



REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS (RFQ) No. 026-006

L'ENFANT STATION AND 4TH TRACK IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT CONSTRUCTION MANAGER/GENERAL CONTRACTOR SERVICES

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Below are questions VRE received as of **February 11, 2026, at 2:00 P.M. EST**, with responses. Whenever possible, questions are presented as originally asked. Otherwise, the questions or inquiries are presented to capture the main thrust or idea.

Question #1: Are graphics/visual elements allowed in Form CU / Form E-1?

Response #1: No.

Question #2: Are you able to provide editable forms? Or can we use our own version for the additional pages in the Form CU and E-1?

Response #2: See **Addendum No. 2**. Offerors may only reproduce Forms CU and E-1 to accommodate the allowable 8.5-inch x 11-inch page size with 0.5-inch margins, provided the reproduced versions comply with all RFQ-specified page limits, formatting requirements, and other conditions, and include complete responses to all questions contained in the forms.

Question #3: RFQ Section 6.5.1.2 Firm Experience and Past Performance Evaluation Criteria Part A Firm Experience (page 35 of 43) states, "Using the Project Description Form (Appendix C Form E-1), demonstrate the Offeror's experience by providing at least three (3), but no more than four (4) project descriptions for the Offeror and its Proposed Team/Subcontractors that are similar in program and size as the Project and which began within the past ten (10) years."

Would it be possible to consider a change to this language to capture projects that were in progress within the past ten years, but may have started more than ten years ago?

Response #3: See **Addendum No. 2**.

Question #4: For Form L-1 in Appendix C – Section 5 – F. (5) requests confirmation of compliance with the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, including asking us to certify our Subcontractors. If the team as proposing does not currently include any subcontractors, please

confirm the intention in that scenario is to certify compliance based on the offeror itself and only the offeror. We cannot provide certification for future subcontractors that are not part of the current team and are not identified.

Response #4: See Addendum No. 2. The intent of Form L-1, Appendix C – Section 5 – F. (5) is to require certification of compliance with the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 solely by the Offeror when no Subcontractors are included on the proposed team. In such cases, the Offeror is required to certify only its own compliance and is not required to provide certification on behalf of any potential future Subcontractors.

Question #5: The requirement for Form CU states that response is limited to 7 pages. Can we add additional pages up to the 7-page limit in our own format or is there a specific format VRE intends to provide?

Response #5: See Addendum No. 2 and the response to Question No. 2.

Question #6: Is it VRE's intent to have all responses for Forms E-1 and CU filled out on the PDF forms provided?

Response #6: See Addendum No. 2 and the response to Question No. 2.

Question #7: Are graphics or photos allowed in responses for Forms E-1 and CU?

Response #7: No.

Question #8: The RFQ states the Contractor shall perform no more than 10 percent of the construction Work excluding specialty items. This is a significant restriction for a contractor who typically relies on self-performance to control the critical path and other project risk elements.

- a. Can VRE provide a specific definition or list of examples for "specialty items" that are excluded from the 10% self-performance cap mentioned in RFQ Section 1.3.3?
- b. Will the General Conditions costs be included or excluded from this 10% calculation?
- c. Will VRE consider increasing the self-perform percentage to 50%, in line with industry standard?

Response #8:

- a. See Addendum No. 2.
- b. The self-performance requirement applies to construction work the Contractor performs with its own forces. Costs associated with general conditions alone do not count toward the self-performance threshold unless they are tied to actual construction activities performed directly by the Contractor's own workforce.



Only self-performed construction labor and related construction activities shall count toward this requirement. Administrative costs or overhead-type general conditions expenses do not qualify as self-performed work.

c. **Yes. See Addendum No. 2.**

Question #9: The project requires work in a congested corridor shared with CSXT, Amtrak, and VRE operations. Given the critical reliance on track time and flaggers, will the construction contract provide the Contractor with excusable and compensable time extensions for delays caused by these third-party railroad operators that are beyond the Contractor's control?

Response #9: This represents a complex topic which will warrant further consideration after the RFQ step of the procurement process for this project.

Question #10: The RFQ requires the Contractor to provide "design analysis," while VHB is the Designer of Record under direct agreement with VRE. Please confirm that the "design analysis" required during the Preconstruction Phase (RFQ Section 1.3.2) will not be construed as transferring professional liability or design responsibility from the Designer of Record (VHB) to the Contractor.

Response #10: Confirmed. The "design analysis" required during the Preconstruction Phase (RFQ Section 1.3.2) will not be interpreted as transferring professional liability or design responsibility from the Designer of Record (VHB) to the Contractor. The intent is for the Contractor to support the process without assuming the Designer of Record's professional obligations.

Question #11: The current project cost estimate is \$132M, but the RFQ notes that additional funding sources may be identified and funding relies on federal formula funds and VPRA capital funds. Is the current \$132M budget fully committed and encumbered for this project today, or is the construction contract award contingent upon securing future funding?

Response #11: VRE currently has approximately \$110 million committed to the L'Enfant Station and Fourth Track Project and is actively pursuing additional federal funding to address the remaining budget gap. Through this solicitation, VRE intends to award a CM/GC contract for preconstruction services. Execution of the subsequent construction phase contract and establishment of the final GMP will occur subject to available funding. To support successful delivery, VRE may also implement predefined scope adjustments, such as deferring or modifying select non-critical elements, to ensure the project aligns with available funding while maintaining its core objectives.

Question #12: Please confirm that included Forms CU and E-1 can be modified to accommodate acceptable 11-inch x 17-inch sized page in referenced section as long as page limit is not exceeded.

Response #12: See Addendum No. 2 and the response to Question No. 2.



Question #13: Referenced section allows waiver of minor irregularities. Please clarify which SOQ deficiencies would be considered non-responsive versus waivable.

Response #13: In general, SOQs that fail to meet material submission requirements will be considered non-responsive, while minor irregularities may be waived at VRE's discretion as per Section 3.14 of the RFQ. However, the determination of what constitutes a non-responsive deficiency versus a waivable irregularity will depend on the nature and significance of the specific issue and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Question #14: Please confirm whether any interviews, presentations, or discussions are anticipated as part of SOQ shortlisting process, or whether shortlisting will be based solely on written SOQs.

Response #14: Shortlisting will be based solely on the written SOQs. No interviews, presentations, or discussions are anticipated as part of the SOQ shortlisting process.

END OF QUESTION AND ANSWERS

