

Questions and Answers

RFQ 26-02 JSU Campus Master Planning Services

Addendum #1

1. The website for the addendum postings, as well as other RFQ information, I'm assuming, does not seem to be linking correctly, nor could I find it via the JSUMS website. Could you provide an updated link?

Answer:

Please use the following link: <https://www.jsums.edu/businessfinance/bid-information/#Learn>

2. With respect to Section 1.11, please clarify the registration requirements for firms responding solely for campus master planning services. If the scope of work does not include the provision of architectural design services, must the Prime Consultant and/or any subconsultant architecture firms be registered with the Mississippi Board of Architectural Examiners? Alternatively, is it sufficient for the planning team to include appropriately licensed architectural professionals, regardless of whether the firm itself is registered in Mississippi?

Answer:

The intent of Section 1.11 is that any firm providing professional services that require Mississippi licensure or firm registration must hold the applicable registration. A Prime Consultant providing campus master planning services only, and not independently providing architectural or engineering services requiring professional licensure, is not required solely by virtue of serving as the Master Planner to be registered as an architectural or engineering firm.

However, any architectural, landscape architectural, interior design, or engineering services included in the negotiated scope must be performed by appropriately licensed professionals and, where applicable, firms properly registered to provide those services in the State of Mississippi. An individually licensed professional on staff does not substitute for firm registration where Mississippi law requires registration of the entity providing the professional service.

Consistent with this intent, the RFQ requires entities providing architectural or engineering services to the public to be appropriately registered.

3. Section 3.2.2.1 references a 50-page limit, while Section 4.1.2 limits the submittal to 30 pages. Could you please clarify which page limit should be followed?

Answer:

Respondents shall follow a maximum 30 printed-page limit for the Statement of Qualifications. The reference to a "50-page limit" in Section 3.2.2.1 is an error and is hereby corrected to read 30-page limit.

As stated in Section 4.1.2, the cover, table of contents, divider sheets, Execution of Offer, and any other specifically excluded materials do not count toward the 30-page limit.

The financial information required by Section 3.2.2 is submitted separately and is not included in the page count.

4. Section 1.11.2 includes project assignment requirements that appear heavily focused on mechanical systems, utilities, energy audits, and resource reduction. These requirements do not seem to align with the Master Plan scope outlined in Section 2.3. Could you please clarify these are the desired project assignments for the Campus Master Planning project?

Answer:

The project assignments listed in Section 1.11.2 relating to energy management, utility monitoring, mechanical/energy reduction design, contract documents, procurement, and construction observation are not intended as required base services for the Campus Master Planning project.

The primary scope is development of the comprehensive Campus Master Plan described in Section 2.3. JSU may, however, elect to include specialized studies, technical analyses, or planning-level assessments as optional components or appendices, such as utility and energy assessments, infrastructure studies, transportation and parking analyses, facility condition information, sustainability strategies, or similar studies supporting the Master Plan.

If optional services are included, the selected Master Planner will be expected to provide or coordinate appropriately qualified professionals for the applicable discipline. Contract drawings, specifications, construction procurement, contract preparation, and construction observation are not anticipated under the current RFQ.

Respondents should identify personnel and subconsultants appropriate to their proposed Master Planning team and may identify additional capabilities that could support optional technical appendices. The final scope, including any optional studies or appendices, will be established during scope and fee negotiations with the selected Master Planner.

5. The RFQ states that the HUB Subcontracting Plan requirements are described in Section 1.13; however, this section appears to be missing. The document transitions from Section 1.11 directly to Section 2. Could you please provide the missing section or the applicable HUB Subcontracting Plan requirements?

Answer:

The references to a HUB Subcontracting Plan (HSP) and Section 1.13 were included in error. There is no Section 1.13 in the issued RFQ.

A HUB Subcontracting Plan is not required for RFQ 26-02. Respondents should disregard the HSP references contained in Sections 1.3.3, 1.3.5, 1.3.6, 1.3.9, 4.1.2, and 4.4.1.

Respondents should nevertheless identify all proposed subconsultants and their respective roles as required by Sections 3.3.4 and 3.3.5.

6. Since this project is not intended to include contract drawings, contract specifications, bidding or construction at this time, are forms M55 and M54 needed?

Answer:

Yes. Forms M54 and M55 should be submitted as part of the qualifications package, with key personnel identified for the applicable Campus Master Planning services. JSU may elect to include certain

specialized studies or technical analyses as optional components or appendices, for which appropriately qualified personnel may be identified.

Contract drawings, specifications, procurement, and construction observation are not anticipated as part of this solicitation.

7. Evaluation Criteria Weighting — The RFQ lists evaluation criteria but does not include associated scoring weights. Is this weighting information available, and if so, could you provide it or direct us to where it can be found?

Answer:

No separate numerical weighting or point distribution is being provided. Statements of Qualifications will be evaluated based upon the criteria identified in Section 3, considered collectively by the Selection Committee.

The Selection Committee will evaluate and rank responsive firms based on demonstrated qualifications, team capabilities, relevant master planning experience, knowledge of best practices, and proposed approach to the Campus Master Plan. The RFQ provides for an initial evaluation and ranking and, if necessary, interviews with up to five of the highest-ranked respondents.

No proposed fees or pricing should be included in the Qualifications.

8. Future Work Eligibility — Will the successful respondent be precluded from working on any other Jackson State University campus or any other related projects, particularly projects identified in the updated plan?

Answer:

Selection as the Campus Master Planner under RFQ 26-02 will not, by itself, preclude the successful respondent or its subconsultants from being considered for future Jackson State University projects, including projects identified or recommended through the Campus Master Plan.

Any future professional design, engineering, construction related, or other services will be procured separately in accordance with applicable law, Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL) requirements, JSU procurement procedures, and any conflict of interest or procurement restrictions applicable at that time. Selection under this RFQ does not guarantee the successful Master Planner any future project assignment.

The RFQ also states that JSU makes no representation that it will enter into an agreement with a respondent for any other project

9. The RFQ states that the existing Campus Master Plan is available for review; however, the RFQ does not provide the plan or instructions for accessing it. Please provide access to the existing Jackson State University Campus Master Plan referenced in Section 2.3, or advise how respondents may obtain a copy for review and proposal preparation.

Answer:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1-cwofBxpfSfaEpFHhvTeTtBnacTQSGFe/view?usp=sharing>

10. Sections 1.3.5 and 1.3.9 reference a HUB Subcontracting Plan (HSP), and Section 1.3.5 references requirements described in Section 1.13; however, Section 1.13 does not appear to be included in the RFQ provided. Please provide the applicable HSP requirements and/or form and clarify whether the HSP is required to be submitted separately from the Statement of Qualifications. Additionally, please clarify whether JSU has established a HUB participation goal for this solicitation and whether all proposed professional subconsultants are required to be included in the HSP.

Answer:

The HUB Subcontracting Plan references were included in error. An HSP is not required for RFQ 26-02, and JSU has not established a HUB participation percentage or goal under this solicitation.

Respondents must, however, identify proposed subconsultants within the Statement of Qualifications and explain their selection, responsibilities, and integration into the Master Planning Team in accordance with Sections 3.3.4 and 3.3.5.

11. Section 3.1 indicates a maximum of two (2) printed pages per question, while Section 4.1.2 establishes a maximum of 30 printed pages for the entire Statement of Qualifications. Please clarify how these two page limitations are intended to be applied in conjunction with one another.

Answer:

Both requirements apply. The two-page limitation in Section 3.1 is a maximum for each individual question under Criterion One, not an allocation of two pages that must be used for every question.

The entire Statement of Qualifications must remain within the 30 printed-page maximum established in Section 4.1.2. Respondents are encouraged to provide concise responses and may use substantially fewer than two pages for individual questions.

12. Section 1.11.2 requires M55 Item 7 to identify key personnel for several assignments, including Energy Management System Monitoring, Utility Consumption Monitoring, Design Professional, Contract Drawings, Contract Specifications, Procurement Process and Construction Contract Preparation, and Construction Observation. These assignments appear to relate to mechanical and/or energy reduction projects rather than campus master planning. Please clarify whether these M55 project assignments are applicable to this solicitation and, if so, how they are intended to apply to the Campus Master Planning scope.

Answer:

The project assignments listed in Section 1.11.2 are not intended as required base services for the Campus Master Plan. Respondents should identify key personnel appropriate to the proposed Master Planning team. JSU may elect to include certain specialized studies or technical analyses as optional components or appendices, in which case appropriately qualified personnel should be identified for those services.

Contract drawings, specifications, procurement, and construction observation are not anticipated as part of this solicitation. The final scope, including any optional studies or appendices, will be determined during scope and fee negotiations with the selected Master Planner.

13. Section 2.3.3 refers to the recommended “2025–2035 Campus Master Plan”, while the anticipated contract execution is January 2027. Please clarify the intended planning horizon for the Campus Master Plan.

Answer:

The intended planning outlook is ten years following development/adoption of the new Campus Master Plan.

The reference to the “2025–2035 Campus Master Plan” in Section 2.3.3 should be revised to “2027–2037 Campus Master Plan.” The anticipated contract execution is January 2027, and the RFQ consistently describes the project as development of a ten-year Campus Master Plan.

The current anticipated schedule provides for IHL approval and execution of the professional services agreement in January 2027.

14. Please clarify the anticipated level of analysis expected for campus infrastructure, including civil, utility, mechanical, electrical, and other infrastructure systems. Is JSU seeking planning-level assessment and recommendations, or should respondents anticipate more detailed engineering studies as part of the Master Plan?

Answer:

JSU is seeking a planning-level assessment of campus infrastructure sufficient to identify existing conditions, constraints, deficiencies, capacity considerations, future needs, opportunities, and recommended capital improvements.

The Master Plan should address major civil, utility, mechanical, electrical, transportation, stormwater, communications/technology, and other significant infrastructure systems to the extent necessary to support long range campus development and prioritization.

Respondents are not expected to perform detailed engineering design, construction documents, destructive testing, or project-level engineering investigations for every campus system as part of the base Master Plan. If the planning process identifies a need for specialized or detailed engineering studies, the need may be identified as a recommendation or addressed through negotiated additional services, as appropriate.

The RFQ includes both existing campus infrastructure and future infrastructure projections and asks respondents to identify the infrastructure elements they believe require study.

15. Please identify existing studies, surveys, GIS/CAD data, facility assessments, utility information, enrollment projections, academic planning documents, transportation/parking studies, housing studies, capital improvement plans, and other relevant data that JSU anticipates providing to the selected Master Planner.

Answer:

JSU anticipates making available existing institutional information reasonably accessible to the University and relevant to the Master Planning effort. Available information may include:

- Existing Campus Master Plan and available historical planning documents;
- Existing building plans, site plans, surveys, GIS/CAD information, and mapping;
- Facility inventories, space-use information, facility condition and infrastructure assessments;
- Available utility information and existing infrastructure documentation;
- Enrollment history and available enrollment projections;
- Academic program and strategic planning information;
- Space utilization and optimization data;
- Existing transportation, roadway, sidewalk, parking, pedestrian, and accessibility studies;
- Student housing information and available housing assessments;
- Capital project inventories, deferred-maintenance information, and planned or programmed capital improvements;
- Property, land-use, acquisition/disposition, and regulatory information; and
- Other institutional data reasonably available and determined relevant during scope development.

The final allocation of responsibilities between JSU and the Master Planner will be established during scope and fee negotiations, as considered in Sections 2.3 and 3.6.3–3.6.4.

16. Respondents should not assume that every category listed above is available in a complete or current form. The selected Master Planner will be expected to evaluate existing information, identify significant data gaps, and establish an appropriate methodology for supplemental documentation and analysis. Please clarify JSU's expectations for stakeholder engagement during the master planning process, including anticipated stakeholder groups and the expected number or type of interviews, workshops, presentations, surveys, or other engagement activities.

Answer:

JSU expects a meaningful and inclusive stakeholder engagement process throughout development of the Campus Master Plan. The engagement program should provide opportunities for input from university leadership, academic units, students, faculty, staff, facilities and campus operations, finance/business functions, student services, information technology, athletics, residence life, public safety, auxiliary operations, alumni and other relevant university constituents.

The selected Master Planner should also anticipate appropriate engagement with external stakeholders, which may include IHL, governmental and community partners, neighboring organizations, and other entities having a relationship to campus development.

Respondents should propose an engagement methodology. The final engagement schedule and level of effort will be negotiated with the selected Master Planner.

The RFQ specifically calls for active engagement of diverse stakeholders, including academic affairs, student services, facilities management, finance, and information technology, as well as consideration of community relationships.

17. Please clarify whether JSU expects a formal parking utilization/demand study and/or transportation study as part of the Master Plan, or whether parking and vehicular circulation analysis is intended to remain at a planning-level assessment.

Answer:

The base Campus Master Plan should include a planning-level assessment of vehicular circulation, parking utilization and demand, pedestrian connectivity and access, and future parking needs sufficient to support long-range campus planning and recommendations. Vehicular circulation and parking should be addressed as part of the existing-conditions analysis and recommended Campus Master Plan, including projections of future parking needs.

A separate, detailed transportation engineering study or comprehensive traffic impact analysis is not required as part of the base scope. If more detailed traffic counts, transportation modeling, parking utilization studies, or engineering analyses are determined necessary, they may be further defined during scope negotiations or included as supplemental work or an optional technical appendix.

18. Please clarify the anticipated level of detail for cost estimates and the Capital Improvement Program/Phasing Plan, including whether estimates are expected to be planning-level conceptual costs or developed to a more detailed level for individual recommended projects.

Answer:

Cost estimates developed as part of the Campus Master Plan should be planning-level conceptual estimates appropriate for long-range capital planning, prioritization, and phasing rather than construction-level estimates.

Recommended projects should generally include an approximate cost or planning budget, appropriate escalation assumptions, implementation phases, sequencing considerations, and near/ mid, and long-term priorities.

More detailed estimates may be appropriate for selected high-priority recommendations where sufficient information is available; however, full quantity takeoffs or construction-level estimates are not required for every project identified in the Master Plan.

Consistent with the RFQ, respondents should provide their proposed methodology for developing cost estimates for building, infrastructure, and site improvements and incorporating those estimates into the Capital Improvement Program and Phasing Plan.