ADDENDUM #2
RFQ# CDCM 2013-01   **FACILITY CONDITION ASSESSMENT SERVICES**
      1/14/13 Pre-Submittal Conference – Leslie Helm, RFQ Manager Introductory Comments

Good morning. My name is Leslie Helm, General Facilities Program Manager for the Capital Development and Construction Management Division of the Finance and Administrative Services Department for the City of Seattle. This is the presubmittal conference for the Building Condition Assessment, Request for Qualifications. If you have not yet signed in, please do so prior to leaving. Sign in sheets will be posted to the solicitation on eBid Exchange.

An introduction of our team – Randy Cox, Asset Planning Manager, Stacy Carter, Contract Administrator, David Loy, Senior Management System Analyst, and Sabrina Buchanan, Executive Assistant.

The Finance and Administrative Services Department has a portfolio of approx 170 facilities which include police precincts, fire stations, office buildings including this 62 story high rise, and various shops and yards. While individual studies have been conducted on some of these, this effort focuses on performing a detailed assessment for a group of the facilities. The data from these individual reports will then become the basis for a program which displays the current condition of the building assemblies, as well as providing a facility maintenance plan extending over the next 10 - 20 years.

The RFQ sited the number of facilities as 25. At this meeting we are distributing a list of 10 facilities we have identified for the assessments. The remaining 15 will emerge as we work with the selected firm to determine priorities. Facilities that will <u>not</u> be a part of this study are any additional fire stations not already listed here, as all other fire stations are being renovated or rebuilt under the current 2003 Fire Levy Capital Program.   Similarly, we have just completed a detailed inventory of the component parts for the exterior of Seattle Municipal Tower (the facility we are in for today's meeting) so that will not be requested either.

Before I turn the meeting over to questions from you, I want to reiterate the purpose of this RFQ. The first purpose is to get as many detailed assessments of our facilities as possible within our budget. The scope of these assessments will include structure, roof/envelope, and MEP systems. As part of the selection process and contract negotiations, we will determine what level of regulatory deficiency evaluations, such as ADA, energy and building code, we want perform.

Secondarily, the RFQ process is intended to see what comes forward in terms of taking the assessment materials and creating a Facility Condition Index, Maintenance Schedule and Plan for our asset preservation program, a plan with robust capabilities for projection and analysis.

Please speak clearly so that we will be able to record your questions. The questions and our responses will be circulated by addendum again posted to the solicitation on the eBid Exchange system. Should a question be raised today which we need to review prior to responding, we will post that response as well. Thank you for your interest.

Priority	Building #	Facility Name	Description	Address	Criticality	Owner	Type	Year	SF
1	A50276	Animal Control Center	Animal Shelter	2061-15th Ave W	Important	City FAS	S02	1981	11,000
2	A50161	SPD South Precinct Station	South Precinct	3001 S Myrtle St	Critical	City FAS	S02	1983	13,688
3	A50163	SPD East Precinct Station	East Precinct	1519 Twelfth Ave	Critical	City FAS	S02	1926	61,200
4	A50105	Fire Station #5	Fire Station 5	925 Alaskan Way	Essential	City FAS	S02	1963	6,000
4	A50167	SPD West Precinct Station	West Precinct	810 Virginia St NE	Critical	City FAS	S02	1999	76,752
6	A50360	SPD Southwest Precinct Station	Southwest Precinct	2300 SW Webster St	Critical	City FAS	S02	2002	28,200
7	A50075	Gasworks Park Harbor Patrol Office	Harbor Patrol Office	1717-N Northlake Pl	Essential	City FAS	S02	1928	3,600
8	A50070	SPD Training Facility: K9 Unit Office	PFR K-9 Bldg	10640 E Marginal Way S	Important	City FAS	S02	1948	5,120
9	A50129	Fire Station #29	Fire Station 29	2139 Ferry Ave SW	Essential	City FAS	S02	1970	5,100
10	A50118	Fire Station #18	Fire Station 18	1521 NW Market St	Essential	City FAS	S02	1974	19,982

1Q)   *Will a copy of your introductory notes be available?*
   A)   Yes. We will post them to the eBid Exchange solicitation this week along with the Q&A document.

2Q)   *What system/program will be used to record the data?*
   A)   Unifier is being used currently, but we are looking to you to make suggestions on this. We would like to know if you will be using something else and/or what your recommendations would be. We want a comprehensive package from you and are looking for your analytics.

3Q)   *Does the City own the FAC Unifier module? Is the goal to have the data in the FAC module?*
   A)   No, the City isn't currently using that pre-packaged module now. We'd like you to make recommendations on what to use. We are open to your suggestions.

4Q)   *Does that mean you are only planning to do repairs for the first 10 buildings?*
   A)   We have a critical list of 35 buildings and want to do all we can within our current budget. The starting list of 10 buildings is a representative example of the type of buildings we own and will need evaluated. We want to prioritize this work according to need and budget. The software and your work is expected to assist us illustrating the need for more funding to accomplish all that needs to be done.

5Q)   *Are you talking about capital or maintenance dollars or both?*
   A)   Both.

6Q)   *Have you thought about a software package and the need to license over time or is this work intended as a snapshot?*
   A)   We're not certain; we will look to you for advice in your submittals.

7Q)   *Is software acquisition part of the $350K budget? Does that include assessments & software?*
   A)   The $350k isn't final; it is our best guess and intended to give you a ballpark figure for the contract. The number includes Individual assessment work and recommendations for software, then establishing budgets from there. This could give us the tools to build a better budget for our ongoing funding requests to accomplish all the necessary work.

8Q)   *Do you already have replacement costs for these building or has it been some time?*
   A)   1981 was the last time the bulk of our buildings were assessed.

9Q)   *Can we partner with several software firms/vendors?*
   A)   We are open to considering all your recommendations, but suggest that if you want to offer several software options, you do it in separate proposals.

10Q)   *Are site and civil included?*
   A)   No. At this point, the assessment work is envelope, MEP, seismic, energy saving and ADA only.

11Q)   *Sounds like it's more system-oriented. What about programming?*
   A)   Yes. Efficiencies are important and should be included in your recommendations. We're looking for work to be done immediately within 2-5 years and less urgent work forecasted to be done over 5-10 years.

12Q) *You said your boss doesn't want another "stack of books telling you what's wrong with these buildings." Please clarify.*
  A) We are after solutions, costs, priorities to fixing these buildings presented in an electronically accessible format. A catalog of issues without solutions doesn't help us.

13Q) *Once the software/electronic format is in place, will the City be maintaining the information?*
  A) Ideally the system would be maintained by the City. If you have a program with a licensing agreement, that may be part of your proposal as long as the city has the tools its needs for the work.

14Q) *Who would do your systems training?*
  A) That may be part of your proposal.

15Q) *Is Unifier with FAS only or is the entire City using it?*
  A) Some other City departments are using Unifier such as SPU, but the usages are silos, i.e. don't interact with each other. FAS has been using it for a couple years.

16Q) *Is it possible to get a copy of a report on an existing property as an example of the data and how Unifier looks and works?*
  A) Yes, however we would prefer that you contact Oracle/Skire directly with your questions so you have the best opportunity to find out anything you wish to know. We don't want to confuse things by making a posting that may not be applicable or direct someone to the wrong conclusions. Our ultimate goal is to obtain the best possible tool(s), which may not include Unifier.

17Q) *Is the City happy with Unifier?*
  A) Yes. We're happy with what it is doing for us and wish it was doing more. It is fine for you to contact Oracle (who owns Unifier) with any questions.

18Q) *Do you have a point of contact at Oracle?*
  A) Feel free to contact jeff.mueller@oracle.com.

19Q) *Can Unifier handle drawings and the upload of other documents?*
  A) Yes.

20Q) *Will the City host the software or will we host and then transfer to the City?*
  A) Unsure. Best guess is more than likely, the City will want to host it.

21Q) *Are you looking for future integration?*
  A) Yes.

22Q) *Have you done any other assessments on the Seattle Municipal Tower (SMT) or other City buildings other than the envelope assessment you mentioned?*
  A) The SMT is largely under control, so is not part of this RFQ or this work. We have done piecemeal assessments on other buildings as needs have cropped up and budgets have allowed, but no single, comprehensive assessment of the entire portfolio, which is what this work hopes to accomplish.

23Q) *So is this really a pilot project?*

A) Yes, you could think of it that way although 'pilot' sounds like we may not do the work, which is not accurate. I (Randy Cox) was hired to accomplish this work, so it will be completed, although it will be limited by budgets and accomplished over time.

24Q) *Please discuss the Inclusion Plan requirement.*
Inclusion is a huge cultural priority for the mayor's office, which looks to find opportunities to share government dollars with small and disadvantaged firms who largely tend to be women- and minority- owned. As a result, all consultant contracts valued at $260k or greater are required to complete and submit an Inclusion Plan, which becomes a material part of the contract. 10% of your overall scoring will be based on your completed inclusion plan. The evaluation and selection committee will assign points based on your inclusion efforts and the identified WMBE subconsultant opportunities identified in your plan.

Having said that, the plan is only pertinent to any *subconsultant* opportunities you may have as part of your submittal. If you plan to do all work in house and do not intend to hire any subconsultants, you have no Inclusion opportunities, but you may still receive *some* points toward inclusion by thoughtfully completing your plan. Whichever way your firm intends to submit, do be sure to read and complete the document carefully and thoughtfully in order to receive points on your submittal.

25Q) *Programs can be static. How will that impact what you are trying to do?*
A) Good point. Use your submittal to show us the challenge and your resolution to it. We are looking for a dynamic systems solution.

26Q) *Are the facilities on the list used by only City departments or also by others?*
A) For the most part, they are used by City departments only. All are managed by FAS.

27Q) *Is there a schedule or deadline for the assessments to be completed?*
A) We listed a very aggressive schedule for the assessments in the RFQ, but it is a guideline that will likely change and was included to give you a ball park idea of the contract. The schedule for the work will be somewhat subject to negotiation with the selected firm, also based on when we are able to get the consultant contract itself fully executed and begin the actual work.

What we want to accomplish this year is issuing the RFQ, selecting the consultant, completing the assessments, and having an actionable plan in place to move forward with the work beyond this year.

Additional questions received by the cutoff are as follow):

28Q) *During the pre-submittal meeting, the City indicated a desire for a system more robust in functionality than Unifier. Besides the ability to produce the deliverables described in the solicitation, can the City expand on the desired functionality of the ideal system, i.e. with regard to work order management, supply chain management, etc.?*

A) We are looking for a system that will do more with regard to analytics than Unifier is able to do so that we can make informed financial decisions with regard to maintaining and disposing of

our properties as well as prioritizing and budgeting for those needs. We are looking to our potential consultant to provide us with information on the latest tools available to best accomplish those goals. We're looking for the latest dynamic tools available to manage our properties in a smart, effective and efficient way.

28Q) *Are there desired analytic capabilities of the system beyond short- and long-term capital and maintenance budget planning?*
  A) Please see the response to 27Q above.

29Q) *Approximately how many users of the system are anticipated, and what are their roles, i.e. planners, maintenance personnel, management, etc.?*
  A) Assuming this system would replace Unifier, which means it would, in addition to the above items, be a data base to store information, be able to track work and produce work orders and provide space management and rents, there could be as many as fifty people accessing the system. If it is a tool to simply add to what Unifier currently does by providing the additional analytic capabilities that we are looking for then it may only be used by ten to fifteen people.

30Q) *Has the City considered specific software applications to supplement or replace Unifier? If so, which ones?*
  A) No we haven't; that is what we would like to do as part of this scope; consider alternatives that you provide to us that you think are better tools.

31Q) *Is space planning / utilization a desired analytic capability?*
  A) Yes if it is going to replace Unifier.

32Q) *Will the successful design firm and/or team who is contracted with to perform the facility condition assessments be excluded from the future design work for upgrades, renovations, or replacement of facilities that are evaluated under this assessment contract?*
  A) No.