REQUEST FOR DESIGN-BUILD PROPOSALS

The University of Washington, herein “University”, amends its Request for Design-Build Proposals and any and all previously published addenda to the RFP as indicated herein below:

ADDENDA ITEMS

7-1. RFP / Contract Requirements, Standard Form of Agreement Between Owner and design-Builder – Lump Sum, Article 5.4 Liquidated Damages and Addendum No. 2, Addenda Item 2-2.

Omit Article 5.4 Liquidated Damages in its entirety and replace it with the following:

5.4 Compensation for Loss of Use. Design-Builder understands that if Substantial Completion is not attained by the Scheduled Substantial Completion Date (“SSC Date”), Owner will be denied the use of the facility, or will lose the rents due from one or more facility lessees. Consequently, Design-Builder agrees that the amounts described in this section are a reasonable estimate of that loss and that Design-Builder shall pay Owner the amounts described in this section as compensation. Design-Builder agrees that if Substantial Completion is not attained by SSC Date, Design-Builder shall pay Owner One Thousand Dollars ($1,000.00) as compensation for each day up to one-hundred eighty (180) calendar days that Substantial Completion extends beyond the SSC Date. Thereafter, Design-Builder shall pay Owner Two Thousand Five Hundred Dollars ($2,500.00) as compensation for each additional day that Substantial Completion extends beyond the SSC Date.

7-2. RFP/ Performance Requirements, Chapter B11-Elevated Floors, Page 1, Performance, Paragraph A.1.b: Delete paragraph in its entirety and substitute the following: Floor Levelness:

Meet Code stipulated deflection criteria.

7-3. RFP/ Performance Requirements, Chapter B-Shell, Page 3, Performance, Paragraph C, Health and Safety. Sub-paragraphs 3b and 3c: Delete sub-paragraphs in their entirety.

7-4. RFP/Introductory Information, Chapter 00005- Project Information, page 1, Project Description, paragraph A: Change “five-story” to “multi-story”.

7-5. RFP/ Performance Requirements, Chapter D5-Electrical Power, page 1, Performance, Paragraph A Basic Function, sub-paragraph 6: Delete the sub-paragraph in it’s entirety.

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

7-1. If the cost of the Seattle City Light and QWEST charges to design and install electrical and phone is to be included in the MADCC we’d like you to require all proposers carry the same owner specified allowance for this work to be paid as a reimbursable cost.

Proposers shall include in their Lump Sum Contract Price a cash allowance for a Seattle City Light connection charge of $50,000.00. Telecommunication service connections (but not wire and cable) to the building will be provided by UW C&C at no cost to the Design-Builder.
7-2. **Will parking stalls be made available for rent (contractor staging) at the W6 parking lot due West of the project site? If so, how many are available?**

Yes, up to 30 spaces will be available to the Design-Builder in UW's W6 lot at the following rental rates:

- After July 1, 2005: $84.92 / month / stall.

7-3. **Chapter B11- Elevated Floors includes a requirement for floor flatness (FF) and floor levelness (FL). Industry standard does not apply FF and FL requirement to slab on metal deck construction. If a proposing team is intending to use a slab on metal deck system will the FF and FL requirements apply?**

See Addenda Item 7-2 above.

7-4. **UW - Standard Form of Agreement, Article 10: We understand that the University has in place a capital projects property insurance policy that may cover this project during the construction period. Article 10 of the "Standard Form of Agreement" requires that we provide builders risk insurance. Please confirm that the design-builder must provide a separate builders risk policy.**

The University intends to assign this contract to a non-profit lessor; in which case the University’s property insurance coverage is not available to the lessor. The Design-Builder shall provide builders’ risk insurance as described in Article 10 of the Agreement.

7-5. **Under the program for the Elevator Machine Room 13.37, sheet F3-150 that there is: "Required adjacency: Below grade; Parking Level". This would not be possible for standard electric traction elevators, unless they were underslung.**

Delete Adjacency requirement. Design-Builder to locate machine room as required for system performance.

7-6. **UW - Standard Form of Agreement, Article 11.1: It might be interpreted that design-builder responsibility for building permits includes a financial responsibility for Independent Testing required by the City of Seattle. Please specify whether Independent Testing agency costs that will be required by the City of Seattle are to be included, or excluded from the design-build proposals.**

The Design-Builder shall be responsible for the cost of independent testing required by all applicable codes and regulations. See General Conditions, Article 2.6 Government Approvals and Permits, and Chapter 00830 Design and Construction Procedures, Quality Requirements, par. F. Field Testing and Inspection (page 00830-3).

7-7. **Can ADA Van Accessible parking be located on the Commodore Duchess site?**

Handicapped van parking should be in a location convenient to building entrance, preferably on street curb adjacent to entry (subject to SDOT concurrence).

7-8. **Can UW Educational Outreach refuse containers be located on the Commodore Duchess site?**

For the purposes of this proposal, the proposer may assume that refuse containers can be located on the Commodore Duchess site.

7-9. **Can LEED Silver be made a project goal versus a requirement and all USGBC application and documentation requirements waived?**

No. The Design-Builder will be expected to make a “good-faith” best effort to meet or exceed the requirements for LEED Silver Rating and obtain that certified rating from USGBC.
7-10. Is the Design-Builder required to make provisions on University property for College Inn or College Pub operations?

Yes. See Site Program; page C-5, Relationship to Adjacent Structures. Proposals that include operable windows on the south façade shall include a solution for mitigating the impact of the College Inn’s existing grill exhaust on air quality in the new Educational Outreach Building.

7-11. What is the status of “pending” responses to previous questions?

Pending means answers are still being investigated. See this Addendum for those Q&As.

7-12. Largely due to escalation, we firmly believe that the current program (gateway building, LEED Silver, 25% Energy Savings Performance Standard, and some of the Facility Performance Standards) cannot be met for the MADCC of $12,667,000. Can the MADCC be increased to account for the extraordinary inflation experienced in recent history and expected for the next year?

No. The MADCC is an absolute limit and proposers may not exceed it and remain responsive.

7-13. Can the Design-Builder qualify their proposal with a list of deviations that will become the basis of evaluation and award of the contract?

No, a proposer’s deviation list will not be allowed. A qualified Proposal Form will cause the proposal to be judged non-responsive.

7-14. Addendum 2, item 2.3: GC Article 8.2 is revised to prevent the Design-Builder from being awarded a time extension for any delay event including earthquake, flood, war... Each of these items are insurable risks through the builders risk programs however resultant Liquidated Damages are not insurable as they are considered penalties. Since the Liquidated Damages are meant to cover lost rent can the GC language be changed to eliminate LD's for these insured events in which case actual loss of rent would be recoverable through the Builders Risk insurance? Design-Builders cannot self insure risks of this magnitude.

See Addenda Item 7-1 above.

7-15. Can the program requirements be revised to include one elevator instead of two? If so, which elevator would be included, the combination passenger/freight (4,500lb capacity) or the passenger (3,500lb capacity)?

No, the RFP requires two elevators.

7-16. Can the minimum number of parking stalls required be reduced?

Yes, the minimum number of parking stalls is reduced to 20 stalls (50% average car stalls and 50% small car stalls), but the preferred number of parking stalls will remain at 24. Proposals will be evaluated for the number of parking spaces provided in the garage.

7-17. Can it be assumed that the UW will find an ADA van stall offsite, adjacent to the building? If so, does that change the minimum number of parking stalls to 23?

See Q&A 7-7 above for handicapped van parking. In any instance, the Program requirement for parking stalls (20 minimum, 24 preferred) in the below grade garage remains a requirement of the RFP.

7-18. Can the proposal requirement for full UniFormat or MasterFormat specifications be deleted? It seems that the performance specification combined with the engineering and architectural narratives suffice to describe the proposal at this level.

The RFP/Proposal Requirements, Submittal Requirements, par.B.1.j. calls for “outline” specifications utilizing either format. It will be important for the University to evaluate the quality
of the architectural and engineering materials, equipment and systems proposed. Outline specifications will serve to more fully describe the proposal to the University. Such specifications also define the limits of the proposal and are for the protection of both parties to the agreement.

7-19. Chapter A22 “Basement Walls” describes moisture resistant treatment for basement walls of “habitable” spaces. Is the garage considered a habitable space? A typical developer grade office building would not include waterproofing at garage walls.

The parking garage and all other accessible spaces on that level are to be considered habitable for the purposes of the RFP and the Performance Requirements.

7-20. Can the program be changed to delete the entire garage from the project scope?
No.

7-21. Addendum No. 5, Q&A 19 clarifies the MUP submittal requirements. Does this also delete all requirements to address MUP documentation in the best and final proposals?

MUP documentation will not be required at the proposal stage. Proposers should develop their submittal documents with the idea that after award, they must complete or modify the proposal phase submittal documents to serve as the University’s MUP application. The Design-Builder must complete the MUP application documents by the deadline for submission of Schematic Design Documents (see Proposal Form).

7-22. Please clarify Addendum No. 5, Q&A 25. Please confirm that there is an existing tunnel with adequate clearance to run cabling between the project site and Condon Hall and that the D.B. team may use this pathway for IQ Analyzer connection. If possible, please provide a tunnel map (i.e. length, location, and cross-section).

The University confirms that there is tunnel access from the alley east of the EO site to Condon Hall, with clearance for the required cables.

7-23. Please provide response to Addendum No. 5, Q&A 47 regarding FF and FL requirements. Are the FF and FL requirements only applicable to the finish floor walking surfaces?

The requirements for floor flatness and floor levelness are intended to apply only to the finished floor, i.e., the occupants’ final and finished walking surface.

7-24. Addendum No. 5, Q&A 46 relaxed the structural vibration criteria. Can this be relaxed even further (i.e. match AISC standards for typical office building construction)?

No. The standard indicated is an accepted international standard for office buildings and is intended to limit unacceptable footfall vibration, particularly in steel structures.

7-25. Please provide response to Addendum No. 5, Q&A 41 (off-site parking stalls available to Design-Builder).

See Q&A 7-2 above.

7-26. Please provide further clarification to FF&E requirements. Is it correct to assume that all items listed under the “equipment” or “furniture and fixture” sections of the program data sheets are furnished and installed by the owner even if some of these items are specified in the performance criteria? (i.e. window treatments are listed under “furniture and fixtures” on the data sheets, but also include in chapter C23 of the performance criteria).

DB is responsible for all FF&E items listed in the program data sheets and specified in the Performance Requirements. FF&E items listed in the program data sheets but not in the performance criteria are the responsibility of the Owner.

7-27. Which FF&E items have no UW budget and therefore are not included in the project?

See Q&A 7-26 above.
7-28. Which FF&E items are to be provided with the building in the best and final proposal?

See Q&A 7-26 above.

7-29. Task lighting is listed under the lighting section of the program data sheets. Is it correct to assume that task lighting is furnished and installed by the owner?

Yes.

7-30. Please provide a list of utility impact fees that are carried by the owner.

The University will carry the cost of METRO water, sanitary sewer and storm sewer impact fees in its budget, along with the cost to connect telephone service (but not wire or cable from building entry to wall connections in each space) through UW C&C.

7-31. Chapter B Shell (page B-6) indicates that stucco is not an acceptable exterior finish. Chapter B-21 indicates that stucco is acceptable. Please clarify.

Stucco, as described in RFP/Performance Requirements, Chapter B21 Exterior Walls, is acceptable. In Chapter B Shell, delete “Do not use: 6. Wood Cladding, Siding and Trim” and “Do not use: 7. Exterior Portland Cement Plaster (Stucco).”

7-32. Please confirm that the RFP performance requirements govern in situations where the RFP performance requirements are in conflict with the FDI.

Except for the FDI sections specifically referenced in individual chapters of the Performance Requirements, or FDI Voice, Data and Multimedia Communications Sections, the Performance Requirements govern. See RFP/Performance Requirements, Chapter 111 Facility Performance, paragraphs. A.4.d. and A.4.f.

7-33. Regarding Chapter 111, Substantiation and Chapter D62, page D62-2, item D.3.a., can this substantiation be deferred to a later phase?

Provide substantiation as required in Chapter 111. Substantiation requirements for proposal stage listed in Chapter D62 may be deferred to completion of Schematic Design as defined in the RFP.

7-34. Regarding Instructions to Proposers, page 00200-13, c. 5), please list the specific criteria related to the Concept of the Proposal that you would like discussed. Do you mean “Design Concept”, “Program”, “LEED Rating Points” and “Five-Year Extended Warranty and Maintenance Cost” listed on page 00200-6 or the Initial Proposal criteria A., 1., I., listed on page 00200-12?

The purpose of the criterion-by-criterion discussion is to assist the evaluators to know how the proposal responds to the criteria. In some instances, the “discussion” is a simple reiteration of the facts or the location in the Initial or Best and Final Proposals where the appropriate information can be found. Example: 9.b.1) LEED Rating Points: The proposal includes a total LEED Rating of 36 points, see page xx. Another example: 9.b.2) Five-Year Warranty and Maintenance Cost: The proposal includes options for all D - Services five-year warranty and maintenance costs, for a total of $xx,xxx. See page xx for breakdown of options. In other instances the discussion is an opportunity for the proposer to discuss subjective criteria such as Design Concept or Program.

7-35. Is tandem parking allowed in the garage?

Per RFP, parking layout is to be per UW Parking Services’ standards, which do not allow tandem parking.

7-36. Can the required trash and recycling area be shared with the Commodore Duchess apartments in their service yard along the alley?
Yes, see Q&A 7-8 above.

7-37. Can the program requirement for space 13.13 Waste/Recycling be reduced?
   No, please provide the space programmed.

7-38. Can the Future Academic Program space 0.0 be used for program area now?
   No.

7-39. Can alternate planning concepts and pricing be submitted on 2.14.05?
   Alternates are not allowed in the Best and Final Proposal. If the proposer wishes the University to consider alternative planning concepts or pricing, it may present those alternatives to the University in the negotiation phase, assuming the proposer is the highest scoring proposer (winner). Do not include alternates in the best and final proposal.

7-40. Will the team be deemed non-responsive and the honorarium denied if the construction budget is not met in the B&F proposal?
   Yes, RCW 39.10 includes the prohibition: “Final proposals may not be considered if the proposal cost is greater than the maximum allowable construction cost identified in the initial request for proposals.”

7-41. Must unassigned open space be finished to match adjacent spaces?
   Yes, or if the unassigned space is enclosed, it may be unfinished. Provide but do not install the number and type of light fixtures and ceiling system components to meet the Performance Requirements for the enclosed space.

7-42. Can the Computer Lab be split into two?
   Computer Labs may be separated so long as they are located directly across a corridor or Lobby from each other.

7-43. Will the Design-Builder have access to UW Campus steam and chilled water?
   No.

7-44. Are street trees required on University Way?
   Yes. Refer to Site Program, page C-6, Open Space and Planting.

7-45. What happens if the Green Building Council does not recognize the LEED points claimed or offered in the proposal?
   The University understands that the Design-Builder is not in control of the LEED evaluation and certification process. The Owner will require the Design-Builder to make a good-faith best effort to meet the requirements of the LEED Rating Points offered in its proposal. UW will review and determine the viability of the DB’s LEED proposal. If the UW agrees that the proposal is viable and meets the minimum requirements and the DB is subsequently denied by the USGBC then the DB is not in default of its contract obligations.

7-46. Does the Design-Builder have to meet the minimum programmed area for each space or only meet the total minimum floor area?
   RCW 39.10 specifies that the RFP must include “minimum and maximum net and gross areas of any building.” Chapter 00005 has established those parameters (revised in Addendum No. 5):

   C. Building Areas:
   1. Minimum / Maximum Net Assignable Areas: 35,000 NSF / 38,000 NSF (excluding parking)
   2. Minimum / Maximum Gross Building Areas: 64,000 GSF / 70,000 GSF (including parking)
   3. Maximum Gross Building Area above finish grade: 60,000 GSF (Campus Master Plan).
The proposal's floor area totals must remain within these parameters in order to be responsive. Deviations to individual space requirements are allowed. Minor deviations in the areas of individual spaces are expected, but excessive or numerous negative deviations from the Program Requirements may reduce the proposal's evaluation score. Proposers shall submit a tabulation of the building's gross and net areas, compared to the RFP's Program Requirements, Area Tabulation, indicating floor area deviations (plus or minus) in individual spaces.

The Selection Criteria includes: Program (150 points): Design meets or exceeds program's objectives, spatial requirements, functional relationships and minimum net assignable floor area (NASF).

7-47. The RFP Proposal Requirements Item B1.f requires an area tabulation based on NCES Postsecondary Education Facilities Inventory and Classification Manual. However, the Performance Requirements Chapter 111, Part F.1.b requires that areas and ratios be calculated in accordance with ANSI/BOMA Z65.1-1996. We request the University select one or the other for the submittal. Which standard is to be followed for the Best and Final Proposal Notebook?

Proposers shall use the ANSI/BOMA standards to measure their net and gross floor areas.

7-48. What is the schedule for the D/B teams to present to the Technical Evaluation Panel, the UW Landscape Committee and the in-person presentation to the Jury?

1. B&F proposers make in-person presentations to Technical Evaluation Panel: At the University's option, when and if necessary. 07 MAR 05
2. B&F proposers make in-person presentations to University's Landscape Committee in a public meeting in BCDA order at times to be determined. 11 MAR 05
3. B&F proposers make in-person presentations to University's Jury in a public meeting in BCDA order at times to be determined. 14 MAR 05

7-49. Where do we deliver the proposals?

Proposals, including the six design display boards, shall be delivered to the Capital Projects Office's reception desk in the UW Facilities Building by 2:00 PM Monday February 14, 2005.

7-50. What materials can we bring to the Landscape Committee and Jury in-person presentations?

Proposers are limited to in-person and PowerPoint presentations at both meetings. Please bring your own laptop computer and projector (and an extension cord). Please leave a CD copy of your final Jury presentation with the Project Manager after the presentation. The design display boards will be available in the Jury Room at the time of your presentation.