | 2.2.3 Self Performance                | The Principal Participants (other than the Lead Designer, if the Lead Designer is a Principal Participant) are required to self-perform no less than 30% of the value of Construction Work.<br>Question: Are exclusive Subcontractors required to self-perform any percentage of work? Will an exclusive Subcontractor work be counted toward the 30% self-perform?  | Exclusive Subcontractors are not required to self-perform any minimum portion of the Work. VPRA does not intend to count work performed by exclusive Subcontractors toward the 30% minimum self-performed work.  |
| 10. | 1.1.6 Design-Builder Responsibilities | Part p) Management of hazardous materials.<br>Previous construction at the Long Bridge Park reflected some hazardous materials.<br>Question: Has VPRA identified HazMat in the Long Bridge Park or West/ East Potomac Park?  | VPRA will provide additional information concerning hazardous materials in the RFP.  |
| 11. | 1.5 Conflict of Interest              | If the Proposer selected to be design-builder for the North Package (or a constituent entity of the selected design-builder) intends to pursue work on the South Package, whether individually, as part of a joint venture, as a subcontractor, or otherwise, that Proposer must evaluate any real or apparent conflict of interest that could arise as a result of the engagement, and where appropriate,..."<br>Question: It is anticipated that Contractor awarded the North Package will have day to day interactions and coordination with project Consultants and Stakeholders that may also be part of the South Package? How will the information that is shared with the North Package Contractor, which may include information and knowledge related to the South Package, be shared with the other DB teams pursuing the South Package so that the North Package contractor does not have any special knowledge or | If the proposer awarded the North Package project is pursuing the South Package, VPRA will require the implementation of a mitigation strategy (e.g., a firewall), to neutralize any potential for an organizational conflict of interest based on unequal access to information. Further, VPRA intends to share potentially relevant information regarding the North package with teams pursuing the South Package as a means of further negating the possibility of a firm obtaining an unfair competitive advantage based upon unequal access to information. |

|     |  |  |   |
|-----|--|--|---|
|     |  | information provided by the stakeholders and consultants that may create an unfair advantage?  |   |
| 12. | 5.5.3 Organization                           | Question: Since the Experience of the Subcontractor is not added in Form H. How will the Subcontractor/s experience included in Form J will be evaluated as part of Section 6.1.2 Qualitative Review scoring? and this could impact/ influence the overall score of the SOQ? | Subcontractors will be evaluated as part of the Key Personnel and Organization score and where otherwise relevant. Section 5.5.3 of the RFQ allows Respondents to submit a one-page description of intended Subcontractors.   |
| 13. | 6.1.2 Qualitative Review. Quality Management | Question: Please clarify that all or only part of the QC for Construction can be performed by a qualified third party  | The Quality Manager must be an employee of the Design-Builder. Other than the Quality Manager, the Design-Builder may use Subcontractors to perform Construction Quality Control activities.  |
| 14. | 5.5.1 Key Personnel                          | Question: Clarify if the Quality Manager must work under the direct supervision of an executive officer (as stated in Art. 5.5.1) or under the Project Manager.  | The Quality Manager must work for the Design-Builder and under the supervision of an executive officer above the level of and under a line of authority independent of the Project Manager. The Quality Manager cannot report to or work under the Project Manager.   |
| 15. | 5.6 Quality Management                       | Question: What role will CSXT representatives have in review of construction documents? Will the review for CSXT be coordinated through VPRA's review process?   | CSXT will have approval authority over any aspect of the design and construction impacting CSXT assets. CSXT's review and comment on design submittals will be incorporated into the design review process specified in the Contract Documents. VPRA will transmit Design-Builder's design submittals to CSXT for review. Design-Builder will be required to participate in over-the-shoulder and comment resolution meetings with CSXT (and other third-parties with approval authority) to resolve comments. VPRA's disposition of a design submittal will be contingent on resolution of comments from CSXT. |
| 16. | 6.1.2 Qualitative Review                     | Question: Explain how "Experience of Respondent" and "Key Personnel and Organization" from SOQ score will be carried   | The scores awarded to Experience of Respondent and Key Personnel and Organization during the SOQ evaluation will  |

|     |                                       |  |   |
|-----|---------------------------------------|--|---|
|     |                                       | forward and constitute a portion of the Technical Proposal score in the RFP.   | become a portion of the Technical Proposal score. The weight to be accorded to these scores will be specified in the RFP.   |
| 17. | 2.2.2 RFP Phase. RFP Scoring Criteria | Question: It was stated that the relative weights of technical and price in the best value proposal score will be specified in the RFP. Can this information be shared in the RFQ?   | VPRA will state the relative weights of the technical and price components in the RFP. VPRA anticipates that price will account for no more than 50% of the best value score.   |
| 18. | 6.1.2 Qualitative Review              | Question: Are the SOQ points broken down further than 35 / 35 / 15 / 15. If yes, can you share the point allocation?   | The SOQ points are not broken down any further than as stated in the SOQ.   |
| 19. | 6.1.2 Qualitative Review              | Question: Clarify how the Executive Summary will be scored   | The Executive Summary is considered in the context of the categories identified in Section 6.1.2. The Executive Summary does not receive a separate, discrete score.  |
| 20. | 5.5 1. Key Personnel                  | Quality Manager report. The Quality Manager must work for the Design-Builder under the direct supervision of an executive officer above the level of and under a line of authority independent of the Project Manager.<br>Question: Please clarify if the Quality Manager has to be a Design-Builder employee or could be an employee of a Subconsultant. What is VPRA preference? | The Quality Manager must be an employee of the Design-Builder and not a Subconsultant.  |
| 21. | 1.1.2 Scope of Work                   | Question: Please provide drawings in DGN format during the RFQ they would be very helpful to better understand the project scope.  | VPRA will not provide the drawings in DGN format during the RFQ stage.  |
| 22. | 1.1.2 Scope of Work                   | Question: Clarify the scope of work of the Long Bridge Aquatic Center Trail, beyond south abutment   | There are proposed modifications to the trail around Long Bridge Aquatic Center as noted on the design plans. The Design-Builder will be responsible for designing and building any related appurtenances related to the modifications to the trail. The RFP will provide additional information about the scope of work. |
| 23. | 1.1.2 Scope of Work                   | Maintenance obligations.<br>Question: Clarify the maintenance scope of works during Design and Construction  | The Design-Builder will be responsible for maintenance of the project site starting upon receipt of Notice to Proceed. Further details concerning maintenance obligations will be specified in the RFP.   |

|     |  |  |   |
|-----|--|--|---|
| 24. | 1.1.2 Scope of Work                        | Question: Has VPRA contemplated any temporary staging and laydown area/s that will be provided to the Design-Builder?  | Yes, VPRA-provided staging and laydown areas are shown in the 30% plans. VPRA is currently identifying additional staging and laydown areas, but any modifications are subject to an environmental re-evaluation and therefore cannot be relied upon. VPRA will provide any additional information in the RFP.                  |
| 25. | 5.7.2 Workforce agreement                  | “Respondent shall demonstrate that it has meaningfully considered the use of a Project-specific workforce agreement ...”<br>Question: Please clarify how best demonstrate it to VPRA in the SOQ. Would this demonstration be included in the page count of the SOQ?  | This demonstration is part of the required narrative submitted with Tab 7 of the SOQ and is counted toward the 4-page maximum. Respondents are required to demonstrate their consideration of a Project-specific workforce agreement. VPRA cannot provide further specificity as to how Respondents are to state their efforts. |
| 26. | 1.1.2 Scope of Work                        | It is our understanding that VPRA is undertaking a pile load test program in East Potomac Park in the near future.<br><br>Question: We request that the Pile Load Test Plan be provided to the Proponents for information only.  | VPRA intends to include this information in the Reference Information Documents (non-binding, non-guaranteed information) provided with the RFP.  |
| 27. | 5.5.1 Key Personnel                        | The RFQ requires that several of the Key Personnel to have a PE license in the Commonwealth of Virginia and the District of Columbia.<br>Question: Confirm whether it is acceptable if the proposed staff has an active PE license in another state with the expectation of being licensed in Virginia and DC prior to submission of the Proposal. | This is correct. Proposed staff are not required to have a PE license in Virginia and the District of Columbia until the time of execution of the Design-Build Agreement.   |
| 28. | 5.5.1 Key Personnel                        | Question: Confirm the Time Commitment required of the Public Information Coordinator   | VPRA will address this in an addendum.  |
| 29. | 5. Contents of Statement of Qualifications | Page Limits<br>Question: Please consider allowing an additional 5 to 10 pages to help prospective proposers to better describe to VPRA their qualifications, experience, organization, and design build  | VPRA will not make the requested change.  |

|     |   |  |   |
|-----|---|--|---|
|     |   | approach to ensuring a successful delivery of the South Package project for the Long Bridge  |   |
| 30. | Form E<br>(Conflict of Interest Disclosure) | Please clarify if only the Respondent needs to include a Form E or if one is also required for the Lead Designer, IDQM firm(s) and subconsultants identified in Form J (Subcontractor Information).  | Only the Respondent is required to submit a Form E; that is, only a single Form E is to be included in the SOQ. However, please note that potential conflicts of interest with respect to any participant in the Respondent's organization, including the Lead Designer, IDQM, and all Subcontractors, must be addressed and identified.                                    |
| 31. | 5.7.2<br>Workforce Agreement                | The instructions in this section 5.7.2 state – “Respondent shall demonstrate that it has meaningfully considered the use of a Project-specific workforce agreement...” Please provide further direction on what VPRA is looking for from the Respondents to demonstrate it has <u>meaningfully considered</u> the use of a Project-specific workforce agreement. Is VPRA intending for Respondents to demonstrate their ability to secure a project specific workforce agreement?      | Respondents are required to demonstrate their consideration of a Project-specific workforce agreement. VPRA cannot provide further specificity as to how Respondents are to state their efforts. However, Respondents are not required to demonstrate that they will enter a Project-specific workforce agreement.  |
| 32. | 5.4<br>Experience of Respondent             | Please confirm that a Participant or Designer will receive credit for project experience when scoring their qualifications without submitting a form H for the project but, instead are identified as having worked on the project in another Participant's or Designer's form H.  | VPRA's evaluation committee will consider all relevant experience identified on a Form H, including if multiple participants from the Respondent organization worked on the same identified project. Respondents are not required to submit a separate Form H covering the same project for each member of Respondent's organization that worked on the identified project. |
| 33. | 5.5.1 Key Personnel                         | The preferred qualifications for the IDQM Director include 20 years of experience in the analysis and design of rail systems and bridge structures. I understand the systems work is to be performed by CSXT. As such, is it necessary for the IDQM director to have rail systems design experience? An additional consideration is that rail systems and bridge experience are highly specialized and different skill sets and it is unlikely one engineer would possess both skills. | VPRA will address this question in an addendum.   |

|     |                               |  |  |
|-----|-------------------------------|--|--|
| 34. | 5.5.1 Key Personnel           | The Request for Qualifications section 5.5.1 does not specify the level of time commitment of value added persons. Is it at the team's discretion? The level of involvement is role dependent and can vary over the course of the project life. Our preference is for the proposer to determine and commit to a level of involvement.  | This is correct. The Respondent will identify the time commitment of proposed value added Key Personnel. The committed time is one of the factors that VPRA's evaluation committee may consider when evaluating the value added Key Personnel.   |
| 35. | 1.1.3 (e)<br>1.2 (h)<br>1.3.2 | The RFQ makes reference in several places to noise restrictions and mitigation. Can you please clarify precisely what services are required by our team (if not performed by 30% design consultant or PMSS) for noise-related services both during design and construction.  | Design-Builder will be required to submit Construction Noise and Vibration Control Plan as part of the Construction Management Plan that is compliant with DC and Arlington County Noise Requirements and the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. Additional information will be provided in the RFP.  |
| 36. | Exhibit C                     | Sureties have some concerns with the verbiage in the bond forms provided in Exhibit C of the Request for Qualifications. Will there be opportunity to modify this form after shortlist or is the form already being modified as part of the Long Bridge – North Segment procurement and will that form be applied to Lon Bridge – South Segment?   | The bond forms included at Exhibit C to the RFQ were modeled after forms recently used on other projects undertaken within the Commonwealth, which executed versions were supplied by many prominent sureties in the industry. They have been determined to be sufficient as to form and promote the efficient disposition of claims. Based on industry feedback, VPRA will, however, clarify certain terms within the forms in an addendum. |
| 37. | 5.2.2(b) and Exhibit C        | Bond forms as presented in the RFQ under Exhibit C are inconsistent with surety industry standards and with the amended Long Bridge-North Package bond forms. Bonding letter currently requires sureties' commitment to issue in the bond forms as presented in Exhibit C.<br>Will the surety letter be acceptable without the sentence "each in the forms attached hereto as Exhibit C," and include standard exculpatory language (e.g. "subject to review of contract and other underwriting considerations at the time...")? | See response to Question No. 36.   |

|     |                        |  |                                  |
|-----|------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| 38. | 5.2.2(b) and Exhibit C | <p>Bond forms' language is inconsistent with surety industry standards. Of particular concern are sections 5 and 6 that require the Surety to abide by the ADR ruling despite an appeal and goes further by precluding the Surety from seeking an injunction or stay of the ruling.</p> <p>Section 4.c of the proposed bond form requires full payment of the penal sum, which is unacceptable with the surety industry standards.</p> <p>Will VPRA amend the Long Bridge – South Package bond forms to be consistent with the amended Long Bridge – North Package bond forms?</p> | See response to Question No. 36. |
|-----|------------------------|--|----------------------------------|