



STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF ENTERPRISE SERVICES

1500 Jefferson Street SE, Olympia, WA 98501

ADDENDUM #3
December 17, 2013

Project No. 2014-009
Request for Proposal
Design-Build 1063 Block Replacement Project
Olympia, WA

Addendum #1 was issued on 12/4/2013

Addendum #2 was issued on 12/11/2013.

It consisted of three items: Two submitted questions and answers, and an amendment to RFP Section V, pages 37-38 where Office No's P10.1 thru P10.10 and P11.1 thru P11.8 were missing. The third item was a question and answer template to submit future questions.

Addendum #3 consists of three items:

1. Q and A from the site walk meeting on 12/9/2013
2. Revisions to RFP
3. List of attendees at the 12/9/2013 meeting

ITEM 1 - Questions and Answers from 12/9/2013 meeting:

1. Are the MWBE / Inclusion requirements mandatory or voluntary as stated in the RFP?
 - A. Please see the actual RFP language on this topic. We believe it is clear. Also see the scoring requirements.
2. Within the RFP there are high insurance provisions that are pushed down to the subconsultant level. This may limit small business participation. Can these requirements be adjusted to encourage small and diverse business participation?
 - A. DES is exploring how this issue can be best addressed. Please look for details in a future addendum.
3. Within Section V there is a missing table of programmed rooms.
 - A. See Addendum #2 (distributed 12/11) which includes missing information.

4. The RFP has differing sheet sizes in the RFP Section I and Section III Contract Management. It was suggested that the original sheet sizing be 34" x 42" and the RFP submittal sizing for the design / technical plans be half-size to keep the appropriate scaling.
 - A. These sections have been revised to accommodate 34" x 42" sheet size and ½ size submittals. See revised RFP language included in this Addendum.
5. Is Asbestos / Hazmat abatement in the scope?
 - A. Yes, this was clarified in Addendum #1 with the re-issuance of the correct Appendix Form j. Design Builder / Owner Responsibility Matrix.
6. Building Height Limitation: is the 59' height limit above grade on all sides? If only on the south side, then how is the sloping terrain on that side addressed? What about the exact allowable height of any mechanical penthouse?
 - A. The 59' above grade pertains to the south elevation. The height limitation insures the building is not taller than the Cherberg or O'Brien buildings on the side facing the Capitol Campus. The mechanical penthouse can be no more than 15' above the roof of the main building. See detailed revised RFP language included in this Addendum.
7. Within the RFP there are Section IV Design Narratives and also exhibits with State Lease Site standards and GA Facilities Design Guidelines. What documents prevail when there are conflicts?
 - A. The RFP Design Narratives take precedence over the other documents.
8. The RFP calls out for a "high performance standard" with this 1063 building. Is there a written high performance standard?
 - A. The high performance standard is stated as an aspiration for the project to achieve. There is no "standard" per se other than the EUI goals stated in the RFP.
9. Meeting the budget along with all other RFP requirements may be a challenge to achieve. Is a proposal non-responsive if the proposer doesn't meet the budget?
 - A. The RFP provides for the eventuality that a proposer may not be able to meet performance goals for the available budget. See Section IV.1020.A.8. Proposers fulfilling the requirements of this section for "Guaranteed Alternate Price proposal" will still be deemed responsive. However, DES believes that given the broad EUI range stated in the RFP, it will not be necessary for proposing teams to make use of this option.

10. Within the performance guarantee, does it include the operations costs for running the building?

- A. The guarantee is primarily concerned with energy costs. Operations and maintenance are included only as they pertain to environmental control systems. The successful design-build team is not being asked to directly operate or maintain the building during the five year period, but to guarantee the performance of the systems.

ITEM 2 – Revised RFP Language:

Section I.IV.A (page 8) is changed from: “...(Note: 18 x 24 inch Design Submittal drawings must be submitted in a separate binder).”

New language: “...(Note: Half-size Design Submittal drawings of 17” x 21” - based on a full sized 34” x 42” format - must be submitted in a separate binder.)”

Section I.IV.B (page 11) is changed from: “...Provide nine (9) each 18x24, bound sets of the drawings listed.”

New language: “...Provide nine (9) each half-sized reductions of 17” x 21” (based on 34” x 42” format) bound sets of the drawings listed.”

Section III.Z1010.ii.C.1 (page 5) is changed from: “...but no larger than 30 x 42 inches (750 x 1000 mm).”

New language: “...but no larger than 34 X 42 inches (800 x 1050 mm).”

Section IV.1000.B.2.d (page 4) is changed from: “The height of the proposed building above its grade as measured from its south elevation shall not exceed the 59 foot height above grade.”

New language: “The height of the proposed building above grade at any point measured on its south elevation shall not exceed a 59 foot height above grade measured perpendicular to grade at that point to the top of the main building mass, inclusive of parapet walls, ornament and other architectural elements.”

ITEM 3 – 12/9/2013 Meeting Attendees: see attached scanned sign-up sheets.

This Addendum does not amend the due date or time for Proposals. Proposals continue to be due on February 20, 2014 at 3:00 PM.