



State of New Mexico Public School Facilities Authority

ADDENDUM No. 1

RFP 94000-2027-001 Adequacy Planning Guide Update (Phase 1)

August 13, 2026

This Addendum consists of the following questions and answers to the RFP. Please note the answers in *italicized font*.

Q1: Section II.C.14 prohibits acceptance of a proposal from a person who directly participated in preparing the specifications, qualifications, or evaluation criteria on which that specific procurement is based. Please confirm whether the prime consultant, its affiliated firms, and its approved subconsultants participating in the APG update will remain eligible to compete for future PSFA-issued or PSFA-funded A/E planning and design contracts that apply or reference the updated APG, Statewide Adequacy Standards, or GSF Calculator.

Yes. The prime consultant, its affiliated firms, and its approved subconsultants that participate in the APG update will remain eligible to compete for future PSFA-issued or PSFA-funded A/E planning and design contracts that apply or reference the updated APG, Statewide Adequacy Standards, or GSF Calculator.

Participation in the APG update does not, by itself, constitute direct participation in the preparation of the specifications, qualifications, or evaluation criteria for a subsequent procurement. Section II.C.14 and 10-16-13 NMSA 1978 apply to the specific procurement at issue. Accordingly, a firm that participates in the APG update would become ineligible for a particular future procurement only if it directly participated in preparing the specifications, qualifications, or evaluation criteria on which that specific procurement is based.

The fact that a future A/E planning or design procurement applies or references the APG, Statewide Adequacy Standards, or GSF Calculator does not, standing alone, make a participant in the APG update ineligible for that procurement.

Q2: If participation may restrict eligibility for future work, please describe the scope and duration of that restriction and clarify whether it would apply:

- **Only to a subsequent procurement whose specifications, qualifications, or evaluation criteria were directly prepared by the consultant;**
- **To later phases of the APG update;**
- **To prototype or repeatable school designs arising from the APG update;**
- **To all PSFA-issued contracts; or**
- **To district-issued A/E contracts receiving PSFA funding.**

No restriction arises solely from participation in the APG update. Participation in the APG update will not, by itself, restrict the prime consultant, its affiliated firms, or its approved subconsultants from competing for future work.

Section II.C.14 and 10-16-13 NMSA 1978 apply to a specific competitive procurement. Accordingly, any restriction would apply only where the consultant directly participated in preparing the specifications, qualifications, or evaluation criteria on which that specific procurement is based. There is no separate restriction, solely by reason of participation in the APG update, that:

- *applies to all future PSFA-issued contracts;*
- *applies to district-issued A/E contracts receiving PSFA funding;*
- *applies to later phases of the APG update;*
- *applies to prototype or repeatable school designs arising from the APG update; or*
- *extends for a specified period of time after completion of the APG update.*

If a consultant participating in the APG update subsequently directly participates in preparing the specifications, qualifications, or evaluation criteria for a particular procurement, the consultant would be ineligible to compete for that particular procurement pursuant to Section II.C.14 and 10-16-13 NMSA 1978. Otherwise, the consultant's participation in the APG update does not, standing alone, restrict its eligibility for future work merely because the future procurement applies or references the APG, Statewide Adequacy Standards, or GSF Calculator.

Q3: Section II.C.4 states that subcontractors are “not allowed,” but also states that subcontractors are disfavored and may be allowed with prior written PSFA approval. The Letter of Transmittal also requires identification of proposed subcontractors. May an Offeror propose a multidisciplinary team that includes named subconsultants in its original proposal, subject to PSFA approval? If so, when and how should approval be requested?

Yes. An Offeror may propose a multidisciplinary team that includes named subconsultants in its original proposal, subject to PSFA's prior written approval.

Because the Letter of Transmittal requires Offerors to identify proposed subconsultants, Offerors should identify any proposed subconsultants in their proposal and clearly describe each subconsultant's role and scope of services. The inclusion of a subconsultant in the proposal constitutes a request for PSFA's approval of that subconsultant.

PSFA will review proposed subconsultants as part of its evaluation of the proposal. No proposed subconsultant may perform work under the contract unless and until PSFA has provided written approval. Any substitution or addition of a subconsultant after proposal submission or contract award will likewise require PSFA's prior written approval.

Offerors should not submit a separate approval request before submitting their proposal unless specifically requested by PSFA. The proposal itself should serve as the Offeror's request for approval of the named subconsultants.

Q4: Is the New Mexico resident business preference determined exclusively by the certification status of the prime Offeror, or may a certified New Mexico team member or subconsultant qualify the proposal for any portion of the preference

The New Mexico resident business preference is not limited exclusively to the certification status of the prime Offeror. A certified New Mexico resident business participating as a member of the proposed team may qualify the proposal for a proportional resident business preference, consistent with 13-1-21 NMSA 1978.

Section 13-1-21(F) NMSA 1978 provides that when a joint bid or joint proposal is submitted by a combination of resident and nonresident businesses, the applicable preference is calculated in proportion to the percentage of the contract, based on the dollar amount of the goods or services to be provided under the contract, that will be performed by each business.

Accordingly, where a proposed multidisciplinary team includes a certified New Mexico resident business as a subconsultant, the Offeror should identify the subconsultant, provide its valid New Mexico resident business certification with the proposal, and identify the portion of the contract and associated dollar value that the subconsultant will perform. PSFA will apply the resident business preference proportionally in accordance with Section 13-1-21.

A certified New Mexico resident subconsultant will not, however, cause the entire proposal to receive the full resident business preference when the prime Offeror is not a certified resident business. The preference will be limited to the proportion attributable to the certified resident business's share of the contract, as provided by Section 13-1-21(F).

Q5: What is PSFA's anticipated Notice to Proceed date and desired completion date for Phase 1

PSFA currently anticipates issuing a Notice to Proceed on or about October 1, 2026, and anticipates completion of Phase 1 by March 31, 2027. These dates are tentative and subject to change.

Q6: Has PSFA established a budget or not-to-exceed amount for Phase 1? If so, please provide it.

PSFA has not established a budget or not-to-exceed amount for Phase 1 at this time. Offerors should develop their proposed fees based on the Scope of Work and the level of effort they determine is necessary to complete the required tasks and deliverables.

Phase 1 is primarily a research, analysis, and technical-documentation effort. It does not require the Consultant to develop the revised APG or GSF Calculator, design school facilities, produce detailed architectural drawings, or design, manage, or facilitate stakeholder engagement. The Consultant's work will instead focus on reviewing existing materials, conducting national best-practice research, evaluating facility and campus space types, and preparing the reports, analyses, tables, summaries, and other technical materials identified in the Scope of Work.

Q7: For proposal and fee development, approximately how many in-person project-management meetings, presentations, stakeholder sessions, and Council or committee meetings should the Offeror assume? Where are stakeholder activities expected to occur?

For purposes of proposal and fee development, Offerors should assume that the base Phase 1 scope will require only regular project-management meetings with the PSFA project team. These meetings can be conducted on-line and are intended to coordinate the work, review progress, address questions and comments, and coordinate deliverables. PSFA does not anticipate requiring the Consultant to attend stakeholder sessions, Public School Capital Outlay Council (PSCOC) meetings, committee meetings, or other recurring in-person meetings as part of the base scope.

The primary purpose of Phase 1 is to produce the technical work products identified in the Scope of Work. Each task's findings should be sufficiently clear and well organized for PSFA to review, understand, and present to stakeholders, the PSCOC, or committees as appropriate. For Tasks B, C, and D, the Consultant should provide a concise PowerPoint slide deck summarizing the principal findings and recommendations or considerations identified in the corresponding task, in addition to the reports and other editable materials required by the Scope of Work.

PSFA does not anticipate requiring the Consultant to deliver presentations as part of the base scope. If PSFA requests a presentation by the Consultant, it may be conducted remotely. Accordingly, Offerors should not include travel or in-person presentation costs in their base fees. If an Offeror wishes to provide an optional price for the Consultant to prepare or deliver presentations directly, that option should be separately identified and priced.

Q8: How many draft, review, revision, and acceptance cycles should Offerors assume for each primary deliverable?

For each primary report deliverable, Offerors should assume the following review and acceptance process:

- 1. Outline / proposed organization: Before beginning substantial work on the report, the Consultant will provide PSFA with a proposed outline and general approach for review. PSFA will provide comments or direction before the Consultant proceeds with substantial report development.*
- 2. Initial draft: The Consultant will submit a complete draft report for PSFA review and comment.*
- 3. Revised draft: The Consultant will incorporate PSFA's comments and submit a revised draft for a second review. This review is intended primarily to address refinements, clarifications, corrections, and remaining substantive comments.*
- 4. Final deliverable: The Consultant will incorporate any final comments and submit the final report for acceptance.*

Offerors should therefore assume one outline review and two substantive draft-review cycles for each primary report deliverable before final acceptance. PSFA's review comments will be consolidated and provided to the Consultant through the PSFA Project Manager.

For PowerPoint slide decks, Offerors should assume one review draft followed by one final version. The slide decks should concisely summarize the principal findings of the corresponding task and be sufficiently clear and polished for PSFA to use in its own presentations and communications.

All reports, PowerPoint presentations, tables, and other work products shall be provided in editable formats that PSFA can modify using its in-house capabilities. The Consultant should not assume that PSFA will require specialized software or proprietary formats to edit the deliverables.

Q9: Is Phase 1 limited to documenting the current GSF Calculator structure and known issues, or should the consultant perform quantitative modeling, test alternative allocation methodologies, or develop preliminary revisions during this phase?

Phase 1 is limited to documenting and evaluating the existing GSF Calculator structure and methodology and identifying current known issues, gaps, and areas for further evaluation. The Consultant is not expected to perform quantitative modeling, test alternative space-allocation or sizing methodologies, or develop preliminary revisions to the GSF Calculator during Phase 1.

Those activities are anticipated to occur in subsequent phases of the APG update and should not be included in the Phase 1 base scope or fee.

Q10: Does PSFA expect licensed engineering consultants to participate directly in Phase 1 for HVAC, energy, renewable power, EV charging, climate resilience, transportation, security, and related topics, or may these subjects be addressed by qualified research and planning specialists?

PSFA expects the Consultant to provide qualified subject-matter expertise for the specialized topics identified in the Scope of Work. These topics should be addressed by individuals with demonstrated education, training, professional experience, or other recognized expertise in the applicable subject area.

Professional licensure is not required for these subject areas. Offerors may use licensed professionals where appropriate, but PSFA's primary consideration is demonstrated subject-matter expertise and relevant experience. Offerors should identify in their proposals the individuals or firms providing specialized expertise for the applicable topics and describe their relevant qualifications and experience.

Q11: Section III.C provides a generic proposal outline containing “Project Permit Requirements,” “Problem Statement,” “Planning Document,” “Project Stakeholders and Community Support,” and “Monitoring Plan,” while Sections IV and V provide project-specific mandatory and scored criteria. Should Offerors organize the technical proposal according to the Section III.C outline, the Section IV/V evaluation criteria, or a cross-referenced combination of both?

The proposal outline in Section III.C contains generic language and does not fully reflect the APG Phase 1 Scope of Work. Offerors should follow the required two-binder format, but should organize their proposals around the mandatory and desirable specifications in Section IV, the Scope of Work (Exhibit A), and the Evaluation Factors in Section V.B. Generic items in Section III.C that do not apply to the APG Phase 1 Scope of Work should be identified as “Not Applicable” and do not require a substantive response.

Q12: Please confirm precisely which items are excluded from the recommended 36 single-sided-page limit, including mandatory forms, references, resumes, dividers, the Letter of Transmittal, and appendices. Is the 36-page limit a recommendation or an enforceable maximum?

The 36-page limit is a maximum for the proposal content in Binder 1. Required forms and administrative materials do not count toward the 36-page limit. The specific exclusions identified in Section III.C also remain excluded from the page limit. The Cost Proposal in Binder 2 is not subject to the 36-page limit.

The intent of the page limit is to encourage concise, focused proposals that provide the Evaluation Committee with the information necessary to evaluate the Offeror's qualifications, approach, team, and experience. Offerors are encouraged to prioritize relevant information and avoid unnecessary or duplicative material.

Q13: Section III states that electronic copies of Binders 1 and 2 must be provided, but other provisions state that the Cost Response must not be uploaded to SharePoint and must be submitted only in hard copy. Please confirm that only Technical Binder 1 is to be uploaded electronically.

*The Technical Proposal should be the **only** documents uploaded in the SharePoint file. Cost proposals and hard copy technical responses should be delivered in a sealed envelope/box to the PSFA office on or before the deadline stated in the RFP.*

Q14: Must each of the five required references represent work completed entirely within the last three years, or may ongoing projects and earlier projects with relevant work performed during the last three years be included?

The references can be from ongoing projects with a similar scope of work or from previous projects if no other references are able to be provided by your company.

Q15: Please provide the attendee list, presentation materials, transcript, recording, chat, and questions discussed during the July 30 non-mandatory pre-proposal conference, if available. Please also confirm that only PSFA's written responses and formal amendments will govern the procurement.

The list of attendees and the transcript are attached to the end of the addendum for you to be able to view. Only PSFA's written responses and formal amendments will govern the procurement.

Q16: What is the expected frequency of "regular project-management meetings" (weekly, monthly)?

Assume 2.5 meetings per month on average.

Q17: What does PSFA envision as the "Consolidated project record" (a hard copy binder of all deliverables, a digital file archive, something else)?

The Consolidated Project Record should be a digital file with a cover memo, Table of Contents, and sections with content organized by task and deliverable. It should include the final versions of all deliverables and other significant work products produced during Phase 1, together with relevant supporting materials and documentation necessary to understand the work performed and the basis for the findings. The record should be provided in an organized, easily accessible, and editable format, as appropriate.

Q18: Will PSFA provide the consultant with all existing workshop/engagement materials (notes, surveys, presentations) referenced in Task B, or is the consultant required to locate and compile these independently?

PSFA will provide all of the materials the consultant will need to complete Task B.

Q19: Approximately how many prior workshops and engagement sessions were conducted, and in what format are those materials available?

PSFA conducted a total of six workshops during the summer and fall of 2025.

Q20: Will PSFA provide a list of "current known issues" with the GSF Calculator, or is the consultant expected to identify those through independent analysis?

PSFA will provide information regarding current known issues with the GSF Calculator. The Consultant should also independently review the Calculator's structure and methodology and identify any additional issues, limitations, or opportunities for improvement that are apparent from that review. Phase 1 does not include quantitative modeling, testing of alternative allocation methodologies, or development of preliminary revisions to the Calculator.

Q21: Gap analysis: with six specialized topics (school security, electrification, renewable energy, site selection, non-motorized access, wildfire/flood), should each be treated at equal depth, or will PSFA prioritize certain topics?

PSFA has not established a priority ranking among the six topics. For purposes of developing the proposal and fee, Offerors should assume that all six topics will receive a comparable level of research and analysis. Following Notice to Proceed, PSFA and the selected Consultant will discuss and refine the relative level of effort and emphasis among the topics as part of development of the Project Work Plan. The final deliverable need not give each topic identical treatment.

Q22: Does the gap analysis assume we are evaluating all schools, or is it just finding deficiencies in the current standards?

The gap analysis is a review of the existing APG, Statewide Adequacy Standards, GSF Calculator, and related guidance and materials. It is not intended to involve a facility-by-facility evaluation of individual schools. The Consultant should identify gaps, deficiencies, inconsistencies, or opportunities in the existing standards and guidance based on the research and analysis required under the Scope of Work.

Q23: Is there a minimum number of states you consider as comparable planning models?

PSFA has not established a minimum number of states or other jurisdictions that must be reviewed. Offerors should propose a research approach that is sufficiently broad to identify meaningful national best practices and comparable planning models relevant to New Mexico. The emphasis should be on the relevance and quality of the examples reviewed rather than on meeting a specified number of states.

Q24: For the "Best Practice Reference Materials for Stakeholders," how many engagement sessions should the consultant plan to support, and what format is preferred (handouts, slide decks, posters)?

PSFA does not expect the Consultant to prepare separate materials for individual engagement sessions. For purposes of Phase 1, the Consultant should provide one editable PowerPoint summary for each task, incorporating relevant case studies, examples, tables, and other visual materials identified in the Scope of Work. PSFA will use and, as appropriate, modify these materials for individual stakeholder or other meetings. Attendance or presentation by the Consultant at such meetings is not included in the Phase 1 scope. If PSFA later requests such services, they would be separately authorized and compensated.

Q25: The SOW references "residential uses (e.g., dormitories and staff/teacher housing, where applicable)." How significant a focus should this be relative to other program areas? Are there specific NM districts with active residential programs the consultant should study?

Residential uses should be considered as one of the program areas identified in the Scope of Work. PSFA does not intend for residential uses to receive disproportionate attention relative to other program areas, but the APG should address issues that may arise in planning and developing new school facilities, including student and educator housing where applicable. New Mexico has several relevant examples, including the three constitutional special schools—the New Mexico Military Institute, New Mexico School for the Deaf, and New Mexico School for the Blind and Visually Impaired—which have residential programs. Some charter schools also operate residential programs, such as the New Mexico School for the Arts. The Consultant should also consider educator housing needs, particularly in rural and remote communities, and relevant national practices that may inform future APG guidance. PSFA does not intend to prescribe a specific list of schools for study.

Q26: Are the specialized topics (prototype planning, cost control, dark-sky lighting, EV charging, etc.) all weighted equally?

No. The specialized topics are not intended to be weighted equally. Educational programs and space planning are the central focus of the APG. Among the specialized topics, cost control and efficiency are a particularly high priority, including the potential role of prototype planning and other repeatable approaches. The remaining topics are important areas of research, but PSFA does not expect equal levels of effort for each topic. PSFA will work with the selected Consultant after project initiation to determine the appropriate level of effort for each specialized topic.

The APG will address these questions through four broad areas of work:

- *Educational Programs and Space Planning: The APG should provide a framework for determining what facilities and spaces are appropriate to support the educational programs and services provided by New Mexico public schools. The research should examine how current and emerging programs—including academic programs, Career Technical Education, Pre-K/early childhood, special education, wellness, performing arts, and residential uses—affect space needs, space allocation, utilization, flexibility, and overall facility planning. It should also consider ancillary and support spaces and identify where existing APG categories, assumptions, or allocations may no longer adequately reflect how schools operate or how educational programs are evolving.*

- *Cost Control and Efficiency: The APG should support school facilities that meet educational needs while controlling the cost of planning, designing, constructing, maintaining, and operating those facilities. The research should examine approaches that can improve cost control, schedule predictability, and operational efficiency, including prototype school planning, common-core and kit-of-parts approaches, and other repeatable planning models. It should also consider how planning and design decisions affect long-term M&O costs and identify relevant methodologies, assumptions, and performance measures that could inform future APG guidance and the GSF Calculator.*
- *Site Selection, Campus Planning, Access, and Security: The APG should provide guidance for planning school sites and campuses that are safe, functional, accessible, and appropriately connected to the communities they serve. This includes considering site selection and campus layout; safe and convenient access from surrounding neighborhoods, particularly by walking and bicycling; accessible pedestrian and bicycle circulation within the campus; bicycle parking; and accessibility for people with disabilities. The research should also address how personal vehicles and school buses can be accommodated without unnecessarily compromising pedestrian and bicycle access, and how security measures can be integrated into campus planning without creating barriers to safe and convenient access.*
- *Energy, Resilience, Electrification, and Outdoor Lighting: The APG should address facility and campus planning considerations that can improve energy efficiency, reduce operating costs, support renewable energy, and increase resilience to the environmental conditions facing New Mexico schools. This includes HVAC, passive environmental strategies, renewable energy and solar generation, wildfire and flood risks, extreme heat, heavy rainfall, dust storms, and other hazards. The research should also address the planning and site integration of electric vehicle and electric school bus charging infrastructure. Finally, the APG should provide awareness and planning guidance regarding outdoor lighting, including safety, energy use, light pollution, and protection of New Mexico's night skies consistent with the New Mexico Night Sky Protection Act.*

Q27: How many current APG space types exist that the consultant will be evaluating?

Our Adequacy Standards include 11 space categories. Art Education is further divided into visual arts, music, and performing arts. These categories may be expanded if the project identifies new program areas or if Career Technical Education is divided into subcategories by career pathway. The current categories are:

- *Academic Classrooms (with standards for Elementary, Middle and High)*
- *Science Classrooms*
- *Special Education (All types and categories including support spaces)*
- *Art Education (Visual Arts, Music, Performing Arts)*
- *Career Education*
- *Technology Aided Instruction*
- *Physical Education*
- *Media Centers/Libraries*
- *Food Service*
- *Administration including teacher workroom/lounge, and student health)*
- *Building Support (janitorial, maintenance, general storage)*

Within some space categories, there are spaces that are necessary for school operations but are not currently addressed by the Adequacy Standards or Adequacy Planning Guide, such as PE locker rooms.

This task should identify and analyze these spaces and determine whether they should be incorporated into the Adequacy Standards and/or Adequacy Planning Guide.

Q28: For the "Candidate Space Categories Summary," is this envisioned as a brief summary memo or a detailed technical document with supporting analysis for each candidate?

For this stage, a general summary memo identifying trends in the space categories plus identification of new/emerging trends in new educational and school support programs that could be part of a revised Adequacy Planning Guide developed in subsequent tasks is acceptable.

Q29: For the "Technical Materials for Stakeholder Engagement," What level of graphic design/production quality is expected (simple Word tables vs. designed layouts)?

PowerPoint, tables, spreadsheets, and PDFs of handouts, agendas, meeting notes, photos will be acceptable. At this stage, we are not looking for designed layouts unless this is part of your stakeholder engagement plan/process.

Q30: Are Technical Materials intended for use in the subsequent phases of this project?

Yes, our intent is for any technical materials and analysis to be available for subsequent phases of the project to inform discussion and facilitate decision making. We do not envision the need for too detailed technical material being produced during this initial phase.

Q31: Should the space-type evaluation address all types of grade configurations (PreK, elementary, middle, high) with equal depth, or is there a priority?

Yes, elementary, middle, and high school should be covered, however, middle and high school may need more attention due to specialized academic and curriculum programs for the higher grade levels including CTE, early college education, advanced programs, electives, music/performing arts, and various types of physical education (weights, aerobics, dance, traditional curricula). PreK also requires more attention since we currently do not have standards for PreK classroom sizes and support spaces. Various combined configurations such as combined elementary/middle/high school, combined elementary/middle school and combined middle/high school will need to be addressed as well for the combination schools.

Q32: Is there an existing software platform that the successful firm will need to interface with?

At this stage, the successful firm will need to produce deliverables utilizing the Microsoft Office Suite and Adobe Acrobat. There is no other specialized software platform use required during this initial phase.

Include this signed and dated Addendum 1 and Acknowledgement with your Proposal.

Acknowledgment not signed, dated and included with the RFP Proposal, may deem the Proposal submission as non-responsive, and the proposal may be rejected.

Thank you for your interest in the New Mexico Public School Facilities Authority (PSFA) solicitations.

Daniel Dominguez
PSFA Contracts Analyst

RFP 94000-2027-001

ADDENDUM #1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:

Business Name

Authorized Signature

Date

APG RFP Pre-proposal meeting-20260730_130128-Meeting Recording

July 30, 2026, 7:01PM

22m 38s

 **Daniel Dominguez** started transcription

 **Daniel Dominguez** 1:17

I'll give you guys a couple more minutes just to go ahead and type in everything that you need to, that way you're not feeling rushed and then we'll get started.

All right. Good afternoon, everybody, and thank you for joining us. My name is Daniel Dominguez. I am going to be the RFP procurement manager for this RFP. Any questions that you may have in regards to the RFP, I ask that you go ahead and submit them to me and to myself only. The e-mail address should be listed in the RFP.

or the ones that you guys have been emailing me on already, which is the CARFP at nmpsfa.org.

Thank you all for joining us today. What we'll do is we'll kind of go through the RFP real briefly. And then we'll, what I'm going to do is I'm going to kind of go over the schedule of sequence of events for this RFP. Then I'm going to turn it over to one of my subject matter experts to kind of go over the scope of work with you guys. And then after we will open it up for any questions that you may have.

Any questions that you have that you want to ask today, if you can submit those in writing after to the e-mail as well, I'd appreciate it.

We had one last entry.

All right, let's go ahead and go down to the sequence of events. Like I said, this RFP, sorry, is going to be for our adequacy planning guide update, phase one. This is going to be a multi-phase project, which is going to consist of three different RFPs. Right now, this is just going to be the first RFP that we'll be going through and needing the assistance from one of your firms.

Yeah.

For a sequence of events, I know most of you have already turned in your acknowledgement of receipt. If you have not sent any of those, if you can go ahead and continue to send those in so we have them on file. Just so we know that you have received the RFP in its entirety and you

are possibly willing to participate.

in sending us a proposal. As of right now, we have our deadline for questions for anything that you may have questions on in the RFPs, set for August 7th by the end of the day.

We will answer those questions to the best of our ability and send out a response to those questions at the end of the day by August 13th.

That should be our last amendment going out for this RFP, unless I'm forcing circumstances. you will be notified again and another addendum will come out. But as of right now, that should be the last RFP amendment that will go out. We're trying to leave you guys plenty of time to be able to go through your proposals, put as much information in there as you can, and be able to

get as detailed as you possibly can and not feel rushed and be able to do this. All proposals that you do submit are due by September 10th at 3 P.m. into our office. There's going to be a SharePoint link that will be going out to your firms if you are interested in participating.

I will send those out closer to that date, and then we will also need a hard copy submitted into our office.

And at this time, I will go ahead and turn the RFP over to our subject matter expert, Claude, and he'll be going through it briefly with you guys. Thank you, Daniel. Hi, everybody. My name is Claude Morelli. I'm the planning and design manager here at PSFA. And I appreciate the time you are taking out of your days.

this afternoon to hear about this phase of our accuracy planning guide update. In this RFP, there are four tasks. The first task is a project management task, really fairly straightforward. It's, you know, basically a work plan and some meetings and notes and things of that sort. fairly standard stuff. If you have questions about that, I can go into more detail. But I want to focus more on the three substantive tasks, task B, task C, and task D. Task B focuses on what we already have in our toolkit. This is the framework for planning schools in New Mexico that we use.

That's our adequacy planning guide, our statewide standards for school facilities, and then our maximum allowable gross square foot calculator.

So this work pretty much in task B is going to involve your going up a learning curve. That's one of the reasons why it's in there, is to give you an opportunity to really steep yourselves in what we do and how we do it. And then to summarize that, so there's basically an existing condition summary report, which is the main deliverable.

It's a summary of the APG, including space allocations, eligibility criteria, and guidance language. And then a summary of the adequacy standards and how they're reflected in the

APG, what is the statutory basis for this. And then the maximum allowable GSF calculator or square foot calculator, and an analysis of current known issues related to it. And we will provide folks here at PSFA and possibly elsewhere to give you background on that. You'll also be reviewing some notes from some engagement, stakeholder engagement we did last fall, providing input on the APG and the GSF calculator. So fairly straightforward task, nothing, no rocket science. There'll be a gap analysis you do and a summary of the stakeholder input from that's already happened and so on, as well as kind of a summary of key findings and that sort of thing to kind of get you ready for the next two tasks. The next task, C, is a synthesis best practices and emerging educational programs nationwide. And this is really doing a more deep dive into what we would like to know more about and presumably your firm knows quite a bit about, which is why we're calling on you to help us. So it's a Research and summary, essentially an external scan of sorts, researching national, current national guidance and standards and trends for school facilities, including academic spaces, career technical education facilities, pre-K and early childhood education, things like wellness, facilities in schools, performing arts, special ed, and also residential uses, both in the sense of dormitories for students and then also staff or teacher housing where applicable, and then any other kind of ancillary services. That's kind of the really the the core of it. And then we want to know something about innovative and evolving approaches to space allocation and program integration and design flexibility that align with these emerging educational practices. We want you to review national and state level approaches to prototype school planning and design approaches, including a variety of different elements, kit parts, people, planning models, and so on, as a way to improve cost control, improve schedule, predictability, operational efficiency, et cetera. Then we want you to identify trends in high performance and resilient school design, particularly focusing on climate change. This is a major issue in our state. Schools that have not had HVAC systems, for instance, in the past now need them. So we're putting a lot of those in. We're looking, wanting to look at some passive environmental strategies, lots of renewable energy discussions going on these days. We'd like that to be part of this conversation. And then best practices related to minimizing planning, construction, maintenance, and operations costs. That's another major theme. Our council is very, this is a very high priority for them, cost reduction. And then best practices for site selection and campus layout, particularly focusing on reducing M&O costs.

but also on reducing exposure to hazards like wildfire or local flooding, extreme heat and so on. And then finally, addressing security concerns without compromising safe and convenient non-motorized access to school campuses. So we know that security tends to kind of create fortress schools. We don't want that to have a negative impact on the ability of kids to walk or bike to school.

And then also identifying best practices for safe walking and bicycling to school and best practices for outdoor lighting as well. On the next page, Daniel, addressing how you would plan and integrate electric vehicles and electric school bus infrastructure into schools. We have an electric school bus program where this is particularly relevant.

And in the state, we also have schools are required to provide EV charging. So you would document methodologies, assumptions, and performance metric used in other states for planning, sizing, and cost estimation, and then synthesize all that into a national best practices way.

paper, as well as some material that we can use with our stakeholders.

You would then take the results of tasks B&C and start looking at what we do here in New Mexico to evaluate our facility and campus space types, conduct basically a baseline review, and evaluate our APG, identifying potential revisions to it that would then be carried forward into the next phase.

phase of the work, which is actually going to be involving updating the APG. In A nutshell, that is what we are doing. There is also, I'll call your attention to an evaluation framework we have in the RFP, and it is called out on our website.

well as the scope of work. Those are both straight out of the RFP. They're not different, but they're easily accessible to you. With that, I'll stand for questions.

Chavez.

Okay.

Kristen, if you had a question, go ahead.

Or is it Christine?

 **Christine Steenport** 13:58

Sorry, I didn't unmute. Thank you, and thank you for sharing all of this information. Super helpful. Can you help share any preliminary visions for how future phases of modernization's effort might build upon phase one findings?

DDaniel Dominguez 14:16

How future phases of this APG update process, is that what you mean by that? Well, we need a base of knowledge. This is the second RFP we've gone out for on this project. The first one had everything bundled together and we realized that consultants were scared away by that for whatever reason. So we've broken it down into parts.

CSChristine Steenport 14:20

Yes.

DDaniel Dominguez 14:39

This piece is the foundation for the rest of it. It's the knowledge base we will use to have a conversation with our internally and also with our stakeholders about what the APG will be in the future. So we we're not we're not we don't know what that looks like yet.

We want to have that stakeholder informed. The vision will come out of the stakeholder engagement process. Let's put it that way. What we do know is that the ultimate goal is to make the APG something different from what it is today, which is a very legalistic document and turn it into something that's much more visually rich.

And also, it doesn't just focus narrowly on what we must do in the state of New Mexico, but on what we could do as well, because we're finding there are most of the questions we're dealing with are in that kind of what we could do territory. So we want to be prepared to answer those intelligently and offer at least guidance to schools.

And then if there are mandatory things, then we will clarify those. And then I'll just add the last piece of this is the update of the gross square foot calculator. We would like to make it a little bit broader than what it is today, which is simply delivering a number.

based on school type of maximum allowable per square footage. We want to be able to have districts understand the implications of those numbers on, for instance, maintenance costs and staffing and so forth and so on and some other things as well. But those are bridges we'll cross later. And then finally, I'll say there's another piece of it.

that's coming will be on training material and for various purposes.

CSChristine Steenport 16:22

Thank you so much.

DD Daniel Dominguez 16:24

You're welcome.

Any other questions?

Is it Carrie?

KM Mari-elin Mock 16:37

Yes, it's Carrie Allen. Hi, I'm here with Cunningham today and I have a question about just your general thoughts on that timeline for phase one and maybe how you see it relating to those future phases that you were just speaking about.

DD Daniel Dominguez 16:52

So initially we had anticipated that the entire, you know, process project would be about 18 months-ish. And since this is a subset of that, it's not going to be 18 months. Hopefully it's something more, no more than six months.

To be determined, we understand that availability is sometimes an issue on the consulting side, so we didn't want to specify that too narrowly. But we do want to get it done reasonably quickly.

No, I think that's about the best I can answer I could give you.

KM Mari-elin Mock 17:29

Thank you.

DD Daniel Dominguez 17:36

Any other questions?

Yeah.

Okay, it doesn't look like there's any other questions.

So with that, I know you all are very busy, and we'd like to get you out in a timely manner. If you do think of anything else that you do have questions on, please do go ahead and send those to myself in the e-mail address, and we will be sending out another addendum with the answers to those questions.

I'll go ahead and open it one more time just in case anybody has anything else, and if not, I'll go ahead and let you all go.

CS Christine Steenport 18:28

All right, I do have one more. So I heard stakeholder engagement, so that can kind of change the trajectory of what this looks like. At what?

What decisions do you want to be able to make that you cannot make today? Meaning, really, is it looking, I know it seems looking at educational programming, not just facility standards, capital planning, funding, equity, all of the above. I heard also, you know, renewables, things like that. Yeah.

That's my general question.

DD Daniel Dominguez 19:03

Is the question about stakeholder engagement? That's where you started, but I'm not sure if I understand the question again.

CS Christine Steenport 19:08

Yeah, I just want to see where like the where the primary concerned is with or it seems to be the full gamut of what you were all saying. Just what decision do you want to be able to make you can't make today? And I guess the primary focus of obviously the educational programming in combination with the facility standards.

DD Daniel Dominguez 19:31

So, so let me let me just throw out some examples of issues that often come up in our conversations with districts or throughout the state. CTE spaces are very large or they can be automotive or those kinds of things are very large facilities. So if a school proposes a campus that exceeds our maximum allowable gross square footage calculator. And, you know, they are on the hook to pay for that extra space. So what innovative models are there out there to kind of deal with that question? We've heard, you know, maybe you sort of partly do something that's focused on.

learning in a smaller classroom space and then you go to the larger. So that we don't really know. That's why we're asking for this kind of national scope research. Similarly with, we know

how to do solar arrays on schools. That's sort of a separate issue, but how do you design those in? Can you design?

Shade is an important issue in the state. We don't currently fund outdoor shade structures, correct me if I'm wrong, John. But can we consult, can we combine solar arrays with shade structures for kids and outdoor play spaces, that sort of thing. That's the kind of innovation we're really looking for some input on.

We know the basics. We just want, we want to know what's really going on out in the world that's innovative, that's practical, that doesn't cost a small fortune. You know, we're not Aspen, Colorado in most communities. We're not Boston or places that are Cambridge or wherever. They have a ton of money. We, most of our communities are very, stretched with some exceptions, but they're mostly stretched. So we have to be kind of looking at innovation that's affordable within our context.

CS Christine Steenport 21:24

Thank you so much. Yes, thank you.

DD Daniel Dominguez 21:25

Does that answer? Yeah. I'll say parenthetically, stakeholder engagement is not a part of the scope of work, but the delivery of material that is stakeholder ready, which means it's not overly technical or there's the kind of technical version and then the refined material that's used to present it. That's what we mean by that.

That's the connection to the engagement part.

CS Christine Steenport 21:48

Thank you. That answers my question perfectly.

DD Daniel Dominguez 21:51

You're welcome.

Any other questions?

All right. Again, we do thank you for your time. Thank you for joining us this afternoon. Like I said, go ahead and submit any future questions over to the e-mail. It's the CARFP at nmpsfa.org. And we'll be glad to answer those through an addendum and get that out to all of

you.

Thank you all and have a great afternoon.

 **Kari-elin Mock** 22:30

Thank you.

 **Scott Pashia** 22:31

Thank you.

 **Daniel Dominguez** stopped transcription

2. Participants

Name

Daniel Dominguez

Matthew Schimmel

Christine Steenport (External)

Doug Majewski

Scott Pashia (External)

Isabella Munoz Morales

Chris Griego (External)

Danny Berger (External)

Brayra Podeyn (External)

Emily Erickson (External)

Kari-elin Mock (External)

Allison Mastel (External)