

Library Mall Redevelopment Study Q&A

Question 1:

We wanted to confirm whether the lead firm/prime contract holder pursuing this project must comply with the eligibility and qualifications outlined in the UW Division of Facilities Development and Management Policy and Procedure Manual for Architects/Engineers and Consultants (https://doa.wi.gov/DFDM_Documents/Forms-Templates/DOA-4518P-AE-PPM.pdf), see below? page 1-9 in particular:

1.D.2.d Eligibility and Qualifications

The term "eligible Architect/Engineer" (in accordance with Wisconsin Administrative Code, Chapter Adm. 20) means one who meets the following criteria:

- 1) Has more than one Architect/Engineer as a responsible member of the firm;
- 2) Has been in business at least three years;
- 3) Has a permanent office within Wisconsin where responsible direction of all services will be based. Note: Out-of-state firms will be considered when the Selection Committee determines there are no Wisconsin firms qualified or available to provide the services required;
- 4) Has been responsible for the design and completion of a project with a total construction cost or size at least 50% as large as the project under consideration and of similar design. For projects with total budgets less than \$1,000,000, criteria 1.D.2.d.1, 2 and 4 may be waived.

No, the UW Division of Facilities Development and Management Policy and Procedure Manual for Architects/Engineers and Consultants does need to be followed due to the nature of this project being 100% gift/grant funded.

Question 2:

Can you confirm that the total page count of 25 pages is for double sided pages, for a total of 50 single sided pages? Shall cover pages and section dividers be included in the total page count?

The page count is 25 pages, single-sided, which includes the cover page.

Question 3:

The schedule in the RFQ indicates a long period of time in November/December for stakeholder review of concept drawings. Does UW plan to facilitate those stakeholder meetings or will that be the responsibility of the selected A/E firm?

The UW will facilitate the various public stakeholder meetings with the support of the selected A/E firm. The firm will supply the necessary drawings and presentation materials for the meetings. The A/E may wish to participate in the actual meetings.

Question 4:

Does the UW wish to pursue SITES pre-certification for this planning effort, or do they prefer an internal review of the project's qualifications for SITES?

We do not wish to pursue SITES pre-certification but wish to use the framework of SITES to justify and understand why decisions are being made at this advanced planning stage. This site can be planned, designed, developed, and maintained to avoid, mitigate, and even reverse detrimental impacts to ecosystem services. Through development of the site with a SITES lens we can elevate the value of the landscape. An understanding of the criteria within the system is required to inform decision making.

Question 5:

Do you require that a SITES AP be a member of the project team?

Please see response to Question #4.

Question 6:

The RFQ states that some of the inquiry into the status of current MEP systems at the site has been completed by Campus FP&M. Can you give us a better sense of what data the A/E design team will have available for its MEP review?

We have existing underground utility information, including as-built drawings from the many various major utilities and the underground tunnel work completed in this area in the past 10 years. We also have some utility information on the existing fountain in the center of the mall.

Question 7:

At what point in the design process do you anticipate meetings with the Design Review Board, the City's Joint Campus Area Committee, and Planning Staff? What level of documentation is typically required for these meetings? We would like to make sure that our tentative schedule and proposed task structure provides deliverables that align with these meeting requirements.

The A/E team will meet with the DRB and JCAC at least twice each to review initial plans and the final study recommendations. Meetings with UW Planning staff will be an on-going process as the campus project manager is in the Planning office.

Question 8:

What role, if any, will the SHPO play in the development of a plan for Library Mall?

The Wisconsin Historical Society and the State Historic Preservation Office will be a key stakeholder in this planning process. The area is within the NRHP listed Bascom Hill District and the fountain is a contributing feature within the district. We expect the WHS/SHPO will be involved in at least two to three review meetings, including early in the planning process, as well as a review of the final draft advance plan to assure they support the overall project. They also consider this their "front yard" and are very anxious about the project living up to their expectations.

Question 9:

Can the historic fountain be relocated on site or is it to remain in place and be protected?

The WHS/SHPO have previously advised that the fountain can be replaced, redesigned or remain in place. It is a contributing feature in the historic district and any changes would need WHS/SHPO review and approval. They also might require some sort of mitigation for the loss of this contributing feature if it is changed.

Question 10:

The RFP noted that 3 virtual stakeholder meetings/interviews would be required to help understand opportunities and constraints and define the vision. What role does the University want the consultant team will (to) play in the engagement process (establish methods of engagement, facilitation of virtual events, simply attend, etc)?

As noted, the university will facilitate the stakeholder meetings with the assistance and support of the design team. The A/E can and should recommend engagement processes and methods of facilitation to the university planning team.

Question 11:

Is there an expectation that the plan for Library Mall can transition onto neighboring properties or is the boundary the set limits of design?

The project area of Library Mall can and should complement the surrounding neighborhood areas, but it is a key destination point and needs to be easily recognizable with key features that help define the space as "Library Mall". The boundaries as identified in the RFQ are the boundaries of the project. While it is true this site is a key destination it must relate, reflect, and merge into its surroundings. We do not want a 'fence' around this site saying, "You are now entering Library Mall". The space needs to be part of the campus landscape and part of the cityscape in this urbanized area of Madison.

Question 12:

We have assembled a qualified team of professionals with experience on projects similar in nature to the Library Mall Redevelopment Study. We do not however have experience working on projects for the UW campus or the UW system. Based on the experience section in the RFQ, would our team be disqualified from selection for this project because we do not have direct experience working on UW projects?

No, your firm would not be disqualified, but the selection committee would take this into consideration when reviewing the proposals.

Question 13:

Could you provide additional clarification of the anticipated scope of work related to "MEP Requirements"? Is this study limited to MEP requirements of the site (water feature, lighting), or do you expect it to be more substantial, including existing sub-grade facilities?

Like Question #6 above, we have existing underground utility information, including as-built drawings from the many various major utilities and the underground tunnel work completed in this area in the past 10 years. We also have some utility information on the existing fountain in

the center of the mall. We would expect the AE team to understand all the existing utilities within the project area as they plan for redevelopment, including changes to the site-specific utilities (water features, lighting, stormwater management, etc.).

Question 14:

What role will the City have regarding the Design Process?

The city will have a key stakeholder role at the table and will have a representative on the Core Team. It would be expected that under the review process, the team and UW staff would present the draft plans to the city Planning Staff and city committees as requested by the alder, but the UW Design Review Board will make the final recommendation to the city for review. At this point in time, it is not expected that this project will have to go to the city's Urban Design Commission as that function is being provided by the UW Design Review Board.

Question 15:

Has the Steering Committee for the project been identified? If so, which stake holders are included on this committee?

The steering committee has not been identified, but may include: UW-Madison Facilities Planning and Management (FP&M) entities such as: Physical Plant, Capital Planning & Development, Campus Planning & Landscape Architecture, user groups, Environment, Health and Safety Department, UW Police, Division of Information Technology (DoIT). Other stakeholders on the Steering Committee may include adjacent users (Historical Society, Memorial Library, University Club, Wisconsin Union, as well as City of Madison and UW-System. We would anticipate a Steering Committee of no more than 10 people with a single designated point of contact for questions and comments outside of meetings.

Question 16:

How is the consultant expected to coordinate with the project stakeholders?

The university will facilitate the stakeholder meetings with the assistance and support of the design team. The AE can and should recommend engagement processes and methods of facilitation to the university planning team. There will be a designated point of contact for questions and comments outside of these meetings for the A/E to work with.

Question 17:

Is there additional funding available to help meet the proposed scope listed in the RFP?

The budget for this planning initiative is in alignment with the project scope.

Question 18:

How prominent of a role will cultural aspects play in the design and engagement process?

Understanding, reference, and interpretation of the Bascom Mall Cultural Landscape Inventory will be required to meet stakeholder desires. Culture is the agent; the landscape & hardscape is the medium and the cultural landscape is the result.

Question 19:

What departments are represented by the selection committee?

The selection committee will be made up of three professional staff: Two (2) from UW-Madison and one (1) from UWSA.

Question 20:

The Amended AIA contract B101 states that travel to and from meetings are considered Basic Services and not Reimbursable expenses. The RFQ document does not have a statement on this topic. Can you please confirm whether travel to and from meetings must be included within the 40K maximum fee?

Please see response to Question #21.

Question 21:

If travel-related expenses are to be included under the maximum fee, given the number of meetings, will video conferencing be acceptable alternatives to in-person meetings in order to limit travel expenses?

The anticipation is that most if not all meetings will be done in a virtual capacity until such time that public meetings can be held with more than 10 and up to 50+ people.

Question 22:

The RFQ notes (4) meetings under "Reviews and Approvals", and (2) (Preliminary and Final) Campus Technical Reviews that the design team will facilitate, involving a wide mix of attendees. Will the UW Project Manager coordinate these meetings for the design team, minimizing the number of meeting days and locations?

Yes, every effort will be made to consolidate trips/times. Note, virtual meetings will be acceptable to help in this capacity for reviews and approvals.

Question 23:

The Amended AIA contract B101 states that the Architect shall solicit necessary surveys, but the RFQ states that the Architect will be "provided with existing base information from the client". Can you please clarify which information will be provided to the Architect and which information will need to be generated by the Architect?

Base information will be given to assist in initial programming and budgeting. Once an actual project begins, the A/E team will solicit the necessary surveys.

Question 24:

The Scope of Services requires renderings for the preferred conceptual design but does not state how many are required. It does state that two chosen views will be used in a variety of ways by the client. Can you confirm if there is a required number of renderings in the project scope?

Two chosen views will be required. The A/E will need to provide enough visual information to convey design intent and justification for decisions to be made, including which views to select.

Question 25:

Based on what was written in the RFP, for scope it appears a certain process with specific deliverables is desirable. What we would like clarification on is, would it be acceptable to go through an alternate design process with potentially reduced scope or do we need to adhere to the proposed process as best as possible?

The process as outlined in the RFQ is the obligation and terms to be met by the A/E. If there are alternative methods to reach these same outcomes, that is a valid discussion during the kick-off and scoping confirmation meeting with the selected A/E team.