CONTRACTING WITH *Tulsa District*

IFPC/M-SHORAD

INSTRUCTIONAL FACILITY

FORT SILL, OKLAHOMA

Market Research Questionnaire

TRUSTED PEOPLE • STRONG PARTNERSHIPS • QUALITY PROJECTS

Comprehensive Market Research Questionnaire

Project Delivery & Acquisition Strategy

Originating Agency	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers / Tulsa District
Document Type	Sources Sought / Request for Information (RFI)
Target Audience	Project Delivery Teams (PDTs) & Industry Partners
Classification	Unclassified / Pre-Solicitation

Table of Contents

Table of Contents 3
1. Project Information Packet (PIP) 4
Project Overview & Constraints 4
2. Industry Questionnaire 6
Part I: Company Information & Bidding Intent 7
Part II: Delivery Method Feasibility & Risk 8
1. Design Control vs. Single-Point Responsibility 8
2. Feasibility of Early Price Certainty 8
3. Rationale 8
4. Relevant Delivery Experience 8
Part III: Budget, Cost Drivers & Schedule 9
5. Budget Realism 9
6. Primary Cost Drivers 9
7. Schedule/Supply Chain Risk 9
Part IV: Defining Value, Collaboration & Financial Drivers 10
8. Collaboration Priorities 10
9. Industry Engagement & Proprietary Meetings 10
10. Stipends (Honorariums) & Proposal Costs 10
11. Contract Incentives 10
12. Program Capability/Interest 111
Part V: Overall Delivery Recommendation 122
13. Recommended Project Delivery Path 12
14. Basis of Recommendation & Contracting Vehicle 122
15. Evaluation Strategy 122
16. Industrialized Construction Methodologies 133
17. Commercial Best Practices & Concerns 14

1. Project Information Packet (PIP)

Project Overview & Constraints

Project Name & Location	**IFPC/M-SHORAD Instructional Facility | Fort Sill, OK**
Mission Statement	The U.S. Army requires a new instructional facility at Fort Sill to serve as a cornerstone for the modernization and enhancement of its air defense capabilities. Its core mission is to provide soldiers with the critical skills and doctrinal knowledge necessary to operate and maintain two of the Army's newest and most advanced air defense weapon systems: the Indirect Fire Protection Capability (IFPC) and the Maneuver-Short Range Air Defense (M-SHORAD). This facility represents a vital investment in the readiness and lethality of the force, directly supporting the strategic initiative to field one Divisional Air Defense Battalion per Division. This project is especially significant because both the IFPC and M-SHORAD systems are new additive capabilities for the Air Defense Artillery Branch. Currently, there are no existing facilities at the institutional training base dedicated to these platforms. The construction of this dual-use training center will fill that critical gap, consolidating training for both systems under one roof and creating a synergistic learning environment. Ultimately, the mission of this facility is to serve as the institutional crucible for forging the next generation of Air Defense Artillery soldiers. It will provide a state-of-the-art environment for hands-on, realistic training that transforms recruits into proficient operators and maintainers. The soldiers trained here will depart Fort Sill prepared to deploy globally, equipped with the skills to ensure the Army's dominance of the airspace and the protection of its ground forces and assets against modern aerial threats.
Facility Type & Scale	Automation – Aided Instruction Building | 75,930SF
Primary Functional Spaces	1. Automation Aided Instruction Classrooms (Classrooms XXI) 2. Simulator Training Rooms 3. Applied Instruction Area (Vehicle Bay) 4. Administrative Staff Space 5. Arms Vault 6. Secure Storage for Classified Training Items 7. FEMA Safe Rooms

	8. Tactical Vehicle Hardstands 9. Outdoor Training Area
Funding Type	MILCON
Target Budget (CCL)	$84M
Period of Performance	~720 Days
Critical Milestones	Construction Award in FY28

2. Industry Questionnaire

Purpose: The Government seeks your expert feedback to select the optimal project delivery method and contracting vehicle (FAR-based or OTA) for the above facilities. **Please email your response to Shay Hill at Julie.S.Hill@usace.army.mil, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Tulsa District (CECT-SWT), no later than 2:00PM CST 28 August 2026.**

Accelerated Design-Build to Budget (DBtB)
Project delivery approach where the Government develops sufficient project definition to competitively establish a Firm-Fixed-Price before collaborative design development.

Construction Manager at Risk (CM At Risk) - OTA
Project delivery method where a construction manager acts as a consultant to the owner during the design phase and transitions to a general contractor role during construction.

Progressive Design-Build (PDB) – OTA
Single design-build agreement. Phase 1 collaboratively matures the design and negotiates a Guaranteed Maximum Price before the Government decides whether to proceed with construction.

Part I: Company Information & Bidding Intent

Company Name & CAGE Code	
Point of Contact *[Name, Email, Phone]*	
Socioeconomic Status (Check all that apply)	☐ Large Business ☐ Small Business (SB) ☐ 8(a) Business Development Program ☐ HUBZone Small Business ☐ Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned (SDVOSB) ☐ Women-Owned Small Business (WOSB)
Bonding Capacity	Single Project Limit: Aggregate Limit:
Intent to Propose	☐ Yes as Prime ☐ Yes as Sub ☐ No ☐ Undecided
Anticipated Teaming	☐ Standalone Prime ☐ Joint Venture (JV) ☐ Mentor-Protégé ☐ Subcontractor/Designer Only

Part II: Delivery Method Feasibility & Risk

1. Design Control vs. Single-Point Responsibility

Given the projects scale and complexity described in Section 1, which foundational approach poses the least risk to cost and schedule?

☐ Owner-Controlled Design: The Government should retain the design team but hire a builder early for constructability/pricing (CM@Risk).

☐ Single-Point Responsibility: The Government should shift design-completion risk to a single Design-Build entity (DBtB or PDB).

2. Feasibility of Early Price Certainty

For the projects listed above, is it feasible to propose a reliable fixed-price early in the process (e.g., DBtB), or are the scopes too undefined, requiring progressive design development (e.g., PDB)?

☐ Yes, a reliable price is achievable early based on the provided requirements.

☐ No, there is too much risk. We would need the design to reach 0% completion before offering a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP).

3. Rationale

Please briefly explain the top 1–2 factors driving your answers to Questions 1 and 2:

4. Relevant Delivery Experience

Has your firm successfully executed projects of similar size/complexity using your recommended delivery method in the last 5 years?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide 1 brief project name/location:

Part III: Budget, Cost Drivers & Schedule

5. Budget Realism

Based on current market data, does the target budget appear realistic for these facility types and scale?

6. Primary Cost Drivers

What specific mission needs or functional requirements do you anticipate driving the most cost?

7. Schedule/Supply Chain Risk

What systems or trades present the most significant schedule risk (e.g., long-lead MEP, local labor)?

Part IV: Defining Value, Collaboration & Financial Drivers

8. Collaboration Priorities

Please rank the areas that would benefit most from early builder involvement during the design phase of the above projects (1 = Greatest Benefit, 5 = Least Benefit).

Area of Collaboration	Rank (1–5)
Cost Certainty & Real-Time Estimating	[ ]
Schedule Certainty & Phasing	[ ]
Constructability & Quality Control	[ ]
Innovation & Scope Betterments (Getting more for the money)	[ ]
Overall Risk Reduction / Site Mitigations	[ ]

9. Industry Engagement & Proprietary Meetings

If the Government utilizes a delivery method that allows for confidential, one-on-one proprietary meetings during the solicitation phase to collaboratively discuss innovative solutions, would your firm participate?

☐ Yes ☐ No

10. Stipends (Honorariums) & Proposal Costs

In highly collaborative procurement methods (like DBtB), offerors will incur design and proposal development costs. Would the Government's offer of a stipend significantly influence your decision to compete?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, what is a commercially reasonable stipend amount for a project of this scale?
[Insert Amount/Percentage Here]

11. Contract Incentives

What specific contract incentives would best drive innovation and maximize your firm's interest in these projects?

☐ Shared Cost Savings (e.g., within a GMP structure)

☐ Award Fee for Quality / Innovation

☐ Other:

12. Program Capability/Interest (Tinker AFB)

Considering the project listed in Section 1 for Fort Sill with an estimated value of approximately $84M:

a) Would your firm be interested in proposing as a prime contractor for this project?
☐ Yes
☐ No

b) If yes, does your firm have the necessary bonding capability to cover the value of the project
☐ Yes
☐ No

Part V: Overall Delivery Recommendation

13. Recommended Project Delivery Path

Considering all factors, which project delivery path is optimal for this specific project? (Provide a response for each project listed in Section 1 above)

☐ Design-Bid-Build (DBB): Scope is simple and fully defined (closer to 30-35%); traditional FAR Part 36 and FAR 15 is sufficient.

☐ Design-Build (DB): Government establishes performance requirements and a baseline design (typically 10-35% complete); traditional FAR Part 36 and FAR 15 is sufficient.

☐ CM@Risk: Government needs to control the design but needs early builder collaboration.

☐ Design-Build to Budget (DBtB): Requirements are understood enough to drive a competitive (10-15%), fixed-price solution, use of proprietary meetings to advance design solutions (highly collaborative).

☐ Progressive Design-Build (PDB): Scope is highly complex/undefined. Requires a single contract to collaboratively mature the design before locking in a GMP.

14. Basis of Recommendation & Contracting Vehicle

Please explain your selections above for each project. Indicate if you recommend executing this via a standard FAR-based contract or an Other Transaction Authority (OTA):

15. Evaluation Strategy

For these specific projects, what evaluation criteria do you believe the Government should weigh most heavily to ensure success? (Rank top 3: 1 being most important)

☐ Past Performance

☐ Technical Approach/Design

☐ Price/GMP

☐ Key Personnel & Team Integration

☐ Other:

16. Industrialized Construction Methodologies

In alignment with the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations, Energy, & Environment (ASA IE&E) policy memo, "Facility Construction Policy Implementing Installation Resilience through Industrialized Construction (IC) Methodologies," the Army is transitioning to modern construction methods to deliver facilities 50% faster and at a 30% lower cost. This policy directs the use of IC to accelerate the delivery of critical infrastructure, reduce initial capital costs, and increase the flexibility of the Army's real property portfolio.

Considering the mission and functional spaces of the IFPC/M-SHORAD Instructional Facility - a facility comprised of classrooms, simulator bays, an applied instruction area (vehicle bay), and administrative spaces - please provide your detailed assessment on the applicability of the following Industrialized Construction methods:

- Volumetric Modular Construction
- Kit of Parts (Panelized) / Pre-Cast Concrete Systems
- Pre-Engineered Metal Buildings (PEMB)
- 3D Printed Structures

In your response, please address the following:

1. Applicability and Suitability: Which of these methods are most suitable for this project? Please specify which functional areas of the facility (e.g., classrooms, vehicle bay, entire structure) are best suited for each method.
2. Opportunities: What are the primary opportunities (e.g., schedule acceleration, cost savings, quality improvements, enhanced durability, supply chain resilience) that could be realized by implementing these technologies on this project?
3. Risks and Challenges: What are the potential risks, challenges, or limitations (e.g., design constraints, local labor availability, transportation logistics, long-term maintenance, adherence to DoD standards) associated with using these methods for an instructional facility of this type at Fort Sill?

17. Commercial Best Practices & Concerns

Please provide any additional comments, overly prescriptive constraints to avoid, or commercial best practices the Government should consider: