



Request for Proposal Determining the Capital Needs of Libraries in Rural Distressed Counties

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

The Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, hereafter called "DEPARTMENT", is initiating this Request for Proposal (RFP) to solicit proposals from firms interested in participating on a project for:

Determining the capital needs of libraries in rural distressed counties.

1.2 OBJECTIVE

The letting of a contract by the DEPARTMENT is to attain assessment of the capital needs of libraries in rural distressed counties for the purposes of developing a statewide grant program. The study will also include an assessment of the bonding and levy capacity of local governments/library districts to assist funding the capital needs of libraries.

The consultant will prepare a draft and final report for review that identifies the backlog of capital needs by library or district, evaluates local funding capacity, and identifies the current total number for the capital needs of libraries in distressed counties.

1.3 MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

The successful contractor must be licensed to do business in the State of Washington. The contractor must have a minimum of five (5) years experience assessing the capital needs of both historic and non-historic buildings and in the application of the Secretary of Interior's Standards for the treatment of historic properties. The applicant should also demonstrate an understanding of the local and state bonding and levy process.



1.4 FUNDING

The DEPARTMENT has a set budget not to exceed \$80,000 for this project. Any contract awarded as a result of this procurement is contingent upon the availability of funding. The Contractor must coordinate with the Department of Commerce on assessing the local funding capacity for both historic preservation and non-historic preservation needs.

1.5 PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE

The period of performance of contract resulting from this RFP is tentatively scheduled to begin on or about **July 1, 2018** and to **end on June 30, 2019**.

1.6 DEFINITIONS

DEPARTMENT – The DEPARTMENT is the agency of the State of Washington that is issuing this RFP

CONTRACTOR – The individual or company submitting a proposal in order to attain a contract with the DEPARTMENT.

PROPOSAL – A formal offer submitted in response to this solicitation.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) - Formal procurement document in which a service or need is identified but no specific method to achieve it has been chosen. The purpose of an RFP is to permit the contracting community to suggest various approaches to meet the need at a given price.

2. GENERAL INFORMATION FOR CONTRACTORS

2.1 RFP COORDINATOR

The RFP Coordinator is the sole point of contact in the DEPARTMENT for this procurement. All communication between the Contractor and the DEPARTMENT upon receipt of this RFP shall be with the RFP Coordinator, as follows:

Name:	Greg Griffith
Address:	PO Box 48343, Olympia, WA 98504
Phone Number:	360-586-3073
Fax Number:	360-586-3067
E-Mail address:	Greg.Griffith@dahp.wa.gov



2.2 ESTIMATED SCHEDULE OF PROCUREMENT ACTIVITIES

Issue Request for Proposals	May 14, 2018
Question and answer period	May 15-31, 2018
Pre-proposal conference	May 31, 2018 at 11am
Proposals due	June 8, 2018
Evaluate proposals	June 13, 2018
Conduct interviews with finalists, if required	June 15, 2018
Announce apparent Successful Contractor	June 18, 2018
Hold debriefing conferences, if required	June 22, 2018
Negotiate contract	June 25, 2018
Begin contract work	July 1, 2018

2.3 PREPROPOSAL CONFERENCE

A per-proposal conference is scheduled to be held on **May 31, 2018 at 11:00 am** at the location of the DEPARTMENT. See RFP page one heading for DEPARTMENT location address. All prospective contractors are encouraged to attend; however, attendance is not mandatory. Written questions may be submitted in advance to the RFP Coordinator. The DEPARTMENT shall be bound only to written answers to questions. Any oral responses given at the pre-proposal conference shall be considered unofficial.

2.4 SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

Contractors are required to submit at least one written copy of their proposal. Two copies are recommended. The proposal, whether mailed, e-mailed or hand delivered, must arrive at the DEPARTMENT no later than **5:00 pm, local time, on June 8, 2018.**

The proposal is to be sent to the RFP Coordinator at the DEPARTMENT address. See RFP page one heading for DEPARTMENT address. Late proposals will not be accepted and will be automatically disqualified from further consideration.

All proposals and any accompanying documentation become the property of the DEPARTMENT and will not be returned.

All proposals received shall remain confidential until the contract, if any, resulting from this RFP is signed by the Director of the DEPARTMENT and the apparent successful contractor; thereafter, the proposals shall be deemed public records as defined in RCW 42.17.250 TO 42.17.340, "Public Records."



2.5 MINORITY & WOMEN-OWNED BUSINESS PARTICIPATION

In accordance with the legislative findings and policies set forth in chapter 39.19 RCW, the state of Washington encourages participation in all of its contracts by firms certified by the Office of Minority and Women's Business Enterprises (OMWBE). No preference will be included in the evaluation of proposals, no minimum level of MWBE participation shall be required as a condition for receiving award of contract, and proposals will not be rejected or considered non-responsive on the basis of minority and women owned business participation.

2.6 ACCEPTANCE PERIOD

Proposals must provide sixty (60) days for acceptance by the DEPARTMENT from the due date. A proposal that does not state sixty days for acceptance will not be rejected; however, any proposal that places an acceptance of less than sixty (60) days by the DEPARTMENT will be automatically disqualified from further consideration

2.7 RESPONSIVENESS

The DEPARTMENT reserves the right at its sole discretion to waive minor administrative oversights.

2.8 MOST FAVORABLE TERMS

The DEPARTMENT reserves the right to make an award without further discussion of the proposal submitted. Therefore, the proposal should be submitted initially on the most favorable terms which the Contractor can propose. There will be no best and final offer procedure. The DEPARTMENT does reserve the right to contact a contractor for clarification of its proposal.

2.9 COSTS TO PROPOSE, NO OBLIGATION TO CONTRACT, REJECTION OF PROPOSALS

The DEPARTMENT will not be liable for any costs incurred by the Contractor in preparation of a proposal submitted in response to this RFP, in conduct of a presentation, or any other activities related to responding to this RFP.

This RFP DOES NOT OBLIGATE the State of Washington or the DEPARTMENT to contract for services specified herein.

The DEPARTMENT reserves the right at its sole discretion to reject any and all proposals received without penalty and not to issue a contract as a result of this RFP.



3. PROPOSAL CONTENTS

Proposals are requested to be submitted on eight and one-half by eleven (8 ½ x 11) inch paper, with tabs separating the major sections of the proposal.

Name, address, principal place of business, telephone number, and fax number/e-mail address of legal entity or individual with whom contract would be written is to be included.

Federal Employer Tax Identification number or Social Security number and the Washington Uniform Business Identification number (UBI) are to be included.

It is highly desirable that the proposal include references for the principals of the Contractor.

4. SCOPE OF WORK

- 4.1 The consultant will meet with identified libraries and library districts to identify capital needs. The consultant will determine the facilities back log of both historic preservation and non-historic preservation needs for each library and/or library district.
- 4.2 The consultant will travel to the identified libraries to work with facilities managers on developing the backlog of capital needs.
- 4.3 The consultant must coordinate with the Department of Commerce on assessing the local funding capacity for both historic preservation and non-historic preservation needs.
- 4.4 The consultant will prepare a draft and final report for review that identifies the backlog of capital needs by library or district, evaluates local funding capacity, and identifies the current total number for the capital needs of libraries in distressed counties.

5. COST PROPOSAL

- 5.1 The maximum fee for this contract must be \$80,000 or less to be considered responsive to this RFP.

The evaluation process is designed to award this procurement not necessarily to the Contractor of least cost, but rather to the Contractor whose proposal best meets the requirements of this RFP. However, Contractors are encouraged to submit proposals which are consistent with State government efforts to conserve state resources.

6. EVALUATION AND CONTRACT AWARD



Responsive proposals will be evaluated strictly in accordance with the requirements stated in this solicitation and any addenda issued. The evaluation of proposals shall be accomplished by an evaluation team, to be designated by the DEPARTMENT, which will determine the ranking of the proposals.

The DEPARTMENT, at its sole discretion, may elect to select the top-scoring firms as finalists for an oral presentation.

7. DEBRIEFING OF UNSUCCESSFUL PROPOSERS

Upon request, a debriefing conference will be scheduled with an unsuccessful Proposer. The request for a debriefing conference must be received by the RFP Coordinator within three (3) business days after announcement of the apparent successful contractor. The debriefing must be held within five business days of the request.

8. PROTEST PROCEDURE

Protesting of this procurement must be in writing and signed by the protesting party. The protest must state the grounds for the protest with specific facts and complete statements of the action(s) being protested. A description of the corrective action being requested should also be included. All protests shall be addressed to the RFP Coordinator. A protest can only be filed following attendance of a debriefing conference, and must be filed with the RFP coordinator within three business days of the date of attendance of the debriefing conference.

Only protests stipulating an issue of fact concerning the following subject shall be considered.

- A matter of bias, discrimination or conflict of interest on the part of the evaluator.
- Errors by the evaluator.
- Non-compliance with procedures described in the procurement document or DEPARTMENT policy.

Upon receipt of a protest, a protest review will be held by the DEPARTMENT. The DEPARTMENT director or an employee delegated by the Director who was not involved in the procurement will consider the record and all available facts and issue a decision within five business days of receipt of the protest. If additional time is required, the protest party will be notified of the delay.



CAPITAL NEEDS OF LIBRARIES RFP ADDENDUM

NOTES FROM PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE ON 5/31/2018

The following questions were posed by participants at the Pre-Proposal Conference held at the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation Conference Room. The following questions and staff responses have been annotated for

QUESTIONS

- 1) How did this project come about?
Members of the Hoquiam community have been working to obtain funding to conduct needed repairs to the Hoquiam Public Library, listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Constituents approached legislators about potential State Capital budget funding for the project. While receptive, legislators wondered about rehabilitation needs and funding capacity of other libraries in the state, particularly in economically distressed communities.
- 2) The goal for the project? How will deliverables be used?
To provide the Legislature with an informed estimate based on well researched data and information, of the capital needs and funding capacity of libraries/library districts in the state's economically distressed counties. In turn, the data will help the Legislature in crafting an approach as to how the State can best assist these communities to tackle identified capital needs.
- 3) What time horizon should be considered for the capital needs to be included in the report? Should identified needs be calculated to account for inflation?
This is undefined in the scope of work. However, well into the future (10 years at least) would be reasonable given many unknowns as to when State assistance would be available (if ever) and at what levels funding would be available. Estimated capital needs should be given in current dollar value, not adjusted for inflation.
- 4) Has DAHP notified libraries/library districts about the project so that they can be expecting to be contacted?
No.
- 5) What about libraries in leased spaces? What about fixtures/furnishings/equipment?
Yes, include in analysis even when spaces are privately owned (a shopping mall was cited as an example). Libraries may need assistance to make needed tenant improvements and purchase equipment to make the facilities functional and of value to customers (broadband infrastructure was cited as an example).
- 6) How much detail of the capital needs should be conveyed in the final report?
As much detail as needed to be responsive to the RFP. With that said, again the goal of the project is to reach a dollar value for library capital needs so a high level of detail is not important as is reaching a "bottom line" dollar value of capital needs and library



bonding capacity. The Historic Theatre's capital needs assessment completed in 2008 was cited as an example of the level of detail for historic facilities for which rehabilitation needs were broken down into broad categories such as roof, plaster, accessibility, etc.

- 7) Have you received any feedback from the preparers of previous needs assessments (courthouses, barns, theatres) as to lessons learned from those studies?
No
- 8) It is calculated that there are over 100 libraries in distressed counties which averages to about \$700 to spend to assess the capital needs of the libraries. Is travel to each library for evaluation and discuss capital needs required? Any chance that the budget could be increased?
The scope of work states: "The consultant will travel to the identified libraries to work with facilities managers on developing the backlog of capital needs." Proposals can set forth an alternative methodology that could satisfy this requirement. \$80,000 is the budget provided by the Legislature in statute and cannot be increased and the product must be completed by June 30, 2019.
- 9) For library buildings not currently identified as "historic" (i.e. listed in a historic register, determined eligible, recorded on a DAHP historic property inventory form) but as a result of a site visit could be considered "historic," how should that building be treated in the capital needs assessment? As historic or "non-historic?"
Treat as historic if it clearly meets national, state, and/or local designation criteria or contact DAHP staff for an opinion.
- 10) A question not raised during the meeting but raised by staff regards historic or non-historic library buildings no longer being used as libraries (i.e. retail, museums, offices, etc).
These buildings, whether historic or non-historic but previously used as libraries will be excluded from the study; again, the objective is to assess the capital needs of library facilities only.
- 11) How much time should be allotted for review of the draft final report?
Review of draft products and importantly a draft final report will involve circulation of draft documents concurrently to staff members at DAHP, Commerce, and others engaged with the project. While a final project timeline will be negotiated during the contract negotiation, respondents to the RFP should keep in mind that the deadline for the final report is June 30, 2019; so it is advised that drafts should be submitted well in advance of that date and account for busy schedules, the length of the document, plus recognizing that reviews may result in the need for several iterations of the draft based upon comments & recommendations of the reviewers.
- 12) How will proposals be evaluated? How will components of the proposals be weighted?
A committee of reviewers comprised of staff from DAHP, Commerce, and others involved in the project from initial stages will be provided with copies of the proposals and scoring sheets. After all scoring sheets are completed and returned, DAHP will



compile the scores. Reviewers will be convened to select the preferred proposal or decide to conduct interviews of top scoring respondents.

Proposals will be based on a 100 point scale. Of the 100 points, a maximum 50 points will be awarded for technical aspects (project approach/methodology, work plan/tasks, schedule/timeline, risk/risk management, deliverables); 30 points for project management (project team members, level of authority, and responsibilities, qualifications/experience of team members and sub-consultants (if any) related to the project scope of work, examples of relevant previous projects with contact information); 15 points for the cost proposal/budget (salaries/expenses are reasonable and appropriate for the scope of work; rates (i.e. mileage, per diem, etc.), and expenditures are directed to accomplish tasks necessary for successful product; and 5 points are awarded to providing contact information for three references (not to include DAHP or Commerce staff).

- 13) Several questions were posed to Department of Commerce staff regarding the project requirement to "include an assessment of the bonding and levy capacity of local governments/library districts to assist funding the capital needs of libraries." Noreen Hoban and Elizabeth Green-Taylor provided information and insights to these questions. One question posed was about the capacity of library staff to know capital needs and bonding capacity. Green-Taylor replied by estimating about 50% have access to facilities and/or budget staff or data who can readily provide information or recommendations. The other 50% would be small libraries with little extra capacity or resources to know or find out answers to questions.

Other questions centered on how to research/where to obtain data on local bonding and levy capacity, plus the level of expertise needed to address this aspect of the scope of work, and the level of detail needed to be included in the final report. After the meeting, Green-Taylor and Hoban provided the following tips and weblinks:

Regarding library debt and bonding capacity:

As explained in the Debt Limitations Primer and specified in the Limitations on Municipal Debt table (links below), limitations on general obligation debt (i.e., debt payable from a local government's or special district's general fund, that is, from taxes rather than revenue) are calculated as a percentage of the assessed valuation of the taxable properties within the taxing district – not on district-owned assets. Debt limitations are further divided into limits on councilmanic (not approved by the voters) and voter-approved debt.

For library districts, the statutory non-voter-approved debt is limited to 1/10% of assessed valuation and a maximum term of six years under RCW 27.12.222. Voter-approved debt (and total general obligation debt) is limited to ½% minus any non-voted debt, but may go that high for capital purposes only. RCW 39.30.010 allows additional debt only under very specific circumstances. Debt capacity at any given time equals the difference between actual outstanding debt and the debt limitation. Constitutional debt limits for all special districts is 1.5% of assessed valuation for non-voted debt and 5% for voter-approved and total debt (Article VIII,



Section 6).

Note that the GO Debt Report and the Public Debt Reports (links below) have data only for libraries that constitute separate special taxing districts, and not for libraries that are wholly owned and operated by cities or counties. For districts that reported to Commerce, the GO and Public Debt Reports also have assessed valuation data and a calculation of the percentage of debt/bond capacity used at the time of the reporting. The bond issuance data spreadsheets have a field describing the purpose of bond issuances, some may provide information on whether bond proceeds included library capital expenditures.

Links to data:

Department of Commerce's Debt Limitation Primer: <http://www.commerce.wa.gov/about-us/research-services/bond-users-clearinghouse/local-debt-limitations-primer/>

Commerce's list of debt limitations for all local government types: <http://www.commerce.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/RS-BUC-Limitations-on-Municipal-Debt-Table-2014.pdf>

Commerce Bond Users Clearinghouse GO Debt Reports (reports on local government outstanding debt – includes library district debt for districts that responded to our request for debt data) and Public Debt Reports (reports on all bonds issued by state and local governments each year as well as Excel spreadsheets that can be sorted and searched for library district bonds) : <http://www.commerce.wa.gov/about-us/research-services/bond-users-clearinghouse/reports-articles-databases/>

Department of Revenue for assessed valuation data: <https://dor.wa.gov/about/statistics-reports/local-taxing-district-levy-detail>

Link to the Bond Cap Allocation program: [Bond Cap](#): The federal government bases each state's annual Bond Cap allocation on its population.

Link to the Bond Users Clearinghouse: [BUC: Chapter 39.44 RCW](#) requires all state and local governments or their agents to submit a Bond 101 report on all debt issues within 20 days of issuance. Local governments are also required to report annually on their outstanding general-obligation debt.

Washington Electronic Business System – [Vendors by Commodity Codes](#)

Contact info for Elizabeth Green-Taylor: Elizabeth.green-taylor@commerce.wa.gov.

Contact info for Noreen Hoban: Noreen.hoban@commerce.wa.gov.

