

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)  
for

**Education/Interpretation Needs Assessment**

---

issued by:

**SKAGIT ENVIRONMENTAL ENDOWMENT COMMISSION**

**KEY PROPONENT INFORMATION**

1. Closing date for response to this Request for Proposals: **March 1, 2004**

Closing Location: same as Commission contacts listed below

2. Send four complete copies of the proposal. All envelopes should be sealed and marked "Proposal for: **Education/Interpretation Needs Assessment**"

3. Commission Contacts:

**In Canada:**

**Chris Tunnoch**  
**Skagit Commission**  
**1610 Mount Seymour Road**  
**North Vancouver, BC**  
**Canada V7G 2R9**  
[chris.tunnoch@gems5.gov.bc.ca](mailto:chris.tunnoch@gems5.gov.bc.ca)

Telephone: (604) 924-2224

**In United States:**

**Celia Grether**  
**Key Tower**  
**700 Fifth Ave., Suite 3100**  
**Seattle, Washington 98104**  
[Celia.Grether@Seattle.gov](mailto:Celia.Grether@Seattle.gov)

(206) 684-3270



## **Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission (SEEC)**

# **Request for Proposal**

**RFP Title: Education/Interpretation Needs Assessment**

### **1.0 Introduction**

#### **1.1 Purpose:**

The Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission (SEEC) seeks a contractor to do a needs assessment of education and interpretation in its service area, which is the Skagit River watershed above Ross Dam and surrounding areas that bear upon activities in that watershed. The purpose of this needs assessment is to ascertain and describe educational and interpretive programming, identification of gaps in these activities, opportunities and unmet needs; and to suggest how SEEC may contribute to the filling of these gaps in this region.

#### **1.2 Overview/Background:**

Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission was established in 1984 through international treaty by agreement between the City of Seattle and the Province of BC to "conserve and protect wilderness and wildlife habitat" and to "enhance recreational opportunities" in the upper Skagit watershed above Ross Dam. This Commission administers the Skagit Environmental Endowment Fund which finances a variety of grants that provide or maintain environmental values and recreational facilities within the watershed.

Since 1985 SEEC has funded a large number of recreation, education/interpretation, and conservation biology initiatives on both the Canadian and US sides of the international border. For 2004/05, the Commission has decided to suspend the traditional project cycle and focus on defining a more proactive role for Commission activities and expenditures of the Endowment Fund.

In order to set strategic direction for the future of the Endowment, needs assessments will be carried out in the areas of recreation, education/interpretation and conservation biology. It is the Commission's intent that each assessment will complement the others and play a critical role in identifying trends and gaps in these activities and possible future opportunities, as well as suggest how SEEC may contribute to the filling of these gaps.

It is the Commission's intent that the recommendations resulting from this RFP will assist in defining SEEC's focus for the future.

## **2.0 Scope**

**2.1 Geographic scope** – The primary study area is the Skagit watershed upstream of Ross Dam in Washington State and British Columbia. However, if unique and critical opportunities exist outside of the geographic boundary of the watershed they should be considered and identified in the outcomes of this project.

## **2.2 Objectives/ Tasks/Methods**

The successful proponent will be required to research, answer and provide direction and a trends analysis around the following questions:

1. What environmental education and interpretation programming in the lower mainland of British Columbia and the northern region of Washington State that bears on the Upper Skagit watershed (including the watershed itself), is and has been offered during the past 20 years (1983-2003)?
2. What need and potential for such programming is present in the specified region?
3. How might environmental education and interpretation programming assist in addressing problems and issues in the region and help address the goals of the SEEC?
4. What resources are present or lacking that might assist in greater levels of environmental education and interpretation programming in the region?
5. Are there political constraints on such programming, and if so, what are they? What options exist for dealing with these constraints?
6. What has been the result of the investment by SEEC and other agencies providing environmental education and interpretation programming in the region over time? How well can this be documented, and how can the result be more adequately assessed if assessment of the programs offered to date has not been adequate?
7. Has SEEC funded research influenced educational and interpretive programming in the region? If not, how might ties between these SEEC priorities improve?
8. What role can and should SEEC play in the future of environmental education and interpretation in the region?
9. How might SEEC prioritize its involvement in education and interpretation in the region?

## **2.3 Information Sources**

Information sources that should be consulted should include but not be limited to professional environmental education and interpretation associations, government agencies north and south of the international boundary, leading practitioners, and those who have received SEEC education and/or interpretation grants. Periodical and professional literature should also be examined.

Key contacts for the assessment should include but not be limited to:

North Cascades Institute – Saul Weisberg and staff  
Western Washington University - Wendy Walker, Gene Myers, John Miles  
Royal Roads University – Rick Kool  
North Cascades National Park Complex – Tim Manns  
BC Parks – Chris Tunnoch  
North Vancouver Outdoor School – Victor Elderton  
Tony Angell – recently retired supervisor of environmental education for Washington State

## **2.4 Contractor International Partnerships**

Because aspects of this contract will likely require work being done in both BC and Washington, the proponent will need to explain how this will be done most effectively. There may be the need to team with another contractor residing in Washington State.

## **3.0 Deliverables**

1) A final draft report detailing: methods of research and analysis; a matrix description of all programs in the region; advice and recommendations regarding priority areas in which SEEC could effectively direct future funding to satisfy important gaps in education and/or interpretive programming; potential costs for SEEC in terms of both dollars and staff/commission time of being involved in each recommendation. Final draft report due June 4, 2004, final report due June 30, 2004.

2) A presentation to SEEC Commissioners, alternates and staff, based on the final draft report (comments may influence the final report). The presentation will be scheduled for mid-June after the SEEC working group has had time to review the final draft.

## **4.0 Timeframe**

Proposals must be delivered to either of the Commission contacts listed on the cover sheet **on or before noon of March 1, 2004.**

## **5.0 Pricing**

Please supply estimated costs including: research, travel costs and report writing. Total pricing including fees and disbursements are required.

## **6.0 Proponent Qualifications**

The successful proponent will have:

- Considerable experience in environmental education and/or interpretation planning and program delivery
- Ability to forecast trends and opportunities for SEEC in order to fill any existing gaps and needs identified within the findings
- The ability to partner with a US based contractor if necessary

## **7.0 Submission format**

All proposals will include:

- a schedule of work broken down by task and personnel involved
- staff involved and their qualifications and experience including descriptions of past relevant work that provides substantial qualification for the work to be done; references; résumés for staff that will be participating in the contract; any other information that could be useful
- methods of work
- if using subcontractors, must include their qualifications and experience
- a budget section in Canadian and US dollars that provides details on tasks, time spent on tasks over the duration of the contract, personnel attached to tasks and their charge-out rates, travel expenditures, sub-contracts (if any), equipment, disbursements.

## **8.0 RFP Conditions**

**8.1 Evaluation Criteria** – the following criteria will be used to evaluate the RFP:

Proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-methodology</li><li>-delivery of planned activities/schedule</li><li>-supervision</li><li>-proposed project team</li><li>-clarity and scope of presentation</li></ul>
Proponent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-qualifications and experience of personnel</li><li>-past performance (previous government, private sector contracts)</li><li>-resources to complete the tasks/deliverables</li></ul>

## **8.2 Negotiation**

Negotiation sessions may be held at a location TBD, to work-out contract details and other expectations between the successful proponent and SEEC that are based on the RFP and proposal.

## **8.3 Acceptance of Proposal**

The lowest bid will not necessarily be selected.

## **8.4 Proposal Revisions**

Proposal revisions must be received prior to the RFP submission closing date and time.

## **8.5 Disclosure**

All documents submitted by proponents shall become the property of the Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission.