



**Minnesota Department of Transportation  
TH169 (St. Peter) Design-Build Project  
S.P. 5209-64  
RFQ Clarification**

Date: 3-3-09

Clarification#: 3

Clarification No.	Volume & Section	Question or Comment	Mn/DOT Response
3-1	RFQ 3.3.2	Is the information required to be provided with Section 3.3.2 to be included in Appendix A as part of the 14 page limit for resumes or is it to be information included in the 12 page main body SOQ?	Provide this information in the 12 page main body SOQ.
3-2	RFQ 3.3.2	Is the information required to be provided with Section 3.3.2 for Key Personnel pertain to Levels A and B personnel or just Level A in keeping with the resume requirements?	This information is only required for Level A Key Personnel. This will be clarified by Addendum.
3-3	RFQ 3.1, 5.2	Can the Title Page and Table of Contents be combined on the same page?	No. Please separate these two items. These items do not count against the overall page limit. See Addendum #3 for additional clarification.
3-4	RFQ 6.6	Will MnDOT raise the stipend specified in Section 6.6 similar to the Bridges of Mower County stipend or perhaps higher?	The stipend will be raised to 0.4% of Mn/DOT's final estimate of Project construction.
3-5	RFQ 2.2	Would MnDOT please clarify the statement in Section 2.2 regarding "all aspects of the project will be completed and open to traffic no later than	In Addendum #3, the statement in Section 2.2 has been revised to read "The project must be substantially completed and open to traffic no later than November 25, 2009."

Clarification No.	Volume & Section	Question or Comment	Mn/DOT Response
		November 25, 2009" - does this include plantings, sod, etc... which may likely be beyond the plantings dates allowed?	Mn/DOT expects to have plantings included in a separate contract to begin in Spring 2010.
3-6	RFQ 3.3.3	Will MnDOT revise the co-location requirements found in Section 3.3.3 to exclude the design team? With the accelerated nature of the schedule for this project and the shortness of the design schedule, it isn't feasible to co-locate the designers. Valuable time will be lost assembling the office space and IT requirements for the design team to co-locate. We suggest an alternative of allowing MnDOT space at the designers office for over-the-shoulder reviews, etc...	Yes. Mn/DOT will not require co-location of the design team. Mn/DOT will expect the Contractor to provide meeting space for design meetings during the project. See Addendum #3 for additional clarification.
3-7	General	Will additional soil boring information be available prior to SOQ submission?	Additional soil boring information will be posted by March 6, 2009.
3-8	RFQ 3.7.2	Our team has noticed what we believe is a typo in Section 3.7.2. The second paragraph, Item (c.) refers to the 610 project. Should this say the TH 169 project instead?	Yes, this is a typo. This has been revised in Addendum #3.
3-9	RFQ 5.2	We have read via the 610 RFQ clarifications that the cover letter and title page do not count toward the SOQ page count, is that the same for the table of contents?	Yes. See Addendum #3 for additional clarification.
3-10	Project Data	I am looking for soil boring information for the St Peter Project that was referenced at yesterday's informational meeting. The only thing that I have been able to locate on the web site are the old	There is also additional information in the Materials folder posted on Feb 19 <sup>th</sup> . Otherwise, the information is in contained in Microstation format. Once they are announced, you may contact the short-listed teams regarding further soil boring information contained in the .dgn files.

Clarification No.	Volume & Section	Question or Comment	Mn/DOT Response
		storm sewer plans with rock profiles which are located in the Geotech folder posted on Feb 19 <sup>th</sup> . Perhaps they are one of the numerous dgn formatted file types that can only be viewed with Micro Station software.	