



Oregon State University

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) #2025-017147

UNIVERSITY HOUSING & DINING SERVICES (UHDS) DINING SUPPORT FACILITY DESIGN SERVICES

ADDENDUM NO. 2

ISSUE DATE: December 4, 2024

CONTRACT ADMINISTRATOR:

Matt Hausman, Construction Contracts Officer

Construction Contracts Administration

Email: ConstructionContracts@oregonstate.edu

This Addendum is hereby issued to inform you of 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:

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

Item 1 Additional Supplemental information has been made available at:

<https://oregonstate.box.com/s/kw0gk4s416vjmomcokofm99yon0cfn1v>

QUESTION AND ANSWER:

Item 2 Included with this addendum are Questions and Answers received prior to the deadline.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 2

UHDS Dining Support		
QUESTION NO.	QUESTION	OSU RESPONSE
1	Can you clarify if the successful team will NOT be precluded from competing for subsequent OSU UHDS expansion (UHDS Vision Plan – Phase 2 projects)?	Confirmed. The awardee will not be precluded from competing for future phases of the Vision program.
2	Site-Specific Challenges: Are there any known site conditions, such as existing soil contamination, hazardous materials, or utilities, that could pose challenges during design or construction?	It is believed that all potential soil contamination was remediated by Atlas Holdings (previous owner). There is a utility easement that will need to be addressed by OSU and the Design Team once more is known about the design, other than the utilities serving the existing building no utilities transit the site.
3	Flood Risk: Since the property includes areas within a flood hazard zone, are there additional requirements for mitigation or infrastructure improvements?	Yes, there are design criteria due to being in a flood hazard zone. Please see the zoning memo provided in the addendum for more information.
4	Soil Contamination: Have any environmental site assessments (Phase I or Phase II ESAs) been conducted for the property? If so, could those reports be shared?	Environmental Site Assessment posted in addendum.
5	Third-Party Consultants: Will OSU provide third-party environmental consultants for hazardous material identification and abatement oversight, or should the design team include this expertise?	OSU or the CMGC will provide the environmental assessments and abatement as required.
6	Existing Structure Details: To better assess the scope, could you provide detailed as-built drawings or reports for the structures slated for demolition?	There are very limited records, and they are of poor quality. The available information is posted in the addendum.
7	Hazardous Materials Surveys: Are there any hazardous materials surveys or abatement reports available for the existing structures?	Hazardous Materials Survey posted in addendum.
8	Asbestos and Lead-Based Paint: Have asbestos-containing materials (ACM) or lead-based paint (LBP) been identified in the buildings slated for demolition? If so, are there existing plans for abatement?	Environmental Site Assessment posted in addendum. If any materials are discovered OSU will provide abatement.
9	Abatement Timeline: Will OSU handle hazardous material abatement prior to the design team's involvement, or is this expected to be coordinated as part of the project scope?	Assuming the existing buildings will be demolished any necessary abatement will be provided/managed by either OSU or the CMGC doing the demolition. Design Team will not provide these services.
10	Long-Term Maintenance Goals: Are there specific long-term maintenance requirements or goals for the new facility that should inform the design approach?	Not at this time, TBD during programming
11	Operational Workflow: Are there any detailed operational workflows for the commissary kitchen and bakery that we should consider in space planning and systems design?	Not at this time, TBD during programming
12	Future Expansion Compatibility: Can you clarify OSU's vision for accommodating future modifications or expansions in the commissary kitchen and bakery?	OSU currently has ~5,000 students on dining plans which will grow to ~7,500 over the next 5 years. We contemplate an approach where we add capacity over the next 10 years (personnel and equipment) to accommodate the 50 percent increase in demand.
13	Should programming be provided for kosher food production	Not at this time, TBD during programming
14	Please provide more information about the composting program and operation for this program,	Composting is currently handled by Republic Services (contracted waste hauler).
15	Preferred Construction Materials: Are there specific material preferences (e.g., durability, ease of maintenance) to align with OSU's standards for dining and food service facilities?	Materials will be determined during design but will be based on OSU Design and Construction Standards. Deviations may be considered by project team in order to align with project budget.
16	Sustainability Priorities: Are there particular sustainability certifications (e.g., LEED, WELL) or carbon reduction milestones OSU prefers for this project?	OSU aspires to be carbon neutral in the future, so electrical capacity for that may be considered as design progresses, however natural gas fueled equipment is assumed to be installed at this time. Please see OSU Design and Construction Standards for sustainability criteria.

17	Phased Permitting: Are there specific dates or milestones for phased permitting, and how will these align with the overall project schedule?	Phased permitting will be utilized if beneficial to the project schedule. It is assumed at least two phases will be beneficial, but the Project Team will determine the best course of action during the design process.
18	Coordination with Other Dining Projects: Will the timeline for this facility need to align with schedules for other dining and residence hall projects coming online?	Yes, the hope is to have this facility up and running sometime in the 26-27 academic year so that when new dining facilities start coming online in the 27-28 year this operation is past the initial start up.
19	Stakeholder Engagement: What level of direct involvement is expected with stakeholders such as students, faculty, and dining services staff during the programming and design phases?	This is primarily a "back of house" facility so minimal external stakeholder participation with faculty and students. We do anticipate engaging OSU's food innovation center as part of the design process, and may engage faculty in the food sciences as well as content area experts or collaborators (creamery, fermentation, meat lab, etc.) but not general faculty engagement.
20	Stakeholder Review Process: Could you provide more details on the expected duration and frequency of OSU's strategic partner reviews during the design phases (e.g., Schematic Design, Design Development, and Construction Documents)?	This will be done in collaboration with Bergmeyer and their wider campus dining vision work. Anticipate engagement at the programming and schematic design phases
21	Pre-Construction Integration: What is the anticipated timeline for engaging the pre-construction contractor under the CMGC delivery method? Will this overlap with the schematic design phase?	The selection of a CMGC partner is planned as soon as we conclude this process. It is desired to have them engaged (along with their trade partners for design assist) as soon as possible.
22	It would be helpful if the UHDS team could provide their anticipated level of cook/chill equipment (if known), i.e.: will more traditional/versatile cooking equipment be utilized (combis, kettles, skillets) with food being panned and then blast chilled or will a more sophisticated cook/chill process be used, i.e.: sous vide, pump/fill, and sealer type equipment?	A highly mechanized, high volume, and sophisticated approach to cook/chill is anticipated for this project.
23	What are the roles and names of the members of the selection committee?	OSU does not provide this information
24	Are there any known challenges/constraints that could affect the overall project schedule? i.e., timing of replating of the site, new infrastructure connections, zoning/planning compliance with setback variance, etc.	OSU is not aware of anything specific that would affect the overall schedule.
25	Has a Geotechnical investigation report with recommendations for soil bearing capacities been completed?	No, not to date. OSU will obtain Geotechnical services for the project.
26	Given the Dining Support facility's planned Spring 2027 opening, ahead of UHDS's new residence hall and dining buildings, is there a more specific target date for Certificate of Occupancy?	OSU will work with the Design Team and Contractor to develop a realistic schedule. It is desirable to have C of O by early 2027. The project team will adjust this schedule as needed to ensure project success.
27	Are there specific components to be included in the Programming phase deliverable? Does the programming deliverable need to include ROM pricing?	Nothing specific for programming. OSU will request ROM pricing for the SD deliverable, which will be developed by the CMGC with close collaboration from the Design Team. Programming need not contain project pricing, but should address major cost considerations.
28	Are there any typical owner and/or stakeholder review timelines that should be applied to the overall project schedule at the completion of each of the Design Phases and/or be incorporated during the Design Phases?	Plan reviews are typically scheduled at major milestones: SD, DD and 50% CD, and typically take two weeks to complete. Page-turn meetings can help expedite design review timelines and should be anticipated at each milestone.
29	What is the preferred approach to meetings? In Person? Web-hosted/Zoom/MS Teams?	This will be determined by the individuals on the Project Team, but is anticipated to be a mixture of in-person and remote.
30	Is there any more definition that UHDS already has in place in terms of how the commissary kitchen will be shared between different culinary professionals? Is it anticipated that culinary professionals will be included in the programming phase, potentially in a Focus Group meeting?	UHDS culinary professionals will be involved in all phases of design, with third party consultant informing only the programming phase. One to two focus group meetings should be anticipated during this design process.

31	Does the \$11-\$13 million dollar estimated construction cost include the Kitchen Equipment? Is the estimated construction cost to include demolition of the existing building (whether that be full or partial demo)?	The construction budget provided does not include owner furnished kitchen equipment. The construction budget should include any required demolition and site preparation. Design Team will support the development of the OFOI kitchen equipment bid package.
32	As there will be excavation for the site, and there is a chance this site may be considered historically significant, is there a need for State Historic Preservation Office to have a chance to review the findings?	No in depth Historic processes are anticipated for this project. OSU will submit a form to SHPO as needed for demolition.
33	Will the general contractor selection be made by UHDS/OSU or is that selection intended to be made with Design Team input?	OSU will select the CMGC. The design team is welcome to have a non-voting presence in the interviews.
34	At what phase is it anticipated to bring the general contractor on to the project team? Is it likely the general contractor will be engaged as early as the Programming Phase?	It is anticipated the CMGC will be brought in prior to Schematic Design. The CMGC will be asked to provide feedback on the Programming deliverable as soon as contracted, and work with the Design Team during SD.
35	At what phases is it intended to have Cost Estimates completed by the general contractor? Will it be cost estimates at phase completion only, or will there also be 50% phase cost estimates? Is there a minimum duration of time that should be allocated for the cost estimates to be completed? Should the Design Team anticipate pausing during this time?	OSU will request ROM pricing for the SD deliverable, which will be developed by the CMGC with close collaboration from the Design Team. Cost Estimates are typically requested for SD, DD and 50% CD phases. If budget is trending too high, a mid-point estimate may be requested in order for the team to manage the project budget. Pauses are not typical, but could be needed if the design is not closely trending within budget.
36	Is UHDS/OSU planning to hire a commissioning agent near the completion of construction prior to Final Occupancy? Or is commissioning a service that the Design Team should anticipate including?	OSU will contract with a third-party Commissioning Agent during the design process for collaboration prior to bidding as well as full commissioning of the project.
37	With utilizing a CMGC method and a general contractor coming on board, do you foresee wanting parallel cost estimates (one from the cost estimator and one from the GC) throughout all the design phases?	No.