



State of Rhode Island  
Department of Administration / Division of Purchases  
One Capitol Hill, Providence, Rhode Island 02908-5855  
Tel: (401) 574-8100 Fax: (401) 574-8387

Solicitation Information  
February 7, 2019

**ADDENDUM # 3**

RFP# 7597657

**TITLE: Educational Facility Master Planner – School Construction Projects,  
Master Price Agreement / Continuous Recruitment**

**Submission Deadline has Been Postponed Until:**

**Monday February 18, 2019 at 11:00 AM**

- **Attached includes:**

- Sign in sheet from non- mandatory pre-bid conference
- Questions received with responses, no further questions will be answered

**Tom Bovis**  
**Interdepartmental Project Manager**

*Interested parties should monitor this website, on a regular basis, for any additional information.*



**"NON-MANDATORY" PRE-BID CONFERENCE SIGN IN SHEET**

BID NUMBER: 7597657  
 BID TITLE: EDUCATION PREVIEW MMRN LEARN  
 PRE-BID DATE AND TIME: 12/5/18 10:00 AM

Purchasing Representative: \_\_\_\_\_  
Tom Bid  
 NON-Mandatory Pre-bid START TIME: \_\_\_\_\_  
 NON-Mandatory Pre-bid END TIME: \_\_\_\_\_

COMPANY NAME	COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	CONTACT E-MAIL	CONTACT PHONE NUMBER
16	Collins	Shirley Demco	72 Bend St Prov	hollydemco@collins.com	401-3744
17	Collins	Siemal Dark	72 Pine St. Prov	jiana.dai@collins.com	401-402407
18	Studio MESA	ERIC ARMY	11 alegg St Prov	eric@studio.MESA.com	481-0633
19	Tapparo	Robert Stack	35 greenwich st prov	Stack.la.tenada@gmail.com	401-242-1242
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
29					
30					



"NON-MANDATORY" PRE-BID CONFERENCE SIGN IN SHEET

BID NUMBER: 755 7657  
 BID TITLE: EDUCATION SERVICES MAJOR FURNITURE  
 PRE-BID DATE AND TIME: 12/5/12 10 AM

Purchasing Representative: Tom Bous  
 NON-Mandatory Pre-bid START TIME:  
 NON-Mandatory Pre-bid/END TIME:

COMPANY NAME	COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	CONTACT EMAIL	CONTACT PHONE NUMBER
1 Fingold Alexander Templec Macdonald	Bryan Shields Ives Jose R Oliva		77 N. Washington St Boston, MA 02114 84 Sprague St Providence RI	shields-ives@faaic.com jost@templec.com	617-227-9272 401-295-3533 401-272-6100
2 UHB	Scott Lindgren			SLindgren@UHB.com	
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					



"NON-MANDATORY" PRE-BID CONFERENCE SIGN IN SHEET

BID NUMBER: 759 7657  
 BID TITLE: EDWARDS FACILITY MAINTENANCE  
 PRE-BID DATE AND TIME: 12/5/18 10 AM

Purchasing Representative: Tom Bar  
 NON-Mandatory Pre-bid START TIME:  
 NON-Mandatory Pre-bid END TIME:

COMPANY NAME	COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	CONTACT EMAIL	CONTACT PHONE NUMBER
16 TEBON ARCHITECTS	DAVID ESCHÉ	<i>[Signature]</i>	17 RAILROAD AVE. WESTERLY, RI 02891	Kathline@tebonpx.com	401.596.7555
17 STV/DPW	Robert Garrison	<i>[Signature]</i>	280 Transwell St. Hartford CT	rob.garrison@stvd.com	941.578-4911
18 RSB Arch.	ANDREW RAMER	<i>[Signature]</i>	52 Hillhouse, P.A., RI	aramero@rsb.com	401.272.1330
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
29					
30					



"NON-MANDATORY" PRE-BID CONFERENCE SIGN IN SHEET

BID NUMBER: 797679  
 BID TITLE: DUCSON FACILITY Modern Renovation  
 PRE-BID DATE AND TIME: 12/5/12 10 AM

Purchasing Representative: Jon Bow  
 NON-Mandatory Pre-bid START TIME:  
 NON-Mandatory Pre-bid END TIME:

COMPANY NAME	COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	CONTACT E-MAIL	CONTACT PHONE NUMBER
Edward Rouse Architects	Jim Partridge	<i>James M. Partridge</i>	400 Massachusetts Ave East Providence, RI 02912	partridge@jpartridge.com	401-331-9200
STUD WED	KATE JESSUP	<i>Kate Jessup</i>	10 DOUBLET ST STE 100 PROVIDENCE RI 02903	JESSUP@STUDWED.COM	401-519-5117
RIDE ISBA	Christine Lopes Metcalfe	<i>Christine Metcalfe</i>			

RFP # 7597657

Title: Educational Facility Master Planner – School Construction Projects, MPA/CR

**Attached:**

-List of Attendees to Pre-Bid Conference

**Clarification:**

As expressed at the pre-bid meeting, vendors do not need to include names on the budget detail sheet. In addition, vendors can add additional lines or provide their own spreadsheets in the same format as the budget detail sheet. Please note that only the job titles that are provided on the budget details sheets can be used throughout the life of the Master Price Agreement. For example, if pricing is not provided for a Jr. Project Manager, then vendors cannot use that job title in their responses to any solicitations.

For example:

**FY 2019 (Year 1)**

Project Manager \$130 an hour

Sr. Project Manger \$150 an hour

Project Executive \$180 an hour

**FY 2020 (Year 2)**

Project Manager \$133 an hour

Sr. Project Manger \$152 an hour

Project Executive \$183 an hour

**Scope Change:**

In Section 3 Scope of Work and Requirements: Remove item *xiv. Schematic Design* (page 13 and 14). Vendors will not be required to provide these services.

**Technical Proposal Clarification:**

Under A. Technical Proposal, 1. Staff Qualifications, add the following sentence: Preference will be given to firms that have an accredited planner on staff, as recognized by the Association of Learning Environments (A4LE) or another equivalent organization, or firms that commit to hiring or training staff to attain accreditation by June 30, 2020.

**Questions**

1. **Is it the intent to qualify architectural firms as the prime vendor to provide these EFP services?**  
No. This RFP is to establish a Master Price Agreement (MPA) that will be available to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to help ease and expedite the procurement necessary to conduct educational facility planning.
2. **Do you require that the prime vendor identify all subconsultants in their response?**  
Yes.
3. **Is the cost proposal required for this response? If so, will hourly rates be required for each subconsultant?**  
Yes.

- 4. Please explain how the prime vendor should anticipate differences in LEA project scope/size in their cost proposals?**

This RFP is to establish a Master Price Agreement that will be available to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to help ease and expedite the procurement necessary to conduct educational facility planning. The LEA and/or the State can identify the scope of work and schedule in their procurements.

- 5. How will the ISBE participation rates be evaluated since this RFP isn't for a specific project with a set lump sum?**

ISBE will be evaluated for a specific project during the mini bid process

- 6. Will this MPA have a fixed not-to-exceed fee limit?**

Yes.

- 7. Will prime vendors be qualified for unlimited project size and project cost?**

No.

- 8. Does the formatting of written documents, which calls for 1" margins and 12 point font, apply to the entire document, including photos?**

Yes.

- 9. "The technical proposal is limited to twenty (20) pages.": Can you confirm whether 20 pages is referring to 10 sheets of paper with a page count of 20, or 20 sheets of paper with a page count of 40?**

10 sheets with a page count of 20.

- 10. Can you confirm that both the technical and cost proposals can only be bound with removable binder clips?**

Yes.

- 11. Is the intent of this RFP to assemble architectural and engineering teams including educational consultants to provide master plan Services to school districts throughout the state as needed and to provide stage one and stage two study services for RIDE?**

The intent of the RFP is to create a Master Price Agreement of Educational Facility Planners to help expedite the procurement for LEAs. The LEA and/or the State can identify the scope of work in their procurements.

- 12. 2) If teams are submitted in response to this RFP, for the MPA, will the teams remain as teams if selected off the MPA or will districts have the option to select from different teams listed on the MPA?**

Because this procurement is for an MPA that is primarily designed for use by LEAs it is not possible to answer hypotheticals regarding local procurement. That said, the MPA is intended to pre-qualify teams to ease procurement for facility planning services at the LEA level.

- 13. 3) If a firm does not submit a proposal for this RFP, will this firm be excluded from performing future work related to RIDE stage one and stage two studies?**

No.

- 14. 4) the RFP is written in a way that suggests that an educational consultant will be the leader of the team. Is this the intent or is the state expecting an Architectural firm to be the lead?**  
The intent of the RFP is to create an MPA of educational facility planners.
- 15. 5) is this RFP strictly for master plans or does it include stage one and stage two studies for school districts?**  
As clarified elsewhere, the RFP is primarily intended for master planning services.
- 16. 6) how many teams will be selected for the MPA this solicitation?**  
Multiple depending on the amount of qualifying responses.
- 17. It is unclear to me if this RFP is soliciting services for a specific project, a State-Wide Master Plan, or generally for future Master Plan work among individual Districts State-Wide. Can you please clarify?**  
This RFP is to create a Master Price Agreement for future master plan work with individual LEAs statewide.
- 18. Is the intent to select 1, or more than 1 Firm?**  
Multiple depending on the amount of qualifying responses.
- 19. Will the Firm(s) selected through this process, be assigned/offered Master Plan Projects or are they simply considered pre-qualified for Master Plan work?**  
As stated in the RFP, this is a procurement for a Master Price Agreement – not a commitment or assignment to any specific project.
- 20. Can Firms compete for Facilities Master Plans if not selected under this solicitation?**  
Facility master plans are procured by LEAs at the local level.
- 21. Is the cost proposal intended to be for any hypothetical Facilities Master Plan Project from a given District (despite size, complexity, site, etc.)?**  
The cost proposal requested is an hourly rate for the purposes of evaluating bidders. As stated above, the LEA and/or the State can identify the scope of work in their individual procurements.
- 22. The existing conditions portion indicates the option of using the Jacobs Report; is this in-place of a Firm assessing existing conditions?**  
Yes.
- 23. Do Firms need a RI office to do this Master Plan work in the State?**  
As stated in the RFP, "The services of qualified and capable vendors with offices in Rhode Island, or those who propose a joint venture with a Rhode Island firm, shall be utilized whenever possible."
- 24. How does the Facilities Master Plan completion fit into the Necessity of Construction application process? Is the expectation that LEA's will have their Facilities Master Plans completed prior to submitting their Stage I application?**  
Yes.



**25. Can the sign in / attendance sheet for the Pre Proposal Conference be provided?**  
Included in Addenda.

**26. Can questions asked and answered at the Pre Proposal Conference be provided?**  
No. Per Section 6 of the RFP, all questions were to be directed to the Division of Purchases.

**27. Are there a maximum number of service providers (EFPs) that can be selected for this Master Price Agreement?**  
No.

**28. Section 1 (page 4) "The term of this Master Price Agreement / Continuous Recruitment will be for three (3) years (projected May 1, 2019 – June 30, 2022) with four (4) one-year extensions at the sole option of RIDE.**

**1. Will the 1-year extensions be granted for all services provided or only specific service providers?**

Extension would be offered to every vendor on the MPA.

**2. How will the need for 1-year extensions be justified and what will the basis be for their approval?**

This extension is not a contract extension and will be at the State's discretion.

**29. Section 1 (page 4) "Additional responses will be reviewed every six months for the duration of this Continuous Recruitment period."**

**1. Please clarify. If a firm submits their proposal in response to this RFP no than the deadline but is found not eligible or is disqualified, may the firm resubmit for review at the next 6-month cycle?**

Yes.

**30. Section 1. Introduction (page 4) states "This is a Request for Proposals, not a Request for Quotes". Page 16 starts the Cost Proposal portion of the RFP. Section 5, Evaluation and Selection gives criteria for Cost Proposals, ultimately ranking the vendors by costs (i.e. Quotes). Please clarify.**

As stated in the RFP, this is a procurement for a Master Price Agreement – not a commitment or assignment to any specific project. Costs are used to qualify vendors for the MPA and subsequently individual LEAs and/or the State will procure services for their specific needs.

**31. Section 2. Background (page 6) Is the Educational Facility Planner (EFP) required to be an "Accredited Educational Facility Planner" as recognized by the Association for Learning Environments (A4LE)?**

In scoring, please note that preference will be given to EFPs that are accredited planners as recognized by the Association of Learning Environments (A4LE) or another equivalent organization. Please see note above under Technical Proposal Clarification.

**32. Stage 1 – the LEA is responsible for providing demographic projections. The EFP will not include the cost for developing demographic projections in their proposal. Please confirm.**

This procurement does not preclude the LEA and the vendor from negotiating the scopes of work as necessary to achieve the LEA's goals.

**33. General Scope of Work (page 8), Para. 1,vii "including a Letter of Intent, Stage I, Stage II, and all necessary supplemental documentation necessary for approval." This suggests the EFP provides all necessary services for Stage I and Stage II. This is re-stated at the top of page 15.**

**1. Is this RFP requesting a cost proposal for Stage I and Stage II services for undefined projects?**

As stated in the RFP, this is a procurement for a Master Price Agreement – not a commitment or assignment to any specific project.

**34. Facility Analysis (page 9) – will the EFP be required to update the data for the schools in the district, that is currently provided in the Jacobs Statewide Assessment?**

No, but this procurement does not preclude the LEA and the vendor from negotiating the scopes of work as necessary to achieve the LEA's goals.

**35. Facility Analysis (page 9) states that LEAs are currently allowed to use the Jacobs Statewide Assessment School level reports.**

**1. Is it correct to assume that the EFP will be performing a facilities analysis that is new and completely separate/independent of the Jacobs reports?**

No, but this procurement does not preclude the LEA and the vendor from negotiating the scopes of work as necessary to achieve the LEA's goals.

**2. Is it correct to assume that the EFP will not be required to use any information from the Jacobs reports?**

The EFP will work with the LEA or State to identify any and all sources of information that assist the planning and decision making process.

**36. If the EFP is required to refer to or make use of the Jacobs reports, can the EFP rely on the accuracy of the Jacobs Statewide Assessment reports?**

Yes, but please note that when an LEA submits the Jacobs Statewide Assessment to represent facility conditions, the report becomes the basis for identified deficiencies. Any deviations can be noted as part of the Necessity process.

**37. xiii. Site Selection (page 12): If a new site is selected by the LEA, and the EFP is responsible for the Stage I and Stage II applications, including a site survey; wetlands delineation and other site characteristics documentation. With the site location, topography and size undefined, it is impossible to provide a fee for said services.**

**1. Please confirm that cost for these services are not required in the cost proposal submission.**

Please note that all project solicitations will be directly with the LEA or State, with specific scopes of work defined.

**2. If costs for these services are to be provided, please clarify what unit should be used.**

Provide an hourly rate for all sub-consultants necessary to satisfy the scopes of work defined in the RFP.

**38. xiv. Schematic Design (page 13) these paragraphs are located within SECTION 3: Scope of Work and Requirements. Please confirm that the Schematic Design services that are to be provided by the EFP are strictly those detailed in the Stage I and Stage II guidelines and Necessity for School Construction regulations.**

As noted in the scope change, this the Schematic Design portion of the Scope of Work has been eliminated from this RFP.

39. **B. Cost Proposal (page 16) - All school districts are unique, with varying numbers of schools; building sizes; numbers of sites and site sizes, grade configurations etc. These variables (unknowns) will create a different "scope of work" for each district, and resulting different consulting fee and team make-up. Will submitting hourly rates for the key team members fulfill the requirements of the RFP cost proposal?**

As stated above, the RFP cost proposal is for the purposes of creating a Master Price Agreement. Costs are used to qualify vendors for the MPA. Once the MPA is created individual LEAs and/or the State will use it to expedite procurement of services for their specific needs.

40. **The scope of work also notes that the EFP is responsible for submitting Necessity of School Construction applications that are responsive to the guidelines current at the time the specific project proposal is solicited. Reference example page 15:  
*"Additionally, the School Construction Regulations and/or the Necessity of School Construction process may change in FY 2019, and the requirements of this solicitation would apply to the most recent versions of the School Construction Regulations and the Necessity of School Construction application."***

**Providing a fee based on these unforeseeable changes to the Stage I and Stage II guidelines would put the EFP at risk. Will submitting hourly rates for the key team members fulfill the requirements of the RFP cost proposal?**

As stated above, the RFP cost proposal is for the purposes of creating a Master Price Agreement. Costs are used to qualify vendors for the MPA. Once the MPA is created individual LEAs and/or the State will use it to expedite procurement of services for their specific needs.

41. **Expense Category (starting on page 16) –**

1. **Can the *Employee Salary and Benefits* be interpreted as "Billing Rate"?**  
Yes.
2. **What is the definition of *Purchased Services*? Is this consultant or sub-contract services?**  
See Clarification note at the start of the addenda.
3. **What is the definition of *Employee Salary and Benefit Detail* – ?**  
See Clarification note at the start of the addenda.

42. **Employee Salary and Benefit Detail (page 17)**

1. **Is this table to be submitted with the cost proposal?**  
See Clarification note at the start of the addenda.
2. **Is it correct that this table is asking for each key team member's annual salary OR hourly rate?**  
The request is for an hourly rate.

43. **Purchased Services Detail (page 17)**

1. **Is this table to be submitted with the cost proposal?**  
See Clarification note at the start of the addenda.
2. **Please define *Purchased Services*.**  
See Clarification note at the start of the addenda.

3. The column in this table titled HOURS. With an unknown project scope, how should hours be estimated?

See Clarification note at the start of the addenda.

44. Is there a *\*detail budget sheet* format that should be used, or is that up to the vendor? (page 17 of 24)

See Clarification note at the start of the addenda.

45. Page 17 – Please clarify what is considered an indirect cost?

See Clarification note at the start of the addenda.

46. What is the schedule for review of proposals and award to services providers?

The State will review as soon as possible.

47. Will interviews be required? If so, please provide a date, week or timeframe during which to expect the interviews.

Interviews may be required.

48. Section 3 (page 15) “Districts anticipate issuing formal RFPs for design and construction administration of the plan after Council on Elementary and Secondary Education approval. LEAs will specify a preliminary project budget or range when soliciting proposals from vendors.”

1. Are service providers (EFPs and their teams) on this MPA/CR permitted to propose on and be awarded Design and Construction projects (Stage III submissions) that are a result of their work or other service providers' work on the Stage I/Stage II?

The procurement does not preclude this, but there are too many unknowns to answer this with any certainty, including the fact that ultimately these will be local procurements that must comply with all applicable laws and regulations.

2. Is there a plan for an MPA for Stage III services?

Per RIGL 16-105-3, the SBA will develop a prequalification for architects and engineers.

3. Can a District submit a scope of work to a service provider on this Stage I and Stage II MPA that includes Stage III scope?

The State cannot anticipate or speculate on local procurements.

49. Section 3. Staff Qualifications (page 13) “Scoring will be split between Educational Facility Planner qualifications/certifications and architectural and Engineering Design Team.”

1. How will the scoring (10 points?) be split/weighted between the EFP and the AE Design Team?

Proposals will be evaluated at the discretion of the Review Team. See Technical Proposal Clarification at the start of the addenda.

50. Page 16 – “The vendor must prepare a cost proposal reflecting the hourly rate or other fee structure proposed for this scope of service using the below cost proposal forms.”

1. **Please clarify how the cost proposals can be evaluated using the methodology on page 19 if vendors are submitting proposals using different units and methods for conveying costs?**

See Clarification note at the start of the addenda.

2. **Please provide uniform criteria for submitting cost so that proposals can be evaluated equitably.**

See Clarification note at the start of the addenda.

51. **Per this RFP ISBE participation must be submitted as a percentage of the total contract price. Due to the fact that each District may request a different scope of work, the total contract fee is not known at this time, nor is the make-up of the team. What contract price and scope of work should we assume in order to provide the consultant team and percent-participation by ISBE in response to this requirement?**

ISBE will be evaluated for a specific project during the mini bid process

52. **Section 8 (page 22) "NOTE: Proposals received after the above-referenced due date and time shall not be accepted."**

1. **This is in conflict with the statement on page 4 that "additional responses will be reviewed every six months for the duration of this Continuous Recruitment period." Please clarify.**

The above note is standard for State procurement – if a vendor misses the deadline they will not be considered at this moment. However, the State will review proposals every six months to update the Master Price Agreement.

53. **With the deadline for submission of this proposal being on 1/11/2019 by 10:00 AM, by what date and time can the proposing vendors expect to see a response to these questions so that there is sufficient time to adequately incorporate responses to the questions into final proposals for submission?**

The responses to the questions have been posted and the deadline has been extended.

54. **Is it correct that addenda will only be posted on the Division of Purchases website and that no notifications will be sent out?**

Addenda will be posted on the Division of Purchases and no notifications are sent out.

55. **Is it correct that the Educational Planner needs to be the Prime Contract Holder for this RFP?**  
Yes.

56. **Does the Educational Planner need to be A4LE Certified?**

See Question 31 above.

**As this RFP pertains only to the Masterplan, do we need to identify A & E Consultants as part of the Master Planner team?**

Respondents should include all consultants necessary to complete scope of work identified.

57. **Please provide clarification: Do for A & E firms teaming up with the Educational Master Planner have to form a legal Joint Venture or can they be associated?**

This procurement does not required teams to form a legal joint venture.

**58. Whereas the cost proposal requires only hourly rates (as opposed to a lump sum fee), how should the ISBE Participation Rate be quantified?**

ISBE will be evaluated for a specific project during the mini bid process

**59. When can we expect to receive an Addendum that addresses the corrections to the RFP cost proposal document, which were referenced at the pre-proposal conference?**

See Clarification note at the start of the addenda.

**60. How many firms will be selected for the MPA list?**

To be determined based on responses.

**61. Should we include a proposed team of consultants to complete the potential work (including Civil Engineering, MEP Engineering, Educational Planning, Cost Estimating, etc.)?**

Respondents should include all consultants necessary to complete scope of work identified.

**62. The cost proposal form requests a "Number of Hours" for both Employee Salary & Benefit Detail and Purchased Services Detail. As the specific scope of work for each actual project may vary, could you please determine a number of hours (as an allowance or example contract) to ensure that firms are being compared on the same scope of work?**

Because this RFP is to develop a Master Price Agreement, the State cannot establish a number of hours – this will be determined by the LEA or State agency that chooses to use the MPA to procure these services.