

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL #2020-011

University of Southern Maine (USM) Public-Private Partnership for Portland Campus Student Housing & Student Center

RESPONSE ADDENDUM #05

DATE: August 30, 2019

QUESTIONS

Please see below for responses to questions submitted as a part of the Portland Campus Student Housing & Student Center RFP process:

1. In the appendix, when you click on the Site Topography link you get an RFP. Could you please correct and resend this file? A Topo map would be helpful.

RESPONSE: The Appendix I file has been updated and you should now be able to access the site topography map via the following link: <http://www.maine.edu/strategic-procurement/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2019/08/Appendix-I-Site-Topography-Map.pdf>
2. Are you able to email me the GC bidders or plan holders list for this project, or direct me on where to get it? Thanks in advance.

RESPONSE: The firms selected to participate in the RFP are posted on the Strategic Procurement website via the following link:
<http://www.maine.edu/strategic-procurement/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2019/08/RFQ-2019-075-Selection-List.pdf>
3. Since the RFP is being issued to a select group of developers, may we have the list of firms that got the RFP so we can approach them about joining their team?

RESPONSE: Please see the response for question #2.
4. Is the University System contemplating procuring owner's representation services to assist the System in managing P3 projects? The University of Massachusetts Building Authority recently prequalified several firms to be the owner's representative on the Authority's P3 projects, and we are one of those prequalified firms.

RESPONSE: At this time, the University of Maine System is not soliciting for an owner's representative for P3 projects.
5. The campus master plan shows the new student center connecting to Sullivan. Is this also the intent for the purposes of the RFP?

RESPONSE: For the purposes of this proposal, do not include the connection to Sullivan.

6. There is an existing campus center on a portion of the project site. Does the team need to consider phasing, to allow the existing facility to remain operational during construction?

RESPONSE: No, the University is currently planning to temporarily relocate the functions in the Woodbury Campus Center elsewhere on the Portland campus during construction.

Note, however, that the site is anticipated to be used in a phased way. The Facilities Management building currently located at 25 Bedford Street is anticipated to be standing and operational throughout construction and at the completion of the Student Center and Phase 1 of Student Housing (included in this project and RFP). The Facilities Management building site will be considered for the potential future construction of Phase 2 of Student Housing (not included in this project and RFP).

7. For the student housing, does the University have a specific resident cohort in mind (e.g. upperclassmen, etc.)?

RESPONSE: Yes. Student housing on the Portland campus will be available to junior and senior undergraduate students, law students, and graduate students. Please refer to Addendum 2: Appendix K – Market Analysis.

8. What is the approximate square footage of the three existing structures to be demolished?

RESPONSE: For the Student Center and Student Housing Project, there is one existing structure for demolition: Woodbury Campus Center – 28,256 GSF. Drawings for this building will be provided in a separate addendum.

9. Appendix C-1: Please clarify the discrepancy with Unit Type A where the Quantity number (220) does not match the Total Beds (206). Is this discrepancy related to the Non-Revenue Beds (14).

RESPONSE: Yes. In the conceptual program, the total number of beds for unit type A is 220. This includes 206 revenue generating beds as well as 14 non-revenue beds for RAs.

10. In order to more accurately plan and program the central quad or courtyard, could the University provide more information about the anticipated uses of this quad? In addition to pedestrian circulation, what active or passive or recreational activities are contemplated, like beach volleyball?

RESPONSE: The University currently anticipates a “formal” student life quad resulting from the Campus Master Planning effort. In addition to pedestrian circulation, the University assumes that the quad should be able to accommodate special events and activities rather than specifically programmed recreational uses like beach volleyball.

11. Has an official determination been made as to whether the P3 project will be subject to the recently instituted City of Portland impact fees, or whether this project will be exempt from these fees? If no official determination has been made, what is the University's expectation in this regard? What should proposers assume relative to these fees?

RESPONSE: Developer teams should assume that City of Portland impact fees apply to this project.

12. Will this project be subject to sales taxes on construction materials?

RESPONSE: Our understanding is that any and all projects done for UMS are tax exempt, regardless of who procures the materials or services, as provided by law.

The Maine Revenue Services Sales/Excise Tax Division provides a Contractor's Exempt Purchase Certificate. This certificate provides a mechanism for a contractor engaged in the performance of a construction contract, for an exempt organization or government entity where the purchases of materials will be permanently incorporated in the real property belonging to the exempt organization or government agency, to certify that such purchases are exempt from sales/excise tax. See: <https://www1.maine.gov/revenue/forms/sales/STP72.pdf>

As provided in statute: "Exemption certificates issued by the State Tax Assessor pursuant to section 1760 must identify the exempt activity and must state that the certificate may be used by the holder only when purchasing property or services intended to be used by the holder primarily in the exempt activity. If the holder of an exemption certificate furnishes that certificate to a person for use in purchasing tangible personal property or taxable services that are physically incorporated in, and become a permanent part of, real property that is not used by the holder of the certificate primarily in the exempt activity, the State Tax Assessor may assess the unpaid tax against the holder of the certificate as provided in section 141."

13. Can USM clarify whether the University or the private partner will be responsible for facility maintenance and asset management of the proposed student center?

RESPONSE: USM would like for the developer teams to propose facility maintenance and asset management services for the student center. The University will evaluate the value proposition against the University's self-operation prior to making a final determination.

14. We understand that key cores for door locks must be obtained through USM. Can USM clarify whether the University expects the developer to be responsible for the storage and management of keys in the residential facility, or does the University expect to accept this responsibility?

RESPONSE: USM will accept the responsibility of storing and managing the residential facility keys. In addition, building access should utilize the card access system outlined in Addendum 3: Appendix M: UMS IT Standards. The University would consider an option of a card access only system throughout the residential facility.

15. Who is responsible for maintaining the hardscape and landscape on the exterior of the new P3 housing and student center facilities (beyond say 5 to 10' outside the buildings)? Who is expected to perform snow removal?

RESPONSE: USM will be responsible for maintaining the hardscape and landscape on the exterior of the new facilities beyond the standard of 5-10' outside of the project. USM will also be responsible for snow removal.

16. Having the University-commissioned market demand study and related information is important to inform proposers design, construction, development and operational planning responses to the RFP. Please advise the date that these studies, as well as other due diligence information, will be distributed. We hope this will be soon.
RESPONSE: The Market Analysis was posted as Addendum #02 on August 21, 2019 and can be accessed via the following link: <http://www.maine.edu/strategic-procurement/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2019/08/RFP-2020-011-Addendum-2.pdf>
17. Page 1 of the RFP states that the response deadline time is 11:59 PM EST and the table on Page 21 identifies a time deadline of 5:00 pm EDT. Please clarify what the time deadline is for proposals.
RESPONSE: The correct response deadline time is 11:59 PM EST via electronic delivery.
18. Please advise as to whether all rental rates should be structured as academic year or calendar year.
RESPONSE: For the purposes of consistent modeling, all rental rates should be structured by academic year. Please also assume summer revenue consistent with revenue during the academic year.
19. We understand from our civil/site engineer's prior experience on campus, the University may utilize outside legal counsel during the approvals process, however is it the intent of the University (per pages 10 and 11 of the RFP) to contract directly with the developer's civil/site engineer (or other to be chosen by the University) to prepare applications drawings and narratives, make submissions, meet with City and Maine DEP staff, attend Neighborhood and Planning Board meetings, etc to secure local and state planning and zoning approvals, OR should the developer's scope and Project Budget include these services by it's civil/site engineer?
RESPONSE: The developer's scope and project budget should include the preparation of applications drawings and narratives, submissions, and approvals meetings.
20. Are there any drawings available for my contacts to bid off of?
RESPONSE: The University will be providing additional drawings regarding the existing conditions of the Woodbury Campus Center in a separate Addendum.
21. Are there any wage reqs?
RESPONSE: All UMS projects typically follow the ME State wage determination for Cumberland County in the year in which the project starts unless it is federally funded (Davis-Bacon would apply here).
22. Can the university provide additional information on their expectations of the net assignable square footage prescribed in appendix C-1 and those relationships to incidental circulation and clearances within the individual unit types? Should we assume the NASF accounts for this unassigned square footage, or is the unassigned square footage addressed by the efficiency factor? It is evident the

University is making a concerted effort to encourage proposals that are based on the same facts and assumptions, and thus can be compared on an apples-to-apples basis. Despite that good faith effort, without the clarification requested herein there is concern that proposers may interpret the requirements differently, or propose units based on different assumptions— without those differences being clearly indicated.

RESPONSE: The University used the square footage assumptions in Appendix C-1 during the assessment of the project's financial feasibility prior to the issuance of the RFP. The assumptions were provided in the RFP to serve as background information as opposed to a dictation of the square footage requirements to the design team. USM is looking to the developer teams to use creativity, efficiency, and their expertise within these building typologies to drive the highest and best value in their submission.

In direct response to the question, incidental circulation and clearances within the individual unit types were assumed to be addressed by the efficiency factor.