UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS
CONSULTING SERVICES FOR
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING SPACE ASSESSMENT, VISIONING AND ACADEMIC FACILITIES PLAN
PROJECT NUMBER: 205169

Submittal Deadline: No later than 3:00 pm, August 26, 2015

The University of Washington Office of the University Architect (OUA) is soliciting Statements of Qualifications (SOQ) from qualified firms experienced in academic and campus planning to develop a Space Assessment, Visioning and Academic Facilities Plan for the College of Engineering (CoE) to provide a guide for facilities/space management and phased change in the immediate future and over the next five to twenty years.

The planning study will begin with an assessment of current space utilization using and, augmenting as needed, recent department-based space assessments and past precinct studies available from the College of Engineering (CoE) and OUA. This task is envisioned as one of verification, validation and updates of information necessary to provide a current and accurate profile of current space use by all departments of the College and of the College as a whole. It will be informed also by the College of Engineering’s 2014-2019 Strategic Plan and existing evaluation of facilities conditions conducted by the University Facilities Services group. The final product will be a database and observations about the physical conditions and facilities needs of the College that is consistent with OUA’s SIMS database, inherently consistent from department to department, and establishes for the College a College-wide statement and priorities regarding needs, goals and desired outcomes of the Academic Facilities Plan. The consultant will be supported by OUA and CoE staff in their endeavor to verify and validate the CoE’s physical conditions, space and facilities needs.

Working from this basic understanding of the College facilities and space utilization and having summarized and overviewed the facilities’ current status, the consultant, through interviews with the College’s administration, department chairs, center directors and Dean, and other campus staff familiar with the facilities conditions and the university’s space standards, will develop a vision - immediate, near-term and long-term - to maintain, enhance and extend the College’s teaching, research, student life and administrative functions through academic facilities and campus places. The consultant will become familiar with the College’s 2014-2019 Strategic Plan, and other relevant studies including the university’s recent Learning Space Assessment, Campus Master Plan, Campus Landscape Framework, and other relevant
studies, to assist the College in articulating its vision—as it relates to space and facilities—in the context of the overall campus and the wider institutional goals. This process will be managed by the consultant and directed by a core planning group of faculty and administration, staffed by the OUA.

The core UW team that oversees the project will be advised by a steering committee that meets periodically to review and comment on the goals, key issues and work products. The consultant will articulate a clear and feasible strategic, prioritized and phased, action-oriented framework for the planning and development of capital facilities and the vicinity related to space use, space assignment, academic facility needs, existing facility conditions, capital planning, siting of facilities and site development, new and renovated construction projects, in support of CoE’s mission, existing and ongoing UW-Seattle campus master planning, and University of Washington capital planning and budgeting.

The scope of this study will require a team that includes expertise in academic planning for schools of engineering, trends in engineering, research lab design, learning spaces, maker space, and campus planning.

Key issues will include consideration of how to pursue the CoE’s vision given funding constraints, and how to balance demands for new space and maintaining existing facilities.

The final product will be a fact-based, strategic, practical and forward looking document that articulates a vision and approach to achieving it designed to assist UW leadership with planning for both the College and the campus environment over the next 5 - 20 years. At a minimum it will propose a framework for near-term implementation based on data, existing conditions, CoE and campus-wide goals, projections for growth, relevant educational trends. It will identify needs for follow-on planning, and provide illustrative scenarios for phased renovation and new construction and outline future capital planning proposals.

The university intends to conduct the project over approximately nine months, starting in late Summer, 2015. The space verification, assessment and projected needs portion of the study should be complete in Fall 2015 and will provide the foundation for the Visioning and Academic Facilities Plan to be completed in Spring 2016.

**Solicitation Schedule:** these are anticipated dates and may change

- August 26, 2015 by 3:00 pm: SOQ’s due
- August 31, 2015: Evaluations completed and shortlisted firms determined
- September 14, 2015: Interviews conducted. Winning firm announced.
- September 15 – 29: Contract execution
- October 5th: Kick-Off Meeting
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Background:
The University of Washington's Seattle campus reflects over 100 years of thoughtful campus planning and expansion. The OUA works with colleges and units across campus to develop academic facilities plans that maximize the limited resource of land, space and funding. The UW continues to expand enrollment, launch new programs and grow new research. Continual change is essential for the university’s vitality, and sustaining the university over the long term requires strategic planning and effective fiscal management. Given financial realities it is critical that, in addition to building new space, the university makes the best use of existing space and capital investments.

The consultant will be familiar with the 2003 Campus Master Plan\textsuperscript{1}, 2015 Campus Landscape Framework\textsuperscript{2}, CoE 2014-2019 strategic plan\textsuperscript{3}, the college’s previous Precinct Plan completed in 2010 and other relevant plans such as South Campus Study II, the West Campus Development Framework, UW Tri-campus STEM Engineering Capital Planning Study, the UW Learning Spaces Study, CoE Computer Science & Engineering Feasibility Study, and the UW’s One Capital Plan and will make recommendations within this context. Many of these studies were recently completed and the information included in them will serve to highlight the vision, mission and academic thrust of the CoE to create a framework on which to build strategic phased development scenarios for new building(s) and the renovation of existing buildings within the vicinity study area (see page 4) and the surrounding campus.

The Visioning and Academic Facility Plan will consider the sustainability impact of its recommendations, recognizing the university’s commitment to sustainability in all its forms—environmentally, financially and socially, and impacts on energy/utility use and transportation infrastructure will be identified. Use as a reference, the UW Climate Action Plan\textsuperscript{4}, sustainability updates\textsuperscript{5} and reports to the Environmental Stewardship Committee\textsuperscript{6} and others, as necessary.

CoE is a diverse community of innovators working to improve the quality of life by leading in engineering discovery, innovation, education and engagement. The college is a national leader in educating engineers; US News and World Report ranks the college as #13 among public universities. The college comprises 10 departments, with 250 faculty members, approximately 4,900 undergraduate students, and 2,100 graduate students and awards Bachelors, Masters and PhD degrees. Each year the college delivers new scientific discoveries, inventions and top-ranked graduates. The plan will reflect CoE’s background, stature and vision.

CoE has varied revenue sources with grants and contracts making up 57% of total revenues for fiscal year 2014. Tuition represents 19% of total revenues, and state-funded operating revenues were 9%.

\textsuperscript{1} http://www.washington.edu/community/seattle-campus-master-plan/  
\textsuperscript{2} http://clf.opb.washington.edu/  
\textsuperscript{3} https://www.engr.washington.edu/mycoe/strategicplan  
\textsuperscript{4} https://green.uw.edu/inform/uw-climate-action-plan  
\textsuperscript{5} https://green.uw.edu/cap/progress-and-updates  
\textsuperscript{6} http://green.uw.edu/inform/esc
In its entirety, on and off campus, the college is assigned 680,000 assignable square feet across 31 facilities (3 of these are leased space). This study will focus on the 25 campus buildings shown in orange (670,000 ASF) and land included inside the dashed boundary (29 acres) in the image below.

The site vicinity research, which includes a description and analysis of the complexity of the topography, utilities, circulation and significant trees will draw information gathered from recent studies such as: the Campus Landscape Framework Plan, the Computer Science and Engineering Feasibility Study as well as the Campus Tree Inventory.

**SCOPE OF SERVICES**
Working within the parameters of the 2003 Campus Master Plan as well as synthesizing with ongoing efforts for the next Campus Master Plan, the scope of services shall include, but is not limited to, the following:

1. **Establish Work Plan & Schedule**
   Provide a proposed work plan in two sections: 1. Integration of verified and assessed space data and Facilities/Site Conditions and 2. Visioning and Academic Facilities Plan. Indicate the anticipated deliverables and methodology. Include specific tasks, with milestones, to provide services and generate products, and note expected roles of OUA, CoE and other UW staff.

   Clarify roles and responsibilities of the consultant, core team and steering committee. Identify process for information-gathering and communication such as surveys, interviews, focus groups, data validation, and/or public forums. All should foster transparency, and include opportunities for input from constituencies.

   Describe how the plan will incorporate relevant existing plans and other, concurrent, planning efforts in a way that fosters continuity and minimizes overlap of tasks.

2. **Articulate Vision and Guiding Principles for Plan Development**
   Review and validate the Visioning Session from the recent UW Tri-Campus Engineering Study. Facilitate, guide and support the articulation of the College’s long-term vision and strategic plan as it relates to space planning and an Academic Facilities Plan. At least two sessions will be held with the planning group and core team. This may include new directions in teaching and learning, research or service. This vision should reflect programmatic, academic and architectural aspirations, and will reflect what is known about specific facility needs, as well as potential phasing options. Identify and address projected changes in faculty, staff and student FTE, and projected program changes. Examine, at a minimum, five peer institutions for insights and lessons learned regarding challenges facing the College of Engineering. The report will reflect the interplay of functions, program locations, interactions with other UW units, the public, existing facilities and infrastructure.

   The final report will include highly illustrated narratives describing the vision and guiding principles, important factors in their development, and paths to their realization as identified through this study.

3. **Integration and Analysis of Space Inventory and Functional Use**
   The consultant will use the verified space program and inventory and graphically integrate them into the analysis and narrative regarding the functional use, adjacencies and utilization of space, also identifying efficiencies, restacking and “fit to function” recommendations. Identify spaces that are under- or over-used and suggest how to “right-size” use. Apply benchmark data of past consultant projects. Identify trends that will create demand for new kinds of space. This will assist with the key issues that will be addressed in scenario development.

   Deliverables include verified and integrated inventory (in a format approved by OUA for university data consistency), updated floor plans, and a narrative outlining the qualitative observations and analysis of current and recommended use of space. The final report will
include summary data in tabular form, in addition to any other tables, marked up floor plans, stacking plans and other graphical reports.

4. **Integration and Analysis of Facilities/Site Conditions**
Consultant will develop a facilities/site condition report, utilizing information from the recently complete Campus Landscape Framework Plan and Computer Science and Engineering Feasibility Study. Information will be analyzed and graphically integrated into the report with a narrative that describes the overall space quality, functional suitability and the alignment of assigned space with needs. A facilities condition analysis will need to be created for the 25 buildings located on campus and integrated into the overall planning study.

5. **Identify Issues to Address in Scenario Development**
Analyze space needs based on the validated programmatic/space needs and facilities/site conditions outlined in 3 and 4 above. Assess current space versus projected needs based on research, instructional and service trends. Review facilities, infrastructure, open spaces, view corridors and landscape character of site vicinity study area (utilizing Campus Landscape Framework) for strengths and weaknesses to the College and to the university as a whole. Identify needs for interior and exterior program elements to support the academic enterprise. Project program needs for near-term, mid-term (5 years) and long-term (20 years) in three physical and capital environments: steady-state, modest growth, and significant growth.

6. **Create Scenarios for Future Development, Highlighting Tradeoffs and Choices and describe how these scenarios will be implemented**
Structure at least three development scenarios depicting possible futures that resolve the assessed needs in a variety of ways (right-sized space use, relocation, phasing of new construction, renovation, restacking, etc.). Note unusual project costs for each scenario, including site development, renovations, enabling projects, F&E, escalation, and fees. (It is unrealistic at this time to get useful costs, but it can be useful to identify key cost considerations that will help build and/or differentiate among the scenarios.) The core team and steering committee may advise the consultant on particular solutions to explore.

Scenarios will address, at a minimum:
- Alignment of existing space to optimize utilization and meet functional needs. Provide examples of right-sized space and relevant design solutions.
- Changes to existing space to support greater use efficiency, create flexible room types, eliminate deferred maintenance or improve physical and functional conditions.
- Construction of new space or major renovation for needs that cannot be addressed in existing space with consideration to building renewal projects to solve facility needs.
- Factor existing facilities conditions into concepts regarding extent of renovation, decision-making regarding renovation v. replacement (example: Sieg Hall, others), and test a range of approaches using the scenarios and phasing to do so.
- Requirements for building replacement and the relocation of current occupants should be part of the criteria for constructing and analyzing scenarios.
- Take site development challenges and opportunities into consideration in constructing and analyzing scenarios.
• Description of the development capacity for areas where new construction is proposed, and how the scenario makes strategic use of this capacity. (Utilize existing 2003 Campus Master Plan and coordinate with ongoing new Campus Master plan) Factor site development considerations into the plan, including architectural and landscape character; height, density, setback and other Campus Master Plan requirements; landscape development; campus connectivity and any regulatory issues and restrictions. Address competing construction needs in this area, as identified by OUA.

• Massing studies for proposed new construction.

• Sustainability impact of recommendations, particularly impacts on energy, utilities, and transportation.

• Scenarios need to be constructed to test a full range of possible options for addressing the needs of the College and the facilities and site vicinity. Key variables should be identified and expressed in the scenarios. Analysis of the scenarios should include comparative assessments of their benefits and costs. A hybrid scenario may be developed and recommended to illustrate a recommended course of action that maximizes the benefits and minimizes the costs.

• Sequence for scenario implementation based on realistic funding and growth/phasing expectations, including near-, mid- and longer-term plans. Describe enabling projects, decanting, site considerations such as infrastructure and circulation projects, and related costs. Estimate project costs.

• Summarize in narratives, graphics and tabular forms.

PROJECT DELIVERABLES
The consultant will be responsible for the project deliverables, which will include:

1. At the outset of project, written work plan and schedule, drafted and worked through approvals process with core team and steering committee.

2. Collect, verify, validate, update, and complete, as necessary and appropriate, space data regarding its location, layout, types and utilization, in order to produce a complete and consistent space database for the College as a whole that is useful in developing this Academic Facilities Plan, and in the space management at the College and departmental levels of CoE.

3. Integrate validated space data and floor plans (updated into GeoSims by OUA) into the document.

4. Final document will correspond to the tasks listed under Scope of Services and will include:

   i). Executive Summary. Summarize the vision and principles, findings, primary issues to address in future development, key recommendations, and the study’s methodologies. This section must be able to function as a stand-alone document.
ii). Vision. Narrative describing the guiding vision and principles articulated for the plan.

iii). Current Conditions: Integrated the validated and updated Space Inventory =; Site and Facilities Condition Summary. Include summary of all space by type, building, department and condition, with corresponding narratives, plan views, tables and graphics useful to describe salient observations about inventory and, conditions.

iv). Assessment. Summary of peer analysis, current programs and size, projections for programs and size, space use analysis, needs assessment, and right-size study. Identify the key issues surfaced during the study that will be addressed by scenarios.

v). Scenarios and Strategic Implementation Plan. All elements of the proposed scenarios indicating phasing, facilities conditions, enabling projects and how these could/should be implemented in the future. Include a summary of the strengths and weaknesses of each.

vi). Capital project proposals and key associated costs. List of projects with potential schedule and cost analyses as appropriate.

vii). Rendering(s) of selected scenarios for use in capital campaign.

The final document should have a professional published appearance and format. Graphics should be readable in both color-printed and web-appropriate formats.

All final site and floor plans, existing and proposed, shall be delivered in AutoCAD 2012 format or higher as well as PDF. Aerial oblique drawings and/or vignette sketches for current space utilization and any proposed new staking or assignment plans, construction and large-scale surge moves will be delivered as PDF’s and PNG’s in an 8.5” x 11” size.

SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) must include and will be evaluated on the criteria listed below. It must include an index and be organized by discrete sections corresponding to the criteria and in the same order as listed below. Excluding the cover letter and the response to GSA Standard Form 330, Part II, the SOQ should be submitted in no more than 25 page sides.

1. Cover Letter. A cover letter of 1-2 pages, addressing, at a minimum, the following:

   a). Expression of interest in this project.

   b). A summary of your firm’s relevant qualifications.

   c). The size of your firm and its capability to manage a project of this size and scope within the identified time frame, relative to its other workload.
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Acknowledgement that you have reviewed any addenda issued to the RFQ, as posted on the University’s website.

The name and contact information of the individual the University should contact with questions about the SOQ and to schedule an interview. The contact information should include the person’s name and title (Mr., Ms., etc.), firm name, mailing address, telephone number, and e-mail address.

2. Team Qualifications

A. **Team expertise and availability.** The project is expected to take approximately 9 months from the initiation of the work to its conclusion. This work will require a well-coordinated, agile interdisciplinary team. Identify essential team members by discipline and expertise, availability, and their experience and qualifications relevant to this scope. Include resumes for the team’s key staff. Identify sub-contracted firms and staff. Provide a staffing plan, indicating the percentage of work-hours commitment of individual lead and key staff for each phase of the project, including but not limited to, principal-in-charge, project manager, project planner, and other lead and key roles. It is at the discretion of the proposer to identify a core team of staff, including other consultant firms, if any are deemed appropriate to address the scope of work. The university will work with the successful firm to identify additional consultants to supplement the proposed team, so not all consultants must be identified by name.

B. **Experience facilitating, shaping, and defining the development of an academic vision (in particular, in Colleges of Engineering).** Give examples of your team’s approach to comprehending programmatic and academic needs for growth on geographically restricted sites. Indicate how you have helped users articulate their vision and planning guidelines to help create an implementation plan that is responsive to their needs, and the campuses’ needs, as outlined in this RFQ.

C. **Communications and engagement.** Give examples of your team’s experience in providing strategic communications and engagement services with upper administration, faculty and Deans. Give examples of planning documents you have produced that were strategically developed for strategic results that were achieved. Describe the firm’s philosophy regarding communications and engagement in a consensus-based environment.

D. **Project management.** Show your firm’s successful completion of similar projects, in the supervision, coordination, communication, and management of schedule and budget throughout the project phases. Compare original and final budget and schedules for each project.

E. **Coordination with other efforts.** The 2003 Campus Master Plan and 2014 Campus Landscape Framework, will inform this study and the new ongoing campus masterplan will be influenced
by this study. In addition, recent targeted planning projects will inform this plan, and other, concurrent, planning efforts will shape and in turn be shaped by this project. Please describe relevant projects that demonstrate the team’s ability to cohesively incorporate concurrent planning efforts. Outline your approach to fostering collaboration and minimizing overlap of tasks or making contradictory recommendations.

F. **Components of scenario planning.** Provide relevant examples of work that the team has been responsible for that include similar components of the scenario planning process:

1. Existing Conditions - physical and functional characteristics, projected demand, building program, site vicinity conditions and program, topography and vegetation
2. Capacity for growth and expansion
3. Identification of enabling projects and phasing plans that will allow for the phased implementation of building renovation and growth
4. Cost associated with scenarios for future development, implications and trade-offs
5. The character of the campus and the relationship of the College and its facilities to the campus character and implications for the campus given the character of the College and age of existing historic facilities. The University is a committed steward of historic preservation, landscape and any scenario planning should consider the historic exterior envelope of the buildings, how sustainability fits into the overall renovation of existing buildings and how they impact phased implementation strategies, as well as on natural and designed landscape features.
6. Historic preservation planning
7. Sustainability planning and design
8. Implementation Strategies and Next Steps

3. **References.** Provide at least three (3) project owner references for work completed by your firm. References should be selected from projects prominent in your SOQ with relevance to this scope of work. Cited references should include project name, reference name, title, project role, and current contact telephone number, and email address. Refer to the Selection Process section of this RFQ for information about how reference checks will be used in the evaluation process.

4. **GSA Form 330, Part II.** As part of the qualifications submitted, include a copy of the completed Federal Government GSA Standard Form 330, Part II. The form is available online at: http://www.gsa.gov/portal/forms/download/116486.
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5. **Acceptance of University’s Standard Contract.** The University intends to enter into an agreement with one firm as a result of this RFQ process and to use its standard Agreement for Professional Services for the work. The Agreement is available on the Capital Projects Office’s website at http://f2.washington.edu/cpo/business/contracts-forms. Select the ‘Agreement for Professional Services – (OA4) Miscellaneous’ located in the ‘Consultants’ section. Each firm must affirm in this section of the SOQ that the terms and conditions of the agreement is acceptable, or if the firm takes exception to any of the proposed language in the agreement, the firm must specifically describe the reasons for the exceptions and propose in this section of the SOQ alternative language for review and consideration by the University. The University makes no commitment that it will modify any of the terms of the standard agreement based on the firm’s suggestions. Firms should not comment on the terms of Attachment A to the Agreements that include compensation provisions. Failure to respond to this item may result in the University eliminating the firm’s SOQ from consideration.

**EVALUATION AND AWARD**

1. **SOQ Evaluation.**

The SOQ’s will be evaluated by a university evaluation committee and the most qualified firms will be invited by letter to an interview. Determination of the firms to be interviewed will be based on the following criteria and point values. Points will be awarded based on the Proposer’s ability to demonstrate that it meets the requirements of this RFQ.

The University reserves the right to conduct reference checks for the highest scoring firm(s) either after qualifications have been evaluated, and/or after interviews have been held. Should information obtained during reference checks reveal concerns about the firm’s past performance or its ability to successfully perform the contract to be executed based on the RFQ the university may, at its sole discretion, determine that the firm is not qualified to move forward in the selection process and/or enter into negotiations with the university. In reference checks, the university may include itself as a reference if the firm has performed work for the university, even if the firm did not identify the university as a reference. Likewise, the university reserves the right to check references for the firm from other owners and designers even if they were not identified by the firm as a reference in the Statement of Qualifications submitted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION CRITERIA</th>
<th>Maximum Points Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Qualifications</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team expertise and availability.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience facilitating, shaping and defining the development of an academic vision based on updated conditions assessments and guiding a scenario based, phased, strategic implementation plan. Communications and engagement.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise in strategic, multi-department, College-wide and campus scenario planning. Coordination with other relevant institutional planning</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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efforts.

Other Documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>No points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GSA Form 330 Part II</td>
<td>No points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of University’s Standard Contract</td>
<td>No points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Points: 100

2. Interview Process

Key team members are expected to lead the interview and describing their approach to this study. A 50-minute interview period will be allocated to each firm, as follows: 25 minutes to present, 20 minutes for question and answer, 5 minutes for consultant questions and closing statement. Firms will have 5 minutes to set up before the interview and 5 minutes to take down and remove presentation material after the interview.

Interviews will be evaluated based on the criteria below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVIEW EVALUATION CRITERIA</th>
<th>Maximum Points Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project approach.</strong> The team’s understanding of and approach to the project</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel.</strong> Demonstrated experience and knowledge relevant to the project. Suitability of project team, including sub-contractors.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication.</strong> Interpersonal communication among team members and with the interview committee; strategically valuable use of communication tools and techniques throughout the planning process and its products and deliverables.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation and questions.</strong> Clarity of expression and organization in the firm’s presentation, and in providing insightful answers to questions asked by the interview committee. Quality of questions asked by the firm.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total.</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Final Selection Process

The most highly qualified firm, based on the total points from the evaluation of the SOQs and interviews, will be invited to enter into negotiations with the University. Only one firm (the prime consultant) will be designated as the contracting entity. If the university and the most highly qualified firm cannot agree on fair and reasonable terms, the university may enter into negotiations with the next most highly qualified firm.

All sub-consultant team members will be finalized prior to execution of the contract.
SUBMITTAL DEADLINE

One (1) unbound original, five (5) copies organized in removable, recyclable covers, and one (1) CD/DVD in PDF format of the Statement of Qualifications containing the above-listed information must be received at the University of Washington Tower no later than the submittal deadline stated on the first page of this RFQ, or as modified by any subsequent addenda. Submittals sent by mail or courier shall be sent to the address below (use box number for U.S. Postal Service (USPS) delivery only). Faxied or e-mailed submittals will not be accepted. Consultants are responsible for ensuring receipt of the SOQ at the University Tower by the deadline stated above, and should take into account internal UW delivery times once USPS delivers a submittal to the box number indicated, and other delays that may occur when using a delivery service. Submittals received after the deadline will not be considered.

University of Washington
Office of the University Architect
Attention: Lyndsey Cameron
University Facilities Building
Box 352205
Seattle, WA 98195-2205

Any addenda issued for this RFQ will be published at the following website address: http://f2.washington.edu/cpo/business/consult-opp, within the ‘Current Advertisements’ box. Consultants are responsible for checking the website for any addenda prior to submission of qualifications. If you are unable to download the addenda, you may contact the individual noted at the end of this RFQ.

Minority and Women’s Business Enterprise Participation

The University of Washington is committed to providing the maximum practicable opportunity for participation by minority business enterprises (MBEs) and women business enterprises (WBEs) in its contracts through direct contracts with the University, and sub-consulting or supplier participation. The University strongly encourages MBEs and WBEs certified by the State OMWBE to respond to this RFQ. Voluntary goals of 10% for MBEs and 6% for WBEs have been established for this project. However, no minimum level of MWBE participation will be required as a condition for entering into a contract. The University is also an affirmative action-equal opportunity employer.

Questions

All questions regarding this RFQ should be addressed to Lyndsey Cameron, at 206 616 0201 or Lyndsey2@uw.edu

JUDITH GINIGER
Contracts Manager

Publication date(s) in the Seattle Daily Journal of Commerce: August 12, 2015
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