

**SCHEDULE OF EVENTS**

<b>EVENT</b>	<b>DATE</b>
Deadline for Receipt of Written Questions	TBD, 2022
Deadline for Posting Written Responses to the State's Website	TBD, 2022
RFP Response Due Date	January 18, 2022
Intended Date for Contract Award (Optional)*	Early February 2022
*The dates above identified by an asterisk are included for planning purposes. These dates are subject to change.	

**Introduction**

The Montana Districting and Apportionment Commission ("commission") is a five-member, citizen commission created by the Montana Constitution to draw congressional and state legislative districts after each decennial census. The nonpartisan Montana Legislative Services Division (LSD) is assigned to provide administrative and technical support to the commissioners. The LSD staff use Maptitude for Redistricting from Caliper as their redistricting software. The commission must present a state legislative redistricting plan to the Montana Legislature at the beginning of the 68<sup>th</sup> Legislative Session that starts in January 2023. After receiving recommendations from the Legislature, the commission can adjust and will finalize the state legislative districts for use in the 2024 election cycle.

During the 2020 Decennial Census, the U.S. Census Bureau counted incarcerated individuals as residents of the facilities where they were incarcerated on Census Day rather than their home communities, or previous addresses.

The commission seeks to adjust the Public Law 94-171 redistricting data (P. L. 94-171 data) to reallocate incarcerated individuals from the prison facilities in which they were held to their last known residence when possible. The adjusted data will be used when the commission draws state legislative districts in 2022 and at the start of 2023. The commission recognizes that Montana is limited in our ability to complete comprehensive inmate data reallocation, due to missing residential addresses for many incarcerated individuals. The Montana Department of Corrections currently does not collect last known residence information from inmates on intake into a prison facility. As a result, the residential address information in its offender management system is derived from any address information collected from individuals who have previously been under probation or parole supervision in the community and might be old or incomplete for the purposes of reallocation. The state also does not have residential address information for federal prisoners who were housed in facilities in Montana on Census Day.

The commission seeks an experienced technical contractor to complete the inmate data reallocation process by adjusting P. L. 94-171 data for Montana’s roughly 2,829 state inmates incarcerated in seven facilities on April 1, 2020, as well as the federal inmates. Roughly 1,132 inmates have residential addresses and the remaining do not have a last known address on file or have a previous prison facility listed as the last known address. Inmates without residential addresses and those with addresses that cannot be geocoded and reallocated to their smallest geographic unit will be excluded from the Census numbers that the commission will use to draw state legislative lines.

Montana Department of Corrections operates 4 facilities that house state inmates:

- **Montana State Prison** - 400 Conley Lake Rd, Deer Lodge, MT 59722;
- **Montana Women's Prison** - 701 S 27th St, Billings, MT 59101;
- **Riverside Special Needs Unit** - 2 Riverside Rd, Boulder, MT 59632;
- **Pine Hills Correctional Facility** - 4 N Haynes Ave, Miles City, MT 59301.

Other secure facilities that housed prisoners on April 1, 2020:

- **Cascade County Regional Prison** - 3800 Ulm North Frontage Rd, Great Falls, MT 59404;
- **Crossroads Correctional Facility** - 50 Crossroads Dr, Shelby, MT 59474;
- **Dawson County Correctional Facility** - 440 Colorado Blvd, Glendive, MT 59330.

**Scope of Work & Contractor Responsibilities:**

The services must include the following tasks:

1. Perform address cleaning and standardization for residential addresses reported by the Montana Department of Corrections to prepare the addresses for geocoding and attempt to correct any addresses that were unable to be geo-coded initially.
2. Identify the Census block(s) where correctional populations were reported for each incarceration facility.
3. Geocode roughly 1,132 inmates with available residential addresses from the Montana Department of Corrections. Assign all geocoded inmate addresses to 2020 Census blocks.
4. Assign all partial or imprecise inmate addresses to smallest geographic unit possible (e.g., city/town, etc.).
5. Exclude from the total population count and specific Census blocks all remaining inmates that cannot be reallocated to the smallest geographic unit, are missing a residential address, list an out-of-state address, or are incarcerated in the federal portion of a facility.
6. Deliver a written mid-progress report to the commission when the contractor has completed 50% or more of the work required under this scope of work. The report should detail the methodology used, include a discussion of the results, elaborate on difficulties encountered, and list time spent on each step.
7. Adjust P. L. 94-171 data according to the requirements specified by this scope of work.
8. Return adjusted P. L. 94-171 data to the commission and Caliper for use in Maptitude. The dataset may only be considered to be returned to the commission when the contractor has:
  - (a) reestablished the tabular relationships between the adjusted P.L. 94-171 data and the TIGER/Line shapefiles;
  - (b) provided all of the necessary files to Caliper for upload to Maptitude; and
  - (c) rectify any problems in the underlying files if the files cannot be upload by the commission or Caliper.
9. Deliver a written final progress report to the commission. The report should detail the methodology used, include a discussion of the results, elaborate on difficulties encountered, and list time spent on each step.
10. Complete all work no later than April 1, 2022.

**Commission Responsibilities:**

- Provide contractor with inmate addresses collected by the Montana Department of Corrections as an Excel or .csv file.
- Respond to contractor questions during the contract period to ensure the contractor has the guidance necessary to complete the task.
- Verify that the dataset has been received in the proper format and uploaded to Maptitude by the contractor.

**RFP RESPONSE**

To enable the State to determine the capabilities of an offeror to perform Inmate Data Reallocation for Legislative Redistricting, the offeror shall respond to each of the following sections regarding its ability to meet the State's requirements.

Each item in each of the following sections must be thoroughly addressed. Offerors taking exception to any requirements listed in the following sections may be found nonresponsive or be subject to point deductions.

**TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR SERVICE PROVISION**

The offeror must provide a technical proposal for each of the following tasks or series of tasks described under the Scope of Work. Both technical proposals must describe the offeror's methodology used to perform each of the required services:

1. Tasks 1 through 7 and 9
2. Task 8

**IMPLEMENTATION MILESTONES AND TIMELINE**

The offeror must provide a description of the timeline and milestones it proposes to complete the work, including whether it can meet the timeline provided in task 10 under the Scope of Work. In addition, the offeror should provide an estimate of time required for each step in the Scope of Work.

## OFFEROR QUALIFICATIONS

### References

Offeror shall provide a minimum of three references using the attached client references forms. The references must be from clients that are currently using or have previously used geocoded addresses and Census data similar to the type proposed in this RFP. The references may include state governments or universities for whom the offeror, preferably within the last 10 years, has successfully completed address geocoding and merging that data to polygon shapefile or similar mapping data or tables. At a minimum, the offeror shall provide the company name, location where the services were provided, contact person(s), contact telephone number, e-mail address, and a complete description of the data provided, and dates of service. These references may be contacted to verify offeror's ability to perform the contract. The State reserves the right to use any information or additional references deemed necessary to establish the ability of the offeror to perform the contract. Negative references may be grounds for proposal disqualification.

### Company Profile and Experience

Offeror shall provide documentation establishing the individual or company submitting the proposal has the qualifications and experience to provide the specified in this RFP, including, at a minimum:

- a detailed description of any similar past projects where the contractor cleaned and geocoded residential addresses, merged addresses or points with polygons, and has worked with Census data shapefiles or similar formats, and adjusted P. L. 94-171 data, including a description of services provided and dates the services were provided;
- the client for whom the services were provided; and
- a general description of the firm including its primary source of business, organizational structure and size, number of employees, years of experience performing services similar to those described within this RFP.

### Resumes

A resume or summary of qualifications, work experience, education, and skills must be provided for all key personnel, including any subcontractors, who will be performing any aspects of the contract. Include years of experience providing services similar to those required; education; and certifications where applicable. Identify what role each person would fulfill in performing work identified in this RFP.

### Equal Pay for Montana Women

Executive Order No. 12-2016 promoting equal pay for Montana women directs the Department of Administration to include incentives in the RFP process for contractors who engage in best practices to promote wage transparency. These best practices include the following:

- a) posting salary ranges in employment listings;
- b) certifying that the contractor will not ask about wage history in employee interviews; and
- c) certifying that the contractor will not retaliate or discriminate against employees who discuss or disclose their wages in the workplace.

No, I do not agree.

Company Name (Clearly Printed): \_\_\_\_\_

Authorized Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

### Statement of Compliance with Equal Pay for Montana Women

Offeror indicating it will comply with Executive Order No. 12-2016 will receive 5% of the total points available. Offerors who do not comply will not receive the available points. Offerors are required to sign and upload a PDF copy of this certification with their proposal to certify compliance.

Yes, I agree and will comply with the best practices to promote wage transparency outlined in Executive Order No. 12-2016.

Company Name (Clearly Printed): \_\_\_\_\_

Authorized Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

### **COST PROPOSAL**

The commission's budget for this work is \$10,000. The State would like an offeror to provide the total project cost with an itemized budget along with a narrative justification.

NOTE: Exceeding the amount of \$10,000 will result in a score of zero points for the cost proposal during the evaluation.

### **BASIS OF EVALUATION**

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 1,000 points.

The Ability to Meet Provision of Services, References, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, and Oral Presentation portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth below. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth below.

### **SCORING GUIDE**

In awarding points to the evaluation criteria, the evaluator/evaluation committee will consider the following guidelines:

*Superior Response (95-100%):* A superior response is an exceptional reply that completely and comprehensively meets all of the requirements of the RFP. In addition, the response may cover areas not originally addressed within the RFP and/or include additional information and recommendations that would prove both valuable and beneficial to the agency.

*Good Response (75-94%):* A good response clearly meets all the requirements of the RFP and demonstrates in an unambiguous and concise manner a thorough knowledge and understanding of the project, with no deficiencies noted.

*Fair Response (60-74%):* A fair response minimally meets most requirements set forth in the RFP. The offeror demonstrates some ability to comply with guidelines and requirements of the project, but knowledge of the subject matter is limited.

*Failed Response (59% or less):* A failed response does not meet the requirements set forth in the RFP. The offeror has not demonstrated sufficient knowledge of the subject matter.

### **EVALUATION CRITERIA**

<b>Evaluated RFP Section</b>	<b>Weight (%) (determines aggregate points)</b>
<b>Technical proposal for service provision of tasks 1 through 7 and 9 under the Scope of Work, including methodology used.</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>Technical proposal for service provision of task 8 under the Scope of Work, including methodology used.</b>	<b>5%</b>

Implementation milestones and timeline, including provision of services by the timeline defined in task 10 under the Scope of Work.	5%
References	5%
Complete contact information provided.	Pass/Fail
Company Profile and Experience	20% Total
Company Profile and Years in Business	5%
Relevant Past Projects	15%
Resumes	10%
Equal Pay for Montana Women Certificate	5%
Cost Proposal	20%

The State shall score the cost proposal as follows:

Lowest overall cost receives the maximum allotted points. All other proposals receive a percentage of the points available based on their cost relationship to the lowest. Example: Total possible points for cost are 200. Offeror A's cost is \$20,000. Offeror B's cost is \$30,000. Offeror A would receive 200 points. Offeror B would receive 134 points ( $(\$20,000/\$30,000) = 67\% \times 200 \text{ points} = 134$ ).

Lowest Responsive Offer Total Cost      x      Number of available points = Award Points This Offeror's Total Cost

**CONTRACT**

Sample contract attached.