

REQUEST FOR COMPETITIVE PROPOSALS

YESLER TERRACE BLOCK 6.6 JUNIPER APARTMENT CONSTRUCTION Solicitation No. 5454

ADDENDUM NO. 2
Issue Date July 1, 2021

This Addendum containing the following revisions, deletions and/or clarifications, is hereby made a part of this solicitation and Contract Documents for the above-named project. Bidders / Proposers shall take this Addendum into consideration when preparing and submitting their response to this solicitation.

This Addendum adds Addendum Letter No. 1 to Exhibit B (see Item 1 below), lists questions / comments received, SHA's responses and adds documents related to easement question (see Item 2 below), provides a note to subcontractors (see Item 3 below) and replaces Attachment C.2. Section 00800 – Supplementary Conditions (see Item 4 below).

Item 1. Attached as a separate document SHA is publishing the following letter to be added to **Exhibit B**:

- EPS Recommendations - Addendum Letter No. 1 / Juniper YT Site 6.6 GT Report dated 02.12.21.

Item 2. The following is a list of questions received and SHA's responses to those questions.

1. **Question:** I'm curious if there is a geotechnical report for the project noted above.
Response: Geotechnical report was Part of previous addendum
2. **Question:** Existing Vehicle Path, will it accommodate construction equipment?
Response: The PAD will accommodate construction traffic.
3. **Question:** Easement at west side of property showing 60'. Is this correct?
Response: There are multiple easements to the west, see attachments 6735840-CN - Recorded YeslerTerrace_Relinquishment SPU Easement, 2017243-20_2020-06-19_SCL PRIVATE ACCESS EASEMENT I, and 2017243-20_2020-06-19_SCL PRIVATE ACCESS EASEMENT II for known easement information. The public utility easement noted in the survey (KCRN 2014209001425) that takes up Lot 23 is 60' wide, we believe that to be the easement referenced in the question. That easement is scheduled to be vacated. SHA is tracking that vacation, status currently pending. There is an SPU easement indicated on the architectural site plan and noted in the set on G064.

Civil is showing this easement on C400. There is an SCL easement on the site. This easement is also pending being finalized and recorded. This easement is shown on C400 as TBD.

Pending easements will be finalized and recorded prior to the start of construction. In response to this question the following documentation is attached to this addendum #2.

- 6735840-CN - Recorded YeslerTerrace_Relinquishment SPU Easement
- 2017243-20_2020-06-19_SCL PRIVATE ACCESS EASEMENT I
- 2017243-20_2020-06-19_SCL PRIVATE ACCESS EASEMENT II

4. **Question:** Will the existing Drill Piers/Grade Beams support surcharge for construction equipment?

Response: Per geotech report section 6.9.1 Permanent Walls, surcharges are not provided for construction equipment or construction staging areas. The geotech report has also provided some initial surcharge information in Figure 15 for traffic loads and other items, but surcharge for construction equipment "...should be considered on a case-by-case basis, as shown in Figure 15. GeoEngineers can provide the lateral pressures from these surcharge loads as needed."

5. **Question:** Will adjacent property be available for staging?

Response: No

6. **Question:** Are there any restraints for using the vehicle access areas?

Response: Must coordinate with other projects in the area.

7. **Question:** In the Pre-Submission meeting, SHA announced that HUD had revised Community Participation requirements relating to section 3. Please clarify these changes as well as clarify all requirement percentages for all of the social equity section including section 8 requirements.

Response: In 2020 HUD revised the Section 3 program requirements which historically counted 'Section 3 new hires' to 'Section 3 labor hours'.

Under the new regulation, each project shall meet, to the greatest extent feasible, a total of 25% of labor hours performed by Section 3 workers; including 5% of labor hours performed by Targeted Section 3 Workers.

For further information please review the HUD Section 3 website:

<https://www.hud.gov/section3>

8. **Question:** Will there be a CWA (Community Workforce Agreement) in place for this project?

Response: No.

9. **Question:** Will the P.A.D. (Public Access Drive) be closed or open during Juniper Construction? Will Contractor be able to use access drive if it remains closed?

Response: See response to question 6.

10. **Question:** What projects will be underway and what will the constraints be, if any, in coordinating or routing around those projects.

Response: Currently, we anticipate construction occurring on the adjacent site to the North West and the tower project west of Washington, south of Yesler. This will require coordination with other contractors.

11. **Question:** Article 7 A. Part 1 Proposal form section states that SHA Purchasing Div. will be scoring the Cost Form section. Also states that the scoring is based on the # of SHA Purchasing panel members. (i.e. "The score will be multiplied by the number of persons serving on the evaluation panel" How many people on the Purchasing Panel? Based on the 100-point total, and the 20-point total for the cost form, there seems to be a contradiction in the scoring method. Please clarify this.

Response: The Part 1 Cost Proposal Form is evaluated separately by the Purchasing Department. Criterion #1 is worth 20 points for the lowest cost. This score is **not** based on evaluation panel members, but instead is based on the costs compared against all proposers. The formula that is used to get the scores is: $(\text{Lowest Cost} / \text{Proposed Cost}) \times \text{Available Points} = \text{Points Assigned}$

12. **Question:** There doesn't appear to be a total page count max. requirement for the RFCP. Also, no maximum page count for sections Part 1, 2, and 3. Only Part 4. Are there max page counts for sections Part 1-3?

Response: No maximum- but please be succinct in your responses. Do not include standard marketing materials. Respond only to targeted requests.

13. **Comment received by vendor:** While I was reviewing the specified solar panel that is asked for in the project, the Q-Cell Q.Peak-Duo-L-G8.2 420w, with our distributor at Platt, he informed us that that panel is not in production anymore. He did inform us though that the Q-Cell 425W and Q-Cell 430W are available. We will plan to bid with the Q-Cell 430W panels and while not a major change, I just thought I would inform you of this discrepancy in the specs so you are aware.

Response: This will be reviewed during preconstruction and is not required as part of the proposal.

Item 3. Note to subcontractors interested in bidding this project: SHA does not bid RFCP projects by component. We intend to award to a single General Contractor. Please review the pre-bid sign-in sheets available on Builders Exchange and network with the General Contractors listed on those sign-in sheets and others who may be planning to propose on the project. The General Contractor awarded the project will be the one who would sub-contract this work. They would post those sub-contract packages after the pre-construction phase of this project.

Item 4. Remove and replace Specification Section 800 – Supplementary Conditions in its entirety with updated Specification Section 800 – Supplementary Conditions – Addendum #2, attached.

List of Attachments:

1. EPS Recommendations - Addendum Letter No. 1 / Juniper YT Site 6.6 GT Report dated 02.12.21.
2. 6735840-CN - Recorded YeslerTerrace_Relinquishment SPU Easement
3. 2017243-20_2020-06-19_SCL PRIVATE ACCESS EASEMENT I
4. 2017243-20_2020-06-19_SCL PRIVATE ACCESS EASEMENT II
5. Attachment C.2. Specification Section – Supplementary Conditions – Addendum #2

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 2