

**ADDENDUM NUMBER 2
TO
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS # 08-23**

Request for Proposals Title: Development Feasibility Analysis for a Living Building, the Sustainability Center of Excellence in Portland, Oregon

Date this Addendum Issued: February 2, 2009

Solicitation Coordinator: Daniel Spero, CPPB
Senior Procurement Specialist
Professional Services
Portland Development Commission
(503) 823-3291 (office)
(503) 865-3738 (fax to email)
sperod@pdc.us (email)

PURPOSE OF THIS ADDENDUM:

The Portland Development Commission (“PDC”) is issuing this Addendum Number 2 to the above-referenced Request for Proposals (the “RFP”) to: i) answer questions about the RFP raised by potential proposers; ii) modify the “Schedule of Solicitation and Contract Award Events” and “Project Schedule” in the RFP; and, iii) clarify a portion of the project background on page 5 of the RFP.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:

- This Addendum constitutes an integral part of the RFP and shall be read in conjunction with the RFP
- Where inconsistent with the RFP, or any previous Addendum to the RFP, this Addendum shall govern
- It is the responsibility of all Proposers to conform to this Addendum
- Unless specifically changed herein, all other requirements, terms and conditions of the RFP remain unchanged and can only be modified if in writing by PDC

PART I. CLARIFICATION OF THE RFP

PDC received several questions regarding the Phase 2 activities listed in Section III (A) of the RFP (page 5). To address these questions, the following replaces the paragraph that begins “If, after the Feasibility Study is delivered...” in Section III (A) on page 5 of the RFP:

"The selected Proposer and Project Team as a whole must possess the skills, experience and expertise to both i) fulfill the Scope of Work for Phase 1 of the Sustainability Project (Section IV of the RFP), and ii) design and construct the Sustainability Center (possible Phase 2). There are no specific requirements or preferences as to the type of organization (e.g. design firm, general contractor, developer) that is designated to serve as the Proposer or Project Team leader; however, the Proposal must address why the Project Team make-up and organizational structure can best meet the RFP and Project needs and requirements.

"The Project Team may, but need not, include a developer. However, the Project Team must include experienced members who can perform certain functions that are often provided by developers (e.g. development of financial pro formas, project management and coordination, etc.).

"If the project is deemed feasible as a result of Phase 1, a determination will be made respecting whether to proceed with Phase 2, and in what manner. If the decision is made to proceed with Phase 2, it is possible Phase 2 will be accomplished by entering into one or more agreements for the Phase 2 work. The agreement(s) will include design, construction, project management and other services necessary to successfully complete Phase 2 of the Project. The delivery method for Phase 2 has not been determined, but may be design/build, design/bid/build, CM/GC or some other form of delivery. The agreement(s) may be with one or more of the Phase 1 Project Team or with other firms. These firms must be able to demonstrate that they meet the contracting policies and requirements and any bonding requirements of the City, PDC and/or OUS. The selection may be through available alternatives or special procurement methods. The Phase 2 agreements may also address the roles and responsibilities of the various tenants and/or future owners including but not limited to OUS, Portland Community College, City of Portland, PDC, P+OSI and LBI."

Other questions PDC has received regarding this RFP are answered as follows:

Question 1. How will the "Promotion of M/W/ESB Firm in Subcontracting Opportunities" criterion in Section V (G) of the RFP be evaluated?

PDC Response: The "Promotion of M/W/ESB Firm in Subcontracting Opportunities" evaluation criterion, described in Section V (G) of the RFP, will be evaluated in accordance with PDC's prescribed evaluation methods: review of the information submitted in each responsive Proposer's proposal. Note there are four principal items in Section V (G) of the RFP: 1) Proposer's description of past experience promoting M/W/ESB firms as partners, subcontractor, etc.; 2) Innovative or successful methods taken to provide business opportunities to M/W/ESB firms; 3) Proposer's description of proposed and future efforts to promote M/W/ESB firms; 4) Plan to include any M/W/ESB firms as subcontractors on a contract awarded from this RFP (if applicable). The stronger the response on the Proposer's part for these items, collectively, the more points will be awarded to that Proposer for this criterion.

Question 2. Could you explain the difference between "Quality Assurance" in Section V (B) and "Quality Control" in Section V (E) of the RFP? Are we to answer in both places?

PDC Response: By "Quality Assurance" (Section V (B) of the RFP), PDC refers to any systematic processes and procedures the Proposer and their Team Members typically undertake to eliminate or minimize mistakes and errors in their work products. Such quality assurance processes and procedures may refer to certain management techniques, statistical control, inspection methods, etc. By "Quality Control" (Section V (E) of the RFP), PDC refers to any techniques, methods and processes each Proposer proposes

to meet or exceed PDC's requirements in relation to the Scope of Work described in the RFP, including those techniques, methods and processes to assure the same level of quality of other Proposer's Project Team members (i.e. partners, consultants and subcontractors). This information, along with the other submittal requirements set forth in Section V of the RFP, are required.

Question 3. Regarding Section V (F) of the RFP, "Price Proposal," does PDC want to see fees for **all** team members' personnel hours? Or does PDC want to see a portion of the fees only for the "key personnel" identified in proposal?

*PDC Response: To be responsive to this evaluation criterion, Proposers must list the estimated hours and fixed hourly rate (i.e. no hourly ranges) for all named "key personnel" who will perform work on the Project for Phase I. However, if Proposer proposes necessary but unnamed personnel in their proposal (e.g. CAD drafters, other technical staff, clerical assistance, etc.), names are not necessary, but estimated hours and hourly rates (not hourly ranges) are required. Essentially, **all** proposed costs and expenses must to be accounted for in the Proposer's Price Proposal, but only for the Phase 1 work required in the Scope of Work of the RFP (Section IV).*

Question 4. Regarding the Streetcar alignment adjacent to the Project Site, what information is publicly available?

PDC Response: Proposers are directed to the two (2) concept-level "Proposed Streetcar Alignments" drawings on the PDC website here:

http://www.pdc.us/pubs/inv_detail.asp?id=914&ty=15

Both the single-track and double-track options are being discussed; though various stakeholders have indicated that the double-track option is preferred. Note that these drawings are still at the concept-level stage of development.

Part II. Changes to the RFP.

Change 1. Section II of the RFP, "Schedule of Solicitation and Contract Award Events" is hereby deleted and replaced with the following (changes from the RFP in bold underline):

"RFP Issued	January 7, 2009
Pre-Proposal Meeting, Voluntary	January 23, 2009***
Deadline for Proposer Questions and Request(s) for Change(s)	<u>February 6, 2009</u>
Proposal Due Date and Time	<u>February 18, 2009 by 3:00 PM</u> (Pacific Time)
Finalist Interviews	<u>To Be Determined</u>
Evaluation Period, Ending (<i>tentative</i>)	<u>March 4, 2009</u>
Notice of Intent to Award, Issued (<i>tentative</i>)	<u>March 5, 2009</u>
Deadline for Protest of Intent to Award	<i>Seven (7) calendar days after Notice of Intent to Award</i>
Anticipated Contract Execution Date (<i>tentative</i>)	<u>March 18, 2009</u>

Change 2. The paragraph that begins “If, after the Feasibility Study is delivered...” in Section III (A) on page 5 of the RFP is hereby deleted and replaced with the quoted text in the first item of Part I of the this Addendum Number 2.

Change 3. “Question and ‘PDC Response’ #3” in Addendum Number 1 to the RFP is hereby deleted and replaced with the following (changes from the original in bold underline):

“Question 3. If the project is feasible and completed, who is likely to own the Sustainability Center?

*PDC Response: Details of the ownership structure are not known at this time; though it is possible that ownership will be a condominium model where multiple parties have an interest in the property. Likely owners **and/or tenants** under this scenario would be the City of Portland, the Oregon University System, Portland Community College and some Living Building Initiative members.”*

Change 4. The schedule of dates in the “Project Schedule” section IV (B) of the RFP is hereby deleted and replaced with the following (changes from the RFP in bold underline):

“PROJECT SCHEDULE	
Tasks, Activities and Deliverables	Estimate Performance Period / Deliverable Due Date
Anticipated Contract Execution Date	On or around <u>March 18, 2009</u>
Review of existing PDC due diligence	<u>April 3, 2009</u>
Determination of additional due diligence	<u>April 10, 2009</u>
Code modification application underway (if requested)	<u>April 10, 2009</u>
Development program (square footage breakdown, massing/site plan/elevations (integrating streetcar and station), plan for Living Building Standards and LEED Platinum designation)	<u>May 29, 2009</u>
Development Budget (costs/uses, partner financing sources, alternative funding sources)	<u>May 29, 2009</u>
Project Schedule (Phase 1 activities, through full development scenario)	<u>May 29, 2009</u>
Anticipated Contract Expiration Date	On or around <u>June 12, 2009</u> ”

Those deliverable due dates in Sections IV (A) (1) – (4) of the RFP that correspond with revised deliverable due dates in this updated “Project Schedule” above are hereby deleted and replaced with the corresponding dates above.

END OF THIS ADDENDUM