

**DPI COMPETITION: RESPONSE TO REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION****Date: September 11, 2020**

---

**Information regarding October 20<sup>th</sup> Presentations**

The firms will appear in the following order on October 20, 2020:

8:30am	Foster+Partners with Epstein
11:00am	Studio Gang
2:00pm	Jacobs with OMA Architecture

The CDB will send each firm an invitation to their virtual presentation meeting.

Presentations are virtual. Presentations are an opportunity for the teams to present their complete competition design that was submitted on October 6. The presentations will be recorded. As a public competition all materials and recordings will become a part of public record.

Each team will be given a two-hour appointment, scheduled as follows:

Opening Remarks by CDB	10 Minutes
Team Presentation	45 Minutes
Break	5 Minutes
Q and A	45 Minutes
Closing Statement	5 Minutes

The Q/A period will begin with a short set of prepared questions asked by the Selection Committee. These will not be shared in advance.

### **Response to Requests for Clarification**

---

- 1. The DPI Presidents statement indicates that they would collaborate with teams during the design competition. Is there potential for engaging DPI and other stakeholders and community during the competition?**

Response: Opportunity to collaborate with the executive body of the DPI will be provided to the winner of the competition after a selection has been made. No communication with DPI, outside of the official channels noted in the brief, shall be permitted during the competition.

- 2. How will this collaboration be structured to assure that teams get exclusive access to individuals, and ensure that information is not shared from one team to another?**

Response: No collaboration with DPI or its executive body shall take place during the competition.

- 3. Is a programmatic engagement with DPI available?**

Response: No contact with the DPI is permitted during the competition. Any communication regarding the competition outside of the official channels provided for in the competition brief with the DPI, members of the selection committee, members of the design jury, representatives from Related Midwest, or members of professional firms responsible for the feasibility study may be grounds for disqualification.

- 4. Page 12 indicates that the project site is an assumed 3.5-acre site at the south end of the 78. Is it possible to get a digital vector-based site plan indicating the assumed site boundaries?**

Response: Unfortunately, no. The only information we have on the site is illustrated in the brief. The specific dimensions are shown on P. 19 and more contextual guidance appears on P. 20.

- 5. Is there a defined format for the Order of Magnitude Cost Estimate?**

Response: Please follow, roughly, the format of the estimates provided in the feasibility study, with major costs categorized by division.

- 6. What are DPI's initiatives? What types of research are anticipated in the building?**

Response: DPI is still refining its initiatives and the latest information can be found on their website. <https://dpi.uillinois.edu/about>. It is certain that further refinement of the program will take place after the design team is selected. The feasibility study discusses potential types of research spaces.

- 7. What is the matrix of users in the building? What percentage is academic versus private business use?**

Response: Per the feasibility study, about 3,000 full time equivalent users are expected to be housed in the facility. That number includes a variable mix of students, researchers,

administration, and outside professionals. Numbers are expected to fluctuate depending on initiatives, which is why flexibility and adaptability of space should be emphasized in the responses.

**8. Can we request a 3D massing model of Related Midwest's The 78 development?**

Response: Please refer to Related Midwest's webpage for The 78 : <https://www.78chicago.com>. Please remember that any communication regarding the competition (outside of the official channels provided for in the competition brief) with the DPI, members of the selection committee, members of the design jury, representatives from Related Midwest, or members of professional firms responsible for the feasibility study may be grounds for disqualification.

**9. Our understanding of the PUD indicates there will be two high-rise towers in Sub Area 2. Please confirm. Confirm one tower to the southwest of the site, and one to the east.**

Response: The development of "The 78", outside of the parcel of land to be donated to the DPI, is the sole privilege of Related Midwest. Information regarding their development plans are in Appendix C, the Planned Use Development zoning amendment. These indicate that 2 high rises are planned (eventually) for the site.

**10. Is topographic information available for the site?**

Response: No. Please refer to the response to question 4 above.

**11. The total project cost has been given as \$250 mil. In the Feasibility Study, the various construction budget (not including contingencies, fees, general conditions, or escalation) estimates ranged from \$165-\$180 million. Would this (\$165-\$180 mil) be an accurate assumption for the construction budget? If not, what is the assumed the construction budget (hard costs only) for the project?**

Response: While a final budget has not been set, \$180M in hard cost is the goal for competition purposes. The cost estimate is not to be considered to be a major portion of the competition response, but rather used as a guide to help the teams prepare for the next phase of the project.

**12. Is it possible to receive a Land Use Plan for The 78 masterplan?**

Response: Please refer to the response to question 8 above.

**13. Is it possible to receive proposed grading information for the proposed building site area?**

Response: No. Please refer to the response to question 4 above.

**14. Is there any additional detail on the assumed technology included in the technology budget from the Feasibility Study? There is a single line item for AV and for IT (nothing for Security as far as we can see) included in the Feasibility Study cost estimates, and it would be helpful to understand what the assumptions are in terms of equipment and infrastructure or if this is an area that the design team should propose additional solutions, or the winning team will work with the Client to develop.**

Response: Please refer to the “Technology” section of the data collection conclusions in the Feasibility Study. The building will be expected to be “state of the art” with regards to its communication, technology, and adaptability to new technologies. After award the winning team will work with the client to develop these systems. However, addressing them in the conceptual design may allow opportunity to explore the potential of these systems at the competition level.

**15. During the interview, a question was asked about the possibility of this project moving to a smaller parcel. Should the competition design assume adaptability to a different site in the future?**

Response: It is highly likely the final site will not be the site assumed for the brief, so adaptability of the design concept and the design process is paramount. (For site information please refer to question 4 above.) Because the final site will likely be different it is very important to consider site in terms of context as the greater neighborhood of the South Loop which includes the influences of the river and railways to the west, a residential area to the east, Chinatown to the south and the Chicago Loop to the north. Greater emphasis should be given to the “idea’s” relationship to this “context” than to any specific proposed buildings to be eventually located within The 78.

**16. Is there a page size (e.g. 11"x17, 8 ½" x 11", etc.) limit for the 60 page max primary submission?**

Response: We ask that teams use an 11"x17" page size that will allow for easy viewing on laptop screens.

**17. Are there any specific requirements for the materials that should be included in the October 20th presentation vs. the October 6th submittal? E.g. Is it acceptable to add new content to the October 20th presentation that is not in the October 6th submittal?**

Response: Competition selection period and judging begins October 6 thus a complete competition package shall be submitted on October 6<sup>th</sup>. The October 20<sup>th</sup> Presentation may not include new content. October 20<sup>th</sup> is an opportunity to present the complete design as submitted October 6<sup>th</sup> to the Selection Committee.

**18. Is it possible to receive feedback on any of the interview materials we've already presented as either written comments or through a teleconference?**

Response: No. As indicated in the Professional Services Bulletin, debriefs on a firm's submittals will not be given until the selection has been finalized.

**19. Will teams be provided any CAD plans, topographical surveys, or 3D files of 'The 78' development site, its proposed buildings, and/or the surrounding context?**

Response: No. Please refer to the responses to questions 4 and 8 above.

**20. Will the teams be provided 3D buildings files + digital textures as portrayed in 'The 78' renderings? (Files can be Autocad, Revit, Rhino or 3dsMax file format).**

Response: No. Please refer to the response to question 8 above.

**21. Will any interim design check-ins occur before the submission deadline?**

Response: No.

**22. Please clarify whether A/E teams will be presenting to the selection committee on October 20th.**

Response: The teams will be presenting virtually to the selection committee. The committee will have reviewed your October 6 submittal, and will have already consulted with the design advisory jury.

**23. Will the October 20th Team Presentations be virtual or in-person?**

Response: The Presentations are virtual.

**24. How many team members are permitted to attend the October 20th presentation?**

Response: There is no formal limit, but teams should consider how they will manage a large team during a virtual presentation.

**25. Will hard-copy prints of the submission and boards be required for the October 20th presentation? If so, how many copies?**

Response: No hard copies are required. All submittals are electronic.



**26. If the October 20th Team Presentation is in-person, will teams be permitted to bring physical models?**

Response: The Presentations are virtual. Physical models will not be accepted.

**27. Can you please clarify whether the ‘video fly through’ (2 minutes maximum) referenced on page 30 refers to the same thing as the ‘video summary’ referenced on page 31?**

Response: Yes, they are the same thing.

**28. Can the video fly through be submitted on same day as tentative Oct 20th team presentation?**

Response: No. All required material must be submitted on October 6<sup>th</sup>. Please refer to question 16 above.

**29. Please clarify what the basis of the cost estimate should be. The previous estimate in the JLK feasibility study had approx. \$40 million included for appears to be soft cost items (e.g. design fees, design builder contingency, capital development board fees, loose FF&E and specialist equipment and finally a University of Illinois System Fee). Should these items be included in the current required estimate?**

Response: Please refer to question 11 above. Teams should focus on hard cost. Soft costs from the previous estimate may be re-used. Only provide soft costs if you believe there is a specific or unique aspect of your design that will substantially modify the assumed soft costs.

**30. There is a mention of “design-builder contingency” in the cost estimate. Please clarify if this project is intended to be a Design-Bid-Build or Design-Build.**

Response: This project is currently planned as Design-Bid-Build.

**31. Are there any Aerial drone videos of the site available?**

Response: No.

**32. Will the CDB/DPI/U of I host an on-site visit?**

Response: No visit is planned. Please see question 32 below.

**33. Are teams permitted to visit the site in-person at any time?**

Response: The site is empty and viewable from the public way, therefore the University and CDB will not hold any formal visits or assist in access. Refer to the response to question 4 above for other site information.

**34. When and where will the presentation boards be presented to the public?**

Response: All submitted competition materials may be made available for public viewing at a later date after the selection has been finalized and a winner announced.

**35. Will the Jury and Selection Committee solicit feedback from the public during the scoring/evaluation process?**

Response: No.

**36. What is the CDB/DPI/U of I's media/social media plan? What details and/or images will be released to journalists and members of the public and when?**

Response: No information will be released until a final selection has been made. Please note that this is a publicly funded project and all materials will be subject to public transparency laws.

**37. Can you provide more specific breakdown of the shared/ mechanical spaces?**

Response: Please refer to pages 40 and 41 of the feasibility study. The back of house spaces are included in this group, as well as circulation space not specifically listed in other or included as part of the flexible workspace. Note that this was determined by using a grossing factor of 1.7 added on to the expected core program area, and not specifically enumerated.

**38. Can you please provide additional details around the lab types expected to be housed in the DPI? In particular, can you elaborate on the flex and dry lab program?**

Response: Please refer to the discussions in the feasibility study. No further information is available at this time.

**39. Does the City of Chicago have any jurisdiction over this project? If so, what is the nature of it?**

Response: The city will review for conformance with the PUD (in lieu of zoning) and permit the project to ensure compliance with the city building codes.

**40. Will the University of Illinois system have the same jurisdiction over this project as they would for projects on their state campuses?**

Response: This CDB project will be managed by the CDB for the State of Illinois in collaboration with the University of Illinois System and the Discovery Partners Institute. CDB Standard Documents for Construction will apply. This project is under CDB's new Excellence in Design Program and not subject to traditional design restrictions that may be imposed in any specific campus settings.

**41. With the understanding that the exact location for the DPI has not been fully determined, please confirm that, for the purposes of this competition, teams should treat the site outlined in feasibility study as fixed.**

Response: Yes. Please refer to question 4 above.

**42. Is any more detail on the site location/parameters available for the purpose of the competition?**

Response: Please refer to question 4 above.

- 43. Some of the auditoria cited as examples have traditional seating rows, and others have desks more akin to tiered classrooms. Does DPI have any guidance as to the preferred type? Most of the text suggests something more like the former than the latter.**

Response: One large traditional auditorium is expected, although DPI would like this to be more flexible than a standard lecture hall. Also note that some large instructional spaces are suggested, which might lend themselves to a tiered classroom approach.

- 44. On page 216 of the brief, it is specified that interim uses of undeveloped parcels is permitted. Does this permission extend to competition scope?**

Response: All restrictions and permissions laid out in the PUD apply. While interim use of undeveloped parcels may be permitted it is the intent that the site for the purpose of this competition is limited to the area identified. Please reference the response to question 4 for information and limitations about the competition site.

- 45. The conceptual phasing plan on page 215 of the brief shows the competition site as "Phase 1C". Should the competition design consider the large tracts of Phase 1A and 1B as pre-existing conditions?**

Response: It is our understanding that the developer's plan is to build from north to south, so if DPI proceeds on the stated site in the competition, it will be the first building built on the southern portion of the development. While we cannot be sure what will be built around it in the future, any development will need to comply with the standards laid out in the PUD.

- 46. The property boundary shown in the brief does not include a spur of rail infrastructure. That spur stops east of the St Charles Air Line infrastructure, leaving significant topography, bridges, and underpasses as a part of the developable land. Please clarify any intended uses or demolition for this area.**

Response: As previously noted detailed site information is not available at this time. Teams should assume a clear, build-ready site with the boundaries noted in the brief. Please refer to the response to question 4.

- 47. Please clarify the evaluation criteria titled "Community Engagement."**

Response: Please refer to the "Community Connection" section of the feasibility study, as well as the mission statement from DPI's website.

- 48. What will the grading condition be for the site at the onset of construction?**

Response: As previously noted detailed site information is not available at this time. Teams should assume a clear, build ready site with the boundaries noted in the brief. Please reference the response to question 4.

- 49. To what extent can the competition design influence the neighboring horizontal or transit infrastructure (for example: streetscape, street alignment, shared use paths, shared streets, Metra station design)?**

Response: All ideas are welcome in the competition; however, teams should note that we do not have direct control over the surroundings. If a compelling argument for can be made for intervention outside of our designated site, DPI and the CDB will support the proposal, but the developer (and legal bindings of the PUD) have final say.