Addendum #1 – 9/2/2011
CP144260 – Campus Utility System
Notice 11-23 RFP for CM/GC

1. Add new section I.D – SPECIAL CONDITIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS IN AN OCCUPIED CAMPUS SETTING

These special contract conditions are required because this project involves construction in an active campus setting adjacent to faculty, staff, and students, and adjacent to student housing.

Contractors should be aware of and review the University of Colorado Boulder’s policies that prohibit discrimination and harassment on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, disability, creed, religion, sexual orientation or veteran status. These policies are located on the web at: http://www.colorado.edu/odh. Contractor personnel must adhere to these policies and conduct themselves in a manner that does not discriminate or harass as a result of interacting with and around the University of Colorado Boulder faculty, staff, students, and visitors.


☐ Provide your firm’s approach to address University of Colorado Boulder’s concerns regarding sexual harassment and discrimination throughout this project.

3. Add new bullet point to IV.A – EVALUATION CRITERIA, subsection 4 – Prior Project Experience/Success.

☐ Firm’s experience with LEED certified projects and experience working on sustainable projects


5. Add two new bullet points to section IV.B. ORAL INTERVIEWS/COST PROPOSALS EVALUATION CRITERIA, subsection 3 – Project Management Approach

☐ Explain your approach for effective project communications, including outreach and coordination with the University Project Manager to communicate project impacts to faculty, staff, and students.
Discuss how you would approach design and construction of the utility distribution system. You do not need to have determined a utility routing for this topic.

6. Question: Is the schedule driven by funding timing; or is the project fully funded?

   Answer: The project is fully funded. The selected CM/GC firm will be asked to develop a project cashflow spreadsheet.

7. Question: On the campus distribution is there a specific reason for the condensate running in a separate trench from the chilled water?

   Answer: The condensate line is currently shown running in the existing tunnel system. UCB is open to design/constructability suggestions.

8. Question: Is there future intent to connect steam to the WDEP? If so, why is it not being addressed now?

   Answer: Steam is interconnected between the EDEP and the WDEP. The existing steam distribution system is not shown in the program plan sketch.

END
APPENDIX A

STATE BUILDINGS PROGRAMS
PREQUALIFICATION SUBMITAL/EVALUATION FORM
CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT/GENERAL CONTRACTING SERVICES

Name of Firm: ________________________________
Name of Project: CP144260 – Campus Utility System ________________________________
Evaluator No: ________________________________ Date: ____________________

RFP REFERENCE
MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS Y _____ N _____

If the minimum requirements (including letter from surety) have not been met, specify the reason(s):
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Acknowledgement and Attestation included: Y _____ N _____

SCORE

Score

Weight¹ x Rating² =

1. QUALIFICATIONS OF THE FIRM(s)

☐ Qualifications of the firm ___________ x ___________ = ___________
☐ Organizational structure/lines of authority ___________ x ___________ = ___________
☐ Subcontractor selection and management ___________ x ___________ = ___________
☐ Colorado workforce ___________ x ___________ = ___________
☐ Safety/employee support ___________ x ___________ = ___________

2. QUALIFICATIONS OF THE MANAGEMENT TEAM MEMBERS

☐ Qualifications and relevant experience of superintendent ___________ x ___________ = ___________
☐ Qualifications and relevant experience of in-house staff ___________ x ___________ = ___________
☐ Location/Access ___________ x ___________ = ___________

3. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH

☐ Approach to successful CM/GC Services
  a. Cost effectiveness ___________ x ___________ = ___________
  b. Schedule effectiveness ___________ x ___________ = ___________
  c. Quality effectiveness ___________ x ___________ = ___________
☐ Competitively Bid/Self Performed Work ___________ x ___________ = ___________
☐ Mech./Distr. subcontractor pre-construction approach ___________ x ___________ = ___________
☐ Approach to sexual harassment prevention ___________ x ___________ = ___________
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4. PRIOR PROJECT EXPERIENCE/SUCCESS

☐ Project #1
  a. Timeliness
  b. Budget Considerations
     Acceptability
  c. Quality
  d. Disruption
  e.                                    
     x                                 =  

☐ Project #2
  a. Timeliness
  b. Budget Considerations
     Acceptability
  c. Quality
  d. Disruption
  e.                                    
     x                                 =  

☐ Project #3
  a. Timeliness
  b. Budget Considerations
     Acceptability
  c. Quality
  d. Disruption
  e.                                    
     x                                 =  

☐ Related experience of the firm
☐ Sustainability
                                    
     x                                 =  

5. MISCELLANEOUS

☐ Claims/litigation history
☐ Apprenticeship Training Program
☐ Other
                                    
     x                                 =  
     x                                 =  

TOTAL SCORE:  

NOTES:
1. Weights are to be assigned prior to evaluation and are to be consistent on all evaluation forms. Use only whole numbers.
2. Rating:  1 = Unacceptable  2 = Poor  3 = Fair
            4 = Good  5 = Excellent
3. Total score includes the sum total of all criteria. Note: A passing score (as a percentage of the total points available) is to be established prior to evaluation.