

CITY OF NEW HOLSTEIN

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

FORMER TECUMSEH PLANT MARKET FEASIBILITY STUDY



RFP ISSUE DATE: FEBRUARY 3, 2020

RFP CLOSING: FEBRUARY 28, 2020

RFP REPRESENTATIVE: Cassandra Langenfeld
Administrator/Clerk-Treasurer
City of New Holstein
2110 Washington Street
New Holstein, Wisconsin 53061
clangenfeld@wppienergy.org
920-898-5766



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

| | |
|--|---|
| 1.1 Introduction | 3 |
| 1.2 Definitions | 3 |
| 1.3 Background | 3 |
| 1.4 Objectives/Needs | 4 |
| 1.5 General Responsibilities of the City | 4 |
| 1.6 Project Calendar | 5 |

2.0 PREPARING AND SUBMITTING PROPOSALS

| | |
|---|---|
| 2.1 General Instructions | 5 |
| 2.2 Submitting RFP Questions/Inquiries | 5 |
| 2.3 Proposal Organization and Required Format | 5 |
| 2.4 Submitting Proposals | 7 |
| 2.5 Incurring Costs | 7 |
| 2.6 Multiple Qualifications Statements | 7 |
| 2.7 Withdrawal of Qualifications | 7 |

3.0 CONSULTANT SELECTION AND AWARD PROCESS

| | |
|--|---|
| 3.1 Review of Submittals | 8 |
| 3.2 Preliminary Evaluation | 8 |
| 3.3 Qualifications Scoring | 8 |
| 3.4 Evaluation Criteria | 8 |
| 3.5 Interviews/Presentations | 8 |
| 3.6 Final Evaluation | 8 |
| 3.7 Right to Reject Proposals and Negotiate Contract Terms | 9 |

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 Introduction

The purpose of this document is to provide interested parties with information to enable them to prepare and submit qualifications to perform a Market Feasibility Study to determine redevelopment opportunities for the former Tecumseh site located in New Holstein, Wisconsin and to guide future work at the site. The feasibility study is intended to clarify market conditions in the New Holstein area in order to understand market positioning, target uses and refine future next steps for the project.

The study should include project location, population density, customer trade areas, median household income, changing market conditions, daytime population, assessment of community need and opportunities, vehicular visibility, access and exposure, and other factors as appropriate.

The contact for this RFP will be:
Cassandra Langenfeld, Administrator/Clerk-Treasurer
City of New Holstein
2110 Washington Street
New Holstein, WI 53061
Email: clangenfeld@wppienergy.org
Phone: (920) 898-5766

1.2 Definitions

The following definitions are used throughout the Request for Proposal:

City means the City of New Holstein
CDA means the City of New Holstein's Community Development Authority
EDA means U.S. Economic Development Administration
EPA means Environmental Protection Agency
ESA means Environmental Site Assessment
WAM means Wisconsin Plan Recovery Initiative Assessment Monies
WDNR means Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
RFP means Request for Proposal
VPLE means Voluntary Party Liability Exemption

1.3 Background

The former Tecumseh property, 1604 Michigan Avenue, New Holstein, WI, has a history that dates to the 1800's where Lauson Engines was established. The company changed hands and names and increased its size to a 400,000 square foot manufacturing facility located on 40 acres of land. In the year 2000, Tecumseh Products Company employed close to 2,000 workers at the plant, manufacturing small engines. Tecumseh's business began to fail around 2006. In 2007, Tecumseh sold the plant to Heus Manufacturing; a local custom metal fabricator located about 6 miles west of the City of New Holstein. Heus utilized the facility until 2009, when their business failed, and then abandoned the plant.

Based on an engineering firm's assessment of the plant, the heating, plumbing and electrical systems are no longer in working condition. Copper has been stripped from the electrical system. The plant has deteriorated to an extent that the entire facility will be razed.

Since the time Heus Manufacturing abandoned the plant, a number of initiatives have been undertaken by the City of New Holstein, the New Holstein Economic Development Corporation, and the City's Community Development Authority. In 2011, the NHEDC, hired Vierbicher Associates, Inc. to prepare an Economic Development Strategic Plan for the City of New Holstein. The plan identified four targeted economic outcomes for the city, with reuse of the Tecumseh site as being one of them. As a result of this plan, the City of New Holstein received a \$100,000 grant from the WDNR WAM for the former Tecumseh site. The WDNR and EPA agreed that the site needed a Phase 1 ESA, Phase II ESA and a Site Investigation. The City of New Holstein contracted with Robert E. Lee & Associates, Inc. to complete the project. Phase 1 was completed in January of 2011 and a summary of the Phase II Assessment was submitted to the WDNR in January 2013.

The City obtained ownership of the property in 2017 from Calumet County. The City has obtained VPLE from the WDNR for the property. The City created an Environmental Remediation Tax Increment District (ER-TID) over the parcels in May of 2019.

The City of New Holstein would like to continue to move forward with the development of this site and is looking for a market feasibility study over the eight (8) parcels that make up this former manufacturing facility.

1.4 Objectives/Needs

The purpose of the RFP is to identify and select a consulting firm to satisfactorily accomplish the scope of services required to coordinate and complete a market feasibility study on the former Tecumseh property.

The Final Study must include:

1. Conversations with Community Stakeholders.
2. Market research.
3. Review of infrastructure.
4. Block Models. Visualize the density and intensity of development scenarios.
5. Scenario development.
6. Development comps.
7. Final Report

Outcome of the study is to provide recommendations on future uses and include a roadmap for future steps and funding sources.

City staff may require assistance in completing Performance Progress Reports and the Final Project Report as required by the EDA.

This study is made possible through grant funding by the Economic Development Administration (EDA) and the City. The project must comply with EDA requirements.

1.5 General Responsibilities of the City

Project Management: Cassandra Langenfeld, Administrator/Clerk-Treasurer, will be the point of contact for the feasibility study. She will coordinate the selection process, contract issuance and oversight, approval of invoices and payments for services rendered.

1.6 Project Calendar

Listed below are specific and estimated dates and times of actions related to this RFP. The actions with specific dates must be completed as indicated unless otherwise changed by the CDA. In the event the CDA finds it necessary to change any of the specific dates and times, it will do so by issuing written amendments to this RFP. Failure by the CDA to issue amendments to this schedule will not invalidate this selection process.

| <u>DATE</u> | <u>EVENT</u> |
|-------------------|--|
| February 3, 2020 | RFP issuance date |
| February 14, 2020 | Deadline for submissions of written questions |
| February 28, 2020 | Proposals due on or before 4:30 p.m. local time |
| March 16, 2020 | Interviews/presentations negotiate contract with selected firm |
| June 30, 2020 | Target completion date for final report |

2.0 PREPARING AND SUBMITTING PROPOSALS

2.1 General Instructions

The evaluation and selection of a consulting firm will be based on the information submitted in the proposals, plus references and any required interviews/presentations. Consultants should respond clearly and completely to all requirements. Failure to respond to each of the requirements in the RFP may be the basis for rejecting a proposal. Elaborate proposals (i.e. expensive artwork), beyond that sufficient to present a complete and effective proposal, are not necessary.

2.2 Submitting RFP Questions/Inquiries

Written questions for clarification concerning this RFP shall be submitted by email to Cassandra Langenfeld at clangenfeld@wppienergy.org no later than 4:30 P.M. local time on Friday, February 14, 2020. Written responses will be posted on the City's website no later than 4:30 P.M. local time on Friday, February 21, 2020.

2.3 Proposal Organization and Required Format

The Proposals should be typed and submitted on 8.5 by 11-inch paper and bound securely.

Proposers responding to the RFP must include the following information in the order listed herein. Proposals are not to exceed 25 pages.

(a) TAB 1 – COVER LETTER, RFP SIGNATURE PAGE: Include here any cover letter, including an understanding of scope of work included in the study objectives/needs and the RFP signature page. Provide a statement indicating an understanding of the work to be performed and interest in performing the scope of work. Submittals in response to this RFP must be signed by the person in the consultant’s organization who is responsible for the proposal submittal.

(b) TAB 2 – QUALIFICATIONS OF THE SUBMITTING FIRM AND ANY OTHER FIRMS WHO ARE TEAM MEMBERS:

The specific qualifications of the firm(s) to accomplish the work outlined should be included. Please include areas of specialization, history of firm, and philosophy for approach to work. Provide examples of specific projects undertaken by the consultant relevant to this assignment with dates, project overviews, outcomes, clients, and specific references that could comment on the quality of work should be identified.

(c) TAB 3 – QUALIFICATIONS OF THE INDIVIDUALS WHO WILL WORK ON THE PROJECT:

The proposal should identify all individuals who will work on this project, including availability and commitment of project manager and all other individuals assigned to complete scope of work included in objectives. Include a description of the primary role and responsibilities for each individual in relationship to this project, as well as noting their relevant experience and qualifications. The Proposal must identify a project manager who would serve as the primary contact with the City and explain how this point of contact with the City will work. If selected for an interview, it is expected that the project manager conduct a majority of the presentation and be able to answer most questions asked during the interview process.

(d) TAB 4 – PROPOSED PROJECT APPROACH:

The Consultants’ understanding and approach to the project is an important aspect of the RFP process. The Consultant should provide a clear and concise understanding of the project based on the information given as well as project objectives and requirements. The consultant should explain their study process, vision and approach to the project. The proposal must include the specific tasks anticipated for the project. The proposal should identify detailed descriptions of the procedures and methods proposed to complete all tasks in order to satisfy the objectives/needs identified in the required scope of work. The proposal should include their proposed strategy for public participation, such as number and types of meetings they will hold with the stakeholders.

(e) TAB 5 – SCHEDULE:

Provide a proposed project schedule. Please include proposed meetings that would be scheduled with City staff and projected target completion dates for all proposed tasks to complement the scope of work indicated in the objectives/needs. Indicate a projected project completion date and culminating presentation of the final report.

(f) TAB 6 – REFERENCES:

At least 3 references of directly relevant work must be provided, and no more than 5 references need to be provided. References must include the project name, brief description, contact person’s name, agency, phone number, their role in the project and when the work was completed. It is preferred that references are from the project examples provided in Section 2.3 (b). The City will determine which, if any, references to contact to assess the quality of work performed, and the personnel assigned to the project. The results of any reference checks will be provided to the evaluation committee and used when scoring the written qualifications.

(g) SEPARATE COST PROPOSAL:

In a separate sealed envelope marked "PROJECT FEE" please identify all your associated feasibility study costs and reimbursables for a not to exceed lump sum fee for this work. If additional or alternative efforts are recommended these should be broken out separately from the primary task. Include an itemized schedule of all expenses for each project task, including hourly rate for team members and estimated hours for each task.

2.4 Submitting Proposals

Proposers must submit One Original, plus ten (10) copies, plus one (1) electronic copy on a CD or flash drive of all material required for acceptance of their proposals on or before 4:30 P.M. local time on Friday, February 28, 2020 to:

U.S. Mail, UPS, Fed Ex, etc:
City of New Holstein
Attn: Cassandra Langenfeld
2110 Washington St
New Holstein, WI 53061

The CDA will not accept FAX or email submitted proposals. A proposer can hand deliver their proposal package on or before the date and time listed above. All qualification submittals must be time stamped by the City of New Holstein City Clerk's Office by the stated time. Submittals received after 4:30 P.M. local time Friday, February 28, 2020 local time will not be accepted.

All qualification submittals must be packaged, sealed, and show the following information on the outside of the package:

1. Proposer's Name and Address
2. Request for Proposal for Former Tecumseh Plant Market Feasibility Study
3. Proposals Due Date

2.5 Incurring Costs

The City and CDA is not liable for any cost incurred by proposers in replying to this RFP.

2.6 Multiple Qualifications Statements

Multiple qualifications from a proposer will be permissible if they are teamed with several different firms.

2.7 Withdrawal of Qualifications

Qualification statements shall be irrevocable until contract award unless the proposal is withdrawn. Proposers may withdraw a proposal, in writing, at any time up to the proposal due date and time. The notice must be signed by an authorized representative of the proposer. If a previously submitted proposal is withdrawn before the proposal due date and time, the proposer may submit another proposal statement at any time up to the proposal due date and time.

3.0 CONSULTANT SELECTION AND AWARD PROCESS

3.1 Review of Submittals

The CDA will evaluate the submitted proposals. Proposers may not contact members of the evaluation committee except at the City's request.

3.2 Preliminary Evaluation

The proposals will be initially reviewed to determine if mandatory requirements outlined in Section 2 are met. Failure to meet mandatory requirements shall result in the proposals being rejected. In the event that all firms do not meet one or more of the mandatory requirements, the CDA reserves the right to continue the evaluation of the qualifications, which most closely meet the mandatory requirements of this RFP.

3.3 Qualifications Scoring

Accepted qualifications will be reviewed by the CDA and scored against the stated criteria below. The committee may review references, and request interviews/presentations. The resulting information will be used to rate the proposals. The CDA's scoring will be tabulated and proposals ranked based on the numerical scores received.

3.4 Evaluation Criteria

Each proposal shall be evaluated on the following criteria, weighting and maximum points (out of 100), are as follows:

- **Project Approach:** Proposed strategies to meet feasibility study objectives (40)
- **Consultant Relevant Project Experience:** Overall experience of the firm with similar feasibility studies. (20)
- **Project Team Qualifications:** Abilities of project manager and staff assigned to this project, with consideration given to project experience and staffing levels. (20)
- **Schedule:** Consultant's availability to promptly begin study following the execution of the contract and identify a realistic and expeditious project schedule. (10)
- **Cost:** Quality and value of cost proposal (10)

3.5 Interviews/Presentations

Top-scoring consultants, based on the evaluation of the written proposals, may be required to have interviews/presentations to support and clarify their proposals, if requested by the CDA. The CDA will provide the date and time for the presentations once the date has been established. Failure of a consultant to complete a scheduled interview / presentation to the evaluation committee may result in rejection of the opportunity for award of a contract.

3.6 Final Evaluation

Upon completion of any interviews/presentations by proposers, the City's CDA committee will make adjustments to the scores based on the information obtained in the interview/presentation, possible reference checks, project fee, and any other pertinent information.

3.7 Right to Reject Proposals and Negotiate Contract Terms

The CDA will enter contract negotiations with the organization/business/individual selected. The final scope of the project may vary from the original proposal. If the CDA is unable to successfully conclude good faith negotiations with the organization/business/individual selected, the organization/business/individual will be notified in writing. Negotiations may then proceed with the next highest rank proposal. The CDA reserves the right to reject any and all proposals without cause or notice, and to negotiate and contract with any person, business, or proposer, regardless of scoring or ranking.