



REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

**RFP-453 - Student Housing Master Plan**

**Addendum #1**

Bidders must include the attached **Addendum Acknowledgement** with their technical proposal

Addendum Issue Date: February 23, 2026

**SUBMITTAL DUE DATE AND TIME:**

One (1) **original technical and cost proposal** plus one (1) convenience copy, as well as an electronic copy (submitted on a USB drive) to:

Monica J. Cochran  
Director of Procurement  
Fairmont State University  
Hardway Hall Room 242  
1201 Locust Avenue  
Fairmont, WV 26554

The outside of the envelope or package(s) for both the technical and the cost proposal should be clearly marked:

REQ/RFP #: RFP-453  
Opening Date: March 16, 2026  
Opening Time: 3:00 p.m.

Late submittals will not be accepted. Proposals will be accepted until the time and date specified.

**Addendum Acknowledgement: (must be included with your technical proposal)**

I hereby acknowledge receipt of the following check addendum(s) and have made the necessary revisions to my proposal.

Addendum 's:

No. 1 \_\_\_\_\_

No. 2 \_\_\_\_\_

No. 3 \_\_\_\_\_

No. 4 \_\_\_\_\_

No. 5 \_\_\_\_\_

I understand that failure to confirm the receipt of the addendum(s) is cause for rejection of bids.

\_\_\_\_\_ Signature

\_\_\_\_\_ Company

\_\_\_\_\_ Date

The purpose of Addendum # 1 is to provide answers to the written questions and the list of pre-bid attendees:

## Questions and Answers:

**Question 1:** Section 2.9 of the project scope calls for a building-by-building review of classroom hours with the goal of determining the need for additional classroom space. This is typically not a scope item included in a housing master plan. Could you please clarify what is intended with respect to classrooms, which classrooms are included, and the level of detail required?

**Answer 1:** The intent of this section is not to conduct a comprehensive, campus-wide classroom utilization audit. Rather, this element of the scope is limited to classroom or classroom-like spaces located within the residential portfolio.

Currently, the only formal classroom spaces within University housing facilities are located on the 6th floor of Bryant Place, including the vacant classroom and the classroom utilized by the National Security Intelligence program. These spaces are the only traditional instructional classrooms anticipated to be included in this review.

More broadly, the University is interested in evaluating whether residence halls should incorporate flexible, classroom-like environments that support academic engagement, group work, studying, and Residence Life educational programming. This may include seminar-style rooms, collaborative living learning communities (LLC) spaces, or multi-purpose areas that enhance the residential learning experience. The goal is to assess whether such spaces meaningfully contribute to student success and community development within a housing master plan context.

Respondents should not assume responsibility for a full academic scheduling or utilization study of campus-wide classroom assets. Instead, proposals should address how residential academic and learning spaces, both existing and potential, can be evaluated and strategically integrated into the long-term housing plan.

**Question 2:** Section 2.9 of the project scope calls for an analysis of the dining program and facilities needs for future dining facilities. Can you please specify the level of detail required, the expected participation from the University's current dining contractor and whether it is the institution's opinion that a dining consultant would be needed?

**Answer 2:** The intent of this component is not to conduct a full operational audit of the dining program, but rather to evaluate dining facilities needs within the broader context of the housing master plan and long-term residential growth.

The University currently partners with Elior as its food service provider. Respondents should assume that the dining contractor will be available for coordination, data sharing, and participation in interviews or stakeholder discussions as appropriate. The level of engagement should be reasonable and aligned with a facilities planning study, including input on current capacity, utilization patterns, production constraints, and future growth considerations.

The University is seeking industry best-practice guidance regarding the relationship between residential population growth and dining facility capacity, configuration, and placement. This includes whether existing dining facilities can adequately serve projected residential demand and whether expansion, renovation, decentralization (e.g., retail or micro-market concepts), or alternative service models should be considered.

At this time, the University is not requiring the inclusion of a separate dining consultant; however, respondents may propose collaboration with a dining specialist if they believe it is necessary to deliver a thorough and defensible facilities recommendation. Any such recommendation should clearly outline scope, rationale, and associated cost considerations.

Proposals should focus on strategic facilities alignment, capacity modeling, and long-term planning implications rather than detailed menu design or operational management analysis.

**Question 3:** Is the successful bidder precluded from participating in any future housing related work at the University such as P3 Advisory and/or design services?

**Answer 3: No**

**Question 4:** Fairmont State is focused on aggressive enrolment growth. Has a formal enrolment study or demographic analysis been conducted? If so, will it be provided to the successful bidder?

**Answer 4:** Enrollment Management has established a minimum expected annual growth rate of approximately 3%. While a separate formal demographic study is not being issued as part of the RFP, updated enrollment projections and expected figures will be made available to the selected consultant to support planning assumptions and modeling.

**Question 5:** In the original hard copy proposal, are physical signatures required or is an electronic or digital facsimile of a signature permitted?

**Answer 5:** Physical signature is required on the original hard copy.

**Question 6:** Brailsford & Dunlavey submitted our Intent to Bid letter on Tuesday, 2/3. As IKM Architecture is our exclusive partner on this initiative, we prioritized their attendance at the pre-bid meeting and site tour from a facilities standpoint. Please confirm this approach complies with the eligibility requirement for in-person attendance and the stipulation about one person representing no more than one vendor as outlined in Section 1.9 of the RFP.

**Answer 6:** Yes, however, IKM Architecture cannot submit a bid with another firm too.

**Question 7:** On the site tour, there was mention of Fairmont State reabsorbing the inventory currently allocated for Middle College residents.

**Answer 7:**

- Can you please clarify whether we understood this correctly?

- Yes, it is correct that the University has reabsorbed the majority of the residential inventory previously allocated to Middle College students. Middle College no longer houses its students within University-managed residence halls. Those students are now accommodated in off-campus housing secured independently of the University.
- Is the Middle College program ceasing operations?
  - Overall, the Middle College program is not currently ceasing operations. The program continues to function academically and administratively on campus; however, middle college students are not living on campus as the traditional on-campus model is no longer in use.
- If so, when? Which residence hall does it currently occupy?
  - Middle College operations are currently housed within Prichard Hall. Their on-campus footprint includes two staff offices, a student lounge, and additional program space. The University has regained use of the building with the exception of a designated first-floor wing that remains allocated to Middle College operations. Middle College is expected to remain in this location until Phase II of the Library Renovation project is completed, which is currently anticipated for Fall 2028.
- What is the current and future relationship with Middle College's residents / programs and Fairmont State's Housing & Residence Life?
  - With Middle College students no longer residing in University housing, the operational relationship between Middle College and Housing & Residence Life is minimal. At present, interaction is largely administrative in nature and related to shared facility coordination. There is no direct residential management responsibility for Middle College students under the University's housing portfolio.
  - Respondents should assume that the previously allocated residential inventory is now part of the University's active housing capacity for planning purposes, with the exception of the limited operational footprint described above.

**Question 8:** Facility Condition Assessments - Please confirm that the Facility Condition Assessments are limited to the following residence halls: Bryant Place, Morrow Hall, Pence Hall, Prichard Hall, and University Terrace.

**Answer 8:** Confirmed. We are seeking assessments for the mentioned buildings only!

**Question 9:** Existing Documentation - Please confirm that Fairmont State University (FSU) will provide available CAD and/or PDF files for architectural, site, MEP/FP, structural, and life safety documents.

**Answer 9:** Fairmont State will provide all available archive documents applicable to the RFP.

**Question 10:** Potential New Residence Hall- We understand that a new residence hall may be considered as part of the master planning scenarios. Has FSU identified any potential locations on campus for this development?

**Answer 10:** At this time, Fairmont State University has not formally designated a specific site for future residential development. While certain areas of campus may present opportunities for

exploration, such as proximity to University Terrace or the parking area adjacent to Bryant Place; no advance site selection or formal feasibility analysis has been completed.

The intent of the master planning process is to evaluate potential locations holistically, considering factors such as infrastructure capacity, proximity to existing residential communities, student life integration, topography, utilities, and overall campus flow. It is anticipated that any viable development site would likely repurpose space currently serving another function, such as surface parking. As a result, respondents should incorporate analysis of trade-offs, including strategies to mitigate operational impacts and address replacement needs (e.g., parking displacement, circulation adjustments, or service relocation).

Proposals should include a site evaluation framework and comparative analysis methodology that allows the University to assess multiple potential development locations and understand the long-term campus planning implications of each.

**Question 11:** Financial Information - Will FSU provide the institutional financial information referenced in RFP Section 2.8.1?

Additionally, does FSU currently retain a Financial Advisor?

**Answer 11:** Financial information related to bonding capacity and debt service modeling will be part of our work together. University Finance has information that can be reviewed as part of the engagement.

**Question 12:** Planning Horizon - Is the campus housing Master Plan intended to cover a 10-year planning horizon?

**Answer 12:** The campus housing Master Plan is not limited to a 10-year planning horizon. As outlined in the RFP, the University intends for the Master Plan to provide strategic direction for the next twenty (20) years. This includes phased renovation, replacement, and potential new construction strategies, as well as long-term financial modeling aligned with that timeframe.

While implementation may occur in staged phases over shorter intervals (e.g., 10–20 years), respondents should develop recommendations and financial projections that reflect a comprehensive 20-year planning horizon.

**Question 13:** Capacity Analysis Data - The RFP requests a capacity analysis related to potential meal plan increases and classroom capacity.

- a. Will FSU provide food service operator meal plan and transaction data for the past 2–5 years?
- b. Does FSU have an academic master plan and a current classroom utilization report covering the past 2–5 years?

**Answer 13:**

- a. Yes, Residence Life can provide historical records.
- b. No.

**Question 14:** What enrollment baseline should proposers use for planning (e.g., Fall headcount), and should the “5,000 in 6 years” be treated as the primary planning scenario?

**Answer 14:** For planning purposes, respondents should utilize Fall headcount enrollment as the primary baseline metric, as this represents the University’s peak residential demand period and aligns with housing occupancy modeling.

The University’s current enrollment projections are under review in coordination with Enrollment Management. Updated projections will be provided via addendum once finalized. At this time, respondents may reference the most recent official Fall headcount data included in the RFP materials as the baseline condition. Enrollment Management expectation is a minimum of 3% yearly growth.

With respect to the “5,000 in 6 years” growth target, this should be understood as a strategic aspiration rather than a guaranteed outcome. Respondents are encouraged to model multiple enrollment scenarios (e.g., conservative, moderate growth, and accelerated growth) to test housing demand sensitivity and inform phased development strategies. Proposals should clearly state all enrollment assumptions used in analysis.

**Question 15:** Will the University provide available housing-related documents/data such as drawings/as-builts (if available), prior reports, major system ages/known issues, recent capital work, and maintenance/work-order history?

**Answer 15:** Fairmont State will provide any available archive documents, including equipment information, recent capital work, & maintenance history applicable to the RFP.

**Question 16:** For the residence hall assessment, do you want a planning-level assessment (site walk + document review + interviews + high-level findings), or a more detailed engineering-style assessment that includes estimated remaining useful life for major systems and more quantified recommendations?

**Answer 16:** Planning-level assessment (site walk + document review + interviews + high-level findings)

**Question 17:** Should code/life safety/ADA be addressed as a high-level screening (identify likely issues/risks), or do you expect more detailed analysis and specific upgrade solutions?

**Answer 17:** High-level screening would suffice for this study

**Question 18:** Can the University share recent housing occupancy trends (by hall and semester), along with any known operational challenges (maintenance backlog, staffing constraints, recurring system issues)?

**Answer 18:** Yes. We are compiling this information in an easily usable format.

**Question 19:** For the off-campus housing review, do you want a focused review of the most direct competitors (short list), or a broader regional/peer comparison?

**Answer 19:** The University intends for the off-campus housing review to focus primarily on direct market competitors within the institution's immediate geographic area rather than a broad regional or national peer comparison.

The purpose of this analysis is to assess local supply, pricing, amenities, condition, and proximity in order to understand competitive pressures affecting on-campus residency. This includes properties that are actively marketing to Fairmont State students or are located within a reasonable commuting radius.

Fairmont State maintains a two-year live-on requirement for full-time undergraduate students who do not meet established exemption criteria. One of the primary exemptions allows students to reside with a parent or legal guardian within a 50-mile radius of campus. As such, respondents should consider how local off-campus housing availability and commuter patterns may influence residential capture rates, particularly beyond the required live-on period.

The goal of this review is to ensure that future housing development aligns with demonstrated market demand, supports enrollment growth projections, and positions on-campus housing competitively within the local market.

**Question 20:** For surveys and focus groups, are there any University requirements/constraints we should plan for (preferred platform, approvals needed, target participation levels, access to student contact lists)?

**Answer 20:** The University does not require the use of a specific survey platform; however, any survey or data collection effort involving students, faculty, or staff must be coordinated with appropriate University offices prior to distribution. This includes coordination with Institutional Research, Enrollment Management (as applicable), and University Communications to ensure alignment with existing survey schedules and messaging protocols. Respondents should outline their anticipated data collection approach and identify any approvals typically required as part of their process.

The University will provide reasonable assistance with distribution logistics, including access to student contact lists or facilitated outreach, subject to data privacy policies and FERPA considerations. Vendors should not assume direct access to student contact data without University oversight.

With respect to participation levels, the University does not mandate a specific response threshold; however, respondents should propose target participation rates sufficient to produce statistically and directionally reliable findings. The methodology should include strategies to maximize participation and ensure representative input across residential and commuter populations.

Focus groups can be supported through coordination with Housing & Residence Life and other relevant offices to assist with recruitment and space reservation.

**Question 21:** The RFP references an existing Residence Life financial model. Will this model be provided to the selected consultant (and in what format), and will it include key inputs such as operating revenues/expenses, debt, reserves, and planned capital spending?

**Answer 21:** Yes, this was provided in the RFP. Please see the Housing/Parking Financial Analysis Basic Operating Pro Forma on the last 3 pages.

**Question 22:** For the 20–30 year financial scenarios and P3 evaluation, are you expecting planning-level comparisons of a few scenarios, or a deeper analysis intended to support a near-term financing/procurement decision?

**Answer 22:** The University is seeking planning-level financial comparisons, not a detailed analysis intended to support an immediate financing or procurement decision.

Respondents should provide high-level modeling of several potential development scenarios over a 20–30 year period. This may include institutionally financed construction, phased development approaches, and alternative delivery models, if appropriate. The intent is to understand the long-term financial impact, revenue implications, and risk considerations associated with each approach.

The analysis should help inform strategic planning and long-range decision-making rather than prepare for a near-term procurement action.

**Question 23:** For dining needs assessments, is the expectation a high-level capacity/gap check using existing data, or development of improvement concepts with rough costs? Also, will the University/food service provider provide relevant data (meal plan participation/usage, transactions/peak periods) and participate in interviews/work sessions?

**Answer 23:** a high-level capacity/gap check is ideal. The University will be able to pull relevant data regarding usage, transaction. Food Services reports to Student Affairs and would arrange for any interviews and working sessions to discuss food service.

**Question 24:** The RFP includes a classroom capacity analysis that references building-by-building review and a composite report for on-campus and off-campus owned facilities. Can the University confirm:

- (a) which facilities are included in the classroom capacity analysis, and
- (b) whether proposers should assume this will be completed using existing scheduling/room inventory data provided by the University (screening-level), versus a more detailed utilization study?

**Answer 24:**

- a) The classroom capacity review is limited to classroom or classroom-like spaces located within the University's residential housing portfolio. At this time, the only traditional instructional classroom spaces anticipated to be included in this analysis are those located on the 6th floor of Bryant Place, including the vacant classroom and the classroom utilized

- by the National Security Intelligence program. No other academic buildings, general campus classrooms, or off-campus instructional facilities are intended to be included in this scope
- b) The University is not seeking a detailed, campus-wide classroom utilization study. Proposers should assume that this analysis will be conducted at a screening-level using existing room inventory and scheduling data provided by the University, supplemented by stakeholder interviews as needed.

The intent is to understand whether existing or future residence hall facilities should incorporate flexible academic-support spaces, such as seminar rooms, collaborative study areas, or multipurpose learning environments, that enhance the residential learning experience. Respondents should focus on strategic alignment within the housing master plan rather than a comprehensive academic scheduling audit.

**Question 25:** The RFP refers to the Campus Master Plan started in 2012. Is this document available or will it be made available to the team contracted to provide the Student Housing Master Plan?

**Answer 25:** A clarification from our side, a Residential Master Plan was started in 2012; this document would be made available to the team awarded the contract.

**Question 26:** Will record drawings for each building be made available? If so are these drawings scanned documents or CAD files?

**Answer 26:** Fairmont State will provide any available archive documents applicable to the RFP. There are scanned drawings in Pdf. There are also CAD files that were created from these scanned drawings, so field measurements are recommended.

**Question 27:** If a firm is contracted to provide services for the Student Housing Master Plan, will this preclude the same firm from pursuing additional design contracts for any new buildings or renovations resulting from the Master Plan document?

**Answer 27:** No