



City of McMinnville

To: Interested Parties – Strategy and Communications Services for
the Recreation and Library Facilities Project

From: Susan Muir, Parks and Rec Director

RE: Response to Questions Received between 3.17.22 and 3.23.22 @
2:30 pm

Date: 3.23.22

In addition to the Q&A memo issued on 3.16.22, which contained one question (Q1), fourteen additional questions have come in (Q2-15). The numbering is continuous so all together, there are 15 questions in total as of the writing of this memo. The first question and answer can be found on the bid web page here or by clicking [here](#).

Q2: Can you clarify expectations around providing cost estimates, budgets, or other fiscal information associated with the proposed scope of work?

A2: We need an hourly rate(s) and at least general estimates of cost per task.

Q3: Should the proposal include cost estimates for the polling outlined in the RFP?

A3: Yes, task 2 in the Scope of Work (p. 6) of the RFP states that we expect the community engagement to include two formal polls. Our hope is that we would have one contract for the work with one consultant. Subcontractors, or consultant teams, are acceptable.

Q4: The terms of service identifies completion of services in May 2024 and the project description describes a May 2023 general obligation bond. Can you clarify the anticipated timeline for executing the scope of work and whether activities are anticipated to continue after the measure is referred to voters?

A4: Thank you for the opportunity to clarify. We anticipate the work under this contract occurring between the signing of a contract and a measure being placed on the ballot by City Council. The City has kicked around both dates for a potential ballot measure. The staff has told City Council we could not be ready any sooner than May 2023 but that May 2024 feels more reasonable. City Council has not selected a date yet. Part of what we are looking for strategy on is the timing piece.

For this work, we have funding through June 30, 2022. We anticipate additional funding each fiscal year for this contract in order for the City to be successful when it does go on the ballot.

Q5. Is there already local interest in a PAC to promote the bond measure after the City files the ballot measure?

A5: Yes, the City Council appointed an advisory committee (known as MacPAC – the McMinnville programming advisory committee) who made the recommendation about the facility. MacPAC is a 19 member group that intends to stay active with the project. They are no longer an official city committee due to it being a temporary advisory board, but we send them regular updates and engage with several of them on the project regularly. Including, using one of the members to score these RFP submittals.

Q6. Are any of the team members who produced the "City of McMinnville Facilities & Recreation Master Plan & Feasibility Study" (2020) still under

contract? And since the Study was completed, has the City completed additional work or implementation of some of the Study's recommendations?

A6: The consultant team's (led by Ballard King/Opsis) work is done, however the staff team among the two departments, Library and Parks and Rec, continue to work on implementation strategies. Most notably, we are trying to turn the programming work we do towards the recommendation found in the first, 2020 feasibility [study](#) mentioned in the question (see p. 52 at that link).

After the [final report](#) (same consultant team) was delivered to City Council in December 2021, we have continued our work on formalizing partnerships. Discussions are happening, although no actual commitments are coming out of that work yet.

Q7. Has the City considered mechanisms that may capture funding by drawing from the wider service area, such as by forming a Parks and Recreation District? Or made progress on other funding mechanisms?

A7: Yes, but with limited success. The city currently has about a \$2 million budget gap, before adding in the new/additional operating costs with the proposed buildings. We furloughed employees in the summer of 2021 and closed some of our facilities to address the shortfall. Since then, the City Council has made finding alternative revenue sources a high priority. The two largest projects on our plate related to that are a proposed city service charge on utility bills, and a proposed fire district. The proposed city service charge was anticipated to go into effect July 1, 2022 but, due to process delays and a potential ballot measure to form a Fire District (tentatively planned for November 2022), staff anticipates that a city service charge may not go into effect until at least January 1, 2023. The proposed fire district would put our permanent tax rate almost at the state mandated \$10 property tax limit. Proposers should assume that the City will retain its current level of taxing authority. To create another taxing district, such as a Parks & Recreation District, the City would likely have to reduce its taxing authority to establish a permanent tax rate for another district, on top of the proposed fire district. The issue of districting the P&R department did come up and was

analyzed as part of the phase I study. You can find information about it on p. 77 of the phase I report (link above).

Q8: Many potential partners are named, some of which could contribute funds. Has there been any progress on partnerships— or are talks underway?

A8: As addressed in Q6 above, talks are informally underway. After MacPAC presented its report to the City Council, staff started the next round of conversations with the partners listed in the report to update them on the building and the project. Other than a 6 month Memorandum of Understanding (which has now expired) with Linfield University about one of the proposed sites, nothing has been formalized since the writing of the report.

Q9: Other than the 2014 bond for transportation improvements, when/what were McMinnville's most recent successes winning voter approval for bond measures?

A9: The McMinnville School District passed an \$89 million bond in 2016. Other than that, it would likely go back to the 2006 general obligation bond to build a new police building, which was \$13 million.

Q10: Are you anticipating that print costs for communications materials would be part of the bid, or would they be a vendor cost covered by the City?

A10: For your submittal, assume the city will cover the print costs.

Q11. The RFP calls for multiple, statistically-valid polling events. We assume that to mean traditional, phone-based surveys. Based on our experience, this can be difficult and cost-prohibitive to achieve in communities the size of McMinnville (~22,500 registered voters). Is the City open to considering alternative opinion research modalities, such as focus groups or hybrid (phone/online) survey options?

A11. Yes.

Q12. Does the City have any existing relationships with public opinion research vendors?

A12. The City used Campbell DeLong for a poll on revenue options, reported out to the City Council on May 11, 2021. We understand they have since retired. They presented the findings of that poll to MacPAC in August of 2022. Currently, the city is in a contract with Nelson Research for polling regarding the Fire District. The city is not endorsing or in any way suggesting using certain polling firm(s), particularly the ones listed here, would be advantageous.

Q13. In terms of the overall level of capital needs outlined in the RFP (recreation center, library and upgraded senior center), does the City have a rough estimate or budget range for the total cost of facilities needs?

A13. The only budget information regarding the project produced so far is what's found on p. 18 & 19 of the [final report](#). There was a finance subcommittee of MacPAC, however their work was slated to begin at the same time as the city was trying to deal with the budget deficit. For better or for worse, the subcommittee recommended to not have further detailed discussions until after that problem is addressed.

- a. Has any cost modeling (\$ per thousand, median assessed value) been produced relative to this budget estimate?

A13a. No.

Q14. From our understanding of the RFP, it does not appear that McMinnville intends to conduct formal interviews with multiple proposers. Is this correct?

A14. Correct.

Q15. Are there programmatic or other background materials, e.g. the feasibility study and conceptual design work, that you are able to share with proposers?

A15. We have attempted to post all of the background information at the MacPAC web page here: <https://www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov/macpac>

At that web page you will find:

- Agendas, videos and packets of all of the MacPAC meetings over 2 years
- Background materials (including video links to older City Council meetings where this topic was discussed)
- Guiding principles, the city's strategic plan, the phase I and final reports.
- The original 2018 Facility Condition Assessments for the buildings in the project.