



**9655 SE 36th Building Renovations
RFQ NUMBER: 25-48**

ADDENDUM NO. 1

ISSUED THIS DATE: October 14, 2025

RFQ SUBMITTAL DEADLINE: **3:00 PM (PST) on October 21, 2025**

This addendum is for 9655 SE 36th Building Renovations project request for qualifications, RFQ No. 25-48, issued September 22, 2025. The document is posted to capture any questions received during the open questions period via email or during the mandatory site visit. Agency answers are provided.

The addendum shall become fully a part of the above-named project RFQ documents. Each firm shall be responsible for reading this addendum to ascertain to what extent and in what manner it affects the scope of work.

This Addendum consists of a total of two (2) pages, as detailed below:

1. ADDENDUM No. 01, dated October 14, 2025, containing answers to questions received as of October 7, 2025. Total of 2 pages.
2. New Exhibit 4 –Site Visit Attendance Sheet

Additions to the RFQ Documents

1. **Exhibit 4 – Site Visit Attendance List** added to RFQ documents as part of this addendum.

Questions & Answers

Q1: Would it be possible to obtain an opinion of probable cost for the subject solicitation?

A1: The City has not yet established an opinion of probable cost. The selected consultant will be responsible for providing input and developing cost estimates at key project milestones to support informed decision-making for the City and help achieve the project's goals.

Q2: Prior to the site visit, I was wondering if there had been any studies or reports assembled on the property?

A2: There have not been any formal investigations, reports, or studies completed outside of the property conditions assessment provided as Exhibit 3 of the RFQ.

Q3: The building was originally opened as a B Occupancy, but since housing a private school, do you know if some or all of the building is now an E Occupancy?

A3: The Certificate of Occupancy for the Yellow Wood Academy tenant space was issued in 2015 under Occupancy Group E classification.

Q4: Would the City of Mercer Island be open to considering a Design/Build approach with the GC and design team?

A4: The City is not currently evaluating or pursuing an alternative Public Works contracting method, including Design-Build.

Q5: Will the list of attendees to the mandatory meeting on October 1st be posted on the City's website?

A5: Yes. The attendance list from the site meeting will be posted in Addendum 01 as Exhibit 4.

Q6: The Mercer Island Police Department (MIPD) was noted to temporarily occupy the facility. What is the timeline and what is envisioned for the future space?

A6: The City is prioritizing the future occupancy of the facility by the Mercer Island Police Department (MIPD) and Youth and Family Services (YFS). MIPD is expected to use the space on an interim basis until a permanent facility is delivered through the new Public Safety and Maintenance Facility (PSM), which is contingent upon approval of a future ballot measure. The interim occupancy is currently estimated to be 4 to 5 years, though this timeline is subject to change. Once MIPD relocates to the new PSM facility, the City has not yet determined how the vacated space will be used by other City departments. The selected project team will be expected to work closely with the City to explore and develop a phased programming strategy to best re-purpose the space.

Q7: Will the Police Department need secured parking and will they need a detention area?

A7: The City does not anticipate the need for a secured parking area; however, the specific requirements pertaining to secured parking and detention area will be determined during the programming and schematic design phase in collaboration with the MIPD.

Q8: If the vote to approve the bond measure to fund the new PSM fails will this project be necessary?

A8: Yes.



Connor Dimick
CIP Project Manager
City of Mercer Island – Public Works
206.276.6497 | connor.dimick@mercerisland.gov