REQUEST FOR DESIGN-BUILD PROPOSALS
The University of Washington, herein “University”, amends it’s Request for Design-Build Proposals and any and all previously published addenda to the RFP as indicated herein below:

ADDENDA ITEMS

4-1. Re: RFP Performance Requirements, Chapter 111 – Facility Performance, Performance, par. C.1., page 111-5.

Omit paragraph 1 in its entirety and substitute:

1. Fire Resistance: Provide Type I or Type II construction in accordance with 2003 ICC International Building Code with City of Seattle Amendments.

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

4-1. How quick will the Non-Profit Owner pay the design-builder’s pay requests?

John Finke, National Development Corporation: Normally, we can pay the builder within ten days after receipt of an approved pay request and the inspector’s monthly inspection report.

4-2. Who will attend the proprietary meetings for the University? Will a list of the attendees be available before the meetings?

The Jury, University Representatives, and Consultants to the University (see RFP 00200 Evaluation for names) will all be invited to attend. The University will attempt to determine the names of those planning to attend the proprietary meetings and inform the proposers a few days prior to the meetings.

4-3. Will the D/B Teams be scored in the proprietary meetings?

No, but the meetings contribute to the jurors’ total impressions of the teams and their capabilities. The jurors will be responsible to score the selection criteria for “ability of design and construction personnel” as part of their evaluation of the best and final proposals.

4-4. Will the University’s LEED staff person attend the proprietary meetings?

Yes, individuals with the responsibility to monitor the University’s LEED progress will be requested to attend.
4-5. Describe how the Jury deliberates and scores the best and final proposals.

Jurors will each receive hardcopies of the four proposals as soon as practical after they have been received by the University. The University staff and consultants will review the proposals and submit a technical evaluation to the Jury. After in-person presentations are complete, the Jury will meet in private and discuss the proposals among themselves. University staff and consultants will be available to the Jury to answer technical questions on program and performance requirements.

In accordance with RCW 39.10, best and final proposals will be evaluated and scored based on the factors, weighting, and process identified in the RFP. The University will initiate negotiations with the firm submitting the highest scored best and final proposal.

4-6. Will anyone other than those evaluators listed in the RFP review, evaluate, or comment on the best and final proposals?

Yes, the best and final proposals will be presented by the University to the City/University Community Advisory Committee (CUCAC) at a regular meeting. CUCAC advises the city of Seattle and University on the orderly physical development of the greater University area. CUCAC is comprised of 16 representatives appointed by surrounding communities and plays a key role in providing community input into the planning and design process. While CUCAC has no official standing in the selection process, their comments will be shared with the Jury.

4-7. Are the final in-person presentations open to the public?

Yes, but proposers are requested, as a matter of professional courtesy, not to attend the presentations of other proposers.

4-8. At the in-person presentations to the Jury, can we present anything other than our written proposal?

No, only materials (graphics, charts, text, diagrams, drawings, etc.) contained in the proposers’ best and final proposal notebooks, or in their initial proposal notebooks, may be used in the in-person presentations.

4-9. Can the proposers receive a review or comments on their initial proposals?

Yes, proprietary meetings for this purpose were arranged and completed on December 14th.

4-10. Who will evaluate the proposers’ LEED Rating System Checklist?

Appropriate individuals from among the University Representatives and Consultants to the University will evaluate the proposers’ LEED Rating System Checklist. Only those LEED rating points that, in the opinion of the evaluators, are reasonably attainable will be used to determine the proposals’ scores for sustainability and energy efficiency. The successful design-builder will be contractually obligated to obtain the resulting LEED Rating Score and Certification.

4-11. When must we provide substantiation?

Whenever a RFP Performance Requirements chapter requires a substantiation of the proposer’s or design-builder’s ability to meet a specific performance requirement, the specification will indicate the submittal phase the substantiation must be submitted, e.g., Proposal Phase, Schematic Design Phase, Design Development Phase, etc. Substantiations required in the Proposal Phase must be included in the appropriate sections of the Proposal Notebooks. See RFP Contract Requirements, Chapter 00830 – Design and Construction Procedures, Quality Requirements; and RFP Performance Requirements, Chapter 111 – Facility Performance, Substantiation, for a complete description of the substantiation process.
4-12. **What if we can’t meet the budget; can we exceed the Maximum Allowable Design and Construction Cost (MADCC)?**

No, best and final proposals that exceed the MADCC will be considered non-responsive and returned to the proposer. If a proposer thinks it may not be able to meet the MADCC, it should discuss it with the University in a proprietary meeting.

4-13. **Will EO have to pay for utilities directly?**

No, the Lessor will pay for the normal building utilities (power, water, sewer, gas, trash collection).

4-14. **Has EO ever been together before?**

No, this new building will be the first opportunity for all subdivisions of EO to have their work stations in a single building on campus.

4-15. **Are the RFP Program Requirements malleable, i.e., community vs. private space? What is the flexibility of the program?**

The proposer’s best and final proposal design concept must illustrate the Program Requirements as stated in the RFP (or as the Program Requirements may have been amended by written addendum to the RFP). If a proposer wishes to recommend specific amendments to the program, it should send suggested language (but not the design solution) to the Project Manager. If the University accepts the amended program text, it will publish the resulting modifications in an addendum to the RFP for the use of all proposers.

4-16. **Can the proposers illustrate functional program flexibility?**

Yes, the proposer may include any number of no-cost alternatives to the functional program. However, the base proposal and documentation (drawings, area tabulations, etc.) must meet the strict requirements of the RFP Program Requirements. Any alternative to the program must meet the minimum and maximum assignable area and gross area limitations of the RFP. See RFP Chapter 00005 – Project Information.

4-17. **The City of Seattle may require that the alley be widened from the present 14 foot width. Can we get a definitive answer to the question of whether such widening will be required?**

A discussion with the City leads the University to believe that the City will not require the alley to be widened. Per page C-4 Site Program, for the purposes of the best and final proposal, the alley shall be 14 feet wide.

4-18. **Has the University reviewed the project with the City’s Department of Planning and Development? What is the name of the contact person there?**

Yes, the UW had an initial introductory meeting with Michael Jenkins, Senior Land Use Planner @ DPD and Tammy Frederick @ SDOT.

4-19. **What is the meeting order for the proprietary meetings?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Proprietary</th>
<th>Second Proprietary</th>
<th>Jury Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D 1/5/05 9:00am-12:00am HUB 309</td>
<td>A 1/26/05 9:00am-12:00am HUB 309</td>
<td>B 3/14/05 TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 1/5/05 1:30pm-4:30pm HUB 309</td>
<td>B 1/26/05 1:30pm-4:30pm HUB 309</td>
<td>C 3/14/05 TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 1/6/05 9:00am-12:00am HUB 209A</td>
<td>C 1/27/05 9:00am-12:00am HUB 209B</td>
<td>D 3/14/05 TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 1/6/05 1:30pm-4:30pm HUB 209A</td>
<td>D 1/27/05 1:30pm-4:30pm HUB 209B</td>
<td>A 3/14/05 TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4-20. Can we ask the University private questions?
   No, all questions and answers during the proposal phase will be shared with all proposers.

4-21. Will the University give the proposers a list of Jury, staff and consultants who plan to
   attend the proprietary meetings?
   Yes.

4-22. Who owns the energy rebates?
   The Non-Profit Owner, i.e. National Development Corporation will own all energy rebates.

4-23. What happens between February 14th and March 14th?
   See the answer to Question 4-5.

4-24. Will the University tightly restrict what we can show to the Jury at the in-person
   presentations?
   Yes, you may only use materials, graphics, text, charts, diagrams, drawings, perspective
   sketches, etc. from the proposal notebooks. No new materials are allowed. See Question 4-8.

4-25. Why are the required schematic level drawings limited to civil, landscape architecture and
   architecture?
   The building's engineering systems are adequately defined by the RFP Performance
   Requirements. Only concept narrative descriptions and/or single line diagrams are necessary to
   describe building engineering concepts. However, proposers are free to submit schematic level
   engineering drawings and outline specifications.

4-26. Are models allowed at the Jury presentations?
   No, however, the proposers may utilize physical or computer models in their proprietary
   meetings. Proposers may also show images (pictures) of those models in their best and final
   proposals and in their Jury presentations if the same images are included in their proposal
   notebooks.

4-27. Will the University register the project with the LEED organization so that we can make
   enquiries?
   The University will investigate how it can register early with four design teams.

4-28. Can the UW provide the D/B Teams (or refer them to a source for) floor plans of the
   adjacent buildings, i.e., Commodore Duchess Apartments and the College Inn.
   College Inn - no plans are available.
   Commodore Duchess - typical floor plan will be provided each team at first proprietary meetings
   Jan 5 & 6, 2005. The architects for recent remodels were Stickney Murphy Romein, Architects
   (206) 623.1104.

4-29. What will the UW's policy be for the parking area, i.e., public visitor parking vs. staff
   parking? ADA parking for staff only, or for staff and ADA vehicles. What about
   handicapped van parking?
   UW Parking will want to reserve the right to do any of these over the life of the building, i.e. UW
   building staff typical, perhaps with visitor parking at high demand during peak registration times.
   Provide accessible parking spaces per City requirements. Meet City of Seattle requirements for
   handicapped van parking.
4-30. Can the D/B assume it can prune the existing street trees, or do these trees need to be replaced?

Per page C-6 of Site Program, last paragraph, “The existing trees along Campus Parkway should be removed and street trees should be installed on both frontages of the building with columnar trees approved by the city arborist.”

4-31. Where can the D/B Team find information on the University Way street tree and street lighting master plans?

There is no master plan for street trees on University Way south of Campus Parkway according to Shane Duwald, City Landscape Architect.

4-32. Can the D/B challenge specific criteria in the performance specifications?

Yes, through the RFI process prior to proposal submittal. Response to such challenges will be communicated to all proposers and included in addenda, as necessary.

4-33. Will the UW consider a Code Type II building?

Yes, the RFP Performance Requirements will be modified to allow Type II construction.

4-34. Can we split up the architects and the engineers in the two proprietary meetings?

At the option of the proposers, break-out meetings within the same meeting room will be allowed.

ATTACHMENT

A. ATTENDEE LIST: Design-Build Pre-Proposal Briefing 12/14/04.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 4