



# Oregon State University

## UNIVERSITY HOUSING AND DINING SERVICES (UHDS) FOOD SERVICE PLANNING & DESIGN CONSULTANT

### REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) #2024-015435

#### **ADDENDUM NO. 3**

ISSUE DATE: June 11, 2024

#### **CONTRACT ADMINISTRATOR:**

Matt Hausman, Construction Contracts Officer

**Construction Contracts Administration**

**Email:** [ConstructionContracts@oregonstate.edu](mailto: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: With regards to the campus' response the question published in Addendum 1, if the foodservice consultant is a sub-consultant committed to a team on Phase 1 (which has not been awarded yet), can they also be a sub-consultant (i.e. not Prime) to a design firm on Phase 2? In that instance, the design firm would be prime and the foodservice consultant would be sub.

Does the conflict of interest identified in Addendum 1 apply if the foodservice consultant is NOT the prime? If so, we will form a team and submit as prime. However, if the conflict of interest does still apply, will respectfully not pursue a submission and assume at least the two foodservice consultants I've spoken with will follow suit. We've very interested in the project but don't want to spin anyone's wheels.

A: Addendum 2 extended the RFP Due Date/Time in order to allow for an Intent to Award to be issued for RFP 2024-014771. With that, a conflict would only exist for a firm if it were a kitchen/dining design subconsultant to the top scoring team that was identified in that Intent to Award. Any/All others have no conflict at this time.

Any potential future conflict between the Food Service Consultant selected under this solicitation and future design solicitations for the remainder of the Housing and Dining Vision will be determined at the time those solicitations are let. Should the Food Service Consultant under this solicitation and eventual contract complete/provide all deliverables under the contract, it is likely no conflict would exist, and firms would be able to participate in future design phases. This determination will be made solely by OSU in their best interests.

Item 2 Q: The RFP notes B&D's study included a preliminary financial analysis of OSU's housing and dining operations. Can more information about the extent of this analysis be shared? Specifically, would like to know how many years were included in the analysis, to what level of detail were dining operations financially analyzed, and were recommendations for dining's financials made through 2033 in this analysis?

A: Financial analysis was a macro level analysis to confirm that UHDS would have the necessary reserves and cash flow to afford the build out of the vision. This project will make recommendations regarding the underpinning revenue models, meal plan designs and pricing, etc. that will ensure we are able to meet our future operating and capital obligations.

Item 3 Q: Regarding the "campus food map" included in the recommendations requested, can it be confirmed that this is to include dining venues within the 3 neighborhoods (South, East, West) only? Or is this intended to be a food map of the entire campus? In other words, is the campus food map to be inclusive of residential dining demand, or of the entire campus' dining demand for residential and retail dining?

A: UHDS manages dining on the Corvallis Campus as a whole except for facilities managed by Athletics. Our analysis and future planning needs to incorporate the entire dining footprint on campus with the only exclusions being Athletics and (at this time) the three privately operated outlets in leased spaces - Dutch Bros. Coffee (OSU Beaver Store) Happy Lemon (OSU Memorial Union) and Panda Express (OSU Memorial Union). In addition, we need to address campus dining access in our remote areas of campus (Jefferson Street Building, Western Building and Facilities Shops, etc. and our Research Way sites).

Item 4 Q: The RFP notes that the dining plan developed by the consultant will be provided to selected architects, and that the consultant shall review the architect's deliverables. Will the consultant's review of architect's deliverables be considered a part of the initial proposal for the dining plan project? Or will this future accountability be an additional service to the dining plan project's contract? Or will this be a separate agreement if/once needed?

A: Consultation and collaboration with the Phase 1 design team is expected as part of this engagement. The Phase 1 design team has overall responsibility for the design of the dining facilities being built as part of Phase 1, but we need those facilities to be in synch with the coming overall plan for dining. Any engagements needed after this engagement will be solicited separately on an as needed basis.

Item 5 Q: If we have proposed as a sub-consultant on the Residence prototype (RFP #2024-014771) are we still eligible to propose on this scope?

A: See Addendum 2 and Item 1 above.

Item 6 Q: Is the eligibility requirement just for the Prime contract holder or does this requirement extend to any subconsultant(s) for this scope of work? For example, if this contract is primarily held by an architect, can the foodservice consultant participate in other current RFPs?

A: See Addendum 2 and Item 1 above.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 3