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ADDENDUM #2

Addendum #2 is added and shall become part RFP document posted on August 21, 2023. Respondents shall acknowledge receipt of this Addendum on their proposal.

Responses to Questions

1. Additional project information is as follows:
   a. To help visualize some of the interdisciplinary collaboration in fields that do not yet exist, you may gain some inspiration on the “Digital Transformation” from these videos:
      1. DID YOU KNOW 2022 - YouTube (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cDJWPu6G9j0&t=66s)
      2. Digital transformation: are you ready for exponential change? Futurist Keynote Speaker Gerd Leonhard - YouTube (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ystdf6jN7hc)

2. Questions submitted during the informational meeting and their responses are as follows:
   a. We have a potential consulting partner whose application to the official TG/ED/VO list is still pending, although their information has been submitted. Can we include this partner as part of our 10% commitment with an understanding that the application needs to be approved prior to beginning the project? Yes, businesses must be certified by the due date/time of the proposal in order to be considered toward goals or preferences. Our team tries to work with vendors who have applied and are waiting on certification if we are notified by them that they have a potential opportunity that hinges on certification. While we can’t always accommodate those requests, we do try whenever possible to expedite those reviews. Once we have all of the vendor’s information, we present the application to our certification committee for approval.
   b. The RFP requires a cost consultant separate from the design team. There is also a CM selection to follow the RFP. If the cost consultant is also a Construction Manager, will they be precluded from pursuing the CM selection? Correct. If a CM is on the design
team, they have a perceived unfair advantage over the other CM proposers. In addition, it is not acceptable for a company to be paid from both sides of the table (Owner through the Design Team and Owner-direct). It is considered a conflict of interest.

c. Can you please confirm that the items listed in the Predesign Construction Budget Accommodations (p. 166) are in addition to the estimated project budget for all phases of $77M? Are design services anticipated to be negotiated for these items as needed or possibly by others? The Construction Budget Accommodations are included in the project budget, see paragraph above the table on p 166 “The following table is provided for clarification of specialty scopes of work addressed within this budget and report. Summary costs are broken out for these specific areas of scope as a means of highlighting the included dollars for reference.” Additional details can be found in the following line-item budget. Design of these items is included in the scope of design services.

d. Are there long-term plans for Prentiss-Lucas Hall? Prentiss and Lucas Halls are not considered a long-term asset. Please refer to the Comprehensive Facilities Plan. Our Brilliant Tomorrow (adobe.com)

e. Can MN State University lighting standards be evaluated and adjusted in consideration of microclimate, daylighting, and pedagogical research analyses? There is a variance process that can be used by the design team to request and document variations to our Minnesota State Facilities Design Standards.

f. In the Project Experience section, is the team required to provide relevant projects for all the team disciplines including consultants, or is it optional to provide examples for the expanded team other than the architect? The prime firm should provide relevant projects recently completed or in progress and do not need to provide for all team disciplines. They also can include examples from the expanded team.

g. What type of embodied carbon analysis was completed for the existing facilities (Gildemeister Hall and Watkins Hall)? And, what were the findings? An embodied carbon analysis has not been performed for Gildemeister and Watkins Halls. Analysis of these buildings should be included in total project embodied carbon analysis.

h. In general, what are WSU’s current administrative office and faculty office occupancy/utilization rates? The office utilization rate in Gildemeister and Watkins Halls is 66%, which is similar to the overall campus utilization rates. In many cases, substandard space conditions and layouts contribute to the low utilization rates.
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