Questions and Answers

Facilities Levy and Outreach Consultation Services
RFP Specification No. FI22-0011F

All interested parties had the opportunity to submit questions in writing by email to Erica Pierce, Senior Buyer by February 15, 2022. The answers to the questions received are provided below and posted to the City's website at www.TacomaPurchasing.org. Navigate to Current Contracting Opportunities / Services Solicitations, and then click Questions and Answers for this Specification. This information IS NOT considered an addendum. Respondents should consider this information when submitting their proposals.

**Question 1:** Can you expand a bit more on the recommendations for ballot measure for bonding capacity and what that scope of work would entail? Is the City anticipating a levy strategy component to this project (i.e., polling the community, messaging strategy, etc.)

**Answer 1:** This is an opportunity for the City of Tacoma in the next year to educate our community on the problem that exists, so a key part of this Scope of Work is helping educate the community on the current situation, as well as, helping get community impact on what the levy proposal would look like. The current scope of work is mainly directed to get us to an actual levy strategy and package, not necessarily to do any of the additional community work to get the levy package like an informational campaign. We would like to get recommendations first.

This is a partnership project and in other municipalities, when we look at best practices, it is the approach of getting to the levy package, how you’re engaging the community and educating them on the problem. Fire and the Library have already done work to look at their service levels and what they need in specific communities. That prep work is included in this scope of work and should be an opportunity to build community support around the levy that will ultimately assist going forward.

The City of Tacoma wants to learn more from the consultant about how polling could be leveraged but the actual polling is not outlined in this scope of work. If that’s something that the consultant would view to be helpful, and we also deem to be helpful, it is possibly something that we would look at doing separately outside of this scope of work that might ultimately help inform the package size or be included as part of the information we provide to an external steering committee to guide the work.

**Question 2:** Have you done a conditions assessment for all the facilities already? If so, is that information available?
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Answer 2: We do have a conditions assessment for our facilities, and it is available via link in the RFP document (page 6). These links are information that we shared with the City Council which included conditions for both Library and Fire facilities, as well as some General Government facilities. The assessment is a little bit old, so the data may not be up to date, but it is safe to say that the condition of the facilities has not improved.

The links on page 6 do not appear as links, but if you hover over them you will see the links present and they work if you click through.

Question 3: I had a similar question about levy strategy. It sounds like the focus is more on education and prioritization, and less on communications strategy. Are you looking for advice re: timing of going to voters? E.g. when to go to voters?

Answer 3: That is part of developing the package – to be more specific, we would need to know the size but also when we would be taking it forward. That should be included as part of the recommendations.

Question 4: The length of the contract is for three years; do you not anticipate going to ballot before 2025?

Answer 4: It is preferred to go to ballot before 2025. We are looking for recommendations of when to go to voters. The term was extended in case there was additional work that continues to other years. Part of the context for this and going to voters prior to 2025 is that in 2025, the City already has two current voter-approved funding sources that need to go back to voters and expire in that year, which are the City's Tacoma Creates program as well as the Streets Initiative.

Question 5: You mentioned polling would not be included in this effort. Maybe you'd look for input on what questions to ask in polling and other community engagement? A colleague mentioned that perhaps a related RFP was posted today but I haven't had a chance to look. Is it a companion piece of work for polling, something else, or unrelated to this effort?

Answer 5: We are not familiar with a different RFP that may have been released, but polling is something that may be useful for this effort and getting advice or feedback from the consultant on what type of questions would be helpful, what information we would need to know, what could help inform some of the stakeholder engagement
efforts, as well as community engagement efforts and how to do the size of the package are definitely things we would want input on. We have not included actual polling work as part of this scope of work, believing we would have to engage this scope of work separately.

**Question 6:** Will a list of attendees for this meeting be posted?

**Answer 6:** We typically will put out a list of folks that appear.

**Question 7:** Is it correct that the contract amount is not to exceed $150,000 or $50,000 per year for 3 years?

**Answer 7:** We do have $150,000 for this work – we do not expect that the initial scope would continue for 3 years. This scope is really created for initial recommendations at the end of this year. We want to see what is provided by respondents to the RFP for that funding or how much the work through the end of the year would cost. The $150,000 is what is set aside to get us through this scope of work.