

## REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL #2020-011

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

#### RESPONSE ADDENDUM #13

**DATE: September 9, 2019**

#### **CLARIFICATION**

#### **QUESTIONS**

1. In Addendum #07 the site limits for the student housing were made which makes the site smaller. Since our proposal in part is judged and scored by compliance with the campus plan, we assume the academic quadrangle space must be respected. The impact is that in order to achieve the bed count of 550 beds the residence increases in the number of stories, which likely increases the construction cost due to high-rise code impacts. Please advise if this is the intended impact of avoiding the facilities building site.

**RESPONSE:** Regarding the site limits, please refer to Response Addendum #10 for further clarification on Response Addendum #07. Yes, the academic quadrangle space must be respected. Possible avoidance of the Facilities building site is not based on increasing the number of stories and associated impacts.

2. Regarding the residential phasing possibilities, we interpreted the original RFP to be asking for a proposal to include 550 beds, as is described in Appendix C-1. With the recent language regarding phasing in Addendum 7, to confirm, is the University requesting proposals for 550 beds across the entire project site, including the Facilities Management building portion of the site? If this is the case, would the University be looking for less than 550 on the non-Facilities Management portion of the site (a potential phase 1), with the balance of this 550 total coming in a second phase on this portion? Or, is the University looking for 550 beds in a phase 1 on the portion of the site without the Facilities Management building, and then even more beds than 550 for phase 2?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, please submit a proposal for 550 beds across the entire Project site (the entire site as shown in the original RFP). Please also discuss the impact to the Project should the Project site for the 550 beds be reduced to the site provided in Addendum #07 (the non-Facilities Management portion of the site). Any potential future phases would involve beds in addition to the 550 included in this Project.

3. Regarding the relocation of the Facilities Management building, we'd like clarification. In the RFP section 5.2, USM states it is handling the relocation of existing occupants of demolished buildings in the project site. What cost regarding FM relocation is USM asking us to include? For example, moving the interior contents to another building on campus?

**RESPONSE:** In your development budget, please include a project cost of \$2.0 Million for the full

reconstruction of the Facilities Management building on an alternative site. Section 5.2 is now amended to read:

***Two structures currently exist on the Project site: the Woodbury Campus Center (28,256 GSF) and the Facilities Management Building at 25 Bedford Street (9,744 GSF).*** USM will be responsible for relocating existing occupants, and the existing structures will be turned over clean and hazmat-free. The Developer will be responsible for demolition at the commencement of the Project. The Developer will need to incorporate the cost of demolition of both existing structures in their development budget. ***The Developer is requested to also include an upfront capital contribution to the University at closing of \$2.0 Million, which the University will use toward the cost of rebuilding a relocated Facilities Management building.***

4. Was this Addendum 7 reduction all about deferring (NOT AVOIDING), the cost of demo of the FM Building? Is this FM demo going to be at a cost premium?  
RESPONSE: The University wishes to understand the potential positive or negative impacts of including vs. deferring the cost of demolition and relocation of the Facilities Management building. The University is not considering the impacts of deferring or inclusion due to any anticipated cost premium.