**ADDENDUM NO. 14** 

March 24, 2021

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (BID DOCUMENTS)

FOR

## STUDENT HEALTH AND COUNSELING CENTER PROJECT NO. 950578





The following changes, additions, or deletions shall be made to the following documents as indicated for this Project; and all other terms and conditions shall remain the same. Each Proposer (Design Builder) is responsible for transmitting this information to all affected subcontractors and suppliers before the Proposal Deadline.

## 1. <u>REQUEST FOR INFORMATION</u>

| RFI No. | QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS  |
|---------|--|
| 161     | <ul> <li>Question: Plumbing BOD section 11.2 calls for an electric air-to water heat pump which requires a storage tank, an additional re-heat tank, and two recirc pumps. To save project costs, is it acceptable to use a standard electric storage tank water heater with a recirc pump?</li> <li>Answer: Yes, this is acceptable.</li> </ul>   |
| 162     | <ul> <li>Question: In the original Division 0 RFP Docs there was a folder named "21 Campus Standards", however, this folder was empty. There is a separate folder named "5-Division 2-33" which contains spec sections by discipline. Please confirm the provided Division 2-33 spec sections are the campus standards.</li> <li>Answer: The Campus standards were originally included on the folder. However, at some point, they disappeared. Then, they were re-posted on 3/3/2021 under the same folder: 3-RFP Documents/1-Division 0 – RFP Documents/21 Campus Standards.</li> </ul>  |
| 163     | <ul> <li>Question: Lump Sum Base Price Proposal Spreadsheet, divisions 0 through 33, is asking for itemized pricing breakouts by individual spec sections. It is not feasible to accurately break down the numbers in this manner as many of the trade costs are priced as assemblies, not by spec section or component. To further complicate the matter, many individual spec sections are applicable to multiple trades' scope of work. Is it acceptable to provide a lump sum breakdown by division in lieu of spec sections?</li> <li>Answer: Please follow the requested format and complete the form as accurately as possible at this point. We understand that there is a level of inaccuracy at this point and we understand that this will change as the project progresses.</li> </ul> |
| 164     | <ul> <li>Question: Addendum No. 6, RFI No. 90 indicated today, March 18th was the deadline. With the proposal due date pushed to April 20th, can you please confirm the RFI deadline is also pushed?</li> <li>Answer: Yes. Last Day for RFI's is Thursday, April 8, 2021.</li> </ul>   |



| RFI No. | QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS  |
|---------|--|
| 165     | <b>Question:</b> Technical Proposal Tab 10 and Price Proposal Form Section 8.0 are calling for 3 project alternates. Regardless of whether these alternate costs are included in the base bid or not, the Proposal Evaluation Process indicates the Total Project Cost is to include the cost of these alternates. Does the University see any assignable scoring point value in receiving additional alternate options in addition to the 3 listed alternates that would not affect the Total Project Cost calculation? In other words, if additional alternates are provided, would they be considered in the evaluation and scoring of Tab 10, however, not be included in the calculation of the Total Project Cost? |
|         | <b>Answer:</b> Features not identified as alternates will be categorized and scored as<br>enhancements. It is not in University's best interest to add Alternates at this time. Options<br>that may improve the project that add cost, may be considered after award and during design<br>development. Additional improvements that can be provided within the MAC should be<br>identified as enhancements to the scope requested in the BOD. Generally, those may be<br>scored in the Enhancements tab, but may also impact points in other areas such as<br>Architectural Design, Sustainability or Program Functionality.   |

## END OF ADDENDUM