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UW Tacoma Milgard Hall
Project No. 205854

Submittal Deadline Date: No later than 3:00 PM, January 7, 2020

1.1 INTRODUCTION: The University of Washington (University or UW) is soliciting Statements of Qualifications (SOQ) from qualified design-build firms (which may include joint ventures) to design and construct the UW Tacoma Milgard Hall. The Owner’s intent is to utilize a phased approach to select the design-build team. The Owner will select the builder only with this RFQ and RFP process, and then work collaboratively with the selected builder to then select the design architect and, subsequently, all other team members. For purposes of this and subsequent selection and contract documents, the builder is referred to as the Design-Builder. The process for selecting the design architect is described in Attachment 5, Design Architect Selection Process.

The facility will be approximately 50,000 square feet and provide additional classroom space for the continued overall growth of UW Tacoma’s academic programs. This interdisciplinary building will be a unique innovation space on campus and will provide a front door to welcome the University’s business partners and incoming students. It will also fill a need in the South Sound for STEM programming. The primary programs include the emerging Mechanical Engineering program, the growth of Milgard Business School, and the creation of a central collaboration space that will leverage connections across all campus programs. This space will help bring together intellectual property from disparate departments to create community-based solutions, furthering the education of UW Tacoma students, fostering the University’s urban-serving mission, and driving use-inspired research deeper into the South Puget Sound region.

In accordance with RCW 39.10.300, et seq., the UW will utilize a progressive design-build approach for the procurement and delivery of the project, meaning that the Design-Builder will be selected primarily on the basis of qualifications. This approach does not require design or a complete project price proposal during the selection process. The selected Design-Builder will work collaboratively with the UW in the complete development and delivery of the project.

The UW fully embraces the principles of collaboration and integrated project delivery that emphasize a cooperative approach to problem solving. Toward that end, the UW expects the design-build team, as part of the project team, to deliver this project by creating a culture of open and honest communication, utilizing Lean principles efficiently and effectively, and establishing a collaborative environment where the project team contributes its best efforts for the benefit of the project as a whole.
1.2 BASIS FOR UTILIZATION OF THE DESIGN-BUILD PROCESS: The University is utilizing the Design-Build alternative public works contracting procedure authorized under chapter 39.10 RCW. This project delivery method is appropriate for this project because it meets the following criteria listed in RCW 39.10.300:

(a) The construction activities are highly specialized and a design-build approach is critical in developing the construction methodology;
(b) The project provides opportunity for greater innovation or efficiencies between the designer and the builder; and
(c) Significant savings in project delivery time would be realized.

1.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Milgard Hall will be an innovation showcase on campus through its programming, design and construction. This facility will provide spaces for a new Mechanical Engineering program, including critical teaching labs, related faculty and staff offices, and support spaces. It will also be a home for the Milgard School of Business with large, flexible teaching and collaborative spaces that fit current pedagogies and be flexible over time. A key element of this home will be collaborative space with a public face for the various Centers that connect students to research, industry partners, and employment. Lastly, it will provide campus-wide spaces, to meet the growing demand for large format classrooms and group rooms.

The predesign team utilized focus groups, support from peer institutions, questionnaires, building visits, and registrar data analysis to identify the types and sizes of spaces required to meet program and campus needs and goals. Business school pedagogy and campus-wide need for efficiency drove the request for large classrooms with adjacent group rooms. Adding a new Mechanical Engineering program requires specialized labs, the general specifications for which were outlined by the lab consultant, with input from the University and the design team. Office and support space are a small portion of the identified need, included to accommodate new faculty and staff, primarily for Mechanical Engineering.

Another key element of the program is creating a home with a public face for the Milgard Business School’s many Centers, and Engineering’s growing Centers. This will not only make these critical resources accessible to students and business/industry partners, but will also offer opportunities for collaboration between the Business and Engineering programs. The hub for Innovation Centers includes spaces like interview rooms and a boardroom, ideal for connecting students to professionals, and therefore job opportunities. Unscheduled collaboration space offers opportunities for innovative interdisciplinary work, while meeting the particular needs of Business School students, who typically have group assignments but struggle to find space to work together.

To the extent the budget and program will allow, we intend to use innovative mass timber products. The manufacturer of these products is expected to be an integral part of the team to ensure availability of products, reduce potential delays in re-design and make suggestions based on best practices.

Goals
The UW wants to engage with a design-builder in a robust goal-setting process at the beginning of the project. This early work is very critical, as all choices throughout the building process will be made on the basis of whether they further the realization of project goals.

Current Project Goals are as follows:
- Add labs and support spaces to allow UW Tacoma to start a high-demand Mechanical Engineering program
- Meet existing and new Business School needs by providing appropriately sized and configured classrooms and associated collaboration areas.
- Connect Engineering and Business disciplines in a way that fosters innovation and entrepreneurship and leverages existing industry partnerships.
- Pursue ambitious sustainable strategies to meet the State of Washington’s goals for reducing CO2 emissions and promoting economic growth.
- Utilize Mass Timber Construction methods as the budget and program allows.

Integrated Design-Build: delivering excellence through design
The UW is looking for a Design-Build team with a proven track record of excellence in design through an integrated delivery process. The UW has a long, prestigious history of excellence in the built environment, and we seek the same design and delivery experience in our Design-Build teams.

The highest-ranked Design-Build team will present clear methods and ideas to fully recognize the value of this delivery method by aligning to the following building blocks of integrated delivery:

Mutual Respect & Trust
As modeled by daily interactions, Owner, designer, consultants, constructor, subcontractors and suppliers will understand the value of collaboration and commit to working as a team in the best interests of the project.

Mutual Benefit & Reward
Integrated Design-Build requires early involvement by more parties, and our compensation structures recognize and reward early involvement. Compensation is based on the value added by an organization and it rewards “what’s best for project” behavior, such as by providing incentives tied to achieving project goals. Teams should use innovative and lean business models to support collaboration and efficiency.

Collaborative Innovation & Decision Making
Innovation is stimulated when ideas are freely exchanged among all participants. Ideas are judged on their merits, not on the author’s role or status. Key decisions are evaluated by the project team and, to the greatest practical extent, made unanimously.

Early Involvement of Key Participants
Key participants are involved from the earliest practical moment. Decision-making is improved by the influx of knowledge and expertise of all key participants. Combined knowledge and expertise is most powerful during the project’s early stages where informed decisions have the greatest effect.
Early Goal Definition
Project goals are developed early, agreed upon and respected by all participants. Insight from each participant is valued in a culture that promotes and drives innovation and outstanding performance, holding project outcomes at the center within a framework of individual participant objectives and values.

Intensified Planning
An intensive planning effort results in increased efficiency and savings during execution. The intent of the integrated approach is not to reduce design effort, but rather to greatly improve the design results, streamlining and shortening the much more expensive construction effort.

Open Communication
The focus on team performance is based on open, direct, and honest communication among all participants. Responsibilities are clearly defined in a no-blame culture leading to identification and resolution of problems, not determination of liability. Disputes are recognized as they occur and promptly resolved.

Appropriate Technology
Technologies are specified at project initiation to maximize functionality, generality and interoperability. Open and interoperable data exchanges based on disciplined and transparent data structures are essential to support integration and information sharing. Because open standards best enable communications among all participants, technology that is compliant with open standards is used whenever available.

As such, it is the Owner’s intent to use Building Information Modeling (BIM) to reduce errors within design documents as well as conflicts between trades. We further intend to reuse design and construction BIMs and data for facility lifecycle management, capital planning, future alterations, additions and renovations. To achieve this goal, this project will require, at a minimum, an architectural, structural, mechanical, electrical and plumbing BIM. Each project team will develop an approved BIM Execution Plan (BEP) that includes the BIM team members, specific roles, and the communication plan. The design professionals’ BIM model(s) will be made available to the project team throughout the design and construction, subject to limitations outlined in the BEP, with the intent of the team producing a single, federated model. The construction professional will participate in the development of the BEP which will define various team roles as approved by the Owner. The BIM model(s) will be updated at the end of construction to reflect the actual, “as-built” conditions.

Organization & Leadership
The project team is an organization in its own right and all team members are committed to the project team’s goals and values. Leadership is taken by the team member most capable with regard to specific work and services. Roles are clearly defined, without creating artificial barriers that chill open communication and risk taking.

Project Governance
The UW, as an owner, intends to be active and collaborative participant and provide clear leadership and direction. We have established a project governance structure to ensure sound decisions are made in a
timely fashion throughout the course of the project. Please see Attachment 1 of the RFQ for a complete description and organizational chart.

**Site Review and How Selection Relates to Project Goals**

The proposed massing and siting meet the needs of a lab and classroom building, while implementing the Campus Master Plan and improving accessibility at a campus scale. With many spaces that would function best on a ground floor, and a very steep site, the preferred massing and siting provide multiple floors with access from ground or street level. The full vision massing includes an exterior ‘science court’, to be used for academic purposes as well as to meet the more intense loading needs of the labs. The predesign team studied the opportunity to extend the Hillclimb, and while it is not proposed for this project, it is an important campus goal to be realized in the next phase. The University considers this project to be Phase 1. As illustrated in the site drawings, Phase 1 is the north wing of the full vision massing. It maintains enough ground floor space for critical program elements identified for inclusion in the first phase, while leaving some site costs out of the first phase. Basic assumptions driving the massing include a structure based on a lab module, and a double-loaded corridor scheme sized to support impromptu conversations and collaboration.

**Anticipated Project Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Design-Builder</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
<td>February 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Design-Architect</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Development</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
<td>September 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Work in Progress</td>
<td>June 2021</td>
<td>January 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Feb 2023</td>
<td>June 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budget**

The project budget is $50 million. The University’s target budget for all work to be provided by the Design-Builder under the design-build contract is approximately $38.5 million, exclusive of Washington State sales tax. The University will work with the selected Design-Builder to refine the target design-build contract value as part of the Project Definition and Design Preconstruction phases.

The University intends to work with the successful proposer to develop the basis for incentive payments, such as sharing of savings, to the Design-Builder.

**1.4 PRE-SUBMISSION MEETING:** A representative from each design-build firm that intends to submit a SOQ is strongly encouraged to attend and sign-in at the pre-submission meeting scheduled as follows:

1. Builder Pre-Submission Meeting December 17th 4:00-5:00pm Keystone Building Carwein Auditorium 1754 Commerce Street Tacoma WA.
1.5 SOLICITATION PROCESS SCHEDULE: The anticipated schedule for the solicitation process is indicated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Issue Request for Qualifications of Builder:</td>
<td>December 10th 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Second RFQ Advertisement</td>
<td>December 17th 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Builder Pre-Submission Meeting</td>
<td>December 17th 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Builder Last day for request for information</td>
<td>December 18th 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Last Addendum Issued for Builder RFQ</td>
<td>December 19th 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Issue Architect Letters of Interest Public Solicitation</td>
<td>December 10th – February 21st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Builder SOQ Due at 3:00 pm:</td>
<td>January 7th 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Firms’ Professional References Contacted</td>
<td>January 7th - January 15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Scoring of Builder SOQ and Finalists Selection Completed</td>
<td>January 16th 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Notification to Builders of Finalists Selected</td>
<td>January 16th 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Issue Request for Proposals from Builders</td>
<td>January 16th 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>IDB Contract Review with Finalists</td>
<td>January 21st 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Last Request for Information due from Finalists</td>
<td>January 21st 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Last Addendum Issued</td>
<td>January 22nd 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Proposals Due at 3:00 pm</td>
<td>January 31st 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Office Tour/Meeting Session with the Evaluation Committee</td>
<td>February 3rd – February 14th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ranking of Proposals and Notification of Selection Decision</td>
<td>February 25th 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>UW Initiates Negotiations with Highest Scoring Proposer</td>
<td>February 26th – March 11th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Award Builder Contract</td>
<td>March 12th 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6 SELECTION PROCESS: Firms submitting a SOQ will be evaluated based on the criteria described in this Request for Qualifications (RFQ) by the Project Executive Committee (PEC), whose members include representation from the UW Facilities’ Project Delivery Group (PDG), UW Tacoma Facilities’ Group, UW Tacoma’s Leadership, UW Tacoma’s Milgard School of Business and UW Tacoma’s School of Engineering and Technology. A maximum of three Finalists (the Finalists) will be short-listed. The Finalists will proceed to the second step of the selection process and receive a Request for Proposals (RFP). Finalists submitting a proposal will be evaluated by the PEC, as described in this RFQ and in the RFP. The highest scoring Finalist will be awarded the contract under authority delegated by the UW Board of Regents.

The steps involved in selecting the Design-Build for this project are set forth in greater detail below:

A. Request for Qualifications

The evaluation will be based on weighted criteria identified later in this document. The SOQ shall be submitted in two separate sealed envelopes or packages. One envelope will contain the firm’s completed Project Financial Questionnaire and related documents. The other envelope will contain the response to
the other RFQ requirements. Based on the SOQ evaluations, the University will identify a maximum of three Finalists to proceed to the next step in the selection process. Points from the SOQ evaluation will be considered only for the purpose of determining which firms will be named as Finalists and will not carry forward beyond the RFQ stage.

B. Request for Proposals (RFP)

Each Finalist will be invited to respond to the RFP. The submitted proposals will be evaluated based on weighted criteria, described later in this document.

C. Interaction with Finalists

After issuance of the RFP but before final ranking of the proposals, the evaluation committee will schedule an Office Tour and Meeting with each Finalist to be held at the Finalist’s office. Each Office Tour and Meeting session will not be more than 3 hours in length in total. The project team proposed in the SOQ shall be in attendance. The Finalists may choose to present their qualifications and experience, but the focus should be on their proposed approach to delivering the project, the criteria set forth in Section 1.7B, below, and any additional questions provided in the notification letter to the Finalist. The Evaluation Committee will consider each tour/meeting session in conjunction with the submitted Proposals according to the criteria set forth in the RFP to develop its ranking of the Proposals.

D. Contract Award Determination

The Finalist with the highest-ranking proposal will be selected to enter into contract negotiations with the University. If the University and the highest ranked Finalist cannot agree on terms, the University may enter into negotiations with the next highest ranked Finalist.

E. General Information

1. Content of RFP: The RFP will include additional project information including, but not limited to: The Form of Contract and Division 01 Sections.

2. Basis of Design-Build Award: The contract between the University and the Design-Builder shall be awarded based on the procedure outlined in RCW 39.10.330 (5) (a) and the criteria identified in this document. Each Finalist submitting a proposal in response to the RFP must be in compliance with RCW 39.04.350 and Chapter 18.27 RCW at the time of submittal.

3. Honorarium and Rights: The selection process is based on qualifications supplemented with descriptions of the approaches that will be taken on various aspects of project delivery, demonstrating this project can be completed within the allowable budget and participation in an Office Tour and Meeting, and submittal of a Price Factor. Based on the required level of effort to prepare for the Office Tour and Meeting, a $5,000 honorarium will be paid to each unsuccessful Finalist.
4. **Rejection of Proposals**: The University reserves the right to reject any and all proposals at any time for any reason. In the event the University does so, it shall provide its reasons for rejection in accordance with RCW 39.10.330(2).

5. **Appropriate Contact During Solicitation Process**: Proposers are cautioned that only the contact person listed at the end of this RFQ shall be contacted regarding this project. Any contact by Proposers with any other individual(s), including, but not limited to individuals from any of the organizations represented on the evaluation committee, could result in the Proposer’s elimination from this selection process.

6. **Evaluation Committee(s)**: The evaluation committee for the RFQ and RFP phase will be the PEC as noted in 1.6 above. For the eventual selection of the architect, the University of Washington’s Architectural Commission will interview proposed firms and provide a recommendation to the PEC and Design-Builder.

7. **References**: The University may conduct reference checks for all firms and individuals during the selection process. In the event that information obtained from the reference checks reveals concerns about a firm’s or individual’s past performance or its ability to successfully perform the work to be executed the University may, at its sole discretion, determine that the firm or individual is not qualified to perform the work and deem the proposer not eligible for further consideration. The University also reserves the right to check references from projects and/or organizations not identified by the firm. Reference information will be shared with the evaluation committee and will be considered in the scoring.

1.7 **EVALUATION CRITERIA**

A. **RFQ Evaluation Criteria – 100 points**: The SOQ submitted by firms must include information documenting how the proposed team meets the evaluation criteria below, and will be evaluated based on these criteria and weighting. Each firm’s SOQ must include a Table of Contents and be organized by discrete sections corresponding to the criteria and in the same order shown below. Submittals will not be returned. Statutory evaluation factors from RCW 39.10.330 are listed in parentheses next to each criterion to which those factors are relevant. Statutory evaluation factors may also be addressed in other criteria at the discretion of the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RFQ CRITERIA</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
<th>WEIGHTING (max. points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>How Your Team Will Be Organized (Capacity to Perform)</strong>: Describe your team’s availability to perform the work of this project. Identify how the resources of your team will be integrated into a cohesive Design-Build team, including a description of the management strategies, internal communication protocols, coordination tools, planning efforts and QA/QC plan that you will employ to ensure an effective project. Describe how your team will work with the University’s project governance structure, as described in Attachment 1. Describe how leadership of the design-build team and point of contact with the University will be provided during the project. Explain who will provide</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
overall project leadership and communication with University representatives.

Provide an organization chart showing the staffing proposal for the key team members (as specified in Criteria 2 below) to be assigned to the project and disciplines you propose to include on the team. Do not identify the disciplines by firm name. If not already provided in the response to Criteria 2 below, include a copy of the resume annotated as described in Criterion 2 below of each key individual proposed to provide this management expertise to the project.

### 2 Who Your Team Members Are (Technical Qualifications)

Describe your key team members’ individual specialized experience and technical expertise in similar projects. Work performed while team members were employed at other firms may be included, but should specifically be indicated as such. Clearly state the team member’s role on all projects listed. Experience in the following areas is especially of interest: interdisciplinary higher education buildings, active learning spaces, mass timber construction, building on a dense urban campus, working in a progressive design-build or similar project delivery culture, and utilization of Target Value Design and other Lean principles. Describe the strengths and innovative approach your team will bring to the project.

The following key individuals shall be identified from the design-builder contracting entity:

- Corporate executive dedicated to the project
- Preconstruction/design manager
- Construction project manager
- Superintendent
- Cost estimator
- VDC lead/manager
- Safety officer
- Business equity lead.

No consultants or trade contractors should be included in the proposal; these team members will be selected in consultation with the University after the contract is awarded.

Include a copy of the resume of each key individual proposed to fill these positions on this project. Each resume is limited to one page per person (i.e. two resumes per sheet, one on the front and one on the back). Each resume must indicate each key individual’s specific roles and responsibilities for each past project listed, and include three professional references with phone and email contact information.
Please alert professional references that a representative will be contacting them during the selection process.

### How Your Team Members Have Been Successful on Past Projects (Technical Qualifications)

Provide examples of how your team has worked within a progressive design-build or similar integrated project delivery model to achieve the project goals. Projects delivered within a public work design-build contract are valued but not required; relevant private sector work is welcome. Examples of reducing cost or duration and maximizing value while still achieving recognized design quality (including, but not limited to, awards or publication) should be provided. Demonstration of excellence in similar facilities and increasing value through collaboration and eliminating waste, with a clear explanation of how those outcomes were realized, will be highly valued. Describe the role of the trade partners in helping to realize the successful examples you note.

The role of key team members proposed for this project should be clearly indicated with each project shown. Inclusion of projects on which proposed key team members had little or no role is discouraged. For each project shown, please include the following:

1. a description of the project,
2. key issues addressed,
3. the date and duration of construction,
4. the final cost (clearly indicate whether construction cost or project cost),
5. an Owner’s Reference with telephone number and email address, who is familiar with your proposed team’s performance in completing the project.

Please alert professional references that a University representative will be contacting them during the selection process.

### Construction Site Safety

Describe the safety and accident prevention record of the Construction members of your team. If the Construction member is a joint venture, submit the requirements of this section for each member firm of the joint venture.

Complete the University of Washington’s Safety and Health Qualification Statement and submit it with your Proposal. A copy of the Safety and Health Qualification Statement is included in this RFQ as Attachment 3. If the firm is a joint venture, a Safety and Health Qualification Statement shall be submitted for each member of the joint venture.
### Business Equity (proposers past performance in utilization of BEE):

A. Using 5 of the demonstration projects from previous criteria, list your team’s performance in providing opportunities and including Business Equity Enterprises in the initial programming and design of projects.

For each project, include the following:
- Name of the project
- Date of substantial completion
- Name of the owner and contact person with email and phone
- Final contract value
- Owner’s utilization goals for the project (if any)
- The overall percentage of the final contract value paid to BEE

B. With this project in mind, discuss opportunities to partner with diverse businesses. List specific scopes and potential partnerships that you will sub-contract to accomplish this work. Be sure to first list all sub-discipline and support scopes then talk about opportunities for each.

*The University is interested in how you performed on past projects of similar scope and size, regardless of delivery method or project owner. BEE includes businesses at any tier of project development and support, so include those businesses that involved scopes such as reprographics and other consumables if they are considered diverse.

### Bonding and Insurance (ability to provide performance and payment bond):
The proposal shall respond to the following criteria:

(a) Ability to provide performance and payment bonds for the project for at least the amount of the target Design-Build budget ($38.5 million) plus Washington State Sales Tax. The Proposer must submit a letter from its bonding company (surety) or its bonding agent indicating that the Proposer has the requisite bonding capacity in order to provide the required bonds.

(b) Insurability: Statement from the Proposer’s insurance carrier indicating that the insurance requirements of the contract can be met by the Proposer.

Failure to provide the letters required by items (a) and (b) may result in elimination of the Proposal from further consideration in the selection process.

| Maximum RFQ Points | 100 points |

### B. RFP Evaluation Criteria:
The University will approach evaluating the proposals based on which firm we believe to be the “best fit”, and therefore the most likely to deliver the highest quality of project. The qualification submitted by the Proposers must include information responding to the evaluation criteria.
below, and will be ranked based on those responses. Each criteria will note a priority order to aid in preparation of responses; priority 1 will signal the University’s highest priority.

Statutory evaluation factors from RCW 39.10.330 are listed in parentheses next to each criteria to which those factors are relevant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RFP CRITERIA</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria 1 through 4 provide an opportunity for the Finalists to review in detail their approach to executing the project in each of several key phases. Throughout each criterion, address your approach to meeting schedule and budget requirements, how risks and opportunities are identified and addressed, how your team will form a cohesive unit with the University to effectively deliver this project, and how work in the various phases is optimized. Examples of how these approaches were used successfully on previous projects may be included.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Criteria and Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Project Team Formation and Project Definition (management plan to meet time and budget requirements):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Using your Team Organizational structure submitted with your SOQ, present a management approach. Be sure to discuss how your team proposes to work with the University, and its various campus partners, to develop the project and to complete your Design-Build team, including the role of consultants vs. that of trade partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Based upon the process outlined in RFQ Attachment 4, describe how you would work with the UW to select an architect for the project. What qualifications, experience, or attributes would you be looking for? What makes a great partner for your team?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discuss the methods and/or successful practices used to work together as a high-performing team, and establish and maintain a cohesive team culture. How will these tools work for this project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Address your approach to developing a delivery program for the various project components and how that will support the definition of the project and establishment of a target cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Describe how you propose to interact with the various University stakeholders who will occupy this building, and how you communicate cost and benchmarking information to stakeholders who may have varying levels of experience with design or construction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Priority Ranking: 2

*Note: Proposals may be ranked higher for those teams that clearly present a management plan that demonstrates how all stakeholders, partners, and University personnel, or similar, will be incorporated as a team member and given the direction/tools to be successful in defined roles and responsibilities and given space to meaningful contribute to the project.*

### 2 Integrating Design and Construction (management plan to meet time and budget requirements)

- Describe how your team proposes to work with the selected design consultants to complete final design and construction after the University and the Design-Builder agree that the project is defined well enough to establish a Final Target Cost.

- Describe how your team will collaborate with the University as joint team members during this phase. Describe how your team performed in the past using this approach on similar projects.

- Describe how the Design-Builder will collaborate with University stakeholders as joint team members in the design process.

- How will the Design-Builder assure effective communication among team members and with the University?

- Describe your process for integrating out of area consultants to the team, as well as team members who may join the project later than others.

Priority Ranking: 1

*Note: Responses may be ranked higher if there is a clear connection, with a practical application, to the building blocks of integrated project delivery; also, succinctly describing past practices and how they will translate to this project, or how teams will take those past practices to the “next level.”*

### 3 Approach to Commissioning and Transition to Occupancy (management plan to meet time and budget requirements):

- Describe how your team proposes to manage start up, and conduct commissioning and training of University staff.

- Explain what role the individuals tasked with commissioning will play in the design process, if any.

- How will the Design-Builder assure that the transition to occupancy is as seamless and effective as possible?

- Address how data generated during the design and construction process can be efficiently conveyed to the campuses facilities personnel for their use to optimize
the life cycle costs of the facility and integrate into their current Computerized Maintenance Management System.

Priority Ranking: 2

*Note: The Owner is in the process of integrating our facility operating and space management data process so that the way we operate and maintain will inform our lifecycle, keep operations costs down and predictable, etc. A higher-ranked team will present a holistic approach to design excellence and operational efficiency, helping the University set up better ways to bring new buildings on-line, operate them efficiently and keep current on maintenance.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th><strong>Construction Site Safety</strong> <em>(summary of accident prevention program and overview of its implementation)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summarize the firm’s Accident Prevention Program and describe the firm’s philosophy on and approach to accident prevention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Safety at the Project Interface:</strong> Describe your experience with past projects of similar scope, in an urban environment, and how your team addressed safety outside the fence and at project interfaces where adjacent space is occupied. Summarize your planning and controls, and how the responsibility was assigned among your team and how was it overseen? Topics may include maintaining ingress and emergency egress, emergency services access, security, falling objects, traffic control, wayfinding, shutdowns, hazard communication, regulated building materials (asbestos/lead) odor control/mitigation and business continuity (e.g. no false alarms in adjoining facilities).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Operational Safety of Built Environment:</strong> Describe how your team will address occupational hazards and risks to the eventual occupants and personnel who will service and maintain the building, and how your approach will minimize costly redesign and retrofitting. Summarize management systems and standards that will be implemented and used to reduce injuries and incidents during post development operations. Example topics include confined space, fall protection, safe access, loading, lifting, hazardous materials exposure, local ventilation systems (e.g., labs and shops), hazardous energy control, machinery safety, and the commissioning of safety related systems and equipment. Describe your philosophy and process during design and construction for design safety reviews and utilizing the knowledge, skills, experience, insight, and creativity of employees close to the hazards and risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priority Ranking: 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5 | **Acceptance of Contract:** Compliance with proposed contract. Each Proposer must affirm that the terms and conditions of these documents are acceptable, or if the Proposer takes exception to the documents the Proposer must specifically describe the reasons for the exceptions and provide alternative language for consideration by the University. The University makes no commitment that it will modify any of the terms of the contract. |
|   | Failure to respond result in elimination of the Proposal from further consideration in the |
6 Price Factor: Provide the fee of the firm or joint venture that would be the contracting entity as a percentage of all direct costs. A price factor proposal form will be issued with the RFP.

The evaluation of this criterion will be based on the difference between the percentage proposed and the lowest conforming percentage received by the University. Scores will be based on how far above the lowest value any proposed value is. This difference will be expressed as a percentage according to the following formula and the result will be evaluated using the table below.

Percent above low value = \[
\left(\frac{\text{Proposed Value} - \text{Lowest Value}}{\text{Lowest Value}}\right) \times 100
\]

Example: Let 0.5% = the lowest value, and let 0.65% = the proposed value. Then the percent above lowest value is:

\[
\left(\frac{0.65 - 0.5}{0.5}\right) \times 100 = 30\%
\]

Then, according to the table below, a low ranking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>For this criterion is as follows:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low conforming value</td>
<td>Best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values within 10% of low conforming value</td>
<td>Better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values within 20% of low conforming value</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Priority Ranking: 3

Note: Design-Build is about best value; value to the University will come from the right team with the best approach and experience, with an acceptable price. The University, as a public agency, is required to consider pricing in evaluating teams.

7 Business Equity Inclusion Plan:

Using your experience on past projects of similar scope and size, submit a proposal for including BEEs on the project that, at a minimum, addresses the following:

A. Voluntary Goal: State an overall BEE utilization goal you are proposing for this project and the rationale for that goal. Discuss why this meets, does not meet, or exceeds the project’s aspirational goal identified by the UW. Defend those goals.
B. Discuss your initial thinking for “packaging” or breaking down all work which will likely be “risk/reward” and the approximate percentage of the project value.

C. Discuss your initial thinking on “design” work scopes which are likely to be performed by sub-consultants, including those scopes you anticipate will offer substantial opportunity for BEE participation.

D. Discuss your initial thinking on “construction” work scopes which will likely be subcontracted to trade partners, including those scopes you anticipate will offer substantial opportunity for BEE participation.

E. Discuss your initial thinking on services, supplies, and consumable scopes that will likely be available for suppliers or service providers, including those that you anticipate will offer substantial opportunity for BEE participation.

F. Discuss any scope/industry specific strategies you intend to draw upon in finding new opportunities of the BEEs on the project. What “traditionally” underrepresented scopes will you be looking to grow?

G. Review any opportunities and/or challenges you have identified, including how you would optimize those opportunities and mitigate those challenges.

Priority Ranking: 2

Note: Please focus on specific opportunities. The highest ranked Inclusion Plans should be specific to this project and intentional, relying upon meaningful, project relevant strategies that remove barriers to participation, support the engagement of BEE’s, and incorporate business processes and practices that optimize opportunities for success. Common business practices such as event attendance, community group involvement, or mass-marketing strategies will not be considered for project specific strategies. Goals that are restating the Owner’s general goals and not specific to the work of the project will not be considered “best.”

1.8 CONTRACTING PROCESS: The UW will utilize a single design-build contract between the University and the Design-Builder which will be amended at various stages to develop the base program, complete design and conduct preconstruction activities, and construct the project. The contract will provide for incentive payments to the design-build team. The Design-Builder will be compensated for chargeable costs (as defined in the contract documents) and, subject to project success, the design-build team will be paid a percentage of the Incentive Compensation Layer, which includes the fee as proposed by the Design-Builder, and as defined in the contract. The contract will incorporate the best practices of integrated project delivery, including incentives and shared risk and reward.

1.9 FORM OF SUBMITTAL AND DEADLINE:
The length of the SOQ is limited as follows:

- The SOQ are limited to twenty (20) 8"x11" sheets. The 20 sheets may be printed on the front and back for a maximum of forty (40) page sides, and a font of no less than 10 point shall be used.
- Covers, Table of Contents, and Tabs or other section dividers are not included in the 20-sheet limit and must not contain significant content.
- 11x17 sheets (Z-folded) may be substituted for 8x11 sheets for figures, tables and/or similar content requiring them, but they may only be printed on one side and count as one (1) sheet.
- The bonding letter, and insurance letter are not included in the 20-sheet limit.
- The Safety and Health Qualification Statement submitted in response to Section 1.7 A.5 (Safety criterion) is not included in the 20-sheet limit. However, other information submitted in response to this criterion is included in the 20-sheet limit.
- The resumes submitted in response to the criteria in Sections 1.7 A.1 and A.2 below are not included in the 20-sheet limit for the SOQ. Each resume is limited to one page side per person (i.e. two resumes per sheet, one on the front and one on the back).

The SOQ shall be submitted in a sealed envelope or package. One original in a standard three-ring binder, and one electronic copy (PDF) of the SOQ on its own flash drive must be received at the University Facilities Building no later than 3:00 p.m. on January 7th, 2020. Submittals sent by mail or courier shall be sent to the address below (use box number for U.S. Postal Service (USPS) delivery only). Faxed or e-mailed submittals will not be accepted. Contractors are responsible for ensuring receipt of the SOQ at the University Facilities Building by the deadline stated above, and should take into account internal UW delivery times once USPS delivers a submittal to the box number indicated, and other delays that may occur when using a delivery service. Delivery directly to the University Facilities Building is encouraged. Submittals received after the deadline will not be considered.

University of Washington
Facilities, Project Delivery Group
Attention: Name of Melony Pederson
University Facilities Building
Box 352205
Seattle, WA 98195-2205

Any addenda issued for this RFQ will be published on the PDG website. To access addenda, click the following link: https://cpd.uw.edu/project-delivery/current-solicitations/construction. Contractors are responsible for checking the PDG website for any addenda prior to submission of qualifications and proposals. If you are unable to download the addenda, you may contact the individual noted at the end of this RFQ.

**1.10 BUSINESS EQUITY ENTERPRISES:** The University of Washington is committed to offering the greatest practicable opportunity to diverse businesses in our community; such as small businesses, minority-owned businesses, women-owned businesses, and other historically marginalized businesses, herein referred to as Business Equity Enterprises (BEE). BEE include any entity licensed to do business in the State of Washington, including a corporation, partnership, sole proprietorship, or other legal entity that meets any of the following:
Certified Business Enterprise (CBE): Any business enterprise certified with the Washington State Office of Minority and Women’s Business Enterprises (OMWBE), Northwest Mountain Minority Supplier Diversity Council (NWMMSDC), or Women’s Business Enterprise Council (WBEC)

Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender Business Enterprise (LGBT): More than 50% owned and controlled by at least one person who is a member of the LGBT community.

Minority Business Enterprise (MBE): More than 50% owned and controlled by at least one person who is a member of one or more of the following minority groups:
- Asian Pacific American
- Black American
- Hispanic American
- Native American
- Subcontinent Asian American

Minority Women’s Business Enterprise (MWBE): More than 50% owned and controlled by at least one woman who is a member of one or more of the above minority groups.

Small Business Enterprise (SBE): A business entity that:
- Can attest that it is owned and operated independently from all other businesses and;
- Conforms to the U.S. Small Business Administration Size Standards of the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Codes in which it is to be engaged at the UW; or is certified with the OMWBE

Veteran’s Business Enterprise (VBE): Certified with the Washington State Department of Veteran’s Affairs (DVA)

Women’s Business Enterprise (WBE): More than 50% owned and controlled by one or more women.

Prior to the execution of the contract, the Design-Builder will finalize the Inclusion Plan and submit it to the Owner for review and final approval.

1.11 APPRENTICESHIP UTILIZATION REQUIREMENTS: Mandatory apprentice utilization of at least fifteen percent (15%) of the total labor hours worked on the Contract is required. Apprentices must be registered as apprentices with the State Apprenticeship and Training Council. Design-Builder shall comply with the requirements of the Contract Documents related to apprenticeship. Proposers may contact the Department of Labor & Industries, Apprenticeship Program at 360-902-5320 to obtain information on apprenticeship programs.

1.12 PROTEST PROCEDURE:
In order to be considered, protests of the selection decisions made pursuant to Section 1.6 (A), (B) and (C) must be received by the University no later than four (4) business days from the date of email notification to the proposers/Finalists, as appropriate, of the selection decision as set forth in RCW 39.10.330(3) and (6). Protests must be in writing, and addressed to:

University of Washington
Protests shall include the name, email address, and phone number of the protestor’s authorized representative, the specific grounds for the protest, all supporting documentation, and the specific relief requested.

Upon receipt of a timely written protest, the Owner shall review the protest, consider all available facts, and issue via email a final protest decision. The University may not advance to the next phase of selection and may not execute a contract with the selected firm until two (2) business days after the final protest decision is transmitted to the protestor.

1.13 ATTACHMENTS AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: Please note the following additional information that is part of this RFQ:

Attachment 1 – Project Governance Structure
Attachment 2 – Project site
Attachment 3 – University of Washington Safety and Health Qualification Statement
Attachment 4 – Design-Architect Selection Process
Attachment 5 – Bond and Insurance Requirements
Attachment 6 – UW Tacoma Academic Innovation Building Predesign Report

University of Washington Seattle Campus Master Plan. Link to that plan is: https://www.tacoma.uw.edu/finance-administration/master-planning-documents

COMMUNICATIONS: All communications regarding this RFQ should be addressed to Melony Pederson, Project Manager, University of Washington Project Delivery Group, (253)-370-5734 or melonyk@uw.edu.