



Contracts & Purchasing Services
1028 West Sixth Street
Moscow, Idaho 83844-2006
208-885-6123
juliam@uidaho.edu

Date: October 11, 2020
To: All Interested Bidders
From: Julia R. McIlroy, Director
Subject: Request for Proposals No. 21-06M ~ FM Consultant

This letter will serve as Addendum Number One to RFP No. 21-06M. Here are the changes:

- **Proposals due: 10/16/20 by 11:59pm to juliam@uidaho.edu**
- **Vendor questions and answers**

All RFP terms and conditions remain unchanged.

Addendum acknowledgement should accompany your proposal.

If you need additional information, please call (208) 885-6123 or e-mail juliam@uidaho.edu.

Thank you for your interest in the University of Idaho.

(Company)

(Signature)

RFP 21-06M – FM Consultant

Vendor Questions & Answers

1. Who is the sponsor of this project at the University?

Brian Foisy, Vice President for Finance and Administration

2. Is the University currently working with, or has the University previously worked with, a Facilities Management consultant? If yes, please describe.

Yes, previously.

3. Would the University consider using APPA (<https://www.appa.org/>) standards for this review?

The university would consider and encourage using the APPA standards for this review as reference and benchmarking in conjunction with the analysis, recommendations, and discretion of the selected firm.

4. What factors have led to the university issuing this RFP?

The university continuously looks for efficiencies and opportunities for operational improvements. With a growing facilities footprint, capital projects, and maintenance of existing structures, the University of Idaho seeks to assess the current facilities organization to better understand the current structure, implications on operations of that structure, and recommendations for the structure that best supports the facilities operations.

5. Of the total square footage and acreage indicated in Addendum I, is there any portion of that where Facilities does not have responsibility? Please detail.

Facilities now has responsibility for all (main) campus custodial/grounds/maintenance (since Auxiliary custodial/maintenance transitioned to us in July 2020. Facilities staff is not responsible for maintenance at the golf course or in the Kibbie Dome.

6. What responsibility does Facilities have for Athletic venues, court and field maintenance? Will we be evaluating these?

As noted above, Facilities supports maintenance/repair of all facilities but looks to Auxiliary/Athletics for supporting funds at times. The facilities and responsibilities should be considered when evaluating the adequacy/efficacy of the organization. The university does not have dedicated athletic venues. Buildings, fields and courts are referred to as multi-use facilities. The standard rule of thumb is 'anything in front of the wall is taken care of by multi-use facilities staff and anything behind the wall is handled by Facilities staff'.

7. What responsibility does Facilities have for Auxiliary Services, in particular the Golf Course and Housing & Residence Life? Will we be evaluating these?

Facilities is currently responsible for maintenance and custodial in residence halls. They should be evaluated. Res life programs and Housing programs are managed by others.

8. Of the 6 divisions illustrated in the organization chart, will we be reviewing all 6 and the overall administrative services structure?

Yes. The review should encompass the 6 divisions illustrated in the organizational charts, including the facilities administration outlined in the 'Facilities Directors & Supervisors ORG Chart' document.

9. Will the proposals be reviewed by an individual, several individuals, or by a committee? Are you able to share who might be involved?

The proposals will be reviewed by a selection committee comprised of University of Idaho employees from Facilities, Finance & Administration, and Auxiliary Services.

10. What expectation will there be for us to make presentations? Regarding proposal? Regarding findings/recommendations?

A written proposal is required from all bidders. We expect both written findings/recommendations, as well as, a presentation to leadership and other decision makers.

11. Is this RFP part of a campus wide organizational assessment or directed exclusively at/for/with the facilities organization?

This RFP is specifically for Facilities. However, the University of Idaho continuously looks for opportunities to best manage resources responsibly throughout the organization.

12. What is the anticipated timeframe for this work to be completed and decisions by the university ultimately implemented?

The chosen bidder will be expected to begin work soon after completion of the proposal process. Each proposal should include a timeline of work and completion. The estimated completion time for the work is 2 to 3 months.

13. We see that the University of Idaho participated in the 2018-19 APPA Facilities Performance Indicators (FPI), and we plan to use those comparisons as a component of this report.

- a. Is the university confident in the accuracy of this data, or should we plan to validate this information?

The selected bidder can choose to use this data as a component of the report and final product but should validate this information against current performance.

- b. W3 notice that the APPA FPI data is “without Auxiliaries,” and yet we believe that there are some facilities activities that are executed by others. For example, some entities may perform their custodial services. To evaluate opportunities for efficiencies through consolidation, we would need access to this data, and want to confirm that it is available.

Previously, Auxiliaries maintained a separate maintenance and custodial staff however that changed July 1, 2020 with centralization of both units under Facilities.

- 14. Post-award, who will be the point-of contact for:

- a. Additional information and data?

Lee Espey, Division Operations Officer for Finance and Administration

- b. 65% and 95% review documents and comments?

Lee Espey, Division Operations Officer for Finance and Administration

- c. Final sign off?

Lee Espey, Division Operations Officer for Finance and Administration

- 15. We like to conduct interview to ascertain the existing customer satisfaction at several levels to answer if the university is best configured organizationally to support campus needs. We have also found that 65% and 95% reviews before the final report assure satisfaction with the final deliverable. Due to the current environment with COVID, we would propose to do these via online meetings. Will that be acceptable to the university, or does the university desire an in-person visit?

In-person meetings, remote meetings, or a combination thereof are acceptable if the method proposed is adequate to complete the work. Each proposal should include proposed methods for conducting interviews, meetings, and presentations to be considered by the selection committee.

- 16. The RFP solicitation refers to “meeting the standards for quality of service desired” but does not define this. Does the University of Idaho have a desirable service level such as APPA 1, 2, or 3 or another standard?

Our minimum standard is APPA 2.

- 17. Is there a desired completion date for the study? If this could be expressed as an elapsed time after contract signing, it would be helpful.

Each proposal should include a timeline with the expectation that the study would be complete within 2 to 3 months.

18. Scope of Work 3-1 states that “The consultant will review and analyze current staffing and projects, and will make recommendation to central administration, senior leadership regarding project prioritization, effectiveness of current staffing and overall best practices for Facilities Management.” Projects impact staffing levels, but we are unsure about the role of facilities operation and what types of projects that organization manages. Will at list of projects and more information be available?

Yes, this will be available for the selected bidder to review and integrate into their analysis and recommendations.

19. Scope of Work 3-1 stats that “Proposals should include proposed plan, overall cost, implementation plan, references from higher education institutions and examples of best practices. The successful proposer would begin this project soon after contract signing.” In section 2-2, Response Outline, there does not seem to be a section for the proposed plan/implementation plan. We would propose a Section H but inquire as to where we should place this.

Please include the implementation plan within the proposed plan.