



Oregon State University

CORVALLIS CAMPUS HOUSING AND DINING VISION PHASE 1 - RESIDENCE PROTOTYPE AND BUILDING DESIGN SERVICES

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) #2024-014771

ADDENDUM NO. 5

ISSUE DATE: May 29, 2024

CONTRACT ADMINISTRATOR:

Matt Hausman, Construction Contracts Officer

Construction Contracts Administration

Email: ConstructionContracts@oregonstate.edu

This Addendum is hereby issued to inform you of the following revisions and or clarifications to the above-referenced Solicitation and/or the Contract Documents for the Project, to the extent they have been modified herein. Any conflict or inconsistency between this Addendum and the Solicitation Document or any previous addenda will be resolved in favor of this Addendum. Proposals shall conform to this Addendum. Unless specifically changed by this Addendum, all other requirements, terms and conditions of the Solicitation Document and or Contract Documents, and any previous addenda, remain unchanged and can be modified only in writing by OSU. The following changes are hereby made:

QUESTION/ANSWER:

Item 1 Q: What is the anticipated square footage of the student residences?

A: The 3 6-story buildings will have approximately 355,000 SF.

Item 2 Q: What is the target hard cost of construction for this phase of work?

A: Estimated construction hard cost is \$315 million.

Item 3 Q: The last line of Section 1.5 "Scope of Services" refers to "...Exhibit 1 for preliminary Schedule and budget information." We have reviewed all of the Exhibits provided, but do not see any budget information for either Phase I Design Services or Phase I & II total design/construction budgets. Is total project budget or budget by phase information available? If so, please provide.

A: See Item 2.

- Item 4 Q: The Corvallis Campus Housing & Dining Vision Study documents indicate an intent to diversify the types of housing units offered, with a significant increase in the 2-bed “Suite” typology. Should we assume this unit type as the primary building block for the Phase 1 prototype?
A: This information would be part of discovery during Phase 1.
- Item 5 Q: Phase 1 describes a building type analysis and prototype deliverable. Are teams expected to develop concepts and scope of work for the District Utility Plant in phase 1 by providing a study/programming phase for the DUP in phase 1?
A: Phase 1 does not include programming, design concepts and scope of work for the District Utility Plant (DUP). However, we anticipate the narrative would address site analysis that includes the potential location of the DUP as part of the overall site planning, as well as how the DUP will impact “prototype strategies and systems”.
- Item 6 Q: Alternatively, should teams conclude there is no scope of work for the DUP in phase 1 and that all DUP work will begin in phase 2? If not, please clarify scope of work for phase 1 District Utility Plant base services for fee development.
A: See Item 5.
- Item 7 Q: In section 1.5 Scope of Services, under the deliverables for phase 1, the first bullet indicates building massing, footprint and height. The second bullet indicates “building materials should be appropriate for the Corvallis Campus.” And the fourth bullet requests narratives of “systems.” Is Phase 1 intended to produce architectural concept building designs (windows, façade materials, interior concepts, etc.)? Or is it primarily about massing on the site? If it is the latter, can you please elaborate on your Phase 1 goals for “systems” and “building materials” narratives.
A: Phase #1 is primarily about massing on site keeping in mind the appropriate the design aesthetics for the OSU campus. The goal of systems is referenced in the response to Item 21 below.
- Item 8 Q: Should the cost estimate be included in Phase 1?
A: No.
- Item 9 Q: Section 1.4 Summary of Work - Can you please provide what level of outreach and visioning is anticipated for stakeholder, community, and student engagement for phase I?
A: University housing and dining services will be fully engaged in the process and we look to hear about the suggested process from the proposing teams. All information needed from OSU staff will be available.
- Item 10 Q: Section 1.4 Summary of Work - Can you please provide what the anticipated process is in phase I to determine the additional program that is required to support a thriving student housing community? I.e. study lounges, live/learn, amenities Etc..
A: We are looking for the awarded design team to define this process.
- Item 11 Q: Section 1.4 Summary of Work - Is there a preferred unit mix and unit type for the three buildings?
A: This would be part of the work of the awarded design team to help us define.

Item 12 Q: Section 1.4 Summary of Work - Is it preferred to have ensuite bathrooms or common gender-inclusive facilities?

A: This would be part of the work of the awarded design team to help us define.

Item 13 Q: Section 1.4 Summary of Work - Is OSU planning to have an off-site full kitchen that will support the new dining facility, or will the new dining facility need to accommodate a fully functioning kitchen?

A: Our goal is to have an off-site facility to support dining and catering operations.

Item 14 Q: Section 1.4 Summary of Work – Have there been any visioning or programmatic studies done for the new dining facility. If not, will this scope be part of Phase I?

A: We have released an RFP that is currently out that will be used to develop the visioning and programming for all dining and catering for Housing.

Item 15 Q: Section 1.4 Summary of Work – Has there been a traffic study completed that addresses the anticipated growth of phase II

A: A traffic study has not been completed.

Item 16 Q: Section 1.4 Summary of Work - Can OSU provide the complete and final Corvallis Campus Housing and Dining Vision study created by Brailsford & Dunleavy, Inc., Mahlum Architects, and PAE Engineers?

A: This will be shared with the winning design team after they are chosen.

Item 17 Q: We want to clarify Oregon State University's intent regarding the word "prototype," as the definition we heard in the pre-proposal meeting differed from the one in the RFP. Can you specify the level of design development you are seeking for the prototype? For example, are you looking for complete housing floor plates and building massing that can be replicated across different sites, with variations in the façade materials and ground floor public spaces? Or are you interested in developing a system of unit typologies that includes structural and MEP considerations for use in future projects?

A: We are interested in developing a system of unit typologies that includes structural and MEP considerations for use in future projects

Item 18 Q: In section 7.8.6, OSU has asked that we include “an estimate of [personnel’s] hours and rates charged for their services based on the proposed scope.” Can you confirm you are looking for our firm’s standard billing rates for these individuals? Will billing rates be subject to any maximum limit within Oregon State University or the State of Oregon’s public works standards?

A: The billing rates proposed are to be determined by the Proposer and there is no maximum limit but rates may be negotiated.

Item 19 Q: During the pre-proposal meeting, OSU mentioned that wanting to see a proposed schedule for the work. Can you please clarify if you would like to see a schedule outlining all phases of work or a schedule outlining the first prototyping phase of the work only?

A: Phase 1 only.

Item 20 Q: In section 1.5 Scope of Services, under the deliverable for phase 1 (the last bullet point) indicates “Narratives to include descriptions of prototype strategies and systems”. Does “systems” in this case refer to architectural and structural systems only, or does it include MEP

systems? Given that the definition of central MEP systems is delayed until Phase 2 (per Addendum 3) is the appropriate MEP scope for the Phase 1 fee proposal the development of a BOD?

A: This would include MEP systems. The basis of design that reflects the prototype strategy and systems process is appropriate.

Item 21 Q: In section 1.5 Scope of Services, under the deliverable for phase 1 (the last bullet point) indicates “Narratives to include descriptions of prototype strategies and systems”. Does “systems” in this case refer to architectural and structural systems only, or does it include MEP systems?

A: This is to include MEP systems.

Item 22 Q: Addendum 3 clarifies that “A study of separate mechanical systems per building versus utilizing a DUP will be part of phase 2”. What, if any, scope are you anticipating for MEP systems in Phase 1. Here are a few options

- Option 1: Limited role. Consult with the architect and other team members on the possible integration of systems into a prototype without discussions or decisions on which systems will be implemented. No deliverables.
- Option 2: Concept level role. In addition to option 1 work, present system options to OSU that includes analysis and shoebox energy modeling on systems with the goal to either decide or shortlist the systems down to a few approaches for further study. Prepare a concept level bullet point narrative describing the MEPT scope of work in conformance with decisions and options made as part of the analysis and including OSU and housing standards that can be used to prepare cost estimates. Prepare floor plan diagrams showing locations of MEP components within the housing prototype.

Additional background: If consideration of the DUP and the building systems is not part of phase 1, then it would not be possible to fully assess the impact of MEP as part of the prototype as it would not be possible to identify the mechanical system integration without a better understanding of the central and/or distributed nature of the systems. Additionally, if we are not assessing ventilation, exhaust, and water heating strategies, then we will not be able to assess the horizontal vs vertical strategies or evaluate the overall building massing as it relates to MEP. On previous prototype housing projects where we were assessing modular and prefabrication, the detailed discussion regarding integration of MEP into that prototype was important. It usually requires a higher level of MEP integration earlier rather than later. Conversely, the project can be successful without much MEP analysis if the phase 1 goal is to just optimize the structural system module with the housing unit program without really getting into overall system integration, modularity or prefabrication. The MEP integration could come after that initial effort. Clarity on the role of MEP in phase 1 would be really helpful in understanding the goals of this phase.

A: See Item 5.

Item 23 Q: Are consultants also expected to provide 1 reference on their resumes?

A: No.

Item 24 Q: Are consultant team members also expected to provide current availability and projected project involvement?

A: It is not expected but if the consultant is providing a large portion of design services, this information would be beneficial.

Item 25 Q: With the addition of the "Approach to Phase 1" aspect of question to 7.8.2, would you consider adding additional pages to the overall page limit?

A: No.

Item 26 Q: Will the unabridged Corvallis Campus Housing and Dining Vision be released during the RFP process?

A: See Item 16.

Item 27 Q: Does OSU intend to reschedule the proposed interview dates?

A: No.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 5