

Questions and Answers for Merryfield Design RFP Addendum #1

Some additional questions:

1. Can you provide the names and titles of OSU staff who attended the pre-proposal conference?

Response: Thomas James (Construction Contracts Officer), Julie Drolet (Project Manager), Wade Marcum (Sr. Associate Dean - College of Engineering), Anton Grube (Director of Facilities – College of Engineering)

2. What is OSU's target construction cost budget? Is the \$6m cost shown in the cost estimate acceptable?

Response: The \$6m estimate is based on specific concept criteria and outdated construction start date is what we have right now. The construction cost budget to be confirmed during the Concept, Schematic Design, and Design Development phases.

3. What is OSU's target design schedule? Do you anticipate any important schedule milestones?

Response: OSU is not providing a schedule at this time, rather the RFP requests that the proposer prepare the appropriate project schedule as part of the evaluation criteria.

4. Would OSU like to see a lab design consultant on the project team?

Response: The Design Professional's team of consultants is as they see is appropriate for this project.

5. Regarding 7.8.2 key personnel, why does OSU want to see more information on staff employed for less than three years? What is the intent or concern?

Response: The intent is to review the staff's overall experience.

6. Regarding 7.8.2 key personnel, the list does not mention a project architect. Does OSU require a licensed project architect leading this project?

Response: If someone is listed as an Architect in the state of Oregon, they need to be licensed in the state of Oregon.

7. It does not appear that a concrete curing room is part of the program, can you confirm?

Response: The program is to be confirmed during the Concept and Schematic Design phases of the project; however, the Concrete (Covered) area is currently part of the Concept Design.

8. How will the facility handle combustible dusts generated by woodworking activities? Has any dust hazard analysis work been performed

Response: To be determined/confirmed as part of Schematic Design.

9. Has programming been completed as part of the concept phase? Will there be programming or additional programming as part of this scope, specifically to address how the user groups will share the maker space/shop? I believe that there was a brief mention of a discovery phase for this project, is that envisioned to work through programming?

Response: An updated program to be determined/confirmed as part of Concept and Schematic Design phases.

10. Can you provide examples of the classes that are taught in the lab space?

Response: To be discussed and confirmed in the Concept and Schematic Design phases.

11. Are there assigned researchers to the planned research space?

Response: To be discussed to the point applicable in the Concept and Schematic Design Phases.

12. Are we correct in assuming that OSU will direct all equipment and provide relevant specifications?

Response: To be determined and confirmed as part of Schematic Design process.

13. Can you clarify your anticipated structural scope? It doesn't sound like you are looking for any seismic improvements.

Response: To be confirmed as part of the Concept and Schematic Design process with the Design Professional's review of code requirements.

14. Can you clarify your anticipated acoustic expectations?

Response: To be determined/confirmed as part of Schematic Design.

15. At the preproposal meeting you mentioned that you haven't decided on a project delivery method and are looking at CMGC or DBB. As the method could have some impact on the scope and fee, when do you think you will determine the project delivery method?

Response: To be determined/confirmed as part of Schematic Design process.

16. In addition to our fee proposal you have asked for hourly rates, would you like this information for all potential subconsultant firms as well as the prime architecture firm?

Response: Providing rates for subconsultants is preferred.

17. Have there been any updates to the project budget since the 2023 cost estimate, and, if so, what is the current target for the construction budget?

Response: The Construction Budget is to be determined and will be confirmed as part of Schematic Design process.

18. Could you please make available the documents that are listed as the basis of the cost estimate but have not been provided as part of the RFP?

Response: The Concept Design was included as Exhibit 6 in the RFP. The Merryfield Hall Design Drawings dated 5/31/2018 (referenced in the Concept Cost Estimate as a reference) will be included as a new exhibit. Note, that these are design drawings, not approved permit drawings, not Record Drawings. To the extent of information that we have, Record Drawings and Legacy (older drawings) will be shared with the selected Design Professional Team.

19. Can the full Engineering Next master plan documents be made available?

Response: Information available to share regarding Engineering NEXT can be found at the following link:

<https://engineering.oregonstate.edu/engineering-next>

20. Section 1.2 references “Exhibit 6-N Wing Conceptual Design” and notes: “*Exterior landscape and site design to include outdoor teaching and student gathering, including display to celebrate student competitions such as the concrete canoe.*” However, Section 1.4, “Summary Of Work,” does not note any landscape/site design. Can the landscape/site design scope be clarified? Are “*Exhibit 6-N Wing Conceptual Design*” and “*Exhibit 7-Cost Estimate.pdf*” good guides for the anticipated scope?

Response: Section 1.4 Summary of Work to be modified to include the landscape and site design to include outdoor teaching and student gathering, including display to celebrate student competitions such as the concrete canoe as shown in the Conceptual Design..

21. Is it anticipated that any envelope upgrades or exterior deferred maintenance will be part of the scope of work? I.e., roof replacement, improved insulation/air sealing, brick repair, exterior door replacement, etc. Are “*Exhibit 6-N Wing Conceptual Design*” and “*Exhibit 7-Cost Estimate.pdf*” good guides for the anticipated scope?

Response: To be confirmed in Concept and Schematic Design phases of the work.

22. Was any seismic or energy analysis, including building envelope upgrades, conducted during the south wing project? If so, can those reports be made available?

Response: None have currently been found.

23. Is it known if the building is unreinforced masonry?

Response: Design Professional to review and confirm during Concept and Schematic Design phase including review of existing conditions and legacy documents (older documents on file that will be made available to the selected Design Professional).

24. Is there a preliminary equipment list that can be provided?

Response: To be determined as part of Concept, Schematic Design, and Design Development phases.

25. Are the windows original from 1907 or have they been replaced/modified since?

Response: To be reviewed and determined as part of existing conditions review in Concept and Schematic Design phase.

26. The provided Concept Design A1.01 delineates an area of work including the landscaped court and building entries. Does the Concept Design site extents align with the current project? OR, can you provide a diagram of site area to be included?

Response: Assume area of work aligns with Concept Design sheet A1.01.

27. The provided Concept Design documents show a covered and semi-enclosed porch to the south. Is this scope intended to move forward and to submitted through the HPP process?

Response: Yes, the design in the Concept Design documents to be reviewed and confirmed in the Schematic Design and Design Development phases. HRC submittal process assumed to occur in early Construction Documents phase, though to be planned for in Schematic Design & Design Development phases.

28. "Partial West Wing structural reinforcement," is indicated on the 2024 cost estimate, is structural seismic improvement intended as part of this scope of work?

Response: The required structural design required to meet code to be confirmed with Schematic Design and Design Development design services.

29. Review of Existing Conditions is outlined as scope of work. Will the Design Team be provided access to any concealed conditions, via deconstructive demolition? Or will this scope be specifically tied to the review of visible conditions at Merryfield Hall and the completed building conditions assessment from OSU Facilities Services and the Capital Improvement & Renewal Project Manager.

Response: Deconstructive demolition will not be occurring during Concept, Schematic Design or Design Development phases.

30. Should the Concept/Schematic Design phase include Programming or is the building program completed? What level of stakeholder engagement (faculty, students, campus) should be anticipated by the Design Team.

Response: Yes. Concept & Schematic Design should include confirmation and clarification of Programming including typical OSU engagement with OSU Steering Committee, users (faculty & students), OSU Facilities, and others as determined for this specific project.

31. On the provided Design Professional Fee Form, FF&E is included for Schematic Design and Design Development, although there is no description of this scope within the RFP. Should it be assumed that these are also a part of the scope? If so, what description of scope of work is intended?

Response: The scope for FFE is to be confirmed as part of the Concept & Schematic Design services. The Design Professional to specify the confirmed required new furniture.

32. Review of Existing Conditions is not included in the provided Design Professional Fee Form. Should this be included separately, outside of Schematic Design and Design Development?

Response: Review of existing conditions is part of the Design Professional scope of services within Concept, Schematic Design & Design Development.

33. Should the Design Team plan to prepare a draft package, final package, or prepare for approval through HPP in this first contract or is OSU intending this to occur after Design Development phase?

Response: HRC submittal process should be assumed to start in early Construction Document phase; however, design steps & discussion to occur in Schematic Design & Design Development towards that path.

34. For scheduling purposes, does OSU anticipate that the project budget will exceed the \$10M cap that requires Board of Trustee stage gate reviews?

Response: Scheduling for the RFP is through Design Development at this time. The initial project budget is to be determined and confirmed in the Schematic Design and Design

Development phases. Pending the timing to move forward additional escalation costs and current bid climate will be reviewed and the overall project budget will be confirmed.

35. The “Exhibit 2-Design Professional Fee Form” has cells for “Furniture, Fixtures, Equip. (FFE)” fees. Can it be clarified what OSU is looking for? This is typically a budget line item but not something we see as fee request.

Response: We are asking the Design Professional team to provide design services to confirm and specify required furniture.

36. In order to establish a proposed team and fee proposal, has the University determined which OSU approved external or internal green building rating system this project will need to comply with?

Response: Follow OSU Design & Construction Standards and OSU Requirements for Sustainable Development (RSD). Link for RSD: <https://sustainability.oregonstate.edu/operations/green-building/requirements-sustainable-development>

37. Our understanding is that this project will go through the HRC process. For the portion of the project reflected in this RFP (services through DD), can you confirm that the scope includes design team production of HRC Review Documents and support OSU through the HRC Approval Process prior to obtaining full funding? Or will the HRC process take place at a later date once funding is secured, and the project moves into CDs?

Response: HRC submittal process should be assumed to start in early Construction Document phase; however, design steps & discussion to occur in Schematic Design & Design Development towards that path.

38. Can OSU confirm if a seismic assessment is available, and whether or not a seismic upgrade for this portion of Merryfield Hall is anticipated to be part of the project scope?

Response: There is no seismic assessment available. The Design Professional to review code requirements to confirm seismic upgrades. This will be further discuss in Concept and Schematic Design. See the existing Conceptual Design and associated Construction Cost Estimate plus work indicated in the South Wing Design documents.

39. What are the planned next steps selected team delivers DD documents?

Response: OSU will confirm next steps after review of the estimated construction cost. Pending funding, the hope is to continue into Construction Documents and Construction.

40. Is OSU considering a progress design build (PDB) delivery?

Response: OSU will confirm the delivery method in the early design phases.

41. We see that proposers are asked to provide a schedule for the scope of work. Is there a preferred project timeline for completing this phase of work or key milestones to address?

Response: The schedule for this scope of services is as needed per the Design Professional's understanding of what is needed per the RFP and working with OSU.