



**REQUEST FOR LETTERS OF INTEREST IN
CREATING A TOLL COLLECTION SYSTEM
AND CUSTOMER SERVICE CENTER
STRATEGIC PLAN
*DEADLINES EXTENDED***

The Ohio Turnpike and Infrastructure Commission (“Commission”) issues this Request for Letters of Interest (“LOIs”) to perform the professional services that are necessary to formulate a strategic plan for the Commission’s Toll Collection System (“TCS”) and Customer Service Center (“CSC”) (collectively, the “systems”) and, at the option of the Commission, perform implementation services to support placing the plan into action. The Commission will identify a shortlist of interested consultants based on their LOI responses and issue an invitation to respond to a Request for Proposals (“RFP”). Based on the proposals received from the shortlisted consultants, the Commission will select the most qualified consultant to perform the services. See the draft Scope of Services attached as Exhibit A for a more detailed description of the services the Commission seeks.

Respondents acknowledge and affirm that performing the Strategic Planning Services will disqualify the Selected Consultant from serving as the integrator executing any accepted recommended alternatives developed from the Strategic Plan, other than those services described in the Scope of Services of the RFP.

Consultants interested in obtaining a current draft of the RFP may request the draft from the Commission’s Procurement Manager through the means described below. Interested consultants may also submit specific questions regarding the RFP and/or the LOI requirements.

Consultants interested in responding to the RFP must have a completed “Request For Qualifications” (“RFQ”) package for calendar years 2015-2016 on file with the Commission to be considered as a potential respondent to the RFP. If a consultant has not already responded to the RFQ, the RFQ package may be obtained from the Commission’s Procurement Manager and submitted simultaneously with its LOI.

Any consultant interested in submitting a Letter of Interest (“LOI”) to respond to the RFP is invited to do so by **5:00 p.m. (Eastern), on March 1830, 2016**. LOIs shall serve to provide information for the Commission to evaluate the respondents’ qualifications to perform the services required for a project of this type. (See page 2 for further details on content of the LOI). **Respondents are required to submit one (1) original and six (6) copies of its LOI.** Once the Commission has reviewed the LOIs received, it will select several interested and qualified consultants to elicit sufficient responses to the RFP. The shortlisted consultants will then be invited to submit a response to the RFP. The deadline for responses from those invited to submit proposals based on the final RFP is currently scheduled for **5:00 p.m. (Eastern), on April 1529, 2016**.

Any questions **must** be addressed in writing and emailed to the Commission’s Procurement Manager at kevin.golick@ohioturnpike.org. **Please do not contact the Commission by phone, and do not address questions to anyone other than Mr. Golick.** The final Inquiry Deadline is **5:00 p.m. (Eastern Time), on April 822, 2016**. Answers to all questions will be compiled and copy of each question and the Commission’s response will be posted on the Commission’s Website, www.ohioturnpike.org.

LOI’s must be delivered before 5:00 p.m. (Eastern) on March 1830, 2016 to the following address (LOIs sent via email are not acceptable):

**Ohio Turnpike and Infrastructure Commission
Attn.: Kevin Golick, Procurement Manager
682 Prospect Street
Berea, Ohio 44017**

**CONTENT FOR LETTER OF INTEREST IN PERFORMING TOLL COLLECTION SYSTEM
AND CUSTOMER SERVICE CENTER PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION SERVICES
(Not to exceed ten (10) pages - excluding the cover page/letter and good faith efforts demonstration)**

1. List the types/categories of services for which your organization has a current Qualifications Statement on file with the Commission in response to the 2015-2016 RFQ.
2. List the Project Manager and other key staff members including key subconsultant staff. Address the experience of the key staff members on similar projects. Provide only the résumé of the proposed Project Manager. The Project Manager or key staff must include a professional engineer registered in the State of Ohio.
3. Provide references from three (3) entities other than the Commission for similar strategic planning or general TCS and CSC consulting projects completed in the past five (5) years. For each reference/project listed, provide a contact name and phone number.
4. Describe the capacity of your organization's staff and its ability to perform the work in a timely manner relative to present workload and the availability of assigned staff.
5. Provide a description of your Project approach, not to exceed two (2) pages. Confirm the organization's proposed technical approach, cost containment practices, innovative ideas for this type of project and any other relevant information concerning your organization's qualifications to perform the services contemplated.
6. List significant subconsultants, their categories of service and the percentage of work to be performed by each proposed subconsultant.
7. Demonstration of Good Faith Efforts to attain MBE, DBE or EDGE participation on the interested consultant's team. See Exhibit B for the Good Faith Effort commitment requirements and Exhibit C for the means to demonstrate those Good Faith Efforts.

Items 1 through 7 must be included in the LOI, which should not exceed ten (10) pages - excluding the cover page/letter and demonstration of good faith efforts - on single sided, 8 1/2" x 11" sheets of paper. To be considered for eligibility to submit a proposal in response to the RFP, **one (1) original and six (6) copies of the LOI must be delivered before 5:00 p.m. (Eastern), on March 18³⁰, 2016.**

DRAFT SCOPE OF SERVICES
TCS AND CSC STRATEGIC PLANNING

A. Introduction. The Ohio Turnpike is a 241-mile limited access toll road spanning northern Ohio from Indiana to Pennsylvania. The roadway consists of approximately 1,395 total lane miles. There are approximately 160 contiguous miles of three eastbound and westbound lanes of travel. Remaining portions of the roadway have two eastbound and westbound lanes. The physical turnpike system has 31 total interchanges, consisting of 29 trumpet interchanges and two barrier interchanges at the eastern and western state borders. Eleven of the interchanges provide direct connections with other interstate highways, including the Indiana Toll Road and Pennsylvania Turnpike. Toll plaza facilities located at each interchange consist of a total of 97 entry lanes and 132 exit lanes, inclusive of 41 reversible lanes (i.e., 188 total physical toll lanes).

B. The Current Systems. The current toll collection system, inclusive of electronic tolling via E-ZPass, was deployed on October 1, 2009. Tolls are based upon vehicle classification and distance traveled. Vehicle classification is determined by the number of axles and height over the first two axles. Tolls may be paid with cash, major credit card, or E-ZPass.

Upon entrance to the system, vehicles are classified and also weighed in-motion to screen for overweight conditions. All entry lanes are equipped with automatic toll lane gates. If a valid E-ZPass transponder is detected, the gate rises and the vehicle proceeds to the mainline roadway. If no valid E-ZPass transponder is detected, a dual-height automatic ticket issuing machine (DATIM) produces a paper ticket that must be retrieved by the customer before the gate will rise.

Exit lanes are also equipped with automatic toll lane gates that rise upon detection of a valid E-ZPass transponder or following confirmation of cash or credit card payment to either a toll collector or automated toll payment machine (ATPM). A total of 14 lower traffic volume toll plazas are equipped with ATPMs in two exit lanes and operate unstaffed at least one shift every day. Cash, major credit card, and E-ZPass are accepted as payment in all exit lanes, although most toll plazas have designated “E-ZPass Only” lanes. Due to the automatic toll lane gates, no camera-based violation system is installed. Cameras capable of capturing license plate images are installed in one exit lane, however, to demonstrate that the current toll system is capable of violation enforcement.

The Ohio Turnpike and Infrastructure Commission (Commission) maintains its own E-ZPass Customer Service Center (CSC) at its headquarters in Berea, Ohio.

DRAFT SCOPE OF SERVICES
TCS AND CSC STRATEGIC PLANNING

C. Services Generally. The objective of this RFP is to select a consultant (“Selected Consultant”) to perform the professional services necessary to develop a Strategic Plan for upgrading the Commission’s TCS and any resulting changes necessary for its CSC supporting the TCS. As a starting point, the Selected Consultant shall conduct a study of the existing systems and forecast future system needs of the Commission and its customers. From this study, alternatives for upgrading and enhancing the TCS shall be identified and evaluated, culminating in the development of a comprehensive Strategic Plan of the recommended alternatives. The Commission expects that the Selected Consultant will consider the following non-exclusive topics in developing the Strategic Plan:

- Current tolling and transportation industry trends
- Alternatives for migration to open-road tolling (“ORT”) or all-electronic tolling (“AET”)
- Quantitative cost-benefit analysis of ORT and AET, inclusive of:
 - Effects on revenue recognition
 - Potential for operational savings
 - Cost of infrastructural alterations
 - Impact on CSC and other back office operations
- Policy matters pertinent to the implementation of ORT and AET, inclusive of:
 - Strategies for collecting from violators operating vehicles registered in Ohio
 - Reciprocity with other states for collecting from violators operating vehicles registered in other states
 - Legal, administrative and legislative considerations for in-state and out-of-state vehicles
- Implications for removal of the automatic toll lane gates
- Violation enforcement and processing systems
- Technological advancements in payment methods
- Technological advancements in electronic tolling system components
- Electronic tolling interoperability considerations
- The anticipated evolution of neighboring toll systems

The Strategic Planning Project shall consist of three primary Tasks, with provisions for an optional fourth Task, having defined deliverables for acceptably completing each Task.

DRAFT SCOPE OF SERVICES
TCS AND CSC STRATEGIC PLANNING

D. Task 1 - Evaluation of Existing Systems. The Selected Consultant shall conduct a thorough evaluation of the existing TCS and CSC for the purpose of identifying potential upgrades to enhance system performance and serve the future needs of the Commission and its customers. Recommended alternatives from this process will serve as the basis for the Strategic Plan. A TCS Advisory Committee composed of representatives from various departments within the Commission will assist in the identification of current system issues and needs, provide current system documentation and data, and assist in prioritizing future system goals. The TCS Advisory Committee will meet with the Selected Consultant as needed during the course of the project, with the first meeting to be scheduled approximately one week after issuance of the Notice to Proceed.

The Commission will not consider the Selected Consultant's Task 1 Services complete until the acceptance of the following deliverable from the Selected Consultant:

Deliverable 1: Existing Systems Report

All of the information obtained from Task 1 will be summarized in an Interim Report. This Report shall describe the existing TCS and CSC and their favorable attributes and limitations.

E. Task 2 - Identify Alternatives for Upgrading the systems and Provide Deliberated Recommendations. Following the acceptance of the Task 1 deliverable and receipt of Notice to Proceed with Task 2 Services, the Selected Consultant shall proceed to define a spectrum of alternatives for upgrading and enhancing the current TCS and CSC. Descriptions of the potential alternatives shall be produced as part of this task including analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of each. Following acceptance of the report describing these potential alternatives ("Deliverable 2"), the Selected Consultant shall prepare a detailed analysis to identify recommended alternatives to upgrade and enhance the existing systems. The consultant shall work closely with the Commission's TCS Advisory Committee throughout the performance of this analysis. Recommended alternatives shall be determined based upon a detailed analysis, which shall include, but shall not be limited to, factors such as:

- Relative cost/benefit to the Commission and its customers

DRAFT SCOPE OF SERVICES
TCS AND CSC STRATEGIC PLANNING

- Comprehensive and reasonably accurate capital and integration cost estimates
- Preservation of the toll revenue stream
- Efficient and effective use of new technology
- Ongoing operating, maintenance, and back office costs
- Sufficiency of controls
- Safety considerations
- Time frame for deployment

The Commission will not consider the Selected Consultant's Task 2 Services complete until the acceptance of the following two deliverables from the Selected Consultant:

Deliverable 2: Potential Alternatives Report

This report shall identify and provide detailed descriptions of the spectrum of potential alternatives for upgrading and enhancing the systems, and provide recommendations for the alternatives to be studied further.

Deliverable 3: Recommended Alternatives Report

This report shall thoroughly describe the recommended alternatives identified when performing the Task 2 Services, and provide the detailed documentation and reasoning to support the conclusions reached. Detailed rationales backing the exclusion of alternatives must also be presented. The Commission recognizes that the analysis of alternatives may reveal that the best course of action is for the current systems to remain in deployment substantially as they presently exist, until such time that certain technological or industry advancements evolve and reach a state of maturity.

F. Task 3 - Development of Strategic Plan for the TCS and CSC. Upon Commission management's review and acceptance of the recommended alternatives prepared under Deliverable 3 and issuance of a Notice to Proceed with Task 3 Services, the Selected Consultant shall proceed to develop a cohesive Strategic Plan for implementing the identified recommended alternatives. The Strategic Plan shall include deployment timeframes with consideration of lead-time for infrastructural changes and capital needs.

DRAFT SCOPE OF SERVICES
TCS AND CSC STRATEGIC PLANNING

The Commission will not consider the Selected Consultant's Task 3 Services complete until the acceptance of the following fourth deliverable from the Selected Consultant:

Deliverable 4: Formal Strategic Plan Document

The Strategic Plan must be the culmination of the previously accepted Deliverables developed under the prior Tasks. The Strategic Plan is the document that the Commission's management will present to its governing body for formal adoption so as to provide direction for managerial decision making, allocation of resources, and commencement of the actions necessary to accomplish the recommended alternatives.

G. Task 4 – Optional Strategic Plan Implementation Services. The Commission shall have the sole and exclusive option to retain the Selected Consultant after the completion of Task 3 Services to perform additional professional services as deemed appropriate and necessary to support the implementation of the recommended alternatives identified in the Strategic Plan. These implementation services may include developing contract documents that will provide for implementation of recommended alternatives identified in the Strategic Plan. Such support may include preparing any materials necessary to select an integrator or contractor through RFP or other contract documents for bidding or proposing to perform the work necessary to design or make the improvements described in the Strategic Plan, including, but not limited to, scopes of services, statements of work, detailed specifications, plans, drawings and special provisions.

COMMITMENT TO GOOD FAITH EFFORTS IN ATTAINING PARTICIPATION OF MINORITY OR DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISES (“MBE/DBE”)

On March 24, 2014 the Commission directed that, to the fullest extent permitted by law, a program to facilitate the participation of minority owned firms and economically and socially disadvantaged businesses in the Commission’s contracts. The Commission’s objective is to provide the fullest possible opportunity for all firms, including firms owned and controlled by minorities and females and otherwise socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, to obtain and perform its contracts.

The Commission does not have established goals for the participation of Minority, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises and EDGE certified firms (“MBE/DBEs”) on the Project. However, the Commission expects respondents to agree to utilize and demonstrate Good Faith Efforts to engage qualified and willing MBE/DBEs in the opportunities available for performing Work on the Project. The respondents must commit to use its Good Faith Efforts to utilize MBE/DBEs, and demonstrate those efforts. The final determination of Good Faith Effort shall be made by the Commission based upon the respondents actions as documented in the required forms.

In addition to submitting a detailed Demonstration of Good Faith Efforts, the respondent agrees that if selected for award of the Contract, it shall provide to the Commission the Statements of Intent to Contract and Perform for each MBE/DBE participating on the Project as a condition precedent for execution of the Contract.

Responding to the Commission's solicitation constitutes a commitment to utilize good faith efforts to engage MBE/DBE entities on this Project, and to fully substantiate those efforts. The Commission will utilize the following guidelines in evaluating whether the respondent has demonstrated its use of Good Faith Efforts:

GOOD FAITH EFFORTS DETERMINATION GUIDELINES

A. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with Resolution No. 18-2014, adopted March 24, 2014, the Commission instituted a requirement that each bidder on a public improvement project and each respondent to a request for proposals (“RFP”) to perform services utilize Good Faith Efforts to ensure the fullest possible opportunity for firms owned and controlled by minorities and females or otherwise disadvantaged individuals (“MBE/DBEs”) to participate in the opportunities available under the prospective contract. As part of the evaluation of the bids or proposals received, the Commission evaluates the Good Faith Efforts as part of the responsibility of the bidder or respondent and responsiveness bid or proposal. The bidder or respondent must satisfactorily demonstrate its Good Faith Efforts to attain MBE/DBE participation.

Pending the results of the forthcoming disparity study, the Commission has yet to establish specific MBE/DBE participation goals on its contracts. However, the use and demonstration of Good Faith Efforts are required. The level of MBE/DBE participation should correspond with the Availability of such firms in the marketplace to perform Commercially Useful Functions under the Opportunities each

contract presents. These guidelines are intended for use in making the determination whether a particular bidder or respondent demonstrated its Good Faith Efforts when submitting its bid or proposal.

B. DEFINITIONS

“Good Faith Efforts” means performing necessary and reasonable actions that, by their scope, intensity, and appropriateness, would reasonably be expected to attain MBE/DBE participation. The determination of Good Faith Efforts is based on consideration of the quality, quantity, and intensity of the different kinds of actions taken. The activities or efforts undertaken to when making a Good Faith Effort must be those that one could reasonably expect to deploy when seriously, actively and aggressively attempting to obtain MBE/DBE participation in relative proportion to those that are Available to capably perform Commercially Useful Functions under the Opportunities presented in given contract.

“Commercially Useful Function” means responsibility to perform a component of the contract obligations by actually performing, managing and supervising the work involved. An MBE/DBE does not perform a commercially useful function if its role is limited to that of an extra participant in a transaction, contract, or project through which funds are passed in order to obtain the appearance of MBE/DBE participation. If a MBE/DBE Subcontractor (as distinguished from a Material Supplier) does not perform or exercise responsibility for at least thirty percent of the total cost of its subcontract with its own workforce, there is a rebuttable presumption that it is not performing a commercially useful function.

The analysis for determining whether the bidder or respondent fulfilled its obligation to use Good Faith Efforts, the Commission will consider the demonstration of the following:

1. **“Opportunities”** means the subcomponents of the project that are identifiable as economically viable scopes of work that may interest subcontractors in responding to the respondent’s solicitations to participate in the Project. The unique opportunities each project presents is determined based on the nature of the project using in-house expertise and the aggregation of those that the bidders or respondents may identify in their bids or proposals.
2. **“Availability”** means the degree of ready, willing and able MBE/DBEs available to capitalize on the opportunities presented under each project. The availability consideration examines the amount of MBE/DBEs in the relevant marketplace using (1) the Commission’s list of certified MBE/DBEs (available at <http://www.ohioturnpike.org/business/doing-business-with-us/mbe-fbe>); (2) the Unified Certification Program’s DBE Directory (<http://www.dot.state.oh.us/DBE/pages/DBE-Directory.aspx>); (3) Ohio Department of Administrative Services’ search results for MBE (<http://eodreporting.oit.ohio.gov/searchMBE.aspx>) and Edge Certified Service Providers <http://eodreporting.oit.ohio.gov/searchEDGE.aspx>); (4) the City of Cleveland’s MBE and FBE Registry <https://cleveland.diversitycompliance.com/FrontEnd/ VendorSearchPublic.asp?TN=clevel and&XID=1290>); (5) the Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District’s Certification Directory for MBEs and WBEs: <https://neorsd.sbcompliance.com/FrontEnd VendorSearch Public.asp?TN=neorsd&XID= 9328>) and (5) any other Ohio-centric

database that the Commission recognizes as using standards that are substantially similar to the requirements for certification with the Commission, UCP or DAS as an MBE, DBE or EDGE program participant.

3. **“Efforts”** means the documented attempt to meaningfully and earnestly solicit the interest of available MBE/DBE to fulfill the opportunities presented to perform on the Project, including making a sufficient number of contacts to follow up with any available but non-responsive MBE/DBEs and negotiating in good faith with available MBE/DBEs to reach reasonably agreeable terms for their participation.
4. **“Commitments”** means the bidder or respondent represents to have successfully achieved commitment(s) to utilize verified MBE/DBEs to perform a Commercially Useful Function on the project.

The determination that a given respondent or bidder satisfactorily used and demonstrated its Good Faith Efforts is based on the holistic review of the Opportunities, Availability, Effort and Commitment documented in the bid or proposal documents.

C. PROCEDURE

Each bidder on a public improvement contract and respondent submitting a proposal on a professional services contract are required to submit a form titled, “Demonstration of Good Faith Efforts.” The form is designed to elicit responses documenting the Good Faith Efforts that each bidder or respondent utilized when formulating its bid or proposal to perform work for the Commission. A blank Demonstration of Good Faith form provided to interested parties follows these guidelines.

1. Opportunity and Availability

Upon the opening of the bids or proposals, the MBE/DBE Program Manager reviews the completed Demonstration of Good Faith Efforts to identify the opportunities and availability presented under the particular procurement. This assessment of opportunities and availability compiles those the bidders or respondents may identify in their completed Demonstration of Good Faith Efforts forms, but also goes outside the form to consult with in-house subject matter experts to identify additional possible opportunities and recognized certification registries for possible untapped available firms.

The MBE/DBE Program Manager then examines the response from the apparent low bidder or top-ranked respondent to examine whether the materials document that the respondent or bidder used Good Faith Efforts.

A bidder or respondent can demonstrate fulfilling the Opportunity component is documenting that the bidder or respondent performed actions that include the following:

- a. Selected and packaged portions of the work in order to increase the likelihood that the MBE/DBEs will respond to solicitations and express interest in participating on the project. This includes, where appropriate, breaking out contract work into economically feasible units to facilitate participation through subcontracting.
- b. Soliciting the interest of all MBE/DBE entities available to perform on the project through reasonable, meaningful and available means and providing a reasonable and meaningful time to respond.

The means for a bidder or respondent to fulfill the Availability component of demonstrating good faith efforts includes the following:

- a. Searching recognized registries identifying certified MBE/DBEs that potentially could fulfill the opportunities under the project.
- b. Identifying other possible ready, willing and able MBE/DBEs through the effective use of the services of available from plan rooms, community organizations, contractors' groups, local, state, and Federal minority/women business assistance offices, and other organizations as allowed on a case-by-case basis to provide assistance in the recruitment and utilization of MBE/DBE entities.

2. Efforts and Commitment

Once the MBE/DBE Program Manager has identified the possible opportunities and availability for project, and those Opportunities and Availability that the apparent low bidder or top ranked respondent has documented in its completed Demonstration of Good Faith Efforts form, the low bidder or top ranked respondent's efforts and commitments will examine the documented level of exertion used to engage the Availability pool on the Opportunities presented under the project.

The Efforts component considers the active attempts to successfully reach terms with interested MBE/DBE firms, which may include the following:

- a. Negotiating in good faith with interested MBE/DBE entities so as to facilitate their participation on the Project.
- b. Not rejecting DBE entities without sound reasons based on a thorough investigation of their capabilities.
- c. Assisting DBE entities in obtaining bonding, lines of credit, or insurance as required by the Bidder.

The Commitment component provides a cross-check on the accumulation of the identification of Opportunities, Availability and Efforts. Unless the analyses under the Opportunities, Availability and Efforts prongs demonstrate otherwise, the utilization of Good Faith Efforts is expected to result in the bidder or respondent successfully representing Commitments of MBE/DBE participation on the project. The bidder or respondent must provide justification for any lack of Commitment by showing that the failure occurred despite its Good Faith Efforts through the demonstration under the Opportunity, Availability and Efforts prongs of the test.

DEMONSTRATION OF GOOD FAITH EFFORTS

Project Name _____	Project Number _____
Consultant Name _____	Federal Tax I.D. _____

This document must be completed and received by the Commission with the LOI.

1. List all subconsultants a certified as DBE, EDGE or MBE that the consultant intends to use for this Project, the Work to be performed, and the approximate percentage of the overall contract to be paid to each.

2. Indicate how the consultant subdivided portions of the work or services to increase the likelihood of participation by firms certified as DBEs, EDGEs and MBEs in the Project. (Attach additional pages if needed, and all supporting documentation.)

3. Indicate the services or organizations that provided assistance to you in identifying and recruiting firms certified as DBEs, EDGEs and MBEs in preparing the team. (Attach additional pages if needed, and notes of each contact listed.)

Organization _____	Date of Contact _____
Contact _____	Phone Number _____

Organization _____	Date of Contact _____
Contact _____	Phone Number _____

4. List all DBE, EDGE and MBE entities to which you supplied adequate and timely information about the requirements of the scope of services. (Attach additional pages if needed, and copies of all transmittals, any shipping receipts or documentation of providing info. etc.)

Business _____ Contact Name _____ Date _____

Business _____ Contact Name _____ Date _____

Business _____ Contact Name _____ Date _____

Business _____ Contact Name _____ Date _____

Business _____ Contact Name _____ Date _____

5. List the names, addresses, dates and telephone numbers of all DBE, EDGE and MBE entities with which you negotiated relative to the prospective contract and general scope of services negotiated. (Attach additional pages if needed, and the reason negotiations or bids were not successful.)

Business	_____	Business	_____
Address	_____	Address	_____
City, State, Zip	_____	City, State, Zip	_____
Contact	_____	Contact	_____
Phone	_____	Phone	_____
Date of contact	_____	Date of contact	_____
Scope of Work	_____	Scope of Work	_____

Business	_____	Business	_____
Address	_____	Address	_____
City, State, Zip	_____	City, State, Zip	_____
Contact	_____	Contact	_____
Phone	_____	Phone	_____
Date of contact	_____	Date of contact	_____
Scope of Work	_____	Scope of Work	_____

6. List all interested DBE, EDGE and MBE entities which you rejected to perform the service on the prospective contract. Please provide the specific reason(s) for the determination to reject. (Attach additional pages if needed.)

Business _____
Reason(s) for rejection _____

Business _____
Reason(s) for rejection _____

Business _____
Reason(s) for rejection _____

Business _____
Reason(s) for rejection _____